



Selected Works

**IBRAHIM**

**KAYPAKKAYA**

NISAN PUBLISHING



NİSAN YAYINCILIK  
(NİSAN PUBLISHING)

Nisan Yayımcılık-Nisan Publishing  
July 2014

# SELECTED WORKS

Ibrahim Kaypakkaya

## Table of Contents

Introduction

Forward to the Second Edition:  
"Small Groups and Great Audacity"

Kurecik Regional Report

Let Us Grasp Correctly the Red Political Power Doctrine of  
Chairman Mao

Critique of TIIKP draft programme

The Theses of Shafak Revisionism Regarding the Kemalist  
Movement, Kemalist Government Period, Second World  
War Years, Post-War and 27 May

The National Question in Turkey

The Origin And Development Of The Differences Between  
Ourselves And Shafak Revisionism

The Main Points on Which We Disagree With Shafak  
Revisionism

## INTRODUCTION

### COMMUNIST MANIFEST OF TURKEY REVOLUTION

As in all countries; there have been many revolutionist and communist leaders in Turkey (& Turkey Kurdistan), too.

Each of them contributed so much to revolution or communism struggle. They have existed in Turkey revolution history and in oppressed people's mind and heart as significant personages and will always exist.

But some of them deserve to be exceptional. Their personalities inevitably identified with revolution's political and social characters because they historically shouldered and performed duties during certain moment of history.

Their most distinguishing point of other is that they revealed political and personal country revolution's basic characteristics like finding a gem via the light of scientific socialism.

Leaders, who revealed this gem out, deserve definitely a special place in duration of history. Their names have a talismanic impact. Here, Ibrahim Kaypakkaya merits to be mentioned such a historical personage.

Kaypakkaya identified with Turkey political and social revolution's character. He achieved this by theoretical, political and organizational line he established. He became fairly the spirit of Turkey revolution. He grew early and shouldered this historic responsibility by maturing on the point that ongoing process, availability of social conditions and strong principals of the class struggle which knocked term's door as revealing necessity of a pioneering and leading power.

Controversially to resist tendency against social process and term's

stream, Kaypakkaya struggled for understanding and comprehending this stream within the objective conditions.

Forasmuch understand, comprehend, being interlaced with this stream within the objective conditions and dominating its principals is not only a formidable work but also a venturesome one. And this was built in comply with comprehending of objective world like the class, production and scientific struggles.

Kaypakkaya is a battle front opened against mind which takes scientific socialism's theoretical crops and knowledge as dogmatic heaps and absolute formulations. He adhered only to practical method as a way for true knowledge. He kept faith with historic unity of subjective and objective, theory and practice together with sutras and applying. He did not stand back to attack unexceptionally and fiercely against all kinds of ideas, ideologies and views of world which digress this method.

Kaypakkaya was just 23 years old when he pioneered and made his debut on serial of basic incidents like socio-economical reality, political and social contradictions, political regime's quality, national problem's rudiments, route of revolution, main organizing and working principles.

He put forward his extraordinary ideas for Turkey revolution which were not even considered by any other potential strugglers up to that time. After forty years, even today his ideas are valid so they deserved to be mentioned among communist classics.

In general, the official program of a party is of less importance than what a party does. But a new program is after all a banner publicly raised, and the outside world judges the party by it. (F. Engels, Letter to A. Bebel, London, March 18-28, 1875)

Kaypakkaya's inscriptions on this book consist of communist party' programmatic views of which he is founder-leader. These are developed views some of which were prepared specifically in form of thesis and some of other during polemics with revisionist streams, and they were penned to clarify basic issues of Turkey revolution. Yet

more important, our leader comrade's views are not only crops a deep comprehension in relation scientific socialism doctrines, but also hold the maturity of being grown with the class struggle line.

Kaypakkaya grew and developed an identity from the common point of revolutionist struggle in Turkey on the second half of 1960s and raising class struggle all over the world. His theses have a communist manifesto value as a result of this historical process. Today undisputedly his inscriptions, like all articles belonging to theoretical treasure of scientific socialism, could have out of dated sides with regard to actuality and they have also deficient, inadequate sides, but science progressing perspective becomes meaningful at this point.

However much the state of things may have altered during the last twenty-five years, the general principles laid down in this Manifesto are, on the whole as correct today as ever. Here and there some detail might be improved. The practical application of the principles will depend, as the Manifesto itself states, everywhere and at all times, on the historical conditions for the time being existing. (K. Marks and F. Engels, Preface to the German Edition of 1872, Manifesto of the Communist Party, London, June 24, 1872)

In fact Kaypakkaya's opinions it processed with the leadership of him for decades.

In a side objectives development, on the other hand the progress of the class struggle had tried, tested and strengthened. From the main route on this line, the fact of the classes struggle today's political line, arise and development depend on dynamics, the Communist Manifesto the main principle underlying owes. Analysis and lightening the power.

Also it is justifiable, this process international proletariat common values is enriched by the experience of worldwide. War of the bourgeoisie in all kinds of methods and tactics, forming the basis of hegemony to reproduce all the elements mechanism to run at full speed and taken all the blows of the proletariat representing forces of future. Guiding them the inevitable ideological basis form is further strengthened

For the ultimate triumph of the ideas set forth in the Manifesto Marx relied solely and exclusively upon the intellectual development of the working class, as it necessarily had to ensue from united action and discussion. The events and vicissitudes in the struggle against capital, the defeats even more than the successes, could not but demonstrate to the fighters the inadequacy hitherto of their universal panaceas and make their minds more receptive to a thorough understanding of the true conditions for the emancipation of the workers. And Marx was right. (F. Engels, Preface to the German Edition of 1890, Manifesto of the Communist Party, London, May 1, 1890)

Kaypakkaya had a short but an efficient communist life, torture continued for months, and that lasted finally, murdered by firing squad in the end after completed a historic manifesto of resistance. His communist leadership identification and his heroic resistance against enemy, the enemy did not have any other alternative only to destroy him. I should be happy, that creates the program around the party founded and fighting comrades who have created a great tradition of struggle and resistance.

That tradition of Kaypakkaya's line carried great pay to today and to tomorrow in order to reach revolution continue to grow hopes.

His followers have gathered way with the duty of practicing, developing and taking forward views of Kaypakkaya that he formulized specifically on Turkey and Turkey Kurdistan. For that reason their address have been Kaypakkaya for style of analyze and movement. Henceforth it will continue to be like this. Following in founders and developers of scientific socialism steps passes through admiration philosophy of this theory's correlation with life's material phenomena.

There can be no strong socialist party without a revolutionary theory which unites all socialists, from which they draw all their convictions, and which they apply in their methods of struggle and means of action. To defend such a theory, which to the best of your knowledge you consider to be true, against unfounded attacks and attempts to corrupt it is not to imply that you are an enemy of all criticism. We do not

regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists must develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life. (Lenin, Collected Works, English Edition, Progress Publishers Moscow, Fourth Printing, 1977, Volume 4, p. 211-212)

Kaypakkaya have been conveyer of a science, namely a spirit in the class war that we should catch by the way reaching data, comprehending truth, supplying unity of theory and practice, and comprehending method of social contradictions.

He has been a creative conveyer of communist ideology in Turkey. Namely he is a young but master student and teacher of dialectic-materialist doctrine such in the class war, social liberation process, during organizing and realizing revolution.

He is a productive private and leader of revolutionist communist line.

He is the collimating master of destructive and constructive power of masses' revolutionary spirit.

He is a triggered bullet against dogma, ossified ideas, status quo and things to be seen unchangeable.

He is a revolutionist fighter that adores himself for the sake of people, understanding today comprehensively, looking past with today's eye and with great hopes to future.

He will live forever just like his masters and leaders, just like his all immortal comrades and all private revolutionists of the revolution struggle.

May, 2014

# **Kurecik Regional Report**

October 1971

The area in which we have operated up to now is the sub-district town of K, which has 21 villages within its boundaries. The distance to the provincial capital is 70kms and the distance to the district centre is 25kms. The main road linking the centre of Eastern Anatolia to Central and Western Anatolia passes through this sub-district town. The eastern Taurus Mountains reach down to the land of this sub-district with the high peaks and ranges of the Nurhak Mountains. The sub-district is generally made up of mountains and hills, which are treeless. There is very little flat land. As befits such a hilly terrain the villages have been established over a wide area. In some villages it can take an hour to walk from one end to the other. The houses are generally next to arable land and the dwellings of those from the same family are usually close together and comprise a neighbourhood. Those who own sheep and goats also have sheepfolds in the mountain pastures. On summer days the owners of these sheds ascend to them. This is the geographical and settlement situation of the area in which we are carrying out activities.

## **SECTION 1**

### **The Economic, Social and Political Situation**

#### **A) How to distinguish the classes from one other:**

What is the criterion useful to distinguish the classes in the area? Is it the size of the land owned, or the number of animals, or the number of pear trees, or something else?

**Let us state firstly:** In this area the classes are not yet separated by sharp lines. There are almost no rich peasants (village bourgeoisie) exploiting the peasants through waged labour as we see in the Aegean and Thrace regions.

A widespread poverty afflicts a large proportion of the population (estimated at more than 90%). Within this there are of course those who are worse off, just as there are those who are relatively speaking better off.

**Secondly, let us state that:** there are no landlords, as in the Urfa, Mardin and D.Bakir plain who exploit the peasantry as sharecroppers, forced labour etc. The peasants are in general 'free' smallholders.

**Thirdly, let us state the following:** No aspect of social production has yet undergone serious development and become fundamental. That is, neither arable agriculture nor animal husbandry and animal products agriculture, nor fruit-growing constitutes the main basis of production. All the above are carried on in parallel and all appear to be of the same importance. Amongst these, arable agriculture and animal husbandry based on sheep and goats is relatively predominant, but here, as with the other categories, there is yet to be significant development. Therefore, neither the area of land owned nor the number of animals kept is on its own a correct criteria to distinguish the classes from one other.

Since the terrain is hilly and the land is infertile and arid it is almost impossible to operate modern vehicles such as tractors and combine harvesters. There is no intensive agriculture. The reason crop-producing agriculture has not developed and become the main social means of production is the unsuitability of the terrain. Even on the best land the yield rarely exceeds five to one sown ?? (\*\* explain) Therefore, even families that own more than 25 acres are unable to get by, and are forced to sell their labour. There are some families that barely make a living despite owning 50 acres of land. As they are unable to get a return from the labour they put into the land they abandon some parts of their land and do not cultivate them.

Due to the unsuitability of the land and its infertility not much value is attached to land. There is not a tendency for land to be concentrated in the hands of wealthy peasants (even if it is happening, it is exceedingly slow). The buying and selling of land, renting and sharecropping does not constitute a serious problem. Impoverished and medium peasants' offering of land in return for a loan, or sale for marriage or migration, does occur. But at least, as we have mentioned, this has not led to a fundamental concentration of land in the hands of the wealthy. Some im-

poverished peasants who have migrated have not sold their land, and have not handed it to their partners either, leaving it uncultivated.

The unsuitability of the land, secondly, is an obstacle to the extensive use of agricultural machinery such as tractors, combine harvesters and threshing machines and the use of fertilizers and pesticides, preventing significant development. As far as we know there is a threshing machine and tractor in only one village in K. sub-district. On the few pieces of arable land tractors and threshing machines are hired, but this does not happen on a large scale (tractor hire is 10 lira per quarter acre, of a threshing machine 50 lira an hour).

As for pesticides, chemicals are only used to prevent smut (10 lira a kilo) and manure is used in small amounts (110 kurus a kilo).

Arable agriculture generally consists of wheat. Despite this there are hardly any families that sell grain. As for families that buy grain the figure given by the peasants is close to 99%.

Another branch of agriculture that is of importance is animal husbandry. Sheep, followed by goats, are the most commonly kept animals. But since animal husbandry, like arable agriculture, has not developed into a commercially run, dominant branch of agriculture, the number of animals owned by peasants is not by itself a criterion to distinguish the classes one from the other. A definite distinction between, on the one hand, owners of large flocks and, on the other, semi-proletarians and proletarians who work in the care etc of these flocks, has yet to take shape. Although it is true that a section of the better off have more sheep and goats, and the impoverished have very few or none at all, there are some who are poor and sell their labour but have a large number of animals, and a small number of better off families who have no animals at all. Furthermore, since most of the peasant families own sheep and goats it is necessary to look at the number of animals owned when distinguishing the classes one from the other, but not sufficient by itself.

Another important source of income in K.sub -district is pear trees.

In the fields and the hills there is an abundance of pear trees and the peasants gather and sell the fruit. But there is almost no one who specialises in this, who works at increasing yields, who cares for and endeavours to develop this. The trees give fruit every 2 years and the peasants pick whatever they find. Some of the trees are even cut down and used for fuel. Therefore, the number of trees owned is not on its own a criterion to use in distinguishing one class from another.

In that case what criteria shall we use in order to distinguish the classes one from the other? The arable land, number of animals and number of pear trees, the three of them in total may be a correct criterion to distinguish classes, but it is not a very practical one. We therefore found it more appropriate to use a different criterion. The annual income of a peasant family gives a much clearer picture of what class the family belongs to, and is a lot easier to calculate than working out the above (amount of land, number of animals, number of pear trees.)

**Fourthly, let us state the following:** Trade is entering a little more each day into the peasants' lives. The inhabitants' most basic needs are being met increasingly by the market. Electric lamps instead of kerosene lamps and stoves instead of hearths have been obtained from the market, as have sacks, cushions, pillows and rugs that were previously made by hand. Radios, tape recorders, gramophone players and clocks have entered most houses. Tea has been a regular item on the list of articles consumed for some time. Vegetables are to a wide extent obtained from the market. Wheat grain etc. for consumption is purchased from the market. Handicrafts are being forgotten. On the other hand, products made by the peasants are being taken in increasing volumes to the market on a daily basis. The most commonly sold products are sheep, goats and pears. Smaller amounts of butter, cheese and felt are also sold. What does this mean? This means that to ever-increasing degrees the peasants are being exploited by commercial capital, and being dragged into bankruptcy and misery. While on the one hand the peasants obtain the things they need from the market, when on the other

hand they sell their products they are exploited by the livestock and pear merchants. Those amongst the peasants who are better off and have money to spare generally go into trade. The goods of the imperialist monopolies and collaborationist capitalists pass into the hands of the peasants with high commercial profit. On the other hand, for instance, pears are bought from the peasants for 60-75 kurus and sold at the market for between 200-350 kurus. This situation leads to the further impoverishment of the poor peasants, to their selling their labour more and to their proletarianisation.

**Fifthly, let us say the following:** Peasants whose income is insufficient to meet their needs are gradually becoming indebted. Banks offer very little or no credit to those who are outside the small minority of better off peasants. They therefore have to borrow money from the better off peasants. The interest of loans is on average 5% a month. In a year that makes 60%. In the second year, in the event the loan is not paid off, interest is liable on the interest. While this high rate of interest enriches a handful of usurers, the peasants who take the loans with interest, who have to take them, are gradually forced to take on a heavy burden from under which they will never recover and leads to them losing all their possessions (their land, animals, houses, etc...)

**Sixthly, let us state the following:** A majority of the peasants who are forced into misery by high commercial profits and exploited by loans with interest, end up becoming migrant workers. Most of them go to Antep, Adana, Istanbul and Antakya and work as building labourers, porters, beggars and, most common of all, as street traders. (80% of those who leave are street traders). There are hundreds of street traders from the villages in K.sub.district in the places mentioned (particularly in Antep and Istanbul). A lot of peasants have also gone to Germany, or are awaiting their turn to go. For instance, from one village of 60 dwellings there are 120 people in Germany. From another village of 200 houses there are 200 people in Germany. On average there is one member of every family in Germany. Many of the inhabitants are also

migrating to Antep, Adana, Istanbul and Malatya. There has been a considerable increase in the numbers of those migrating.

## **B) Classes and their attitude to the Revolution:**

### **Let us deal with the classes one by one**

#### **The agricultural proletariat**

An agricultural proletariat, for the reasons set out above, has not come into being. Those in the villages who have no means to make a living in general migrate (to Antep and Istanbul). The small numbers of families that remain usually graze the flocks of 5-10 households, that is, they are shepherds. We may deem them to be agricultural proletarians (apart from a section of middle peasants who graze their own animals). The most impoverished in the area are the shepherds who look after the flocks of others. Their annual income is in the region of 4-5 thousand lira. Additionally, the bread etc. of the shepherd is provided in turn by the families for whom he works.

The shepherds in our area are generally the most revolutionary elements. They are the fieriest advocates of the armed struggle. Most of them suffered the persecution of the commandos and were beaten in the gendarmerie posts for feeding Sinan Cemgil and his companions. But the shepherds put up a stiff resistance and did not give in. They were also promised large sums of money if they told where Sinan and his companions were, but these people, who do not have two coins to rub together, refused without hesitation. They know the terrain extremely well. They know caves and hiding places that are not on military maps. The shepherds will make a significant contribution to the peasant armed struggle.

**Impoverished peasants:** Families with an annual income between 5 and 15 thousand lira in general come into this category. (An increase or decrease in the number of individuals in a family can slightly change these boundaries). They make up the majority of the peasant popula-

tion. The land of impoverished peasants is generally in hilly and stony terrain. Those who had land in flat, fertile places have had to abandon these lands to usurers on account of being unable to pay loans they had taken out on these fertile fields. Since they are unable to afford chemical fertiliser their yields fall year on year (they use dried animal dung as fuel instead of wood).

All the poor peasants leave their homes to work on a seasonal basis. Those from this class who work as building labourers, porters, street traders and beggars constitute the majority of the population of K.

A section of the poor peasantry works as farm labourers on the land of better-off families. The land owner provides the seed and the peasant **share cropper** sows, reaps and brings in the harvest. The wheat and straw is then shared half and half.

A section of the poor peasantry also reaps the field of others at harvest time (upper middle and well off peasants). In return they receive wheat corresponding to the amount of seed sown. The impoverished peasantry constitutes the majority of those who migrate to the cities. They work in particular in Antep as porters, woodcutters and as workers in flour mills etc. Most of those going to Germany are also from the impoverished. The peasants say: "If it wasn't for Germany most of them would die of hunger."

The poor peasants are unable to benefit from the Ziraat Bank or the Agricultural Credit Cooperatives. In order to get 200 liras in credit they need to expend lots of energy and visit many offices. Most of them cannot get any credit whatsoever. Since conditions of life are worsening by the day paying off these loans is another worry. There are virtually no poor peasants who do not have a debt to several local usurers, grocers etc...The usurers do not give loans to impoverished peasants without land or livestock.

This layer feels a strong desire for revolution and the armed struggle, and turn up their noses at all manner of reformist and bourgeois views. They are the force on which we will rely in rural areas. Their

destiny and liberation has definitely and irrevocably united with the destiny and liberation of the proletariat.

**Middle Peasantry:** Families with an annual income of over 15 thousand lira in general come into this category. They either have relatively good land, have 50-60 animals, or have both a piece of good land and a number of sheep. A section also has two oxen, one or a few cows and a donkey or a mule, too. Another section, while having little or no land or livestock, possesses an amount of money. The situation of those who have returned from Germany, of minibus owners, or of grocers and similar in the town, is like this. They are also considered middle peasantry. Some of them lend money with interest; some of them buy land etc...In the city and some go into commerce. Middle peasant families are the second most numerous groups after the impoverished peasantry. But there are a lot fewer of them than the poor peasants. Those families that have returned from Germany, and were previously poor peasants, have joined the ranks of the middle peasantry, creating an increase in their numbers. The medium peasants generally work their own land. There are some who employ poor peasants, but they are in the minority. Several families that own livestock get together and employ a shepherd, while a small section graze their own animals. Again, some middle peasants with a small amount of land work as share cropper on the land of better off middle peasants or wealthy peasants.

Middle peasants are unable to benefit sufficiently from the Agriculture Bank or the Agricultural Credit Cooperatives. Depending on the amount of land they possess they are able to obtain between 500 and a 1,000 lira in credit. They are also unable to purchase enough fertiliser on account of the high cost. For this reason many owe money to local usurers. There who are better off have less or no debt. They are able to save what is surplus to their needs every year. A section of the middle peasantry with high incomes, but who also owe money with interest, is in a worse situation than middle peasants with less income but no debts with interest.

For instance, a peasant earned 35,000 lira from land elsewhere, but his family owe 70 thousand plus interest. Their situation is therefore worse off than a family whose annual income is 15-20 thousand lira but has no debts.

Most middle peasants are street traders in Antep, Adana and Istanbul. They do not perform jobs such as portering, wood-cutting, labouring in the construction sector or begging. These jobs are for the impoverished peasants.

Due to the increasing cost of living and worsening of conditions of life the majority of middle peasants are becoming poorer, while the better off minority are endeavouring to join the wealthy peasantry.

The lower section of the middle peasantry and the impoverished peasantry together constitute the overwhelming majority of the peasant population in the area. The lower section of the middle peasantry wish for a revolution. They are gradually feeling more deeply and grasping the reality that their liberation will come through the armed struggle. They are suspicious of reformist views.

The upper section of the middle peasantry is also sympathetic to the revolution. However, this section does not think it feasible that workers and peasants will succeed with an armed struggle. They tend to succumb to bourgeois reformism. They are very curious to learn whether there are officers in the military that support us and pin their hopes on them. They see the ruling classes as stronger than they are and the people as weaker. These views are prevalent particularly amongst those who have a good chance to join the ranks of the wealthy peasantry. In the future, when the revolutionary wave swells up this section of the middle peasantry will join the ranks of the revolution, having freed themselves of indecision.

**Wealthy Peasants:** The annual income of this stratum is generally above 40-50 thousand lira. The annual income of a section is around 100 thousand lira. The number of wealthy peasants is very low, not exceeding 1% of peasant families.

In general they possess the most fertile land in the village in which they reside. They also own the areas with plentiful water that are suitable for growing vegetables. Most of them have at least 50 animals, some have more than 100. They also have at least 20-30 thousand lira in money-capital. Some have more money, but not as much land or livestock, while others have more land and livestock, but not as much capital.

Those who own land that is flat work their land with a tractor. A section works the land jointly with middle and poor peasants.

Some of the wealthy peasants have gone into commerce: they own land, premises, etc. in towns, or sell wool, butter, cheese etc. Or engage in smuggling. The biggest opium smuggler in the area is a rich peasant with the most capital.

The wealthy peasants are able to benefit from fertiliser and credits from the Agriculture Bank and Agricultural Credit Cooperatives.

Local usurers emerge from amongst the wealthy peasantry. A section of the wealthy peasants endeavour to increase their capital by lending money at high interest rates to the impoverished and middle peasants (and even to the lower section of wealthy peasants).

Those who exploit and bankrupt the poor and lower section of the middle peasants are wealthy peasants engaged in usury. Some of these borrow money from the bank at 3-4 percent interest and lend it out to the peasants at 60% interest, according to the peasants themselves. Compared to the usurers of the Aegean and Thrace regions they are modest, since the richest of these only has capital of around 250 thousand lira. There is another difference to the usurers of the West. Whereas those in the West seize tobacco, cotton, sunflowers, milk and other crops in return for loans and interest, those here take money and interest. However, they do usurp the land and livestock of those unable to pay back their loan, as the market for crops with a value is not developed in this area.

Since revolutionary ideas are increasingly spreading to the area, a

section of the wealthy peasants that sense the smell of blood in the upcoming armed struggle, feel the need to say with appropriate words that they sympathise with the revolution and shed tears for revolutionaries who are gunned down, in order to safeguard their futures and also to free themselves from the pressures of the poor and middle peasants who enthusiastically support the revolutionary struggle.

Those who are openly opposed to the revolution do not make this obvious. They oppose it in roundabout ways. "Can one oppose the government? If you do that's what will happen," they say. Since they are scared of the reaction of peasants they cannot inform on revolutionaries active in the area.

Those in the middle say: "I can't see this succeeding. But it's a shame for these young people who die and are tortured. They duped the youngsters and sent them to their deaths." According to most of them it was Ismet Pasha who deceived the young people and put them in the firing line.

At an advanced phase of our revolutionary struggle some of these (the lower segment of the wealthy peasantry) will be dragged along by the momentum of the revolution, others will try to sit on the fence, while a very small number (in particular the large usurers) will openly oppose the revolution.

**Landlords:** These are no landlords in the area today. According to the villagers there were persons that might be called 'agha' in the past. However, their authority over and exploitation of the peasants stemmed from their cruelty, religious authority or their descent from a large clan (or their economic power) rather than their ownership of large amounts of land. They were a kind of local despot in the villages in which they dwelt.

They would take crops and property and even wives from the peasants by force, and put them to work as they wished solely in return for food. They would send those they didn't need to perform military service and not send those they needed. Even now villages are called by

their names, e.g servant of.... These 'aghass' and their descendants have one by one disappeared as a result of the struggle of the peasants and their own competition and quarrels between themselves and their clans. The last agha remnant was killed by another 'agha' in 1956 on account of competition. In this way the concept of 'agha' was consigned to history. The children and relatives of these 'aghass' remain, but they have absolutely no authority over the peasants. Moreover, economically they are in the same boat. Despite this they still think of themselves as 'agha' and act pompously, looking down on the peasants and the revolutionary struggle. But no one takes any notice of them.

### **C) The class struggle in the area and the level of political consciousness of the peasant mass:**

Now let us review the situation of the class struggle waged by the peasants in the area in question and the level of their consciousness.

The revolutionary past of the area in which we are active stretches back to Ottoman times. According to information we have received from elderly peasants, in the final years of the Ottoman period up to 40 peasants rose up against the oppression of village aghas and the Ottoman state and established armed bands in the mountains. The members of these groups were all impoverished peasants who were employed by the aghas. As long as they did as they were told and served their lord they were not sent to do military service, but as soon as they refused to bow to the orders of the agha they were labelled as 'military fugitives' and the authorities were informed. The bands from time to time raided the aghas' houses and also resisted the state forces.

After the War of Liberation the persecution of the 'aghass' continued. The impoverished peasants, in particular, continued the occupation of slavery under the agha's whip which they inherited from their fathers. The aghas and the state competed with each other to oppress the impoverished people. This persecution tried the patience of the peas-

ants. The heads of the clans that oppressed the people, from time to time channeled the people's anger at state oppression for their own ends. For instance, there was a rebellion in the area after the founding of the Republic, led by the owner of Kasimoglu village and a leading clan member, Kasimoglu Mehmet Ali. He declared independence, taking the people from 4 or 5 villages with him. When state forces surrounded the area he only lasted 2 hours. Kasimoglu and 3 of his companions were executed and the people were tortured.

In the Republican period, as stated above, the 'aghass' vanished one by one as a consequence of the struggle of the peasants and inter-clan conflict. By the 1950s the 'aghass' were no more. Since 1967 in particular the revolutionary spark which is spreading to rural areas has affected the area in which we are active. Peasants in the area have organised many marches and rallies for democratic rights, striking fear into the hearts of the ruling classes with the revolutionary slogans they chanted. Some peasant leaders have even been imprisoned on account of these actions.

Two of the martyrs of revolutionary youth are from this area. Their deaths have inflamed the anger of the people. Furthermore, the merciless gunning down of Sinan and his companions by the oppressor forces of the ruling class has deeply affected the people.

Revolutionary ideas, the desire for revolution and the armed struggle and political awareness have spread and developed in the area in an unexpected way.

Of the 21 villages in the area, 5 or 6 are Sunni and the rest are Alevi. In almost all the Alevi villages religious pressure has been reduced to zero. The state of 'dede's [note necessary regarding Alevi culture] who 20 years ago had people kissing their feet is pathetic. It is impossible to find a dede who does not say: 'I'm a revolutionary'. Since the people know that they give the appearance of being a revolutionary on account of popular pressure, they see them as fake and do not show much respect to their utterances.

In Sunni villages the effect of religion is still strong, with a persisting influence of religious teachers and reactionary religious men on the people. The Sunnis in the area are in general backward and reactionary, whereas the Alevis play a progressive and revolutionary role. We shall not dwell on the reasons for this here, but let us point out that local reactionaries and state forces are doing all they can to degenerate the class struggle of the peasantry by turning it into an Alevi-Sunni conflict. They are endeavouring to incite the Sunnis against the Alevis and in this way pit the oppressed and exploited peasants one against the other. The reactionary religious men in particular label 'revolutionary thinking' as 'kizilbaslik', [note necessary regarding origins of term 'kizilbas'] trying to deceive the peasants by saying: 'look, it's always the kizilbas that hold these ideas, this business is kizilbas itself' and unfortunately the majority of the Sunni toilers is still taken in by this. But the Alevis are not in general affected by this. They say: "it's a mistake to make a distinction by saying Sunni, Alevi, Turk, and Kurd", this struggle is poor against rich, whatever their origin all the impoverished must unite." Twenty of the 21 villages where we are active are Kurdish. All the Alevi villages are Kurdish, but it is not possible to find even the tiniest trace of Kurdish nationalism in the area. On the contrary, the 'Turkicisation' policy enforced by the ruling classes has been quite successful, leading to the emergence of "Turkish nationalism", even amongst the Kurds. Since the majority of the population is impoverished Kurdish and Alevi, they have become accustomed to the yoke of a triple oppression over hundreds of years (economic, national and religious persecution). The state forces of the dominant ruling classes that are the main enforcer of oppression have succeeded to a certain degree in instilling fear in the people. This fear is particularly noticeable amongst the elderly, who are extremely reluctant when it comes to the subject of the armed struggle. The crushing of the Kasimoglu and Dersim uprisings and the subsequent brutal torture of the people is one of the reasons for this extreme caution.

At this juncture we should also make the following point: the fact that some of the local inhabitants have gone to Germany, and that others hope to go, has to a slight extent quietened the revolutionary anger of the people. On the other hand nearly all the poor peasants, in particular the youth, are united on the subject of armed struggle. Amongst them are some who are prepared to sacrifice everything and join the struggle immediately.

Primary school pupils and even 4 and 5 years olds see themselves as revolutionaries, saying in their broken, Turkish: 'I'm a revolutionary, I'm a socialist'; while they raise their left fists into the air.

Most of the young women, brides and daughters feel a strong sympathy for the revolutionary struggle. They sing laments for dead revolutionary youth and shed tears. They admire and respect the companions active in the area. Some of the young girls are even not considering marriage, in order not to create an obstacle to their joining the armed struggle in the future.

Even at this early stage of our revolutionary movement in the area it is possible to observe hundreds of concrete examples of how revolutionary ideas have taken root and flourished amongst the impoverished people.

#### **D) Summary of the chapter and conclusions:**

##### **These are the main economic, social, and political characteristics of the area in which we are active:**

1) Commercial capitalism in the area has developed rapidly in recent years in particular. Just as the goods of imperialist monopolies and collaborationist capitalists are penetrating the villages, the produce of the peasants is also increasingly being carried to the market. This development has led to the merciless exploitation of the peasants by imperialist monopolies, collaborationist bourgeois and many middlemen merchants, and resulted in their being driven to bankruptcy and misery.

2) On the other hand, social division of labour has yet to be realised in production; that is, a system where on the one hand there are land or livestock owners who buy labour and on the other workers and semi-workers who make a living by selling their labour, has not come into being. In particular there is not yet a branch of production producing for the market. Capitalism is at a very backward and primitive level. Wealthy peasants are only now becoming a reality and they exploit the peasant mass by means of lending money with interest, not through waged labour, and become wealthier in this way.

3) The impoverished and middle peasantry faces national and religious oppression in addition to economic persecution. The people have for years heroically resisted oppression on all three fronts, passing through significant struggles.

4) The broad peasant mass (impoverished and middle peasants and even the lower section of wealthy peasants) who are exploited to the very marrow by high commercial profits and interest on loans, constitute the forces of the Democratic Popular Revolution and are rapidly taking their places in the ranks of the revolutionary struggle. The usurers, a section of wealthy peasants, profiteering merchants, reactionary religious men, corrupt, bribe-taking officials, and, indirectly, collaborationist large capitalists and US imperialism, are the enemies of the peasants and constitute the ranks of the counter-revolution.

5) In the area in which we are active local authority is almost non-existent. There are no local reactionaries with their own private forces of bully boys who oppress the peasants, as in the Urfa, Mardin, Diyarbakir plain. The reactionaries perpetuate their dominance over the peasants by relying directly on state authority (gendarme, commando, police and military). Therefore, a policy of 'destruction of class enemies' in order to seize power cannot be the fundamental policy in this area. The struggle for power has to be waged directly against state forces (that is, the central authority)

## Section 2 Revolutionary activity in the area

### A) The activities and influences of Bourgeois and Petit-Bourgeois groups in the area

None of these groups have carried out serious, lasting and fundamental revolutionary activity amongst the peasants in this area.

Apart from election speeches the Workers' Party of Turkey (TIP) [note necessary] has not been active, which is not only the case here, but is also the same in other areas. While in the past TIP received significant numbers of votes the party's current influence on peasants is almost nil.

With the disappearance of the influence of TIP the views of Mihri Belli [note necessary] began to spread amongst the villagers by means of the youth. The Mihri Belli group has also not carried out serious and lasting activity in the area. Neither propaganda, nor agitation, nor setting up organisation...Mihri Belli himself, apparently, went to the area a few times, made contact with a few peasants, but did nothing apart from giving them the good news (!) that revolutionary officers would soon stage a coup. On one occasion he apparently told the peasants that a 'military coup was imminent'; adding that they should keep their ears glued to the radio at night!

The activities of youths connected to the Mihri Belli group consist of calling occasional meetings and propaganda work of a temporary and reformist nature. Organising the peasants for armed struggle has not even crossed their minds. From this viewpoint, although as a movement the M. Belli group has not much influence the effect of their ideas still exists in some circles, but is of a kind that can be easily erased.

The Kivilcimli group has no activity or influence in the area.

The most well known and influential group in the area is the THKO, in particular Sinan Cemgil's group. The arrival of this group in the spring of 1971 in the mountains of this area, their launching of, in

their own words, 'rural guerrilla', their going hungry and sleeping in the cold and suffering 3 fatalities, had a profound effect on the people longing for armed struggle and plunged them into sadness. The peasants saw Cemil and his companions' movement as the concrete expression of their yearning for armed struggle. The majority of the people consider that Cemgil and his companions died for them. This summer, village women who had gathered after the death of an elderly person took the opportunity to wail a lament to Sinan, Niyazi, Battal and Cevahir and shed tears until the evening. Newly born children have been given the name Sinan. Along with this the influence of the THKO on the people consists of a distant sympathy and has not been transformed into something organised and lasting. The THKO's organisational formation is not a clear and disciplined one, it is anarchic. It has neither a programme nor party rules, and no ideological unity is required from those who join its ranks. They consider everyone who joins as one of them and a member of the organisation. Such an organisational form cannot be lasting and so it has been proved. The feeling of the majority of the people for the Deniz-Sinan group is not support for their organisation and political line, but one in favour of the revolution and armed struggle in general. There are no more than a handful of peasants who are bound to the organisation and its political line. Furthermore, the defeat of the THKO movement has made many peasants feel the movement was on the wrong path. Many of their supporters amongst the youth are undecided or have joined other groups. The advanced peasant revolutionaries in the area say that Sinan's grouping set out without consulting the people that they concealed themselves from the people and behaved erroneously in doing so. Most of the people agree that they should have stayed in villages, not in caves in the mountains, and, working clandestinely, given the people ideas. The armed struggle would then have commenced once the people were prepared for it.

Some of the peasants spent days unsuccessfully searching for them in order to assist or join them. Those who did succeed in finding them

were warned (!) by Sinan and his companions: 'it will be better if you don't talk to us.' The peasants do not think this was a correct attitude.

The criticisms of the peasants are entirely correct. Sinan and his companions really did avoid the people. Absolutely no efforts were made to encourage the people to join the struggle. They just visited a few houses in order to procure bread and to sleep. The assistance rendered by the peasants was entirely down to the efforts of the peasants. What is the reason for these shortcomings? The mistaken nature of Sinan and his companions' ideological and political line. Their reliance on a coup by bourgeois officers and on bourgeois reformism. They thought the revolution (!) would achieve success with an officers' coup, not the armed struggle of peasants and workers. They were merely to prepare the ground for such a coup. They therefore did not consider it necessary to organise the peasants, nor did they feel a need to do so. Even though they had no organisational link, ideologically the line they most approved of and adopted was the revisionist, reformist line of M. Belli. Many events, from their activities to debates on giving up arms following the 12 March coup [note necessary], to their testimonies in court, everything confirms what we are saying.

It will be useful to grasp this point: even a movement this cut off from the masses can affect the people and earn their affection, by taking up arms against the coercive forces of the ruling classes.

The THKP-THKC is not active in the area in question and has no influence. We do not know if they are working in the provincial capital, but it is highly likely that they are active amongst the youth, since it is evident that they are relatively influential amongst high school students and some educated persons.

#### **B) The activities and influence of our communist movement in the area**

Two comrades were sent to the area in the month of ... There had also previously been a few propagandist visits there. Correspondence

was taking place with a few individuals and the Isci-Koylu newspaper was being sent to some peasants. The great majority of the peasants, including a section of the most advanced elements, was unable to distinguish the communist movement from the bourgeois and petit-bourgeois cliques, and looked at them all in the same way. A section of peasants who had participated in previous rallies and demonstrations and were aware of the splits in various well-known currents, were in general opposed to our movement. In the city it was almost entirely isolated amongst the youth. While our mistakes have contributed to this, the class character of those opposed to us is also a factor.

The first comrade to be sent to the area in order to carry out lasting activity had stayed there previously. However, neither the first time nor on the second occasion was he able to accomplish serious activity. The reasons for this are both the comrade's personal shortcomings, inexperience and lack of initiative and our movement's lack of a clear action programme and perspective regarding the conducting of activities in village areas. Furthermore, there was no possibility in those days of supervising the tasks allotted.

The second comrade was sent to the area at the beginning of July. A young peasant was immediately recruited. In this way a three-person committee was constituted and this committee was made responsible for all activities in the area. The first comrade was appointed secretary and it was explained in detail to him several times what his duties entailed. However, it proved impossible to supervise these tasks at the time. The reason for this was that the comrade who needed to check up had to take on a huge amount of work on account of a shortage of cadre. It was subsequently ascertained that by August nothing concrete had been done. The reasons for this are as follows:

1) All three comrades have no experience of clandestine work among peasants and lack initiative. They understand being clandestine as concealing yourself from the people.

2) The negative effect on the peasants and the comrades created

by the raids carried out in the area in the spring by Martial Law.

3) The inability of our movement to supervise the allotted tasks and the limited possibilities to issue instructions to the comrades in time and to follow these up.

When it was established that it had not proved possible to carry out serious activity with these three comrades the decision was taken to send a more experienced comrade to the area. At the beginning of August the first comrade was removed and sent to another area. The second comrade was alone for a while. The removal of this comrade, too, was considered, but this was not done as the comrade corrected his mistakes by his own initiative and efforts, making links with many progressive peasants. This activity both developed the comrade and, by enlarging his circle, increased his possibilities in the area as regards shelter and settling in the area.

The comrade distributed revolutionary publications the *Shafak* newspaper sent to the area extensively (previously, in order for secrecy (!), we learned, he had hidden the publications from the advanced peasants). He made links with many sound, determined, perceptive and talented impoverished peasants, gaining their affection and support.

Following this initial step in the work, a more experienced comrade was sent to the area. The work was reviewed and errors ascertained. The most significant error was this: the comrades had to a great degree neglected to explain in a language that the mass would understand, that we represented the real communist movement in Turkey, and the differences between ourselves and the bourgeois and petit-bourgeois cliques. It is true that they had set out in general terms the policy of our movement at all times during propaganda activities, but they had not criticised the crucial mistakes of the revisionist and adventurist cliques in clear, decisive language, citing the names of these cliques. They thought "For now the political awareness of the masses is insufficient to grasp those differences," thus in reality falling behind the masses. For the peasants, while not able to grasp the profound theoretical basis of

the errors which we criticised understood by looking at the practical consequences and made this clear at every opportunity. We were unable to organise and win over sound elements to our organisation on account of this error, which has been corrected. Now we have supporters amongst the peasants and educated people who grasp and definitely adopt the policy of our movement, and their number is gradually increasing. One comrade has recently been recruited and there are several who are ready to be recruited. Many peasants are also working in various ways for the movement. For instance, we make use of their addresses for correspondence and rendezvous, hide publications and other items that need to be concealed in their houses, conveying various publications to others with their assistance. We give a section of them the task of organising a group and reading clandestine publications together. We also gain shelter to a great extent by means of the assistance of the peasants etc.etc.

Through our activities we have now ascertained the most advanced peasants in the area. We have distinguished to a certain degree the good from the bad, the brave from the cowardly, the self-sacrificing from the selfish, the discreet from the talkative, these with belief from those without, the hard-working from the lazy, the modest from the braggart, the talented from those without talent, etc. We know, again to a certain degree, who we can make use of and who and to what extent we can trust. In the coming days we shall do the following:

- 1) We shall train the advanced and reliable elements and organise them around tasks that are appropriate to their talents and the needs of the movement.

- 2) We shall test those persons regarding whom we have not yet reached an opinion by allotting them various tasks.

- 3) We shall endeavour to get to meet those advanced, reliable peasants ( in particular the impoverished) who are 'respected figures' and whom we have as yet not met and bring them into the movement.

- 4) When our movement reaches a certain level of development in

the area in question we shall extend our area of operations towards a new area. We have not yet been able to be active in the provincial capital. We are yet to receive any news regarding the comrade we requested to come and organise the youth. The person we previously considered giving the task left everything and fled. There exists one organised person in the city. This comrade was indecisive and hesitant when it was proposed to give him a previous task; he subsequently failed to turn up to a rendezvous. It has since then not proved possible to meet him, both on account of volume of work and the fact that he is very well known to the police. At the first opportunity the position of this comrade will be resolved: he will either be given a task, or in the event of his persisting in his indecisiveness his connection with the organisation will be severed.

Let us add that the activities we have carried out in the rural area have also influenced the provincial capital. Close to a hundred students from villages in our area attending high school have been influenced by our movement and begun to show an interest in our line.

Moreover, by means of our acquaintances in the villages the opportunity has emerged to create broad possibilities in the city. The chain of isolation from the youth has been broken. We now have an urgent need for an experienced comrade to organise the potential in the city that is moving towards our ranks and to secure our communication with other parts of our movement.

### **C) Summary and Conclusion of Second Section:**

In the world in general and in our country in particular the revolutionary struggle is developing rapidly. The growing and deepening economic and political crisis in our country has created and matured the objective conditions for armed struggle. In our area the conditions for armed struggle are particularly apt.

Although with the defeat of Sinan and his companions the persecution and oppression of martial law has cowed the people to a certain

extent, it has also created the conditions for the sprouting of the most correct revolutionary 'ideas'. Now the people grasp this reality better with every passing day:" the revolution cannot be accomplished with bourgeois officers or a small group of educated people acting separately from the people. It is necessary for the exploited and oppressed people to take up arms themselves. Revolution is a serious business that needs thorough preparation and great self-sacrifice."

We believe that if we possess and constantly protect the qualities needed by a communist movement, our movement will rapidly develop and put down roots and flourish amongst the popular masses. For the people resemble soil that is ready for sowing. We must be seeds that are sound and ready to flourish.

*A letter to administrator comrades  
in a rural area*

7 December 1971

Comrades! There are a lot of cadres who wish to work in the villages. They all have a common characteristic: they are politically backward and inexperienced, but at the same time are hugely enthusiastic. We should boldly mobilise these companions in rural areas. But it is not enough merely to mobilise them. At the same time we have to offer them correct leadership and to train them. The number of our comrades who are politically advanced and relatively experienced is strictly limited. This is one of the problems that emerge when we send backward and inexperienced comrades to the villages. That is, how will the small number of advanced and partially comrades lead and train a large number of backward, inexperienced comrades?

On the other hand, the content and form of our activities in rural areas has changed rapidly since our split from Shafak revisionism. Forms of armed struggle, armed propaganda and methods of agitation have replaced 'peaceful' propaganda and agitation. The attitude of the ruling classes to revolutionary activity in general, and to revolutionary activity in rural areas in particular, has also changed considerably. The ruling classes are launching ferocious attacks in order to prevent revolutionary activity in rural areas and to eradicate existing activity. On receipt of the tiniest scrap of information they mobilise large forces of hundreds and thousands of troops to go after one or a handful of individuals. For this reason it is no longer possible, particularly in the villages, to carry out 'peaceful' propaganda and agitation. We therefore have to arm the cadre we send to rural areas and bring them to a position where they may respond with arms to the armed assaults of the ruling classes. Furthermore, the difficult conditions of the terrain also render it essential that we arm the cadres, even though our arms and material strength are strictly limited. This is the second problem we encounter when sending new comrades to the rural areas. That is, how will we arm a large number (this figure is increasing by the day) of comrades with our very limited possibilities?

Comrades! I assume that as new comrades arrive, these two prob-

lems must concern you, too. But these are not unresolvable unmanageable problems. I believe that if we address these problems in a conscious way, determined to resolve them, we will be easily able to overcome them.

I'm considering the following in order to resolve the first problem:

1) A minimum of several politically advanced and experienced comrades should be given tasks in every guerrilla area, this has now been done.

2) Within groups active in second degree areas in guerrilla areas there should be at least one advanced and experienced comrade. If this is not possible then the advanced and experienced comrades in the guerrilla area should supervise the groups in the second-degree areas in a strict and systematic way. They should allot tasks and demonstrate how these tasks should be accomplished, and check up on whether these tasks have been carried out or to what degree success has been achieved. In this situation a great responsibility falls on the advanced and experienced comrades. In the circumstances in which we find ourselves, in particular, they must work ten times, a hundred times harder, at the same time backward and inexperienced comrades must be assisted in developing their own initiative.

3) The inexperience of backward comrades will, through the practical struggle, turn into experience. But this is insufficient. Our cadre should have a deep theoretical grasp in addition to vast experience. They must be politically advanced and mature perceptive understanding individuals. They should be able to correctly assess their experiences. They should learn to put into practice M-L-M tse-Tung thought; should possess correct and sufficient views regarding all questions of our revolution. They should be able to comfortably advocate and spread the line, policy and programme of our movement. In order for this to happen, advanced and experienced comrades must make special efforts to raise the political and ideological level of backward and experi-

enced comrades. They also have to do this for their own development. Following the split from Shafak revisionism, an error emerged as a reaction to their rightist line that consisted of reading. Ideological and political education has been neglected to a certain extent. Importance has not been attached to it. **We must rapidly embark on political and ideological education training tightly bound to practical activity. For this in my opinion the following must be carried out: a central publication that propagandises our programme, policies and line, and sheds light on the various questions of our revolution must be produced as soon as possible. A decision has already been taken in this regard.**

Immediate preparations must be made to print, duplicate and distribute this publication in your area and you must complete these preparations in a short time. Secondly, **you must organise discussions amongst the cadre at which experiences are summarised. A lively discussion environment must be created in our ranks, mistakes must be constantly removed, correct things must be adopted, and exchange of experience must take place.**

Thirdly, Marxist-Leninist works which are the synthesis of the revolutionary experiences of other countries should be read and discussed within a programme appropriate to the aim of shedding light on our practical activities.

In the event of our implementing all the above mentioned, both our general level will rise, and, in particular, backward and inexperienced comrades will progress rapidly and become experienced cadre.

I'm considering the following in order to resolve the second problem, the arming problem:

1) Existing arms and materials should be distributed in an appropriate way amongst cadre.

2) Our arms and equipment should not be misused, wasted, broken or treated in a cavalier fashion. They should also not be allowed to fall into the hands of the enemy or lost.

3) In order to arm on a broad scale we should make use of these two sources: firstly, popular support; secondly, seizure from the enemy. Popular support can be in two forms: donations that are not to be returned and assistance rendered on a temporary basis. We must ascertain all those in the area who might donate arms, ammunition, explosives, fuses, detonators etc., and make maximum use of these. Secondly, we must establish those who might give us arms on a temporary basis and make maximum use of them, too. I assume that we will be able in this way to make significant use of peasants' breach-loading rifles. When it comes to arming by seizing weapons from the enemy, this may happen in two ways: firstly, cadres and sympathisers in appropriate situations may take the enemy's military equipment, ammunition, explosives etc., secretly and get them to us. For instance, workers employed in road-building and certain construction sites may provide us with abundant explosive material. Cadres and sympathisers within the military may procure various kinds of military equipment in the same way. Those working in laboratories and pharmacies may obtain various poisons and explosive materials.....

All these will of course only serve our arming to a certain degree. We can resolve our problem regarding arms in a fundamental way by seizing them by force from the enemy. In order to do this there is a need for a minimum level of arming. We may achieve this in the ways set down above. In particular we may make broad use of weapons lent to us on a temporary basis by peasants. If we add to these our own small number of arms and equipment we shall have attained a minimum level of arming. Following this, we may arm in a broader way by establishing targets proportionate to our strength, attacking these targets and seizing money and arms. If we can obtain appropriate intelligence we may be able to procure money and arms with much more primitive weapons. Also, some peasants will join our ranks with their own weapons.

If we can do all these things I believe that we will be able to deal with the problem of arming our existing cadre and the new cadre that are joining our ranks every day.

**Another problem is that of our cadres becoming expert in the field of military activity. At present we should do the following:**

1) There are comrades in every area who are pretty experienced as regards preparing and using explosives for sabotage and booby traps and dismantling and reassembling and using and maintaining our existing weapons. These comrades must personally train new and inexperienced comrades in an ordered and systematic way, demonstrating how it is done.

2) On the subject of arms and explosives a text should be prepared containing practical information, that is, information that we may implement, and be conveyed to all comrades. The first draft of such a document has been prepared. Comrades should improve this text by adding various information and experience (a previously distributed text is full of mistakes and should be disregarded).

3) Fundamentally, we will all learn how to fight by fighting. Therefore, all comrades and other fighters should review all manner of experience in the military sphere, removing errors and adopting correct practice. The conclusions of experiences should be shared between comrades.

4) The revolutionary war experiences of the peoples of the Soviet Union, China, Vietnam and other countries should be examined and the necessary lessons drawn. In particular, **Military Writings** by comrade Mao Tse-Tung should be a fundamental work to which we refer in these examinations.

5) The military policy and tactics of the ruling classes in Turkey should be examined and learned as far as possibilities permit.

6) The past struggles of our people, their successes, shortcomings, weaknesses etc. should be examined from a military viewpoint and the necessary lessons learned as regards the present day.

As our struggle advances and in parallel with successes achieved we shall find the possibilities to put our cadres through both theoretical and practical military training (effective training). Today we are to

a great degree lacking these opportunities. But in the event we evaluate properly the more important possibilities we do possess, there are many reasons for our winning military victories.

**Comrades! After all this I propose the following for your area:**

1) Taking into account the new comrade we have dispatched, group the cadre in an appropriate way.

The new comrade has significant experience amongst youth. His ideological and political level is high, but he has no experience amongst the masses. We shall soon send comrade F. to you. Let F. work with H. Also, we are in a position to send new cadre to you. Calculate now how you will mobilise them.

2) Share your experiences with the new cadre. Inform them regarding how and what they will do. Make a work programme for each group.

3) Give the new cadre the necessary information regarding arms and explosives. Teach them how to prepare and use explosives.

4) In order to arm all the cadre in the area utilise all existing possibilities. The goal is for all cadre to have a long-barrelled weapon.

5) Immediately manufacture a large amount of bombs and distribute them amongst the masses. The peasants may be mobilised to a great degree in the making and use of bombs and in sabotage and booby-trapping.

6) Prepare at least one clandestine shelter for each guerrilla unit (each unit should number between 2 and 7 persons.). It would be a lot better to have more than one.

7) Prepare a place you consider appropriate in your area for the installation of a duplicating machine and allot a person to operate it. Teach the person how to operate it. Store large amounts of stenciling paper, duplicating paper ink etc. at or near the site of the machine. Let only the operator and the responsible party cadre know these places. In short, prepare everything in order to print. One of the com-

rades we are sending knows a more practical way of printing. You too can make use of this method.

8) For now prepare a clandestine library. This should be like the shelters and be big enough to work in. All the books, publications and correspondence should be preserved here in an ordered way. When needed they may be taken but after use should be returned. As our books increase in future we should create such libraries in every area.

9) Again, in every area at least one clandestine depot should be prepared and abundant supplies of food, clothing, bedding, military materials and raw materials used in the preparation of military equipment stored there.

As much as is possible the least number of comrades should know where these depots and library are. New cadres who have not been tested, and regarding whom it is not yet clear whether they will stay, should never know the whereabouts of such sites. Each group should only know its own shelter, not the shelters of other groups.

10) For inter-group meetings and other gatherings separate sites should be prepared apart from the shelters.

Comrades! We must complete the above preparations in as short a time as possible. To be able to embark upon prolonged guerrilla activity, be able to win lasting success and march with certain steps on the path of armed struggle is to a significant extent dependent on our having completed these preparations.

Salutes, success. I kiss you on the eyes,

**Ismail**

**N.B:** When M. calls you let him know how to find you, for soon we will also send F.

**Let Us Grasp Correctly the Red Political  
Power Doctrine of Chairman Mao**

January 1972

Comrade, my main objections, criticisms and statement on the replies you have given to a youth committee's questions are as follows:

Firstly, let us look at what conditions Mao Tse-tung laid down for the survival and development of red political power in China (that is, of a few small areas under red political power entirely encircled by the White regime). In a draft resolution dated 5 October 1928 Mao Tse-tung prepared for the Hunan-Kiangsi Border Area Second Party Congress after writing that "**Red Political Power can exist and develop only under certain conditions**" (Mao Tse-Tung, Why is it that Red Political Power can exist in China?), he listed these conditions thus:

**First**, it cannot occur in any imperialist country or in any colony under direct imperialist rule, but can only occur in China which is economically backward, and which is semi-colonial and under indirect imperialist rule. For this unusual phenomenon can occur only in conjunction with another unusual phenomenon, namely, **war within the White regime**(...) Such a phenomenon is to be found in none of the imperialist countries nor for that matter in any colony under direct imperialist rule, but only in a country like China which is under indirect imperialist rule.(...)

**Second**, the regions where China's Red political power has first emerged and is able to last for a long time have not been those unaffected by the democratic revolution where the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers rose in great numbers. In many parts of these provinces trade unions and peasant associations were formed on a wide scale.

**Third**, whether it is possible for the people's political power in small areas to last depends on whether the nation-wide **revolutionary situation** continues to develop... If the nation-wide revolutionary situation does not continue to develop but stagnates for a fairly long time, then it will be impossible for the small Red areas to last long... Actually, the revolutionary situation in China is continuing to develop with the continuous splits and wars within the ranks of the comprador and landlord classes and of the international bourgeoisie.

**Fourth, the existence of a regular Red Army of adequate strength** is a necessary condition for the existence of Red political power.

**Fifth...** the Communist Party organization should be **strong** and its policy correct." (ibid)

If we summarise, Mao Tse-tung links the reasons for the survival of small areas under red political power encircled by the White regime to the following conditions:

- 1) The White regime being in conflict (on account of it being a semi-colony,
- 2) The existence of a sound mass base,
- 3) The development of the **revolutionary situation** nationwide,
- 4) The existence of "a fairly strong" and "regular" Red Army,
- 5) The existence of a strong communist party with a correct policy.

Mao Tse-tung summarised these conditions in an article dated 25 November 1928 (written after the other) entitled "Struggle in the Chingkang Mountains":

"We find on analysis that one reason for this phenomenon lies in the incessant **splits** and **wars** within China's comprador and landlord classes. So long as these **splits** and **wars** continue, it is possible for an armed independent regime of workers and peasants to survive and grow. In addition to these **splits** and **wars** (ibid), its survival and growth require the following conditions: (1) a sound mass base, (2) a sound Party organization, (3) a fairly strong Red Army, (4) terrain favourable to military operations, and (5) economic resources sufficient for sustenance."

Mao Tse-tung did not mention here one of the conditions he saw as necessary, the condition of the "nationwide development of the revolutionary situation". But he says the following immediately after these conditions:

"An independent regime must vary its strategy against the encircling ruling classes, adopting one strategy when the ruling class regime is temporarily stable [this also implies a stagnation of the revolutionary

situation] and another when it is split up [this also means the upsurge of the revolutionary situation]." (ibid)

Subsequently Mao Tse-tung explains other strategies. The conclusion to be drawn here is that a red political power (that is, an existing power) **may maintain its existence** even if the revolutionary situation does not develop nationwide and if it stagnates, **as long as the other conditions exist and a correct strategy is pursued**. That is, the revolutionary situation's stagnation for a time does not end its **existence**. Such a thing will only slow down the development and expansion of the red political power and at worst lead to **partial** regression. In China, independent regimes survived even in periods when the White regimes were stable when correct strategies were pursued, while defeats and losses were suffered when mistaken strategies were followed. In the present day it cannot be said that in any semi-colony (or of course in colonies) White regimes will be stable for very long. The revolutionary situation is excellent both as regards the world and for individual countries (with certain exceptions). This is a **typical** characteristic of our era in which imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing towards victory all over the world.

Let us continue:

In his second article, Mao Tse-tung added two more conditions for the survival of red political regimes within the White regime. Terrain favourable to military operations and economic resources sufficient for sustenance. If we summarise once more:

- 1) Splits and wars within the White regime,
- 2) A sound mass base,
- 3) A sound party organization,
- 4) A fairly strong Red Army,
- 5) Terrain favourable to military operations,
- 6) Economic resources sufficient for sustenance.

Subsequently, Mao Tse-tung's view regarding the impossibility of independent regimes being established in colonies under the direct dom-

ination of imperialism (that is, regarding the necessity of there being war within the White regime in order for a red political regime to emerge and survive) changed. The shaking of the imperialist system worldwide following the Second World War, the weakening or collapse of all the imperialist powers except the USA and the strengthening of the Soviet Union, all these factors:

“meant that it became possible for **all colonies in the East**, or at least in some of them, to establish small or large revolutionary bases and revolutionary regimes that would endure for a long time and to launch protracted revolutionary wars from the rural areas encircling the cities and then to capture the cities and achieve nationwide victory”

The emergence of social imperialism in the Soviet Union was unable to alter this factor. Hence, in many Far Eastern countries red regimes have either been established or are close to being established. There are also liberated zones in the Arab Gulf and in some parts of Africa. Even though red political regimes have not emerged, there are liberated zones in some countries.

As a general rule we can say that:

Today in all oppressed and exploited countries (colonies or semi-colonies) in areas where these conditions exist - 1) a sound mass base, 2) a sound party organization, 3) a fairly strong Red Army, 4) terrain favourable to military operations and 5) economic resources sufficient for sustenance, red regimes that will endure for a long time may be established and from there protracted wars may be launched to seize the cities and gradually establish nationwide victory.

From the point of view of our country it is these five conditions that need to be examined.

1) **A sound mass base**: we shall certainly not seek this in the entire country. In some areas of our country this mass base is stronger, and in others it is weaker. This, alongside other factors, is a natural manifestation of unbalanced economic development. But in many regions of our country a sound mass base exists. In these areas where the other condi-

tions are present red political regimes may be brought into being and developed.

2), 3) a **sound party organization and a fairly strong Red Army**:

These do not yet exist in our country. But a sound party and strong army are necessary conditions for the founding, survival and development of red political power. This should be stressed. Not for the launch of armed struggle. “A **sound** party organisation” and “**fairly strong** red army” will emerge within the armed struggle. That is, while the party is weak it will **gain strength** within the struggle. The armed forces, while previously weak, small and irregular, will become “fairly strong” and “regular” within such a struggle. And the areas of red power will not be established in a moment, but will **emerge** within a process of struggle when the party attains a level of solidity and the armed forces become “fairly strong” and “regular”. It is contrary to Mao Tse-tung’s theory of revolution and line of people’s war to draw the conclusion of delaying the armed struggle when at the outset a “sound party organisation” and “fairly strong red army” are sought and cannot be found.

4) **Terrain favourable to military operations**: although this is not a determining factor, there are many regions and corners of our country that are suitable for armed operations.

5) **Economic resources sufficient for sustenance**: this means that even when an area is under economic blockade economic life may continue and the people in that locale may be able to meet their necessities with their own resources. That is, the people in the area must not be reliant on other regions to meet their needs and have unbreakable ties with the internal market. For instance, places like Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir have unbreakable ties to the internal market. People residing there have their needs met to a great extent from other places and the products of these places are to a great extent consumed in other places. In the event of these cities being encircled and placed under economic blockade economic life would be paralysed and it would become impossible to find food and shelter. In that case the **areas where red regimes may endure**

may be backward areas that are as yet not an indispensable part of the internal market. The backward rural regions of our country fulfil this condition to a great degree.

So in that case what is the conclusion we should reach as regards our country? It is that in our country some of the conditions (a sound mass base, economic resources sufficient for sustenance and terrain favourable to military operations) for the emergence and survival of red political power have existed for a long time. What is lacking are “a sound party organisation” and “a fairly strong red army”. These two conditions are subjective ones, that is, things that will be realised by our efforts. **Our task is to ascertain the rural areas that have economic resources sufficient for sustenance and terrain favourable to military operations, and to construct the party and army within the armed struggle by intensifying our activities and concentrating our forces in these areas.** Within this construction activity when the party attains certain solidity and when our armed forces attain a certain strength and regular state “red political power” will come into being in one or more than one area of the country. And only after red political power has been established in certain areas of the country will it be possible to unite all the revolutionary classes and strata for the proletariat and its party, that is, to establish the people’s revolutionary united front (the front established on the basic worker-peasant alliance).

The conditions for the emergence and survival of red political power should not be confused with the conditions for the launching of armed struggle. While for the reasons we have mentioned the conditions for the former do not exist in our country today, for the latter they essentially do exist. After a **short period** of agitation-propaganda activity and organisational preparation in the rural areas we select (for instance, organising the party’s directive structure, constituting the initial nuclei of guerrillas by means of this and a short agitation and propaganda period regarding the armed struggle and party policies) we can and should immediately launch the armed struggle. We should not forget that this

struggle will awaken and educate the masses in a massive way, not only in that area, but will awaken the masses in other areas of the country and strengthen the mass base, the party and armed forces essentially being constructed during this struggle and that red regimes will emerge at a certain stage of this struggle.

Dear comrade,

In your article you dwell upon the following five conditions for the emergence and survival of red political power:

- 1) “Splits within the reactionary regime”
- 2) “Peasant uprisings”
- 3) “The nationwide development of the revolutionary movement”
- 4) “Regular red army”
- 5) “A strong communist party following a correct policy”

When Mao Tse-tung says “the White regime being engulfed in war” as regards the **first condition**, he means the continuing armed struggles raging between **warlords**, not the natural and inevitable contradictions that are seen in every country amongst the reactionaries. Anyway as we said he later abandoned this view. For this reason there is absolutely no need to address this at length, and to take up the natural and inevitable contradictions that are found in almost all countries (different from those in China). The long explanations found in this section are not in any way a direct response to the questions of colleagues; rather they are a very indirect answer.

**As for the second condition:** the essence of the matter has not been correctly set down there, either. Mao Tse-tung dealt with past (he took up the recent past) peasant uprisings from the point of view of the existing mass basis. That is, the crux of the matter is whether there is a strong mass base today, whereas in the article the peasant uprisings of the Seljuk and Ottoman periods are listed. And no link is made between these rebellions and the fundamental question. The following could have been said: there exists today a strong mass base in the areas where these rebellions took place; uprisings took place in such and such a place and

since its inheritance still endures in the future red areas will emerge essentially in these places. This was not said (As for me, I lack the information to say such a thing) and therefore all the historical events mentioned do not go beyond an exhibition of historical knowledge or a subject of propaganda pertaining to peasants having a revolutionary tradition. It would have been much better if instead of that, recent peasant movements had been dealt with and if it had been said that a strong mass base exists there and examples given of the existence of a revolutionary mass base that will realise, develop and expand red political power. And this would have been the answer required by the question asked.

**Third point:** “nationwide development of the revolutionary movement”.

Mao Tse-tung’s expression is: “nationwide development of the **revolutionary situation**“. Replacing “revolutionary situation” with “revolutionary movement” in my opinion leads us into a serious error in present conditions. What is the “revolutionary situation”? 1) the ruling classes becoming unable to govern as in the past; 2) the popular masses no longer being able to live as they had in the past and seeing **change as imperative**; 3) A massive upsurge in independent actions of the masses.

These are, according to Lenin, “the objective conditions of the revolution” and are “independent from the behest of individual classes, just as they are independent from the behest of individual groups” (for detailed information see Aydinlik, volume 3, pages 379-380). As for the “revolutionary movement” it is in general a **progressive** movement aiming **to overthrow** the existing order. As for the article what is meant by the words “revolutionary movement” is the “communist movement”, one of the revolutionary movements. In this way, “communist movement” replaces “revolutionary situation”. And consequently, this is what emerges: if the communist movement has not organised **nationwide** Red power cannot be established. Since comrade Kazim previously used the words “a party organised **nationwide**“ instead of “a **sound and cor-**

**rect party**” when summarising the Chinese Revolution I am dwelling on this point. Why is this point important? In this respect: we are not a movement which is organised nationwide today. (Comrade Rustem claims we are, but he is wrong). If this were the case there would be no problem. We cannot organise nationwide in a short time (or even in 3 to 5 years). This is the first point. Secondly, as the revolution in our country will develop in an unbalanced way we do not want a widespread nationwide organisation. We attach importance; or rather we should attach importance, to those areas in particular where the revolution will first rise. In the article as a whole since the conditions for the “commencement of the armed struggle” and the conditions for “the emergence of red political power” are seen as the same, or at least as no differentiation is made between them, logically the armed struggle is postponed until there is organisation in the whole country (that is, to an unspecified future), and today “the other forms” of the struggle are being produced for us. This is what is serious.

As for the question of the development of the “revolutionary situation” nationwide, firstly, this exists in the whole world and particularly in our country. The stable periods of the “White regime” are very short and temporary. Secondly, as I have demonstrated with a quote from Mao Tse-tung’s subsequent article, it is a factor that influences whether it will expand and whether it will get stronger, **not the actual existence** of red power. There is absolutely no relation between the things I have written here and the things in the article. Totally different questions are dealt with in the article, and they are not an answer to the questions of the youth committee.

(Let me mention another point here: the communist movement being organised nationwide is, in my opinion, the organisation of party organs, which is party committees, in every corner of the country, in every or most provinces and districts. Inconsistent expressions are being used on this question. For instance, in an article the phrase “a revolutionary political current that can make itself heard nationwide”

is used. This is another thing. For instance, the THKO and THKP-C are not political currents that are organised nationwide, but are currents “that make themselves heard nationwide”. And then there is: “The uniting of the struggle **nationwide** and its direction towards a single goal”. If what is meant by this is not “political orientation” but the “orientation of the popular struggle”, then this, as far as I understand it, necessitates nationwide organisation and this is something that will only be possible in the period when the revolution is advancing to victory. Let us not forget this.)

Let me point out another very important question of **principle** in this section: the sentence below states:

“A movement being nationwide... is a political party **making its presence felt and heard** to the **entire people of the country** and **orienting** to the goal of establishing revolutionary power nationwide.”

(This is a very vague and elastic expression. It may lead to very various interpretations. I have mentioned the question of “making your presence felt (or heard)” above. As for the orienting to the goal of establishing revolutionary power nationwide, this is a characteristic of almost all political movements. I am moving on).

“For instance, a **peasant movement** without the support of the struggle **in the cities** is bound to be suppressed. For instance, a **peasant uprising** in the Eastern region, if it were not supported by a struggle of the peasants in the Aegean and Cukurova regions and a working class movement in our main industrial cities under the leadership of a proletarian party **it could not realise red political power.**” (ibid)

Here there is an important error of **principle**. Peasants may establish and perpetuate red political power solely **with their own forces**. Even if the reactionaries establish absolute dominance in all of the “main industrial cities” and completely suppress the working class movement for a long period, the peasants may still establish and perpetuate red political power, and this is not an impossible thing. In this case to declare a peasant movement to be “bound to be suppressed” is equivalent to

presenting the revolution as impossible from the point of view of the future, just as it leads to a rightist error such as not firing a shot until there is organisation in the main industrial cities. The suppression of worker movements and the breaking off of solidarity between workers and peasants will of course weaken peasant movements but why should it make them “bound to be suppressed”? **Didn't the Chinese revolution advance triumphantly** even in periods when the reactionaries were able to dominate in the cities and silence the workers for a time?

Hence, the following conclusion is reached:

“In conclusion we can say that red political power may be established and perpetuated, **not by a limited** struggle, but by a proletarian party that **has united and directed** the struggle **nationwide**“ (ibid)

In other words, without nationwide organisation and becoming able to “unite” and “direct” the struggle of the entire people we cannot establish red power. For goodness sake, let's not raise a hand. It is as if the red power in question here is not one of political power to be established in one or more areas, but political power to be established in the **entire country**. Consequently, we see that the reality that the revolution will develop in an unbalanced way and the thesis that power will be attained piece by piece from the countryside has been largely abandoned.

I say this: it is not a **condition** in order for red power to be established and perpetuated (not for the armed struggle) to be organised nationwide and for all the people to be united and to be directed by us. Mao Tse-tung did not lay down such a condition either. This is a good thing, but it is something we will not possess until we are in the period of the revolution advancing towards victory. Whereas by concentrating our forces in three to five important areas (as far as our forces and circumstances permit) and launching the armed struggle there we can create “a **sound** party with a **correct** policy” and “a fairly strong red army” (and this is what is lacking today) and establish and perpetuate red regimes. And even in periods when the struggle of the working class is entirely suppressed (although this is an adverse situation) we can per-

petuate these regimes on condition of pursuing a correct strategy. For instance, let us take the Dersim rebellion. The peasants controlled the region for three years solely by their own efforts under the leadership of the feudal leaders. If the clans hadn't been pitted one against the other and if there had been a correct leadership, a communist party leadership, the Dersim uprising could never have been suppressed. This is what the peasants say and there are other similar examples.

Fourth and fifth points: Party and army. In the article these points have not been dwelt upon and a single sentence for each has been considered sufficient. Where, how and within which struggle will the party and army be constructed? And in particular in this period what are our tasks on this question? These have not been dealt with at all, whereas these are what is lacking for red power and in the event of our constructing the party and army in the areas where the other conditions exist (mass base, economic resources sufficient for sustenance, terrain favourable for military operations) we can establish red power (of course the party will not **only** be constructed in these areas, but it will be **primarily** constructed there and within the armed struggle).

I will mention two points regarding the answer to the first question and then move on to the other question.

**Firstly:** the contradictions within the army should not be dealt with separately; they should be dealt with as a manifestation of contradictions between social classes. We will pretty soon be creating a new class called "patriotic officers" For a long time now in all our leaflets, pronouncements and publications we put "patriotic officers" in the top corner wherever we mention "workers and peasants". It looks as though this has replaced the old term "'military civil intellectual class". The people we call "patriotic officers" are people who have adopted national bourgeois ideology and will be categorised amongst them. Let us deal with the question of the national bourgeoisie and when necessary approach the "patriotic officers" as part of the national bourgeoisie.

**Secondly:** "the right of the Kurdish people to self-determination".

Let us abandon this Bukharinist formulation and say "the right of the Kurdish nation to self-determination".

Since time is short I am moving on to the answer to the second question.

When examining this question it is necessary in my opinion for the following three points to be clearly emphasised:

- 1) What is the nature of change in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries that are under the indirect administration of imperialism?
- 2) In general the imbalance in a country's economic structure.
- 3) The difference between a national revolution in a country under imperialist occupation and a democratic revolution, the essence of which is a land revolution, in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries.

**First point:** in the article there is one sentence. In issues of *Aydinlik* too there is no clarity in articles on this question. In general there is the following: "on the one hand feudal relations will dissolve, on the other hand this dissolution will be limited." It is not clear in practice what this means. What happens is this: the system of landlords slowly and within a long process turns into one of capitalist farms and meanwhile feudal domination and forms of exploitation continue for a long time. Even when a peasant working on his landlord's land becomes a waged worker some of the privileges the former landlord and new "gentleman farmer" enjoyed (such as extra work without pay) continue as a tradition. As for the peasant style or revolutionary mode, with a strong peasant revolt it will overthrow feudal property and demolish feudal relations.

On the other hand, in areas where there is not the system of landlords and instead where small and medium landholdings are widespread, in self sufficient patriarchal enterprises imperialism on the one hand ties such places to the market, and on the other by strengthening usury, which is a primitive form of capital accumulation, through banks and credit institutions deprives the peasants of land and this process is a severe and bitter one.

In the cities national industry is dying and being replaced by assembly industry bound to imperialism which is developing. Large commercial and financial institutions are entering the control of imperialism. For these reasons the collaborationist capitalism developed by imperialism can never sort out "peasant style" feudalism. And as long as feudalism is not rooted out the **peasant mass** will remain as a significant revolutionary force and the content of the revolution will remain as a democratic revolution.

**Second point:** A significant characteristic of semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries is the **unbalanced** nature of the country's economic structure. While in some regions feudal relations will dissolve to a greater extent, in others they will retain their force. Imperialism, rather than removing this imbalance, heightens it. Such a situation exists in our country with regard to the west and the east. Even if in the more advanced sections of the country the democratic revolution is of little significance for the general peasant mass (but with us even in the most advanced Aegean region this still has significance) for the broad peasant masses in backward regions it will still retain importance.

As long as the democratic revolution is on the agenda the question of reliance on the peasants will also be on the agenda. This is because the democratic revolution is in essence a peasant revolution. Besides, we live in a country where the peasants constitute 70% of the population today. It is a totally Menshevik logic to say let imperialism liquidate feudalism and let us carry out the socialist revolution. The Mensheviks opposed Lenin, saying the democratic revolution is the task of the bourgeoisie, let's allow them to carry it out, let us not frighten them by going to the head of the peasantry. As for Lenin, he advocated the proletariat immediately forming an alliance with the peasantry, pushing to one side the indecisive, hesitant bourgeoisie, completing the revolution in a determined way and carrying on without pause to socialism. This is the Marxist-Leninist theory of continuous and phased revolution. Mao Tse-tung adapted this to the conditions of semi-feudal, semi-colonial China.

There are two reasons why revolutions in semi-feudal, semi-colonial countries like ours develop from the rural areas towards the towns. Firstly, the fact that the democratic revolution is, in essence, a land revolution, and secondly, the fact that imperialism and the reactionaries who are their lackeys (particularly imperialism) have taken complete control of the cities and advanced regions. Since we are a semi-colony of imperialism, the imperialist yoke renders it necessary that the revolution develop by establishing bases in the countryside and develop towards the cities (with us the democratic revolution and national revolution are fused into one).

In a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country the weakness of feudalism will decrease the tasks of the land revolution or limit its boundaries, that is all.

Third point: in a country under the actual occupation of imperialism, too, the revolution will develop from the rural areas towards the cities, whether it is a backward country which has not got rid of feudalism or a developed capitalist country. For instance, France in the Second World War. This is because imperialism will firstly gain control of the cities and main roads. But it cannot control the broad areas of the countryside. But in this situation the essence of the revolution is the "national revolution", not the land revolution. If the country under occupation is at the same time a semi-feudal country then the "land revolution" does not entirely vanish, but becomes secondary. If it is a capitalist country like France, then there is no question of a land revolution.

My brother,

My time is running out. I do not have the chance to write another copy of the other letter. I'll take it with me for now and send you a copy as soon as I get the chance.

**Revolutionary greetings**

**Bektas**

**January 1972**

## **Critique of TIIKP draft programme**

January 1971

Communism's great leader and teacher Marx said:

"Every step forward, all real progress is more important than a dozen programmes."

These words are of a quality of a timeless law that never loses their value! Our main goal must be to take steps forward, to ensure genuine progress. On the other hand, we must not forget that a new programme is of the utmost importance.

"Generally speaking, less importance attaches to the official programme of a party than to what it does. But a *new* programme is after all a banner planted in public, and the outside world judges the party by it." (Engels to August Bebel in Zwickau)

We are now hoisting a flag to the skies. If this flag etc. (see page 180)

With this aim we have criticised the Draft Programme.

## SECTION 1

**"In order for it to be scientifically correct and in order to contribute to the political consciousness of the proletariat, what should the name of our party be?"**

Lenin asked this question in 1917 and answered it thus

"We must call ourselves the *Communist Party*—just as Marx and Engels called themselves. We must repeat that we are Marxists and that we take as our basis the *Communist Manifesto*."

We must also give such an answer:

As Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao did we must give ourselves the name **communist party**. We must adopt the adjective communist without hesitation. But this is not enough, for firstly, there is a revisionist bourgeois club in our country that uses this glorious name. We have to absolutely differentiate ourselves from this club. Secondly, most of the parties that have taken the name communist have today found themselves sunk in the morass. These are bourgeois parties, not

proletarian parties. They are vehicles of the counter-revolution, not the revolution. These parties in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are not the vehicle of the proletarian dictatorship over the bourgeoisie and reactionaries, but of the bourgeois dictatorship over the workers and other toiling people.

We must definitely distinguish ourselves from them and also use the adjective Marxist-Leninist.

First let us dwell on the other names:

Why is the name **Revolutionary Worker-Peasant Party erroneous**? Because it does not make clear our real character and ultimate goal. We are a working class movement, its vanguard. Not a peasant movement. The current concrete circumstances of our country? Us tasks regarding the peasantry, but this is temporary, a step that will take is closer to our essential task. The peasantry, **as a whole, is “in the sphere of private property of the means of production.”** And is in favour of the conservation of the basis of capitalist society. The peasantry is a class that is gradually disappearing in the face of modern industry, whereas the proletariat has broken all its ties with property. It is the particular and fundamental product of modern industry. It develops and consolidates with the development of modern industry. It represents the future, not the past. It represents that which is developing, not that which disappearing. It wishes the removal of private property, not its conservation. On account of these characteristics history has placed the liberation of all toiling sections of society, and of all people suffering from this order on the shoulders of the **working class**.

As we are the vanguard of this class it is scientifically mistaken to add the adjective peasant in front of our party's name. The existence of one renders the other one impossible.

There have been parties that have given themselves the name- **Peasant Party**., but these have generally been parties which have wished to extend bourgeois democracy to its last boundaries, not par-

ties aiming for socialism or communism. That is, they were **petit-bourgeois democrats**. Proletarian parties too, when conditions make it necessary, wish to extend bourgeois democracy to its furthest extent do this in order to create all the pre-conditions for a **transition to proletarian democracy**. (that is, transition to proletarian dictatorship). Not to remain there and suffice with that. So what does the fighting for proletarian democracy of impoverished and middle peasantry together with the proletariat demonstrate? That there is no difference between them and the working class? No! Only that without the demolishing of the foundations of capitalism the liberation of these peasant strata is impossible, and that their liberation is bound to the liberation of the proletariat. On the other hand, without the essential leading role of the proletariat they cannot advance even a single step from bourgeois democracy. As for the current conditions in our country, without a proletarian leadership they cannot even extend bourgeois democracy to its limits, let alone pass to proletarian democracy. It is also the case that the term peasant includes the rich and middle peasantry in addition to the impoverished and lower middle peasantry. The name Workers-Peasant Party will only in practice serve to erase the difference between bourgeois democracy and proletarian democracy and confuse the class consciousness of the proletariat.

Therefore....Should we mimic the names TSEKP” and “TICSP” which were chosen out of concern over **legality**? Absolutely not, for, first and foremost, our party is not a “legal” party. It must be a party that is founded and “exist” in spite of laws.

Secondly, such a name, even if chosen out of a concern for **legality, is mistaken**. Is it true that the name TIKP will make our job easier, that it will in particular facilitate our approach to and fusion with the peasantry? Perhaps such a facilitation is temporarily possible as regards getting closer to peasants who have been, influenced by the reactionary conditioning of feudalism and the bourgeoisie. But even this may be at the cost of becoming separated from progressive workers

and poor peasants, for progressive workers, peasants and even intellectuals feel confidence in a movement that calls itself communist fearlessly and is worthy of the name. The number of such workers and peasants is increasing by the day. In our work amongst the peasants we distinguish ourselves from the petit-bourgeois and bourgeois democrats (THKO, THKP, TIP, etc) by calling ourselves communist.

This is the best term to separate us with a definite line from them, and this stance serves to gather the most determined revolutionary poor peasants in our ranks.

We said that while the TIHKP today takes us closer to the backward elements, it will distance us from the progressive elements. It may be said: why should we lose contact with the progressive elements? We won't hide the fact that we are communists, and in our programme it states that communism is our ultimate aim. In that case why shouldn't we call our party **communist**? To say we are communist in our programme does not break our links with the masses so why should our party name! Either we remove all mention of communism from the programme and in every party communication to the masses we have to gradually avoid all mention of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung and abandon communist propaganda and distance ourselves from proletarian revolution by making concessions, or, we have to reject reactionary consciousness and conditioning and from the outset embrace the proletarian revolution without concessions, unite with the most progressive elements and make the backward elements progress. One of the two!

The second opinion of those colleagues who approve of this name is that the TIHKP name will ensure that the masses make a connection between the Isci-Koylu movement and our party and that supporters of that movement and elements influenced by it will gather in the ranks of our new movement. In my opinion this is wrong. First and foremost, the political police will make this link. Everyone working in this or that position around the legal publish-

ing activity, subscribers, those making donations, everyone will be held responsible for the illegal party of the new period. In such a situation the best course of action is to conceal from the political police with great care the **link** between legal and illegal activity. It is an error because the best elements in the ranks of the isci koylu movement are already in the ranks of our movement and are increasingly being gathered. The thing that will really attract everyone of any use amongst them is not a **similarity of name** but energetic, comprehensive and well-thought out organisational work. Such work will not only gather the useful elements in the Isci-Koylu (IK) ranks but also all the progressive and revolutionary elements of the people that were not in the ranks of the I-K. It is an error because today our movement should be distinguished from the I-K movement qualitatively as well as quantitatively. The I-K movement was only a legal activity whereas our activity today should in essence be an illegal one. The work around the IK activity was only propaganda and agitation based on a publication and organisation was in line with this task. Our movement today should be a party activity that is directed towards the actual organisation of an armed struggle. Propaganda and agitation should be carried out in accordance with this task. Those working around I-K were people who, to a great extent, maintained their bourgeois links (or, in other words, their reactionary links). Today our movement should gather in its ranks those who have freed themselves entirely these ties, that is, workers, peasants and other revolutionaries. Those who have capitulated to backward links have left. What is necessary is to make a qualitative leap from every viewpoint. This leap should also make itself felt in the name of our movement. In this regard, to advocate the name TIHKP is an effort "**to protect the old**", a position resisting a leap.

On these points I have mentioned I do not agree with the name TIHKP.

The name TIHP is technically correct, but there are some **practi-**

cal objections. Firstly, that it will be confused with the revisionist TIP, a reformist bourgeois organisation far from Marxism-Leninism in all fields. Marxism-Leninism has been betrayed by the revisionist TIP clique on all the most fundamental points: the question of the state, the questions of revolution internationalism etc. We must draw a thick demarcation line between us and them.

The word revolutionary (ihtilalci) is insufficient in drawing this line. Furthermore, in our country the special meaning this word has gained amongst the people must be taken into consideration! Revolution is generally taken to mean the **bourgeois officers' coup**. The bourgeois officers called themselves "revolutionary" and the people have become accustomed to knowing them in this way. For instance, "the revolution of 27 May" is a common utterance. I. Inonu is a "former revolutionary officer" etc. Popular uprisings are distinguished from this kind of coup d'etat by the word "rebellion". The Sheikh Bedrettin rebellion, Pir Sultan rebellion, Baba Ishak rebellion, peasant revolts, Dersim rebellion", soldiers' rebellion etc. We have to draw a thick bold line between the "active struggle" of the masses and bourgeois coup d'etatism.

Another proof. While TIIP is technically correct, and contains our ultimate goal of communism within it, it does not express it openly... Even if by adding (M-L) we remove this obstacle, the drawback of being confused with the TIP, which has become the symbol of reformism, opposition to revolution and communism, opposition to armed struggle, opposition to Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao-Tse Tung (that is, opposition to the world leaders of the cause of communism), and the obstacle of the word revolution having a traditional meaning in colloquial speech will remain. Lenin said the following regarding drawing a definite line between opportunists, revisionists, special chauvinists and all manner of traitors to socialism:

"The objective inevitability of capitalism which grew into imperialism brought about the imperialist war. The war has brought

mankind to the *brink of a precipice*, to the brink of the destruction of civilisation, of the brutalisation and destruction of more millions, countless millions, of human beings.

The *only* way out is through a proletarian revolution.

At the very moment when such a revolution is beginning, when it is taking its first hesitant, groping steps, steps betraying too great a confidence in the bourgeoisie, at such a moment the majority (that is the truth, that is a fact) of the "Social-Democratic" leaders, of the "Social-Democratic" parliamentarians, of the "Social-Democratic" newspapers—and these are precisely the *organs* that influence the people—have *deserted* socialism, have **betrayed** socialism and have gone over to the side of "their own" national bourgeoisie.

The people have been confused, led astray and deceived by *these* leaders.

And we shall aid and abet that deception if we retain the old and out-of-date Party name, which is as decayed as the Second International!

Granted that "many" workers *understand* Social-Democracy in an honest way; but it is time to learn how to distinguish the subjective from the objective.

Subjectively, such Social-Democratic workers are most loyal leaders of the proletarians.

Objectively, however, the world situation is such that the old name of our Party *makes it easier* to fool the people and impedes the onward march..."

Just as this quote from Lenin indicates why our party's name should not be TIHKP, it also highlights why it should not just be TKP, for in the **present day** world there are other **parties and chiefs** with the name communist that have betrayed the cause of the proletariat. The masses have again been astonished by these parties and chiefs and been deceived, turning back from their course.

After these comments it is clear that the correct name will be TKP

(M-L), a name that defines the character of our movement and expresses most lucidly its ultimate aims and contributes in practice to the gaining in awareness of the working class and other toilers, while distinguishing it from all other traitors to socialism.

First and foremost, TKP/ML is scientifically correct, and a complete and lucid expression of our ultimate goal. For:

From capitalism mankind can pass directly only to socialism, i.e., to the social ownership of the means of production and the distribution of products according to the amount of work performed by each individual. Our Party looks farther ahead: socialism must inevitably evolve gradually into communism, upon the banner of which is inscribed the motto, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs". (Lenin, "The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution")

Again, our party, while accepting the need for a state, such as the Paris Commune type, or Soviet type, in order to proceed to communism, its **ultimate** goal is to abolish all manner of state. Whereas these other names are inadequate in expressing these points.

Secondly, this name makes a definite separation between us and all kinds of traitors to socialism; social chauvinists, revisionists, opportunists, anarchists, reformists etc.

In this regard there is no substantial counter argument. Firstly, the claim that peasants will not like the word communism, we have already explained above why this was incorrect. To claim this is to express a **reduction of the movement to a backward level and to accept lack of awareness, reactionary conditioning etc.** Also, to reject this name on these grounds is, in our opinion, the beginning of a backward move from all aspects.

Second counter argument is; the idea that they will confuse us with the revisionist TKP. Such a risk is much less with this name compared to the other names proposed.

Lenin's reply to those who said: "They will confuse us with the anarchist communists" was thus:

"Why are we not afraid of being confused with the Social-Nationalists, the Social-Liberals, or the Radical-Socialists, the foremost bourgeois party in the French Republic and the most adroit in the bourgeois deception of the people?" (*ibid*)

So, why are we not worried about being confused with TIP, TICSF and others like them? As it is, workers and impoverished peasants know the TKP less well than the TIP. Those who are familiar with the TKP are the most progressive elements of the workers and toilers and are already at a level whereby they are capable of distinguishing the TPP (M-L) from the TKP. As for raising the remaining part of the people to that level that is our task. Let us conclude with the words of Lenin:

"Yet we are afraid of our own selves. We are loth to cast off the "dear old" soiled shirt. . . .

But it is time to cast off the soiled shirt and to put on clean linen." (*ibid*)

## SECTION 2

“3..... Foreign capitalists have exploited the labour of our workers and peasants, firstly **by means of trade** and subsequently in the imperialist era **by making investments** in Turkey....”!

The thing that distinguishes competitive capitalism from imperialism is not that while the former exploits ‘by means of trade’ the latter exploits ‘by making investments’. While the distinguishing characteristic of competitive capitalism is the **raw material export**, the distinguishing feature of imperialism is the **capital export**. First of all, exploitation “by means of trade” is a very general expression that does not characterise free competitive capitalism. **Raw material export** is a **particular state** of commerce, a face it gained in the era of free competition. This is not any trade, but one in which foreign capitalists sold manufactured goods and in return bought raw materials and agricultural products. Secondly, the **capital export** and capital investment are different things. **Exported** capital may be in the form of investment or in the form of indebtedness (?). And in the imperialist period the latter is the fundamental one. It is this which demonstrates the parasitical, rotten, decayed nature of imperialism. In the book **Imperialism**, Lenin says the following:

*“Further, imperialism is an immense accumulation of money capital in a few countries... Hence the extraordinary growth of a class, or rather, of a stratum of rentiers, i.e., people who live by ‘clipping coupons’, who take no part in any enterprise whatever, whose profession is idleness. The export of capital, one of the most essential economic bases of imperialism, still more completely isolates the rentiers from production and sets the seal of parasitism on the whole country that lives by exploiting the labour of several overseas countries and colonies.*

*The income of the rentiers is five times greater than the income obtained from the foreign trade of the biggest “trading” country in the*

*world! This is the essence of imperialism and imperialist parasitism.*

*For that reason the term ‘rentier state’ (Rentnerstaat), or usurer state, is coming into common use in the economic literature that deals with imperialism. The world has become divided into a handful of usurer states and a vast majority of debtor states.”* (Lenin, *Imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism*)

This quote from Lenin clearly indicates that the significant part of the excessive profits gained by imperialism through capital consist of **interest, dividends, bonds, commissions**, etc, rather than profit on investment. The expression “they have exploited our workers and peasants’ labour by making investments” is an insufficient statement that conceals the character of imperialism and its pillaging with high interest loans, that is, its parasitical nature.

Let us look at the question from the point of view of our country. It played a significant role in the Ottoman Empire gradually becoming a semi-colony, in its disintegration and collapse and in its sinking up to its neck in debt. Low value exports, high interest loans taken on various occasions had reached such a point that by 1883 the imperialist countries virtually established the Duyun-u Umumiye [Public Debt Administration] as a state within a state in order to recover what they were owed. The Public Debt Administration, with up to 6,000 employees, spread like an octopus to all four corners of the empire, and for long years a Public Debt Administration sultanate existed intertwined with the feudal sultanate. It bound the toiling people of Turkey to tribute and as debt increased the British-French and, increasingly, the German imperialist political domination increased. As the pressure rose the debts rose too. The imperialist countries, their capitalists, ambassadors, consuls etc to a great extent took control of state influence and used it to greatly increase their pillaging and profiteering. So for what were loans used? For investment? No, on the contrary, for the most part they were used to pay off old debts, that is, while one hand received the other was giving it away. As for the remaining funds, they were in general used

to shore up the feudal aristocracy and dynasty and ensure the continuation of the Sultanate of the pashas.

In short, this is the reality of our country. And this reality demonstrates how insufficient the above expression “they exploited by making investments” is, and how it serves to conceal a significant portion of the true story.

“4. Imperialism, which dominates our country, on the one hand in order to open an **internal capitalist market** and to increase its exploitation, developed a dependent capitalism and opened the way to a dissolving of feudal relations”.

**Firstly**, the term “internal capitalist market” is an unnecessary repetition. It is sufficient to say “internal market”. For “internal market” is a commercial economic category, emerging with a commercial economy and reaching its broadest dimensions as capitalism progresses. The social division of labour constitutes the entire basis of development for the commercial economy and capitalism. The development of the social division of labour, that is, the separation from each other of productive workings (the separation of raw material extraction from manufacturing and agriculture etc) “it will make the products of these works each a commodity, each others mutual counterparts; it will make each of this serve as a market for another” (Marx)

That is, the development of the market and the development of capitalism are inter-connected and inseparable. The opening of the “internal market” means the development of capitalism. The “internal market” opens up in line with the extent of capitalist development.

**Secondly**: this statement is illogical. A part by part analysis of this statement: “Imperialism” 1) “in order to open up the internal capitalist market”, 2) “in order to increase exploitation” a) “developed a capitalism dependent on itself,” b) led to a dissolving of feudal relations”. “Imperialism”, “in order to open up an internal capitalist market”, “developed a capitalism dependent on itself”. That is, in order to develop capitalism, it developed capitalism (!).

If what is meant is that imperialism wished “to increase its exploitation” by “opening up an internal capitalist market”, then this idea has already been expressed by the sentence “it developed a capitalism dependent on itself and led to the dissolving of feudal relations”. What need is there for meaningless, illogical repetition?

Even when the sentence is corrected there is another problem. It is as if imperialism is knowingly and willingly developing capitalism “in order to increase exploitation” and leading to the dissolving of feudal relations! However, in reality, the development of capitalism and the partial dissolution of feudal relations is a consequence of the **natural, inevitable** and **spontaneous** function of imperialist exploitation. The capital exported by imperialism for the purpose of exploitation and pillage, leads to a spontaneous partial dissolving of feudal relations. Lenin expresses this reality in his book **Imperialism** as:

“The export of capital affects and greatly accelerates the development of capitalism in those countries to which it is exported. While, therefore, the export may tend a certain extent to arrest development in the capital exporting countries, it can only do so by expanding and deepening the further development of capitalism throughout the world.”

The “capitalism” referred to here by Lenin is capitalism linked to imperialism, which we call “**comprador capitalism**“. The other and fundamental aspect of this is as follows: imperialist countries when exporting capital to underdeveloped countries, while building railway lines etc, they consider high interest rates, low land prices, low wages and cheap raw materials without competitors, and to colonise them and enslave the toiling peoples. This is the essential character and aim of imperialism.

In the Programme this point should be strongly emphasised and given prominence. Let us move on to the matter of the dissolving of feudal relations. How does this occur?

The old manorial proprietorship, which is tied to feudal serfdom with thousand ties, continues and slowly the capitalist enterprise is be-

coming the 'enterprise of landowners'... State's agricultural regime has maintained long-term properties of fiefdoms. The great mass of the great land property and certain basis of the old superstructure must be maintained." (Lenin)

As a result, on the one hand the dominant role of imperialism and on the other of the comprador large bourgeoisie and landowner increases.

Some affluent peasants also shift to their ranks. Whereas, the peasant masses who besotted by the dominance of reaction and who lost all their property are totally collapsing". (Lenin)

This is imperialism's dissolving of feudalism in countries it enters. Lenin puts it thus:

"It is the revisionists who have long been asserting that colonial policy is progressive, that it implants capitalism and that therefore it is senseless to "accuse it of greed and cruelty", for "without these qualities" capitalism is "hamstrung". (Lenin)

In China the Trotskyists lowered themselves to the extent that they stated it was necessary not to oppose Japanese imperialism, claiming Japanese imperialism brought the "socialist revolution" closer by developing capitalism in China. In our country Aren-Boran and the TKP revisionists are endeavouring to portray imperialism in a sympathetic way with the same rationale. We must therefore draw thick, bold lines between ourselves and the revisionist-Trotskyist claim that imperialism develops capitalism and dissolves feudalism, emphasising that the fundamental role imperialism plays in backward countries is to colonise countries, enslave peoples, pillage them mercilessly, and, politically, to consolidate and support the reactionary dictatorship of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords, and to impoverish the toiling peasantry by making them even more impoverished. In the Programme this point is very vague and unclear. The communist revolutionaries and revolutionary masses (in particular the peasant masses) should have absolutely no doubt on this point: the system of large-scale property

ownership and land slavery must be demolished and jettisoned by the revolution that sweeps it all away.

It is only possible to demolish and destroy feudalism in its entirety in this way. And only in this way is it possible to neutralise the vacillation of the middle bourgeoisie and, in particular, the wealthy peasantry, who are undecided or hostile to the revolution, and to ensure the leading role of the working class and peasant mass in the revolution. Only in this manner will the "possibility to create the most favourable conditions" to "re-establish" society on a socialist basis", which "is the real, fundamental task of the working class", emerge.

"4 ...On the other hand, in order to consolidate its economic and political domination of our country it subjugated feudal relations and prevented their dissolution."

"It subjugated feudal relations!" A meaningless sentence. "It united with feudalism" or "established an alliance" would have had a meaning.

"5. Our working class began to appear in the mines in the 19th century. It developed subsequently in mines run by imperialism by gaining capitulations and in the communication and transport sectors in order to open the internal market which developed along with the investment it made".

If the sentence had been as follows it would have had a meaning in Turkish: "subsequently, it developed in the mines worked by imperialism that had obtained privileges and in the communication and haulage sectors in which it had invested in order to open the internal market," not to pillage the internal market"....

"7. In 1917 the Russian proletariat under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, at whose head was the great Lenin, **deposed Czarism and established the first proletarian state.** The Great October Revolution initiated the age of proletarian revolutions all over the world and became the greatest support for wars of national liberation".

The 1917 February revolution and the Great October Socialist Rev-

olution have been mixed up one with the other. Czarism was overthrown in the February revolution, whereas the proletarian state was established during the October Revolution. Such a crude error should have no place in the programme of a communist movement.

More importantly, it should have been stated here that following the Great October Socialist Revolution the bourgeoisie all over the world were scared stiff of revolution and that the era of revolutions with bourgeois leadership closed, that revolutionary movements without proletarian leadership were bound to fail and would immediately have reconciled with reaction and take on a counter-revolutionary line. From the point of view of our country and backward countries like ours under the domination of imperialism and feudalism this is the important thing. However, this point has been glossed over with a vague formulation such as: "lasting victories cannot be won" in article 11.

"8. Our people, fighting heroically against imperialism in 1919-1922, won a victory of National Liberation with blood and soul. Our people received great support from the Soviet Union, the first proletarian state, during the War of Liberation. The people of Turkey waging the first liberation struggle of the age of proletarian revolutions and wars of national liberation, earned the help and affection of all the oppressed peoples of Asia. It gave them courage and hope."

"The first liberation struggle of the age of proletarian revolutions and wars of national liberation!" In this expression admiration for Kemalism once again gives itself away. Despite comrade Mao Tse-Tung's clear and precise statement that: "While the Kemalist revolution took place in the age of proletarian revolutions, it was not part of those revolutions, but a part of the old bourgeois democratic revolutions," and although the author of the Draft Programme was repeatedly reminded of this statement, the above formulation, which portrays the Kemalist revolution as if it was a part of the world proletarian revolution, found its way into the draft.

Moreover, with the addition of "wars of national liberation" to the

"Age of Proletarian Revolutions"! The same thing is repeated in article 11: "The age of proletarian revolutions and wars of national liberation that are the characteristic element of the era in question? Can such a thing be said by looking at the fact that wars of national liberation took place in that era? No, it cannot be said. In our era, too, although there have been more widespread and intensive wars of national liberation than in those years we do not say we are in the era of wars of national liberation. We say: "We are in the era of the total collapse of imperialism and in which socialism advances to victory worldwide. "For this is the most characteristic element that differentiates our era from other historical periods. The whirlwind of national liberation movements in the East began in 1905 and affected the whole of Asia. After the October Revolution in 1917 the new, characteristic thing was the end of revolutions under bourgeois leadership, the sliding of the bourgeoisie worldwide to a reactionary line, its becoming scared of revolution, while in opposition to this there was a great increase in revolutionary action by the proletariat, an end to the old type of bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the East, the beginning of new type democratic revolutions under proletarian leadership, and the uniting of these with the Socialist Soviet Union.

This is the particularity of the new historical period that began with the 1917 October Revolution. Thus, the historical period in question is "the age of proletarian revolutions", not "the age of national liberation wars". Since our era is that of "proletarian revolutions and national liberation wars", and the Kemalist revolution is a national liberation war, then the Kemalist revolution was a typical example of the revolutions of that historical period. Comrade Mao Tse-Tung was mistaken in describing the Kemalist revolution "as part of see above" as being an exception. Look at the wonderful outcome! And the expression used above seems to heap praise on the bourgeoisie, not the people. And the general impression given by the expression is that the Kemalist revolution was a popular revolution.

“The peoples of Turkey gained the assistance and love of all the oppressed people of Asia. It gave them courage and hope”. Why is the naked reality being sacrificed to fancy, conspicuous words? Our people took part in the war of liberation wholeheartedly and shed their blood and gave their lives! However, not as an independent force, but behind an unreliable, inconsistent, cowardly and two-faced bourgeoisie and landlords! Therefore, although the revolution succeeded at the cost of the people’s lives, it was the bourgeoisie and landlords that gave it its character. The revolution contained within it all the vileness and malaise of these classes. It developed in opposition to the people, the workers, peasants and possibilities of a land revolution. That is, the revolution contained the seeds of a counter-revolution within it, and these seeds were gradually germinating. For this reason, there is no question of there being a revolutionary movement that gave ‘courage and hope’, ‘to all the oppressed people of Asia’. The October Revolution gave ‘courage and hope’ to the peoples. The **Chinese** Revolution did, and the Vietnamese Revolution is giving hope. For these concluded with the victory and liberation of the oppressed peoples and toilers, whereas the Kemalist revolution ended with the people again as an oppressed, dominated and exploited mass. Rather than giving courage and hope to the peoples of Asia, this outcome encouraged the timid bourgeoisie of Asia. We learn from comrade Mao Tse-Tung how the bourgeoisie in China were eager to carry out a revolution resembling the Kemalist one in their own country. Another class finding ‘courage and hope’ in the outcome of the Kemalist revolution was the financial oligarchy of imperialist countries. They were absorbed in the ‘courage and hope’ of manipulating the outcomes of national revolutions under bourgeois leaderships in backward countries for their own ends. They were hopeful of transforming the revolution into a counter-revolution. And the point gradually reached by the Kemalist revolution demonstrated that they were right to be encouraged by the national movements under bourgeois leaderships and to have reactionary expectations.

To sacrifice this clear reality to fancy words will only serve to obscure the true nature of the Kemalist revolution and its dominant reactionary character even during the war and while taking power from the working class and toiling people, and to blur the gulf between national movements under bourgeois leadership and national movements under proletarian leadership.

“9. Turkey’s heroic workers and peasants, who did not hesitate to sacrifice themselves **in the long, bloody struggle for freedom and the liberation of our country, were unable to seize the leadership of the national revolution on account of lack of organisation**, and were unable to carry on the revolution to the end.

Initially, we must point out that it is here we first encountered the fantastic idea of **workers and peasants’ leadership**. What is leadership? Leadership is **ideological, political and organisational**. Therefore, the leadership of one class renders that of another impossible. Did the workers and peasants have a single, joint political organisation that adopted this ideology? Did the peasantry and proletariat constitute a single, united class in all respects? This is to confuse corn and chaff, apples and pears. It is obvious that the writer is not aware of what he is saying!

What kind of **‘organisation’** did the ‘workers and peasants’ need in order to seize the leadership, that they were unable to do so? **Mass** organisations like trade unions, village cooperatives, etc?

For instance, reformist mass organisations like DISK and TUTUS, which Aydinlik and I-K so admire? If this is the kind of mass organisation that is meant, then let us state immediately that these organisations are only useful as a means for “economic struggle” against “the government and the bosses”, never as a means for leadership of a social revolution. This is the alphabet (?) of Leninism. Not for the **“leadership of the workers and peasants(!)”** but for the leadership of the workers there is a need for only one organisation, the Communist Party, and that existed. In this context the workers and peasants were not **“without an**

**organisation**“! But there was a significant shortcoming. The TKP **did not have a correct policy**. (Here I will put to one side the meaningless debate regarding whether the objective conditions existed for proletarian leadership. This debate kept us very busy for a time. I am imagining (??) that we all accept that following the First Imperialist World War and the Great October Revolution the objective conditions for the leadership of the proletariat were in existence on a general global scale and particularly from the point of view of Turkey.) If the TKP had been able to follow a correct line it could have wrested the leadership of the revolution in a prolonged struggle, could have rendered ineffective the indecisive, inconsistent and cowardly bourgeoisie, could have organised a people’s army, established an alliance of workers and peasants and set up a united popular front based on this fundamental alliance! Ignoring the deviation in the TKP line, let us state the following briefly: the real underlying reason for the vague expression “the workers and peasants were unable to wrest the leadership of the revolution due to a lack of organisation” is that the writer’s feelings for Kemalism were also nourished by the TKP. The author could not have criticised the rightist line of the TKP regarding Kemalism as he shares the same rightist line.

“9. The bourgeois leadership of the War of Liberation, passing through an arch of victory formed by the workers and peasants borne on their shoulders, established a dictatorship which repressed the workers and peasants as soon as they were able to settle on their thrones.”

Which classes did the established dictatorship represent? Was it politically an independent national bourgeois dictatorship? Or was it the dictatorship of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords? This is a very important point and erroneous things have been stated in the Draft Programme. We shall attempt to answer the above question blow.

“10. Following the demolishing of the Ottoman Empire and comprador bourgeoisie by the War of National Liberation the new Turkish bourgeoisie which seized power undertook “the creation of a national bourgeoisie by utilising the state”, in order to grow and become wealthy.

The new Turkish bourgeoisie mercilessly exploited the workers and peasants and wastefully spent the gains of the War of Liberation earned by the people with great self-sacrifice and came to an understanding with the feudal landlords and imperialism.” “It undertook ‘to create a national bourgeoisie by means of the state’ in order to grow and become wealthy!” The new Turkish bourgeoisie wants to develop and accumulate wealth, but for this purpose undertakes ‘the creation of a national bourgeoisie’. It is obvious that this analysis has been inherited from the Mihri current. According to Mihri Belli revisionism, the Kemalist movement was a movement of “the sharpest (!) Section of the petit bourgeoisie, the military, civilian, educated group.” On seizing power by leading the revolution they chose the **capitalist way of development**, not the **non-capitalist way**, on account of their lack of knowledge and inexperience (!), “and also due to the fact the revolution in the Soviet Union had yet to set a course or achieve any visible success!” **For this reason** they undertook “the creation of a national bourgeoisie by utilising the state.” In the preface to S. Husnu’s book Mihri Belli writes the following: “The Ankara government was seduced by the idea of achieving development by creating a national bourgeoisie from Moslem Turks...” (page 15)

This is the conclusion of the chain logic of revisionism! And this theory is not confined to M. Belli. Aren-Boran [note needed] and TKP revisionists and all modern revisionists, first and foremost Soviet revisionists, play the same tune! They advocate that the revolution will take place in the same way today! “The military, civilian, intellectual class” will take power, and since socialism (in reality they mean social imperialism) is now powerful they will choose a non-capitalist mode of development, not a capitalist one, and our country will canter (??) along and achieve socialism(!) The critique of the Kemalist movement, i.e. “the creation of a national bourgeoisie by the state”, of those who hold this understanding of the road to “revolution”, has found its way into the Draft Programme.

The above analysis, “the creation of a national bourgeoisie through

the agency of the state”, emerged from an erroneous analysis of the Kemalist movement and a mistaken understanding of revolution (!), and is also a repudiation of the Leninist theory of the state. The state is the repressive and exploitative vehicle of the ruling class or classes. The class that possesses state power will use it for its own class purposes. Not in order to create a new class! To claim that state power has been used by those that wield it for the benefit of another class or group would be to forget the class nature of the state, its historical role and function and to attribute to it a supraclass or beyond-class structure.

“10. ... The bourgeois dictatorship over our people has surrendered our country to the imperialist yoke. The large bourgeoisie, in league with feudal landlords, has implemented a policy of national oppression and assimilation on the Kurdish people.

“17. The collaborationist Turkish bourgeoisie emerging from within the new Turkish bourgeoisie growing fat from the “national bourgeois creation” policy, developed rapidly in particular in the years from the Second World War onwards and step by step intensified its collaboration with imperialism.

“18. American imperialism, under the auspices of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, intensified its control (!) over our country through “military and economic aid”. The large bourgeoisie, which grew rapidly due to profiteering during the war, moved under the wing of international capital and consolidated its alliance with the landlords who developed through the policy of high agricultural prices during the war years. This reactionary alliance put its weight behind the DP in order to save itself from the bureaucratic obstacles of the CHP’s state capitalism, maintaining its power with this party.”

These theories are as follows: the Sultanate and comprador bourgeoisie demolished in the War of Liberation under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie - national bourgeoisie period of power - “policy of creating national bourgeoisie” within the national bourgeoisie, the emergence of a collaborationist large bourgeoisie - the

collaborationist large bourgeoisie engaging in cooperation with imperialism and alliance with feudalism - subsequently this reactionary alliance establishes the DP and maintains power with this party. These are the theories

These theories, firstly, conceal the fact that the Kemalist bourgeoisie was in alliance with the landlords from the outset of the War of Liberation.

Secondly, they consider the Kemalist regime politically to be an independent national bourgeois government. They do not realise that Kemalist Turkey was economically a semi-colony and politically semi-dependent, that is, that Turkey was from the beginning under the yoke of imperialism. They conceal the fact that it was under a dictatorship of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords.

Thirdly, the Draft sees the alliance of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords as a single, homogenous front. This reactionary alliance initially takes place within the CHP (it is not clear when this happens), and later continues in the DP.

Fourthly, the Kemalist bourgeoisies establishing of state monopolies, removing competition and robbing the popular masses, thereby creating great wealth and capital, is evaluated as “creating a national bourgeoisie by means of the state. The theories of modern revisionists have been adopted wholesale.

The Kemalist revolution, the class character of this revolution, its consequences, the ruling classes in Kemalist Turkey and our views regarding the struggle between these classes have been detailed in another article. We shall therefore suffice here with summarising certain key points of the text in question.

1) The Kemalist revolution was the revolution of the Turkish mercantile bourgeoisie, landlords, usurers, the small number of industrial bourgeois, and the higher sections of these.

In this revolution the large Turkish bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie of a national character participated.

2) The leaders of the revolution, while still during the years of anti-imperialist war, had commenced covert collaboration with allied imperialism. The imperialists showed goodwill to the Kemalists, accepting a Kemalist government.

3) After signing peace the Kemalists continued and consolidated their collaboration with the imperialists. The Kemalist movement developed "in essence in opposition to the peasants and workers and to the possibility of a land revolution".

4) As a result of the Kemalist movement, Turkey changed from being a colony, semi-colony and semi-feudal structure. That is, its semi-colonial, semi-feudal economic structure was maintained.

5) In the social sphere the new Turkish bourgeoisie which was in collaboration with imperialism and emerged from the middle bourgeoisie of a national character, and a section of the old comprador Turkish bourgeoisie and a new bureaucracy, replaced the old comprador large bourgeoisie, old bureaucracy and the ruling ulema elite. The dominance of a section of the old landlords, large landowners, usurers and profiteering merchants continued, while a section was replaced by newcomers. As an entirety the Kemalist regime did not represent the interests of the middle bourgeoisie of a national character, rather it represented the interests of the above mentioned classes and strata.

6) In the political sphere the bourgeois republic replaced the mesrutiyet [constitutional monarchy] government whose interests were conjoined with those of the dynasty, it being the administration that best corresponded to the interests of the new ruling classes. This government, while supposedly independent, was, in fact, politically semi-dependent on imperialism.

7) The Kemalist dictatorship was called democratic, but was in reality a military fascist dictatorship.

8) "Kemalist Turkey, even, gradually became a semi-colony and a part of the reactionary imperialist world, eventually being forced to surrender to the embrace of British-French imperialism."

9) In the years after the War of Liberation the Kemalist regime was the chief enemy of the revolution. In that period the task of the communist movement was not an alliance with Kemalists against the clique of the old comprador bourgeoisie and landlords that had lost its dominant position (such an alliance never came into being, in any case), but to overthrow the Kemalist regime that represented the clique of comprador bourgeoisie and landlords, and establish the democratic popular dictatorship based on the fundamental alliance of workers and peasants.

10) In Turkey the big bourgeoisie and landlords dominated the administration from the end of the War of Liberation onwards. However, the Comprador bourgeoisie and landlords split into two large political cliques. The clique that dominated the administration and state mechanism initially collaborated with British/French imperialism and from 1935 onwards with German imperialism. Until the Second World War the middle bourgeoisie in general followed this clique.

11) In the Second Imperialist World War years the German collaborationist dominant clique implemented a policy of fascism and profiteering. This clique joined the German fascist ranks, internally against the USSR and the British-American-French bloc. However, the global balance of forces and the existence of the USSR prevented it participating in the war in the German fascist ranks.

12) On the other hand, the opposition clique of the comprador large bourgeoisie and landlords that subsequently organised in the DP and MP [note necessary], was followed by the reformist middle bourgeoisie and other democratic elements that had previously been in the CHP as ancillary. The TKP also attached itself to the tail of this clique. These formed an alliance with the global American-British-French bloc and with the USSR. With the Second World War ending with defeat for the German fascists and their allies this bloc consolidated itself in Turkey. However, as soon as the war ended the imperialist bloc led by US imperialism took over the leadership of reaction and anti-communism under

the banner of "democracy". In Turkey, too, with the backing of US imperialism and the expert use of the abhorrence of the people for the CHP's pro-German fascist dictatorship, the DP was brought to power.

13) In this way, the government of the comprador large bourgeoisie that was the lackey of US imperialism and landlords took over from the government of the comprador large bourgeoisie that was the lackey of German imperialism and landlords. This is a question of the "wings" of US imperialism replacing the "wings" of German imperialism, not of "the large bourgeoisie fattened by war profiteering" "going under the wing of international capital", and of reactionary US lackeys replacing reactionary German lackeys.

14) The fickle middle bourgeoisie, which strangled the resistance of the proletariat and the petit bourgeoisie, after attaching this opposition to the tail of the DP for a time, following the fascist practices of the DP, this opposition returned to the CHP bandwagon. The fact that an independent, powerful popular movement could not be created under the leadership of the proletariat led to a situation where the working class, toiling people and democratic elements were used as leverage.

15) The comprador large bourgeoisie and landlord cliques that behaved like disciples of democracy" while in opposition, were the most ferocious enemies of the people once they came to power These are historical realities of our country.

"19. After 1950 imperialist capital had a freer rein..."

As a matter of fact it was US imperialism that had a free rein... For the characteristic of the period after 1950 was not of imperialist capital....., but of US imperialism dominating Turkey. It is correct that the capital brought in to Turkey by US imperialism in these years was much more than the imperialist capital introduced in previous years. This is the second facet of the issue. Both in this article and the subsequent ones the word "imperialism" is used! This expression dominant in Turkey for a long time! The words "American imperialism" should be used in place of "imperialism".

"Our movement is the real heir of the **revolutionary working class movement.**" **12.....The TKP embraced the revolutionary movement of our working class all over the country...."**

What is meant by the terms "Revolutionary Working class movement" or "the revolutionary movement of our working class is the communist movement.

We see here that care has been taken to avoid using the word communist. The same reluctance to use the concept of communism has been demonstrated when it comes to the party name. This is to take a step back from the situation of Shefik Husnu and his comrades in the 1920s. This is capitulation to the reactionary conditioning that affects some backward sections of our people. Instead of taking them forward, this is to adapt to their position.

Secondly, the term "revolutionary working class movement" brings to mind the mass movement of the working class, not the communist movement. In that case, the meaning that emerges is as if the TKP, as soon as it was established, took on the leadership of all mass movements and demonstrations of the working class. For this reason, too, the phrase chosen is inappropriate.

12....Just as it occurred worldwide, in our country **our working class established its own Leninist Party...** The TKP embraced the revolutionary movement of our working class nationwide and engaged in the struggle as the vanguard of the international proletariat in Turkey.

"13.The TKP participated in the war of National Liberation with all its strength. The communists of Turkey fought loyally in the ranks of the people, struggling for the advancement of the interests of the workers and peasants and the national revolution. But the TKP was unable to organise the workers and peasants and create a popular armed force under the leadership of the party.

"14. The TKP was unable to overcome the severe repression of the bourgeois government in the years after the War of Liberation. It failed to fuse Marxism-Leninism with the conditions of our country in a cre-

ative way, to ensure it became rooted amongst the toiling masses, and to mobilise the masses of workers and peasants for the armed struggle.

“Additionally, the TKP with leaders like Mustafa Suphi and Shefik Husnu, who were devoted to the cause of communism, endeavoured to hold high the proletarian flag in the face of all manner of repression.

Mustafa Suphi and 14 of his comrades were martyred. It always remained faithful to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism: it waged a constant struggle against opportunism and treacherous currents such as Trotskyism and was undaunted in the service of our people.

“15. The administration of the TKP, which was broken up on account of its failure to implement Leninist tenets of organisation, was usurped after 1960 by Yakup Demir revisionists. Following this it was turned into a bourgeois club that was a puppet of the Khrushchev-Brezhnev revisionist clique.

“... In reality this bourgeois club had nothing to do with the name ‘TKP’ which it carried. For the Yakup Demir revisionist clique is a gang of frauds which betrays the revolutionary past of the TKP advocates revisionism in the name of communism and fosters the interests of the bourgeoisie.

16. Our movement will announce to all our people its determination to raise higher in the bands of the workers and peasants of Turkey the red flag it took over from Shefik Husnu and his comrades who waged a struggle on the revolutionary road of the great leaders of the international proletariat, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

“Our movement proclaims it is the true successor of the TKP’s revolutionary past.”

These are the things said about the TKP in the Draft Programme. We do not agree with these views from several points of view. To begin with, the views set forth in the Draft regarding the TKP are full of incredible contradictions. If we ignore the vague, demagogic expressions, the positive things said about the TKP are sufficient for it to be declared a “perfect communist movement.”

To be a “Leninist organisation,” stay loyal to Marxism-Leninism, “always remain loyal to proletarian internationalism” to constantly struggle against treacherous currents such as opportunism and Trotskyism “are qualities of an absolutely exceptional communist movement.

However, according to the Draft Programme it is not possible to refrain from proclaiming that the TKP is an opportunist and revisionist party. “To be unable to meld Marxism-Leninism in a creative way with the conditions of our country,” to fail to put down roots amongst the masses,” “to be unable to mobilise the masses for armed struggle” after over 30 years of legal and illegal activity, “not to implement the tenets of Leninist organisation” and to consequently “be smashed”, are the qualities of an undiluted revisionist movement.

A party will, on the one hand, be crippled by all the ailments of revisionism and opportunism, and, on the other, will “remain loyal to “Marxism-Leninism”, will have “struggled against opportunism” and continued as a Leninist Party”. This, in the mildest words, is to not understand what Marxism-Leninism is, what opportunism is, or what a Leninist party is. A Marxism-Leninism “that does not meld with the conditions of the country”! A Leninist party that “fails to take root amongst the masses”, “that does not implement Leninist tenets of organisation”, or cannot fuse theory and practice”! In a period of more than 30 years when the conditions for a popular armed struggle were mostly suitable,” to fail to mobilise the masses for armed struggle or to create a popular armed force”, “to be unable to meld theory and practice”, “to fail to put down roots amongst the masses”, “to fail to implement Leninist tenets of organisation”< failure to defeat the severe repression of this to be free from “opportunism”, further more, to “have struggled constantly against opportunism! This is incredible. To slip into such profound contradictions due to inheritance calculations does not befit a communist movement!

These are my personal opinions of the TKP. When the party was

under the leadership of comrade M. Suphi it was a Leninist party. After comrade M. Suphi had been brutally murdered by the Kemalists the party leadership passed into the hands of revisionists. Shefik Husnu followed a revisionist line during his 30 years of leadership. At one time during the leadership of Shefik Husnu the TKP established the revolution in Turkey as a “socialist revolution” and awaited this from the Kemalist administration. It subsequently abandoned the slogan of “socialist revolution” but this time began to wait for the Kemalists to complete the tasks of the democratic revolution and to smooth the way for the socialist revolution, with an entirely Menshevik logic. The TKP rejected carrying out a democratic popular revolution under the leadership of the working class based on the peasantry, continuing on to socialism without stopping, that is, the Marxist-Leninist theory of continuous, phased revolution. It was unable to combine the concrete reality of our country with the theory of M-L.

Instead of an alliance of the workers and peasants it constantly gave prominence to an alliance with the bourgeoisie. It rejected the path of armed struggle. It demonstrated a slavish attachment to the Kemalist administration. It strayed so far from Marxism-Leninism that it supported the Refik Saydam government. It approved all the national oppression the Kemalist government imposed on all the minority nationalities, in particular the merciless persecution of the Kurdish people, even the mass killings. In the 30-year period following the death of comrade Mustafa Suphi the TKP was not able to progress beyond being a reform party. The writings of Shefik Husnu trample on even the most fundamental truths of what is deemed the alphabet of Marxism-Leninism. (see: Selected Writings, Shefik Husnu, Aydinlik Publications).

The collapse of the TKP was the inevitable outcome of its revisionist line. There is absolutely no difference between the line followed by the TKP after the death of comrade Mustafa Suphi and hardened revisionists such as Yakup Demir, Mihri Belli and Hikmet Kivilcimli. Both as regards ideology and policy, and organisationally, the TKP is

continuing with the revisionism of Y. Demir, M. Belli and H. Kivilcimli. The Yakup Demir clique really betrayed the TKP line of comrade Mustafa Suphi, but is in fact continuing the subsequent line of the TKP without change.

The claim of being successor of the TKP is a futile one. A communist movement would succeed the TKP of comrade M. Suphi, it would be the successor of the profound belief in the cause of communism carried in the hearts and heads of the militant workers, peasants and enlightened members in the ranks of the TKP, but, it could never be the successor of the revisionist line of the TKP leadership. The Draft Programme has been prepared with a middle of the road logic.

20.... Imperialism and its collaborators using the backward parliament as a means of domination....”

The above phrase is completely contrary to the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state. For the “means of domination” of “imperialism and its collaborators” is not “parliament”, but the state apparatus. The existence or otherwise of parliament does not mean the existence or non-existence of the state apparatus that is the means of domination. This state apparatus is of this or that form, that is, parliament is an institution of the state which is the means of domination. Hence, the ruling classes, when they fling aside parliament they maintain their dominance, they do not throw to one side their means of domination. They merely change the form of that rule.

Let us learn what the essence and function of parliament is from comrade Lenin:

*“To decide once every few years which member of the ruling class is to repress and crush the people in parliament—such is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarism, not only in parliamentary-constitutional monarchies, but also in the most democratic republics.*

*Take any parliamentary country, from America to Switzerland, from France to England, Norway and so forth—in these countries the real business of “state” is performed behind the scenes and is carried*

on by the departments, chancelleries and general staffs. In parliament this is just chatter for the special purpose of fooling the "common people." This is so true that even in the Russian republic, a bourgeois democratic republic, all these sins of parliamentarism were immediately revealed, even before it managed to set up a real parliament." (Lenin)

So even in the most democratic bourgeois republics the throwing aside of parliament by the ruling classes will change two things. Firstly, "for a time, in parliament, the decision as to which section of the directing class will represent and repress the people" may be removed. Secondly, the representatives of the ruling class will not be able to "deceive the people with idle chatter. But the means of domination of the ruling classes will not be removed.

Communists, certainly, will not think: "the form of oppression is a matter of indifference to the proletariat."

*"A wider, freer and more open form of the class struggle and of class oppression enormously assists the proletariat in its struggle for the abolition of classes in general.*

*...make use even of the 'pigsty' of bourgeois parliamentarism, especially when the situation is obviously not revolutionary; but at the same time he knew how to subject parliamentarism to genuine revolutionary-proletarian criticism." (Lenin)*

Since it is not relevant to the subject we shall not dwell on the character of parliamentarism in Turkey and on whether it may be useful.

The Draft Programme has not understood the essence and function of parliament, putting what it calls the "backward parliament" in the place of the state apparatus. According to the draft it is necessary to see a fascist dictatorship without a parliament as a system where the ruling classes have no "means of domination", that is, no (!) state apparatus. This is entirely erroneous as regards Marxism-Leninism state theory and extremely harmful for practical struggle.

"20. ... Turkish soldiers were sent to fight the people of Korea who were waging a war of liberation."

The term "Turkish soldiers" is incorrect for two reasons. Firstly, those who were sent to war were not only "Turkish", in fact, the majority were not "Turkish". The Turkish ruling classes took care to ensure those sent to Korea were from minority nationalities, in particular from the Kurds. Turkish chauvinism and national oppression showed itself in this instance. We listened to peasants in Eastern Anatolia who told us of many Kurdish villagers who went to Korea and did not come back. Secondly, the term "Turkish soldiers" does not explain what is intended in the Programme. What the Programme wishes to say is that the imperialists and their lackeys wanted to pit our toiling people against another people fighting for a just cause for their own interests. I don't know whether the colleague who wrote the Draft intended to point this out, but in my opinion that is what should have been made clear. However, the word "soldier" does not express this idea. It reminds one of the reactionary army and its troops. Instead of this word it would have been better for both reasons to have used the term "toilers that were recruited" or "toilers of Turkey" or "workers and peasants of Turkey".

"20....imperialism and its collaborators disseminated the ideology and culture of their own collapse in order to subjugate the popular masses..."

Collapse has no ideology or culture. Ideology and culture is that of imperialism and its collaborators. This ideology and culture may be an expression of collapse," or "their decaying ideology that reflects their collapse" should have been used. This would have been more meaningful and logical.

"21. The political and economic crisis which intensified the exploitation and repression of the popular masses with every passing day ended with the overthrow of the American lackey, DP govt. on 27 May 1960"

Firstly, it was not the "crisis" that "intensified (see above) it was the **DP govt.** The crisis leads to the intensification of this repression and exploitation etc.

Secondly, the crisis **did not end** with “the overthrow of the DP government on 27 May 1960. If 27 May had been able to work the miracle of ending the crisis in today’s system it would have meant ruin for working class revolutionaries and celebration for all reactionaries. Even the middle bourgeoisie, as a way had been found to perpetuate the system it would have meant ruin for working class revolutionaries bourgeoisie, as a way had been found to perpetuate the system without the calamity of

“Socialism”, would have shouted “victory, victory” as they unfurled their reformist utopias like a flag! The exploiting classes would have proclaimed in a loud voice the entire world that the predictions of Marx, Engels and Lenin had come to naught! All the reactionaries would have taken 27 May as an example for themselves!

Thankfully, 27 May was unable to work such a miracle; the crisis did not end. Today too, it is continuing with all its intensity. As long as the means of production continue to be owned by a handful of exploiters, neither the economic crisis nor the political crisis caused by their will end. What will end the crisis is a victorious popular revolution. The claim that the crisis ended on 27 May befits bourgeois with socialist masks like M.Belli and D.Avcioğlu. According to them, if the army had kept power after 27 May and not held elections there would be no crisis or anything similar in Turkey! There would have been no need for the 12 March memorandum! As the officers did not listen to their bright ideas they cannot free themselves of crises and confusion! To preserve all the fundamental facets of the system, but on the other hand to save it from all its maladies and contradictions! A reactionary utopia that only befits bourgeois reformists.

It would appear that the Draft Programme inherited this from them.

“21....The middle bourgeoisie that gave its character to the 27May operation had capitulated to imperialism from the start. It left the administration to the collaborating big bourgeoisie and landlords. History demonstrated once more that the only force that will demol-

ish the govt. of imperialism and collaborators is an organised force under the leadership of the proletariat. “Along with this, our people gained some, if limited, democratic rights with the 1961 constitution brought in by 27 May and an environment emerged which revolutionary ideas spread rapidly.”

It is true that the middle bourgeoisie participated in 27 May, but it is absolutely incorrect to state that the class that gave this movement “its character” was the middle bourgeoisie. For, this expression indicates the class that led the movement and seized power. Since it is said that “it left the administration to the collaborationist big bourgeoisie and landlords”, it means that the middle bourgeoisie must have taken power after the coup of 27May. In order to leave power it must have had it in the first place...

In 1965 with the AP coming to power by itself, if it is meant that the middle bourgeoisie left power, this means that it is accepted that the MBK government and coalition government, represented the middle bourgeoisie, if it is meant that the middle bourgeoisie government ended with the coalition government, it means it is accepted that the MBK government represented the middle bourgeoisie. However, in reality, both the MBK government period and the period in which there were coalition government were periods when the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords were in power. The clique of comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords that lost power in 1950, in the face of fascist persecution from the DP government, adopted the pose of advocating democracy”, seized power again in 1960 by utilising the movement of the middle bourgeoisie and youth like a winch. Since there was no communist leadership to show the way to the masses, the popular opposition followed this or that reactionary clique and was squandered. The comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords clique which dominated the CHP, after seizing power, did not find it appropriate to oppose the middle bourgeoisie which had played a significant role in the 27 May movement. For this reason it accepted some

limited democratic demands of the middle bourgeoisie in the 17 May constitution. The 27 May movement's leadership that seized power as a result of the movement was the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord clique that dominated the CHP. The middle bourgeoisie was the reserve force following behind it. In our opinion this is the correct analysis of the 27 May movement.

"22.....Our working class, have written **heroic** epics in its countless struggles against the pro-American AP government, bosses and domesticated trade unionism. The struggle which rose up on 15-16 June 1970 struck fear into the hearts of the bosses. It gave many martyrs, Mehmet Cavdar in the Kozlu mine and Serif Aygul in the Gamak factory....."

Firstly, the fact that the DISK leaders, controlled by the revisionist-reformist TKP, had plugged the revolutionary struggle of our working class into reformism should have been exposed. The policy of peace with DISK, that is, the policy of peace with reformism in the ranks of the TKP, this policy that has lasted for a long time, has also found its way into the Draft Programme. In the new period we are entering after martial law, we have, alas, been unable to throw off the notorious policies of the past.

Secondly, to name the workers who died in the Programme is really unnecessary. This weakens the Programme. Further on the names of the young people who died are also listed. This is also unnecessary. With every passing days workers, peasants, youth and enlightened people will disappear from our ranks. The Programme will constantly be behind. There is no possibility of putting them one by one in the Programme! And it is not useful! On the contrary it can be harmful. It may lead to unproductive, sterile, unfortunate conversations as to why such and such is mentioned while someone else isn't. Besides, in a programme where a more detailed explanation is not possible, lists of names from all ranks, communist, revisionist, anarchist, side by side, will confuse the masses, leading them to think they are all elements of

the same movement. If it is considered that by listing people one by one from all ranks that the support of everyone who sympathises with them will be obtained then this is a basic political ploy and will be problematic. Everyone who dies fighting imperialism and reaction is worthy of respect, but this should never lead to us not drawing a line between the communists and the revisionists and anarchist elements. Otherwise it will be disrespectful to communism, which is even more deserving of respect, and to the cause of popular liberation. The fact that Ferdinand Lassalle was murdered by German reactionaries was no obstacle to Marx and Engels criticising him. In a letter to Bebel Engels said "*The Lassalleans had sacrificed nothing, absolutely nothing, which they could have retained. To complete the latter's victory, you accepted as your Party song the moralizing rhymed prose with which Herr Audoerf commemorates Lassalle*"

Praise for the dead, love, respect and criticism have no place in a party programme. Special tracts may be published, leaflets distributed and articles written in party organs for this purpose. There is no need to turn the programme into a commemoration!

"10....The big bourgeoisie in alliance with the feudal lords implemented a policy of national oppression and assimilation against the Kurdish people."

"25. The 6-million strong Kurdish population living in our country raised the banner of struggle against the bourgeois and landlords' policy of severe national oppression and assimilation. They stood up to the severe tyranny and torture inflicted the Kurdish people. The Kurdish people's struggle for democratic rights, equality nations and self determination is rapidly gaining strength. All the workers and peasants of Turkey support this struggle.

The racist imperialist policy of pitting the peoples of Turkey against each other and crushing them is bankrupt and the links binding the peoples on the path of revolution are becoming firm..."

"52. Our movement will declare that it recognises the Kurdish

people's right to self-determination and, if they wish to establish a separate state.

"Our movement...will work for the Kurdish people's destiny to be resolved in a manner that is to the benefit of the Kurdish workers and peasants.

"Our movement will struggle against the reactionary ruling classes of every nationality that is opposed to the revolutionary unity and fraternity of the Kurdish, Turkish people, and against their divisive policies."

**1) "Policy of national oppression and assimilation!** First of all, it is contrary to logic and to grammar to discuss "national oppression as a whole, then to mention "assimilation," which is part of that policy, and to combine the two of them with an 'and'.

2) National oppression is not just implemented against the **Kurdish people**, but against the **Kurdish nation** as a whole, including the bourgeoisie. Furthermore, **all minority nationalities** are subjected to national oppression, not just the Kurdish people. The Draft Programme, by claiming national oppression is only implemented on the Kurdish people closed its eyes to the democratic struggle of other minority nationalities. Secondly, it makes one of the following two errors: either the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords are considered to be included within the scope of the term Kurdish people, in which case, by concealing the bourgeois-feudal character of the Kurdish national movement which is developing to oppose oppression, and seeing the national movement as the workers' and peasants' class movement, is to fall into the line of the Kurdish nationalists. Or, the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords are not included within the scope of the term Kurdish people. In this case the progressive character of the Kurdish bourgeois and small landlords' struggle against national oppression is entirely rejected, and the line of Turkish nationalism is adopted.

3) The aim of national oppression is stated to be **"to intimidate the Kurdish people"**. This is incorrect. That is the aim of class op-

pression. "Intimidation of the people" is the policy implemented by all reactionary governments against all toilers, regardless of nationality. It is the policy applied to the Turkish people, too. Apart from this, the entire Kurdish nation (except a handful of feudal lords) is subjected to "tyranny and torture", not just to intimidate but in order to realise a more substantial purpose. What is this purpose? In general terms the aim is to have unrivalled possession of all the markets, mineral wealth etc. To secure national privileges and hold state privileges in their possession. For this purpose the languages of minority nationalities are banned, their democratic rights are usurped, massacres are carried out etc. The bourgeoisie of the dominant nation do all in their power to protect "territorial integrity", and "to ensure linguistic unity."

The oppression meted out to the toilers of minority nationalities is thus of a **multiple** character. Firstly, the class oppression carried out in order to better suck the blood of the toilers. Secondly, the national oppression meted out to all classes of the minority nationality for national purposes.

The programme, by presenting national oppression and class oppression as one and the same thing, is either concealing (?) the struggle of the Kurdish workers and other toilers against the bourgeoisie and small landlords, or is denying the progressive quality of the struggle of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords against national oppression. The first outcome suits the Kurdish nationalists, the second the Turkish nationalists, but neither is of any use to the cause of the Kurdish Turkish proletariat and toilers.

4) In the draft programme it is said that imperialism is pursuing a racist policy" with the aim of "pitting the peoples of Turkey against each other and crushing them." It is true that imperialism wishes to "pit the peoples of Turkey one against the other", but it is mistaken to say that it pursues a racist policy for this purpose'. The policy of racism is that of the most politically backward sections of the bourgeoisie and of feudalism. Turkish racism is the policy of the most politically back-

ward sections of the bourgeoisie and of the Turkish landlord class. Racist policy also exists in the ranks of the Kurdish nation. And this policy is that of (see above). The source racist policy is within the social basis.. Imperialism supports the racist policy of these classes when it suits its interests and opposes it when it does not. In Turkey US imperialism supports and incites Turkish racism as it is in its interests.

The policy of racism pursued by imperialism itself is an entirely different thing. The crushing of small nations and states by meddling in their internal affairs, interventions, the fuss (?) created by the fascist Hitler, for example, in order for the German race to rule the world, the interference in the internal affairs of small states and nations by US and Soviet Social Imperialism are all manifestations of the racist policy of imperialism.

The erroneous formulation of the Draft Programme assists the work of native racists for it ignores the struggle to be undertaken against their racist policy.

5) The Draft Programme (DP) states: “ **the Kurdish people,** “ has raised the flag of struggle against the policy of **severe national oppression and assimilation.**” Again, the D.P. says” the struggle **launched by the Kurdish people is for democratic rights, the equality of nationalities and for self-determination.**

The Kurdish movement, first and foremost, is a **national movement**, not a popular movement., Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish the class movement of the Kurdish proletariat and toilers, that is, the Kurdish people, from the **national movement** engaged in a struggle against national oppression for democratic rights”, the “equality of nation and “self-determination”.

Secondly, in no national movement are the demand of the bourgeoisie and those land lords that participate in the national movement limited to the ending of NATIONAL OPPRESSION and for DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS AND EQUALITY OF NATIONS. They will go further and ask for inequality and privileges for themselves. They will

wish to usurp the democratic rights of other nations, They will want to dominate unconditionally their own markets and mineral wealth. They will wish implement national oppression against these who are water than them. They will want to separate proletarians and toilers of their own nationality from shore of other nationalities with national fences. Instead of the international culture of the proletariat and democratic politics, they will wish to impose their own national culture and consolidate their own nationalism and struggle for their own national development and national culture. They will oppose the spontaneously the historical tendency for the integration of nations etc... Within Kurdish **national movement** it is impossible not to see reactionary demands similar to those above from a section of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and a section of small landlords in alliance with them.

The Draft Programme, apart from confusing the class movement of the Kurdish people with the national movement, ignores the actions of as of k.b etc to strengthen their own nationalism,.

The Communist movement supports unconditionally the **class movement** of the toiling people of every nationality within a state and provides leadership for this. The Communist movement also supports the struggle of oppressed nations within a state against national ,national inequality, privileges and the ? to establish a state. However, the communist movement does not support the struggle of the bourgeoisie and landlords of oppressed nation for their superiority, and will struggle against those who attempt to combine the struggle against national oppression with efforts to strengthen the position of sheikhs, landlords, mullahs etc. The Draft Programme ignores this task on account of the fact that **it wrongly** evaluates the national movement and sees it as the same thing as the popular movement.

Thirdly, the struggle “for self-determination” means the struggle to establish a separate state. **The Draft talks of** the Kurdish people struggling “for self-d”, that is, to establish a separate state. This is wrong for two reasons; first of all, a struggle to establish a separate

state would be in today's conditions, a national movement not a popular movement: Also, the Kurdish national movement is not yet waging a struggle to establish a separate state, some section within the national movement may have such intentions, but this is not the same as a national movement being waged in order to establish a **separate state**. In Northern Ireland today there is a national movement being waged to establish a separate state, but in Turkey such a thing has yet to emerge. In Turkey the Kurdish national movement is waging a struggle for "**the right to self-determination**", that is, the **right to establish a separate state**.

And we support this unconditionally and will do so in every period.

6) The Draft Programme says: "all Turkey's workers and peasants support the "struggle of the Kurdish people", that is, the "struggle against national oppression and assimilation," and the struggle "for democratic rights, equality of nations and for self-determination." Let us reiterate:

The communist movement will: a) unconditionally support the class movement of the Kurdish toiling people and provide it with leadership; b) the communist movement will support everything that is progressive in the Kurdish national movement, everything that is opposed to national oppression, privileges and inequality, and wishes to provide leadership to this struggle; c) the communist movement will not support actions, demands etc. within the national movement that aim to strengthen Kurdish nationalism and will wage a struggle against these.

The above excerpt from the Draft Programme is incorrect for two reasons; Firstly, apart from all Turkey's workers and peasants", Turkey's class conscious proletariat, too will not in all circumstances support the struggle "for self-determination" that is, the struggle to establish a separate state. The communist movement, in each concrete situation will support or not support according to an assessment of the benefits to social development and the proletariat's class struggle for socialism.

Secondly, we cannot claim that "all Turkey's workers and peasants" today support the most just and progressive demands of the Kurdish people. This is something that is desired but is not the reality. To make such a claim is to ignore the profound effect of Turkish nationalism on Turkish workers and peasants such as claim means to forget the task of counteracting the effect of dominant nation nationalism on Turkish toilers.

7) The Draft Programme states: "our movement...proclaims it recognises the Kurdish people's right to self-determination, and, if it wishes to establish its own state."

The first mistake is this again, instead of Kurdish nation the term Kurdish people has been used. The right to self-determination of a people is entirely different to a nation's right to self-determination. A nation's right to self-determination means the right to found a separate state, whereas a people's right to self-determination means that people's right to carry out a revolution.

The formulation "People's right to self-det." was advocated by Bukharin to comrade Lenin. (see???)

To advocate "a people's right to self-det" is. In reality, to advocate the dominant nation's privilege to establish a state, and is dominant nation nationalism.

Secondly, "...the self-determination of the Kurdish people", is stated. This sentence is illogical and confused. To say "for the self-determination of the Kurdish people" means the Kurdish people's revolution. In an article regarding the national question it is nonsensical to mention such a thing. "If the sentence had read: "the Kurdish people's (right) to self-determination and if it wishes... It would have made more sense and been a more grammatically correct.

Thirdly, "the right to self-determination" is nothing less than "the right to establish a separate state."

The draft presents the "right to self-determination" as if it is something else. The sentence would have been correct if it had been as fol-

lows: "the right to self-determination, that is, the right to establish a separate state." In this case, again, it would be necessary to replace "people" with "nation."

The article in the programme states: "our movement proclaims that it recognises the Kurdish people's (revolution) right and if it wishes to establish a separate state," In this case the Programme is talking nonsense rather than proposing a solution to the national question.

8) The Draft Programme states: "Our movement will work for the Kurdish People's destiny to be determined to the advantage of the Kurdish workers and peasants"> This means to say absolutely nothing. Even if the sentence had read "Kurdish nation" instead of "Kurdish people" it would still have been nonsense. For the phrase "determination of destiny" of a nation implies that the "determination" is going to take place outside. That is, it means that "a separate state will be established" by outside intervention. This, firstly, is a blatant annulment of the "Kurdish nation's right to self-determination". Secondly, the Programme has stated that without fail a separate state is a condition, which is utter nonsense. The Kurdish nation will either exercise its rights to self-determination, or not; this is something that nation will decide. This cannot be decided from outside.

Furthermore, in the event of the Kurdish nation wishing to establish a separate state, communists will of course wish it to be to the benefit of workers and peasants. However, even if it would be contrary to the interests of Kurdish workers and peasants, if the Kurdish nation wishes to establish a separate state the communists will never oppose this, will absolutely reject the use of force and will accept the wishes of the Kurdish nation.

The above article is full of meaningless things. And it results in removing the Kurdish nation's right to self-determination.

9) The Draft Programme states: "our movement will wage a struggle against the reactionary ruling classes of **every nation and their divisive policies.**

The term "divisive policy" is extremely harmful and unfortunate. The ruling classes use this term as a label which they stick on anyone who opposes their chauvinist policies, as in "divisiveness", "dividing territorial integrity" and "establishing a separate state." Communists advocate the "unity" of workers and toilers of all nations. If the oneness of territory or the unity of the state serves the unity of toilers of all nations then they will defend it. If it does not then they will advocate the division of territories and the state and secession. The slogan "unity of territory" or "unity of the state" is the slogan of the bourgeoisie and landlords of the dominant nation. Communists, have to distinguish the concept of "the unity of the working class and toilers" from the slogan "the unity of territories and state". Otherwise, they will find themselves on the same level as the nationalists of the dominant nation. In this case they will fundamentally wreck the unity of workers and toilers of various nationalities. The Draft Programme must abandon the term "divisive policy" and make abundantly clear what kind of unity it favours.

10) We shall not dwell on passages in the draft regarding the national question which are not wrong but which do not need to be included in a programme.

#### **If we are to sum up:**

a) The Draft Programme ignores the national oppression of other nationalities. B) The Draft Programme sees the Kurdish movement as a popular movement, not a national movement, and makes concessions to Kurdish nationalism. C) The Draft Programme mistakenly analyses the reasons for national oppression. D) The Draft Programme ignores the profound effects of Turkish nationalism on Turkish workers and peasants. E) The Draft Programme, like Bukharin, changes the "nations' right to self-determination" into peoples' right to self-determination, and sees the "right to self-determination" as something different from the "right to establish a separate state," it upsets the concepts con-

cerning the national question and as a result removes the Kurdish nation's right to self-determination.

**Conclusion:** Turkish nationalism making concessions to Kurdish nationalism! This is the essence of the Draft Programme.

"26. Between 1960 and 1970 various opportunist currents were effective in breaking-off our people's struggle **from its historical roots and Marxism-Leninism.**

"The opportunist administrators of the TIP sunk into the parliamentary path and advocated reformism. They submitted to imperialism by taking refuge in bourgeois laws and **turned the party into an inactive club of bourgeois intellectuals**"

We have seen what the "historical roots" are and how far the revisionists of M.Belli, H.Kivilcimli and Y.Demir have distanced themselves from "those roots". Instead of getting rid of those decayed roots, if you try to graft on the Thoughts of Mao-Tse-tung the result will be weird tree with a puny trunk and sour fruit. Nowadays such trees are called "modern revisionism" in M-L literature.

Another meaning to emerge from the above term is that the TKP was not born as "an inactive club of intellectuals". That "opportunist administrators" brought the TIP to this state afterwards. The same old sophistry is being continued.

"29. In the last quarter century imperialism and reaction's merciless exploitation and oppression of our people has made life intolerable for the broad masses of toilers."

Why "in the last quarter century"? Did the "merciless exploitation and oppression of our people" begin in 1946? Were previous periods idyllic for "our people"? Let us say that the person who penned the Draft Programme has a particular fondness for the M.Kemal period. And considers that "exploitation and oppression" were more "reasonable". So does he consider the years of the Second World War in the pawXXXXX of German fascism to be like that? So is that the way he perceives the Second World War years?. The characteristic of the

post-1946 period is that in Turkey there was a transition from the military fascist dictatorship based on the one-party absolute rule of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords to a "multi" party (although as all the parties were those of the big bourgeoisie and landlords they were as one) dictatorship. And the domination of German imperialism was replaced step by step by American imperialism. What is the factor that renders the "exploitation and oppression" more "merciless"? M.Belli sees "Philippine type democracy" "in his words, as the mother of all evil. According to him the matter is of the utmost simplicity: transition should not have happened to "Philippine-type democracy", The Kemalist regime of the CHP should have continued. He prefers one reactionary dictatorship to another. Doesn't the Draft Programme make the same preference in a more "refined" and "expert" way? It is also absolutely meaningless to include an unclear term such as "in the last quarter century" as the Programme will be preserved for long years the start date of this "quarter century" will move forward as the years pass. It will become necessary to deem years that are currently included within the period of "merciless exploitation and oppression" as reasonable.

"30. ... With the establishment of the fascist dictatorship the limited democratic rights of the 1961 const. were abolished by the use of force. The state administration degenerated into bribery and corruption."

Firstly, "the democratic rights of the 1961 Constitution" were not abolished by the fascist dictatorship, but had been removed long before that, **de facto** and naturally, "by force". The fascist dictatorship completed this process by abolishing that constitution. In this way, it became clearer that Constitution" were not abolished by the fascist dictatorship, but had been removed long before that, **de facto** and naturally, "by force". The fascist dictatorship completed this process by abolishing that constitution. In this way, it became clearer that even the protection of the thing we call "democratic rights" would only be possible

by revolutionary violence against reactionary violence, that force would only be overcome by a corresponding force.

Secondly, the degeneration of the state administration and descent into bribery and corruption are nothing new. Our people have been fed up with bribery and corruption for decades. Bribery and corruption are the characteristics of the bourgeois feudal state. Bribery and corruption exists wherever such a state exists. A bourgeois-feudal state free of bribery and corruption is unthinkable. Even the most democratic bourgeois state cannot abolish bribery and corruption; it can only reduce it. The Draft Program, by connecting "degeneration" and "bribery and corruption" to the development of martial law, is saying there was no "bribery and corruption" in a previous period and accepting, if indirectly, that with the ending of "fascist dictatorship", that is, Martial Law, bribery and corruption will end.

"35.....The curses of imperialism are inciting racism and militarism and endeavouring to portray the oppression of the Kurdish people as just and to incite hostility to the world's peoples."

The phrase "... the Kurdish people" would be more correct if altered to "the Kurdish nation and other minority nationalities",

"36. The major contradictions in our semi-colonial, semi-feudal society are these: 1) the contradiction between our country and imperialism; 2) the contradiction between the broad popular masses and feudalism; 3) the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; 4) the contradiction within the ruling classes.

"37. The disappearance of all these contradictions and the liberation of our people from exploitation and oppression will be realised with socialism."

The formulation "the contradiction between our country and imperialism" is meaningless. Instead of "our country" the words "our people of Turkey of all ethnic groups". In that case the sentence would have had meaning.

**"The disappearance of all these contradictions (ABC)....will**

be realised with socialism". As is known different contradictions have different ways of being resolved. The contradiction not between "our country", but between our people and imperialism will be resolved by a revolutionary national struggle (national revolution). The contradiction between broad popular masses and feudalism will be resolved by revolutionary civil war (democratic revolution). In semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries the struggles against imperialism and against feudalism, that is, the national revolution and the democratic revolution, cannot be separated one from the other: they are intricately and strongly linked. But according to circumstances sometimes one of these two contradictions, and sometimes the other, may come to the fore. In semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries under the indirect administration of imperialism, although the contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses is the major contradiction, in countries like this that are subjected to the military occupation of imperialism the national contradiction comes to the fore and becomes the major contradiction; but in both cases the resolutions of these two contradictions cannot be separated one from the other. This means that these first two contradictions will not "be resolved" by socialism, but will be resolved with a democratic popular revolution. Since the country in question is Turkey and the "ruling classes" in question the ruling classes of Turkey, once their "ruling" status is ended there will be no question of a contradiction between ruling classes". Today who are the ruling classes? The comprador bourgeoisie and landlords. When they are brought down from their "ruling" positions by a democratic popular revolution who will be the ruling classes? Essentially the working class, peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie and the revolutionary wing of the national bourgeoisie. As for the ruling class within this alliance, it will be the proletariat. It is apparent that the contradiction between the ruling classes of the democratic popular administration will be entirely different to the contradiction between the former ruling classes. And it will be a contradiction that will be able to be resolved by peaceful and non-hostile methods

within the revolutionary people. The contradiction to be “resolved by socialism” is solely the “contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.” In other words, the contradiction between labour and capital. Let us mention another point: in the draft the works resolution of a contradiction are not used: instead “the disappearance of all these contradictions” is mentioned, neither the comprador big bourgeoisie nor the landlords or national bourgeoisie can be entirely removed by either the democratic popular revolution or the socialist revolution. They will maintain their existence in the ideological cultural sphere after the coming into being of the dictatorship of the proletariat and even after the completion of the transformation of all the means of production to collective ownership. This is the reason for the continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Comrade Lenin presented the source for this in his work “Left Communism a Childhood Disorder”. Without the eradication of imper. and reaction all over the world the reactionaries overthrown in a country where the proletariat has triumphed will maintain their existence and await the opportunity to transform the revolution into a counter revolution. The “disappearance” of the contradiction between them and the proletariat will only be possible with communism. What is meant by the resolution of a contradiction, today in the first three contradiction, is the secondary aspect of the resolution becoming the essential, and vice versa. As for the “disappearance” of contradictions, for them to no longer exist, to completely disappear means neither the essential or secondary aspect playing a role. The democratic popular revolution will ensure that imperialism, the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords that constitute the essential aspect of today’s contradiction will become the secondary aspect, while the proletariat and other popular classes that make up the secondary aspect will constitute the essential aspect. But it will not “remove” this contradiction. Under the proletarian dictatorship and in the period of the establishment of socialism, and even after the production to socialist ownership a contradiction will still exist between the pro-

letariat of that country and imperialism, the *whole* bourgeoisie and the landlords (particularly in the ideological sphere). But from that country’s perspective the proletariat will constitute the fundamental aspect of this contradiction while the others will constitute the secondary aspect. There will also be a continuing contradiction between the reactionaries that make up the secondary aspect. “The **disappearance** of all these contradictions will be realised “with communism, not “socialism”! From whichever angle we look the sentence in the draft is erroneous and contrary to Marxism-Leninism.

“37.....our people’s liberation from exploitation and oppression will be realised socialism.”

It is true that our people will be liberated “from exploitation” by the realisation of socialism. In the period of democratic popular administration exploitation, while not extremes, will exist, as the bourgeoisie and its properly will exist: Even the existence of small-scale production means the existence of exploitation to a certain degree. Therefore, as long as the transformation of the means of production to collective ownership is not completed exploitation will continue, **partially**.

Once collective ownership of the means of production is completed in all spheres it will not be possible to talk of exploitation. Finally, the universal watchword of socialism: “from each according to their ability to each according to their labour ! Will have become reality. The possession of the means of production by a group of people, which is the source of exploitation, will have ended and become the joint property of society. The source of exploitation will have been dried up. But the second part of the sentence is a problem. “Our people’s liberation from oppression will be realised by socialism!!! This is to accept that oppression will exist in the system of democratic popular dictatorship. What is oppression? Oppression is the persecution and force inflicted on the people by the reactionaries, that use the ruling classes. It is reactionary violence. The reactionary classes have recourse to this violence and force in order to continue their exploitation and maintain

and preserve their ruling positions. In this respect, the violence they use against the people is also unjust. What enforces thus unjust and reactionary violence? The standing army and police which make it their profession to guard the ruling classes, the prisons etc. As is known, the ruling classes have, for long years utilised two weapons against the people: "executioner and priest." The means of oppression is this "executioner". Since victorious popular revolution under the leadership of the proletariat will throw out the executioner and the priest from that country where will the oppression remain? Yes, after the democratic popular revolution (and even after the socialist revolution) "violence" will not disappear. But the nature of this "violence" will be entirely different. This violence will be revolutionary violence used by the proletariat and popular classes against the reactionary classes that wish to bring back the old order. This violence from the historical point of view is legitimate and just. Is this oppression? If you ask the reactionaries it is, but if you ask us it is the most natural, most inevitable thing, the most just and progressive thing and absolutely not oppression! On the contrary, it is punishment given by the people to those who wish to bring back oppression. Isn't the Draft Programme, by accepting indirectly that oppression will exist in the system of democratic popular dictatorship, falling into a parallel position with the reactionaries?

"59. Our movement's ultimate aim is to remove all manner of exploitation and oppression of humanity, and to take our people to communism, a world in which classes no longer exist and is the greatest and happiest future."

A similar phrase is also to be found in the fundamental tenets section of the Draft Tuzuk???

"Our party's ultimate goal is to realise a classless society, that is, communism, by abolishing all kinds of exploitation and oppression."

The above phrases are from article 37 of the Programme (and Tuzuk). With the above expression the programme (constitution) fell even behind article 37. At a stroke the abolishing of exploitation and op-

pression becomes the ultimate aim of our movement. That is, this removal is postponed until communism, and "oppression" will exist both in the system of democratic popular dictatorship and in the system of proletarian dictatorship! Furthermore, socialism is also protecting "exploitation"! Either this socialism is of the "Swedish socialism" kind, or, the imperialists and reactionaries are right when they say "socialism is system of the most exploitation and oppression". Or else the colleague who penned this Draft is unaware of the real meaning of the concepts he uses.

Let us reiterate: in the socialist society while **classes** and the **state**, as a means of proletarian dictatorship, exist, there is neither exploitation nor oppression. **Exploitation** will disappear along with the construction of socialism. The principle is: "From everyone according to his? , to everyone according to his labour. "To mention exploitation in a society where everyone receives according to their labour shows that this principle has not been grasped. As for **oppression**, it will disappear along with the realisation of the democratic popular administration (this is a people's republic). That is neither the system of popular democratic dictatorship nor the system of proletarian dictatorship does oppression exist. Oppression is the crushing of the revolutionary people by a handful of exploiters and reactionary classes. If the dictatorship of the people and the proletariat over the reactionaries is seen as oppression this is profoundly mistaken. This is the attitude of reactionaries.

It is correct that the world of communism will be "a world where classes no longer exist", But it is not just this. In the world of communism along with classes the **state**, which is the means of oppression of other classes by the ruling classes and the means of proletarian dictatorship in socialism, will also disappear. For with the complete disappearance of classes the proletariat will no longer need a state. On the other hand at the stage of communism, that is, "*From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs*" (Marx).

So the particularity of the communist world is not just that classes

will disappear but that along with classes, class domination will disappear and the slogan "from each according to his ability to each according to his needs," will replace "from each according to his labour....".

The Draft, with the articles we have highlighted, apart from ratifying the characteristics applied by the reactionaries to the system of popular democratic dictatorship and socialism, has broken off communism from its most important characteristics.

"37...of call the feudal and semi-feudal remnants..." The term "semi-feudal remnant" is meaningless. "Semi-feudal" relationships are already a remnant, a remnant of feudalism. "Semi-feudal remnant" is a "remnant" of "feudal remnant", such a phrase is absurd. "All feudal and semi-feudal relations" or "all feudal remnants" or "feudalism" should have been used.

37...Our movement, in order to establish a popular democratic dictatorship under the leadership of the working class based on alliance of workers and peasants..."

"..With the founding of a revolutionary administration of the people.."

"39...Our movement...will organise the armed forces of the people and wage a struggle to establish a popular liberation front on a worker-peasant alliance.

"Our movement will establish an order in liberated zones where the people are in power."

The word "people" has been used in combination with terms such as revolution, power, armed forces... but, in the Programme we are unable to learn who the people are and what classes they include. Yes, what are the popular classes? Which of these classes will the proletariat absolutely trust with which of them will it establish a sound alliance, which ones will it render neutral and which ones will it endeavour to attract to its side, this is not clear. But all these are some of the most important questions of the revolution. "The revolutionary administration

of the people", "The democratic dictatorship of the people", "An order in which the people are in power," it is not clear which classes' administration. Which classes will the "People's revolutionary front" include? The Programme says nothing on this subject. "Our movement will organise the peoples of Turkey," but which classes? Which of these will it be based on, which will it trust and which will it not? While these are the fundamentals that need saying the Draft Programme leaves these questions entirely unanswered. (It suffices with listing literary but empty, sentences side by side. You cannot say": We know these things what need is there to write them down?")! Many new revolutionaries who don't know these things are joining and will join our ranks. The Programme must shine a light on these fundamental questions for them. Furthermore, thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of toilers who pick up our programme will seek answers to these questions. The term people in Turkey is one used frequently by even the most reactionary section of the ruling classes. Of course, we must not abandon this term, but let us give it content. Let us make clear its real content. In this way, the difference between the real meaning of the term 'people' and the demagogues' "people" will become clear.

"38....The essence of the contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses is the contradiction between the peasant masses and the landlords and loan sharks. Only by grasping this contradiction as the fundamental link of the revolution can we organise the worker-peasant masses in a people's army, succeed in carrying out a democratic popular.

Revolution, the essence of which is a **land revolution**, and destroy the rule of imperialism.

"For this reason the main contradiction of the four main contradictions in our country today is the contradiction between the popular masses and feudalism". In the determination of the main contradiction logic has been turned on its head. Instead of going from cause to effect the opposite route has been chosen. In fact, firstly the main contradic-

tion is determined, then this is identified and understood as the main link. The method of the Draft programme is an idealist method, which is why it is absolutely not convincing.

Why is the contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses the main contradiction? In a process where there is more than one contradiction one of them determines the development of the other contradictions and exerts influence. This contradiction is the main one. The contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses will, in our country, play a determining and directive role on both the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and proletariat and on the contradiction between imperialism and the people of Turkey. To the degree that feudalism unravels the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will emerge and sharpen. On the other hand in broad rural areas the feudal forces are the social prop of imperialism. For this reason a resolution of the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses will deprive imperialism of a significant prop and play a determining role in the development and resolution of the contradiction between imperialism and the people of Turkey. These are in short the reasons why the contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses is the main contradiction.

“40...Our movement is always prepared to unite with all democratic and patriotic forces against fascism and reaction.” To unite means to establish an alliance. This is a different thing to “**temporary and partial agreements.**”

Firstly, as communists, we do not consider it possible to have an alliance with the national bourgeoisie under the leadership of the proletariat without the construction of and organised popular army under the leadership of the communist party and, this, without the realisation to a certain degree of a worker-peasant alliance. We would certainly wish for such an alliance in all periods, by to wish for something is different to that thing's coming to fruition. Today only temporary and partial agreements are possible-secondly; communists are not prepared for al-

liance” in all circumstances “. They will establish alliances on condition that programme and that they “ preserve their independence”, “ rely on their own forces “ and “ do not lose the initiative.”

Did the Chinese Communist Party comply with the Kuomintang's call to “ dissolve the Red Army, let's unite with you?” If it had dissolved the Red Army for the sake of unity this would have been a crushing defeat for the CCP and the revolution. Communists of course wish to “ unite” with all forces that can possibly join the ranks of the revolution, but not at any price! Not under any circumstances! Not by abandoning their principles and aims! Not by trusting in the power of another, losing their independence and their initiative! Not as a tail of the bourgeoisie!

The phrase “always prepared to unite” in the Draft arouses a contrary opinion.

“40.Our movement will mobilise the masses for struggle, for the retreat of imperialism, the people's winning democratic rights and improvements in living conditions, by advocating all urgent demands and needs. It will endeavour to increase their awareness and win them to the ranks of the armed struggle”. This article of the Draft Programme wishes to , firstly, make a completely reformist line, such as the advocacy of “ urgent demands and needs “ under all conditions, the line of the party. For communists will only advocate and support “urgent demands and needs” on condition that “partial demands do not replace revolutionary slogans and that “ we remain firmly tied to our general political demands and revolutionary agitation amongst the masses.”

The moment they conflict with “general political demands and revolutionary agitation “ they will be rejected. For instance, it would be blatant reaction to get up in front of the masses who have risen up to overthrow the present order and make a speech on “urgent demands”, and this is the policy of the ruling classes. Furthermore, communists never make the struggle for urgent demand the fundamental one.

Secondly, the theory of “ raising the consciousness of the masses

by advocating all demands and needs..” is entirely inspired by the theory of the economists “ to make the workers aware” and “ promote workers’ actions” by putting forward concrete demands that promise practical results.” And in essence there is absolutely no difference between the two!

“42...state land will be distributed to the peasantry or be turned into popular farms under the supervision of village committees.”

Are “peasant committees” village party committees, or organs of armed struggle, organs of power, reading groups, groups that disseminate publications, it is not clear? In the pamphlet of our Programme for Land Revolution is the following:

“There is only one path to liberation from poverty and oppression. In rural areas TO OVERTHROW THE DOMINATION OF THE GENTRY WITH THEIR BOOTS AND WHIPS AND ESTABLISH THE PEASANTS’ OWN RULE! With this aim we must establish PEASANT COMMITTEES to direct the struggle of impoverished and middle peasantry in every village.

*“Let us be prepared for a struggle to eradicate the landlords and loan sharks one by one. Let us not allow the lackeys who serve the landlords and loan sharks to remain in the villages! Let us stop their swagger and end their domination. The PEASANT COMMITTEES will wage such a struggle.”(ibid)*

As can be understood from the above the peasant committees are organs of armed struggle. And their task is to “implement” and “direct” the struggle of the impoverished and middle peasantry. It is not possible to understand from the pamphlet what the form of struggle will be. Popular war is mentioned but , today what is the form of this, is it guerilla war, or is something else being considered. It is this struggle (whatever it is) that will be “implemented” and directed.”

On the other hand, peasant committees are at the same time organs of power.

“Peasant Committees will implement the Land Revolution Pro-

gramme and the task of dissemination. Agricultural labourers and impoverished and middle peasantry will elect peasant committees in every village. These committees will consist in the main of agricultural labourers and impoverished peasants,

“Forests, lakes, streams and pastures will pass into the direction of the peasant committees. These committees will organise all work concerning their protection, development and the peasants’ benefiting from these in an equal way.

The entire question of organisation amongst the peasantry is, as can be seen, settled in a trice by means of the “peasants committees”, a remedy for all ills! This demonstrates that colleagues have not thought seriously even once about how the peasants will be organised. A peasants’ committee that does everything immediately, although no one knows what manner of committee it is! And these committee, regarding which we have not a clue, have got into the programme. Their new task: to supervise people’s farms!

They should at least have been described as “revolutionary peasant organs of power”. The meaning will be clear. How they would be organised etc. is not a current task. The thing called “peasant committees” now merely serves to confuse.

“43. ...All debts to imperialists will be liquidated.” Instead of the term “liquidated” the word “cancelled” should have been used as “liquidated” also means the payment of debts, which is erroneous.

“44. ...Our movement rejects absolutely the presence of foreign military bases in Turkey, whichever the country.”

The phrase “..whichever the country..” is wrong because it includes the socialist countries. It is mistaken, as a socialist country may certainly send arms and volunteers to support a revolution in another country. However, it will put these arms and volunteers under the command of the revolutionaries in that country. It will leave their utilisation to the initiative of the revolutionaries in that country. It will not intervene in their affairs from outside. This, of course, is not “having military units or bases”.

The People's Republic of China gave the following answer at a United Nations meeting to the USA and USSR imperialists' demagogic "Strategic Weapons' Limitation" meetings and their accusations of aggression towards the People's Republic of China: "The People's Republic of China [PRC] will never be the **first** to use nuclear weapons. And the PRC does not have military bases or units in any country and this is the guarantee of its not being aggressive. On the other hand the USA and USSR imperialists have military bases, nuclear fleets and units in many countries and in seas. Empty words like "limitation" cannot conceal the fact that they are the real aggressors. If they were really sincere they announce like the PRC that they would not be the **first** to use nuclear weapons and would remove all their military bases and units from the territories and territorial waters of other countries. Only after that can sincere talks on disarmament take place attended by **all countries, big and small.**"

The Draft Programme, in its above phrase, is rejecting in a concealed way the reality "that socialist countries will not have military bases and units in a foreign country" and accepting indirectly that "socialist countries will have bases and units in foreign countries". This is nothing less than accepting the reactionaries' "red imperialism" demagoguery. To think of the socialist countries with the logic of reactionaries with the logic of reactionaries and then put pen to paper with this logic! This is what has happened.

"46...from neighbourhood administration to the highest levels a revolutionary government will be realised which the people will determine and oversee by elections."

It should have been openly stated that public servants would be appointed and dismissed from office by election. In the above article it is clear that public servants would be elected but not that they would be dismissed by election. If this is what is meant by "oversee" then this should be made clear.

"47. A democratic popular government will abolish the army that

has made it its profession to protect the ruling classes, consolidate the people's army based on the general arming of the workers and peasants, in this way ensuring the guarantee of our national independence and defence of our country.

"All manner of inequality and rank and title in the army will be abolished and soldiers will have a say in the election of commanders. The right of association will be the soldiers' most natural right. "Beating and persecution of soldiers will be banned absolutely, and the army will be made productive and in the service of the people"

The first paragraph is vague! It is not easy to understand what it means and calls to mind this: It is as if the masses will rise up suddenly and take power, as in the Soviet Union, and that the revolutionary government will dissolve the old reactionary army by taking away their weapons will arm all the people etc. However, the "abolishing of the army that has made it its profession to protect the ruling classes" is not something that can be done in a moment after seizing power. During a prolonged people's war this reactionary army will be torn into pieces, destroyed and will be disarmed etc. The revolutionary government will sweep away the **final remnants** of this reactionary army. This meaning does not emerge from the Draft Programme.

Undoubtedly the development of the people's army will proceed under the revolutionary govt.: "the people's army based on the general arming of workers and peasants, but neither at the outset of the armed struggle (that is, today) nor when power is seized by a democratic revolution will the people's army consist of a general arming of workers and peasants. That is the army and the people will not be the same thing. This will be possible in the future. On the one hand we say: "the people's army will grow from small to large and from weak to strong" and on the other how can the people's army be based on the general arming of the people prior to the seizure of power, and the "people's government's" task is to strengthen it? According to the draft when power is seized the army will already be based on the gen-

eral arming of the workers and peasants “ and the government |” will consolidate this. How is this possible?

In our circumstances in the prolonged war during which the people’s army will need to be constructed step by step these sentences are entirely wrong. The people’s army will of course emerge from the bosom of the people and be a part of them and in their service. It will participate in production but the army and the people will not be the same thing immediately and in a short time. From the moment the army and the people begin to become the same the army will have begun to pass from being an army and the state from being a state. That is, communism will have been attained.

On the other hand the people’s army will not only be the “guarantee” of our national independence and the defence of our country but will at the same time be the guarantee of the protection and consolidation of the democratic popular dictatorship, of the transition to socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As for the “**abolishing** of all inequality, ranks and titles in the army, “since the army in question is a popular one, these will not occur at the beginning. The Draft assumes these and the same may be said for the phrase: Beatings and persecution of soldiers will be banned.” It would have been correct if it had been stated that these never have a place in a popular army.

The Draft Programme, with the above expression, rejects the fact that the people’s army will be constructed step-by-step during a prolonged war. In its place it includes the dream of taking power with a general uprising, with a people’s army being formed under a revolutionary govt. and the reactionary army being abolished after the seizure of power. Furthermore, it confuses the democratic popular dictatorship when the army has yet to become one with the people, and the communist order when they become one and the same thing.

The section sub-headed “Democratic Popular Revolution (should be state) Programme” is full of repetitions. In article 45 there is men-

tion of democracy being given to the people. In article 50 there is again “personal freedoms and freedoms of political thought, organisation, assembly, press and speech to the people,” Freedom of conscience and worship “ is given! In article 47 there is recognition for the right of assembly to soldiers, part of the people ....That is, the draft states that first the people are given the definition of “ democracy” and subsequently its elements. The draft first gives people “democracy” entirely and then ensures “democracy” for the soldiers, who are a part of the people! The draft first provides “democracy for all people, but then provides “democracy” for the soldiers, whom are part of the people. This is all unnecessary repetition. Furthermore, there is entirely unnecessary detail such as “banks will be combined into a national bank”, “torture will be banned”, capital punishment will be abolished” and “public spirited” youth will be educated etc. There is no need for such things in the Programme. Engels made a critique of the Erfurt Programme thus:

*“The fear that a short, pointed exposition would not be intelligible enough has caused explanations to be added, which make it verbose and drawn out. To my view the programme should be as short and precise as possible. No harm is done even if it contains the occasional foreign word, or a sentence whose full significance cannot be understood at first sight.”*

## Appendices and Corrections

I concur with the following points made by other colleagues:

1) It should have been stated that our movement is a product of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

2) It should have been made clear that all over the world imperialism is collapsing en masse, that socialism is progressing towards victory and that there exists an excellent revolutionary situation on a global scale.

3) There should definitely have been a mention in the Programme of the fact that Soviet Social Imperialism is the enemy of the world's peoples and an accessory to US imperialism.

4) There should have been mention of the revisionist Yakup Demir being a lackey of Soviet Social Imperialism.

5) The struggle in the Middle East should have been mentioned briefly and the importance of uniting with it touched upon.

6) There should have been an article regarding the workers in Germany.

7) The Programme should definitely have included mention of the fact that guerrilla war is the fundamental forms of the armed struggle.

#### **Conclusion**

WHETHER THE FLAG WE HOLD HIGH IN FRONT OF EVERYONE WILL BE THE RED FLAG OF THE PROLETARIAT DEPENDS ON WHETHER THE BLEMISHES WE HAVE INDICATED ARE CLEANED. WE WISH WITH ALL SINCERITY THAT THESE STAINS BE CLEANED.

**January-1972**

*The Theses of Shafak Revisionism  
Regarding the Kemalist Movement,  
Kemalist Government Period,  
Second World War Years, Post-War  
and 27 May*

*January 1972*

“These people are branding the independence struggle today being waged by our people and being the heirs of the complete independence principle of M.Kemal with revisionism. This is undoubtedly the attitude of a spendthrift. Those who shirk the revolutionary struggle are looking down on the struggles of the past and are unable to comprehend the importance of making history a weapon in this great struggle. This attitude and class character of theirs stems from their petit bourgeois ideology that looks down on everything.

“As we all know our National Liberation war was carried out under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie and the leader of the national revolution was M. Kemal”. M. Kemal’s principle of complete independence and our liberation war is such a tangible inheritance that tens of thousands of workers and peasants gave their blood and sacrificed their lives for its sake. They did not shirk from any self-sacrifice. But as the workers and peasants were not organised the national bourgeoisie seized the leadership of the national revolution and, being unable to complete the bourgeois democratic revolution, established a dictatorship that oppressed the workers and peasants. The new Kemalist bourgeoisie’s dictatorship over the people came to a compromise with feudalism and imperialism, as necessitated by its character. A collaborationist big bourgeoisie subsequently emerged from this new bourgeoisie, surrendering our country to the clutches of imperialism. To expect a consistent proletarian stance from M. Kemal then when this was not forthcoming to label him an imperialist collaborator, suits the bourgeois idealists. But it is evident that such an attitude is not appropriate for the proletarian movement.

“The analyses of Lenin, Stalin and Mao-Tse-Tung regarding M. Kemal should show the way to us. Why is this question important? Because our stance on this subject will determine whether we give away our people’s progressive past to fascism and reaction. We can see how fascist generals who are lackeys of the Americans have used

parts of our people's progressive history such as the War of National Liberation, Yunus Emre and M. Kemal in their fascist demagogy and how they are trying to create mass support on this basis. What shall we do? Shall we leave all this to them? The revolutionary inheritance of the people is a weapon in the class struggle. Very proper gentlemen may not like some of these weapons because they are muddy and abandon them to the enemy as they do not want to get their hands dirty. But a proletarian fighter waging a life or death struggle does not care if the weapon is muddy. He will grasp the handle tightly" (Liquidationists' Article)

"The fascist government...has launched a contemptible campaign to appropriate the revolutionary past of our people **for itself. They are endeavouring to make M. Kemal a tool of fascist..... The fascist pro-American curs who are the most ferocious enemies of independence presume they will be able to portray M. Kemal as part of their fascist twaddle by distorting his principles**" (The political situation in the World and in Turkey after 12 March, page 45)

"In order to mislead the Kemalists sections of the middle bourgeoisie". (ibid p.45)

"The people of Turkey, who waged the first liberation struggle of the age of proletarian revolutions and national liberation struggles, gave hope and courage to all the oppressed peoples of Asia". (Draft Programme)

"The bourgeois leadership of the War of Liberation....established a dictatorship that oppressed the workers and peasants. (ibid)

"Following the destruction of the Ottoman Sultanate and comprador bourgeoisie with the War of National Liberation, the new Turkish bourgeoisie that seized power endeavoured to create a national bourgeoisie by means of the state in order to grow and become wealthy. The new Turkish bourgeoisie exploited the workers and peasants mercilessly under this label and came to an agreement with the feudal landlords and imperialism."(ibid)

"The bourgeois dictatorship over our people gradually surrendered our country to the imperialist yoke. The big bourgeoisie in alliance with feudal lords implemented a policy of national oppression and assimilation against the Kurdish people "(ibid)

"The collaborationist big bourgeoisie which emerged from within the new Turkish bourgeoisie growing fat from the policy of creating a national bourgeoisie, developed rapidly particularly from the Second World War years on and step by step intensified its collaboration with imperialism." (ibid)

"The big bourgeoisie that grew due to profiteering during the war, took shelter under the wings of international capital and consolidated its alliance with the landlords who had developed as a result of high agricultural prices during the war years. This reactionary alliance supported the DP in order to liberate itself from the shackles of CHP state capitalist bureaucracy, maintaining its power with that party." (ibid)

"From 1950 onwards imperialist capital had free rein" (ibid)

"After 1950 imperialism and its collaborators using the reactionary parliament as a means of domination".. (ibid)

"the political and economic crisis which intensified the exploitation and oppression of the people by the day resulted in the overthrow of the US-lackey DP government on 27 May 1960.

"The middle bourgeoisie which gave its character to the 27 May movement surrendered to imperialism from the outset. It left power to the collaborationist big bourgeoisie and the landlords" (ibid)

Let us summarise the theses of the Shafak revisionists:

1)"Our National Liberation War was carried out under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie."

2) Our Liberation War "Was the first liberation struggle of the age of proletarian revolutions and **national liberation wars**" (ibid)

3) Our Liberation War "gave courage and hope to all the oppressed people of Asia."

4) With our National Liberation struggle, “the Ottoman sultanate and comprador bourgeoisie was demolished.”

5) The Kemalist government was politically an **independent dictatorship of the national bourgeoisie**. “Those who claim M. Kemal was an imperialist collaborator are bourgeois idealists.”

6) “The new Turkish bourgeoisie which took power **endeavoured to create a national bourgeoisie by means of the state.**” (ibid)

7) “The Kemalist bourgeoisie’s dictatorship over the people came to agreement with feudalism and imperialism **as a necessity of the character of the national bourgeoisie.**”

8) **The collaborationist big bourgeoisie** emerged from within the new Turkish bourgeoisie that was growing fat from the creation of the national bourgeoisie.

“The collaborationist big bourgeoisie, in particular from the **Second World War years developed rapidly and intensified its collaboration with imperialism step by step.**”(ibid) “During the war it became wealthy from profiteering and went under the wing of international capital.”

The collaborationist big bourgeoisie established an **alliance with the landlords** who had developed during the war years.

“This reactionary alliance, in order to free itself from the confines of the bureaucracy of CHP state capitalism, backed the DP and continued its power with that party;”

9) After 1950 imperialist capital in Turkey had free rein.”

10) Imperialism and its collaborators used the reactionary parliament as a means of domination.”

11) “The political and economic crisis resulted in the overthrow of the American lackey DP government on 27 May 1960.” (ibid)

12) “It was the middle bourgeoisie that gave its character to the 27 May movement.” With the 27 May movement power passed to the middle bourgeoisie, but the middle bourgeoisie surrendered power to the “ collaborationist big bourgeoisie and landlords.” (ibid)

13) “Kemalism is the ideology of the revolutionary section of the middle bourgeoisie.”

“M. Kemal’s principles are in no way compatible with fascism.”

“M. Kemal is part of the progressive history of our people”.

14) “We are the heirs of M. Kemal’s principle of total independence.” “We cannot abandon this inheritance to the fascists, we must cling to it fervently.”

15) “The analyses of Lenin, Stalin and Mao should be a beacon for us.”

These are the theses of the Shafak revisionists. Now let us begin our critique:

We shall present the character of the Kemalist movement and the Kemalist government's practice with extensive reference to Schnurov. For Schnurov is a reliable witness, a sound Bolshevik. The book from which we shall quote was written to introduce the situation in Turkey and the struggle of the working class to the Soviet working class. There is no reason not to accept the views expressed by Schnurov as being the views in those years of comrade Stalin and the other Bolshevik leaders.

### **1. The classes leading the Kemalist Revolution are the Turkish Big Bourgeoisie and Feudal Lord Classes:**

Comrada Schnurov says:

“The Turkish national revolution, called Kemalist on account of the revolution's leader M. Kemal, was directed by Turkey's national bourgeoisie, that is merchants, landlords and at that time the very small number of industrialists in Turkey.”

\* (All excerpts from this book were taken from the **Türkiye'de Kapitalistleşme ve Sınıf Kavgaaları** book of A Schnurov and Y. Rozaliyev published by Ant Yayınları in 1970 Schnurov's part of the book was republished by Yar Yayınları under the title **Türkiye Proletaryası**. Rozaliyev's part of the book was also republished by Yar Yayınları under the title **Türkiye Sanayi Proletaryası**.

The Kemalist revolution is similar to, and follower of, the Young Turk revolution.

Schnurov says:” As a result of the domination of the large landowners who mercilessly robbed what is essentially a poor country, the religious men and, first and foremost, the sultanate, Turkey fell entirely into the hands of European capital, becoming the slave of European capitalism. In 1908 the rule of the Sultan was for the first time shaken to the roots by the combined force of the Turkish mercantile bourgeoisie, officers and nobles. This bourgeois revolution is known as the Young Turk revolution and was supported at the beginning by the pop-

ular masses.” (After the Young Turk revolution, too) Turkey preserved its semi-colonial character. That is, it was in the position of a market from which capitalist countries bought raw materials and to which they sold industrial products.

Turkey was considered politically to be independent. But Turkey was a toy in the hands of the imperialists., For this reason Turkey was pushed into the First World War by Germany, on which it was dependent economically to an exceptional degree, and on whose account it fought. With Germany losing the war Turkey was entirely pillaged. In order to protect its territorial integrity a second revolution became essential. “This time, the revolution known as the “Kemalist revolution” was carried out against French and British imperialism.

“.....The Turkish mercantile bourgeoisie took over the leadership of the revolution. Since Turkey was an agricultural country the merchants' main trade was in agricultural products. The mercantile bourgeoisie thus established strong links with the feudal gentry and landlords. In every Turkish village the lord and landowner was also a usurer and the main buyer and seller of the peasants' products. These gentry sometimes owned flour mills or small factories processing oil or dried fruit or other enterprises. The gentry also represented large firms that bought agricultural products wholesale.

“Under these conditions if Turkey had been defeated by the European capitalists, foreigners would in a short time have seized all trade and industry. The Turkish bourgeoisie faced a life or death struggle. If the parts under the occupation of the capitalists did not exist, if the state did not support them, if the privileges granted to foreigners continued and Turkey remained entirely dependent on foreign capital the country's trade and industry would sooner or later die. It was this threat that made the merchant, industrialist and large landlord and gentry that sold agricultural products to foreign countries into revolutionaries. The peasants, workers and small businessmen's discontent with the capitalists and landlords was expertly turned into a struggle against foreign capi-

talists. The revolution therefore spread all over the country and took on a national character.”

The Kemalist revolution was essentially led by the mercantile bourgeoisie, but was a “national bourgeois” revolution based on their alliance with a section of gentry large landowners and usurers and at the beginning the bourgeoisie succeeded in gaining the support of the people.

It is necessary to dwell briefly on the above concept of “national bourgeoisie”. Comrades Lenin, Stalin and Schnurov, when discussing the Kemalist revolution used the term “national bourgeois” in the meaning of bourgeois who were Turkish. The distinction between national bourgeois and comprador bourgeois did not yet exist. We see this concept later in its new meaning with comrade Mao Tse-Tung. When comrade Lenin, Stalin and Schnurov call the Kemalist revolution a “national bourgeois revolution” they mean a “revolution of the bourgeoisie who were Turkish”, not a “revolution of the bourgeoisie who were not comprador.” In the booklet we are discussing comrade Schnurov considers the landlords and usurers within the concept of “bourgeois”. For instance, he says: “Turkey’s national bourgeoisie, that is, merchant, landlord” (ibid). We also find this use of the term bourgeois in comrades Stalin and Dimitrov. Comrade Schnurov, when calling the Kemalist revolution the “revolution of the national bourgeoisie”, means the revolution of the mercantile bourgeoisie, landlords, usurers and small number of industrial bourgeoisie who were Turkish, and mentions all these classes one by one.

Were these classes “national”, in today’s meaning of the word, or comprador let us dwell on this: In his book *New Democracy* comrade Mao Tse-Tung quotes comrade Stalin as saying “*A Kemalist revolution is a revolution of the top stratum, a revolution of the national merchant bourgeoisie...*”

The upper class in question were the Turkish comprador big bourgeoisie that grew within the Committee of Union and Progress,

and were lackeys of firstly German imperialism and, after the defeat of German imperialism in World War one, moved close to British-French imperialism.

We know that the Turkish bourgeoisie initially organised around the Committee of Union and Progress and that this class along with the officers and nobles led the Young Turk revolution in 1908. After the Committee of Union and Progress had come to power, due to global conditions and the continuing problem of Turkey’s semi-colonial structure, it went into collaboration with German imperialism.

While on the one hand a wing of the bourgeoisie grew and flourished, constituting the Turkish big bourgeoisie, on the other the comprador bourgeoisie, comprised of in general the minority nationalities, that had existed since the time of Abdul Hamit maintained its presence. The Committee of Union and Progress represented the interests of the former, and as the loyal lackey of German imperialism became the sworn enemy of the working class and other toilers. The growing comprador wing of the Turkish bourgeoisie (that is, the Turkish comprador big bourgeoisie) became fabulously wealthy during the First World War on account of trading in military vehicles, railway monopoly and profiteering on essential goods. Significant wealth and capital was accumulated. With the collapse of German imperialism and the consequent threat to their domination they began to flirt with the allied powers and take necessary steps.

It is these which comrade Stalin called the **upper strata**.

Comrade Schnurov, in his book points out that the Turkish bourgeoisie had to participate in the National Liberation War, “**despite not being revolutionary**.” In backward countries the bourgeoisie that is not comprador that is, the national bourgeoisie has a revolutionary quality, albeit limited. The class that is not revolutionary is the comprador bourgeoisie that is in a union of interests with imperialism.

Again Schnurov says that “the feudal gentry are also agents of large commercial firms that by agricultural products wholesale.” It is known

that in those years the “large commercial firms” were to a large degree under the control or in the possession of the imperialists. All this shows that the leadership of the National Liberation War passed into the hands of the comprador big bourgeoisie, landlords and usurers within the Committee of Union and Progress from the very beginning. Comrade Schnurov explained the reasons impelling these classes into the Liberation War above.

Let us stress another point: the middle bourgeoisie, which did not become wealthy, maintained its existence Committee of Union and Progress. It is evident that this wing of the bourgeoisie played a significant role in the War of Liberation. We were previously of the opinion that the middle bourgeoisie of a national character were the leadership of the Liberation War. However, on examining comrade Stalin and Schnurov in a more careful way we realised this view was mistaken. The middle bourgeoisie of a national character did not lead the Liberation War, but it had a significant role in that war. Those who organised in the Defence Associations were mainly the Turkish comprador big bourgeoisie, landlords, usurers, town notables and the middle bourgeoisie of a national character. These were the classes that provided the leadership of the Liberation War.

## **2. The Kemalists, even during the years of the Liberation War, were embarking on collaboration with the Imperialists:**

When the imperialists began to make a few minor concessions the Kemalists did not delay in signing agreements with the bourgeoisie of France, Britain and other countries.

“The Kemalists’ fear was this: If the war continued the toiling masses might not have sufficed with struggle against foreign exploiters and launched a struggle against exploiters who were their own countrymen”.

Schnurov says this. As for comrade Stalin he wrote the following on 30 November 1920:

*“The defeat of Armenia by the Kemalists, with the Entente remaining absolutely “neutral,” the rumours of the contemplated restoration of Thrace and Smyrna to Turkey, the rumours of negotiations between the Kemalists and the Sultan who is an agent of the Entente, and of a contemplated withdrawal from Constantinople, and, lastly, the lull on Turkey’s Western Front—all these are symptoms which indicate that the Entente is flirting furiously with the Kemalists, and that the Kemalists are probably executing a certain swing to the Right.*

*How the Entente’s flirtation with the Kemalists will end, and how far the latter will go in their swing to the Right, it is difficult to say. But one thing is certain, and that is that the struggle for the emancipation of the colonies, begun several years ago, will intensify in spite of everything, that Russia, the acknowledged standard-bearer of this struggle, will support those who champion it with every available means, and that this struggle will lead to victory together with the Kemalists, if they do not betray the cause of the liberation of the oppressed peoples, or in spite of them, if they should land in the camp of the Entente.”*

The Kemalists did not at the beginning join the ranks of the “allied powers” but they did not neglect to carry out covert collaboration with them against the socialist Soviet Union externally and against communists, working class and other toiling people internally. M. Kemal and his government pursued a hypocritical policy against the Soviet Union. On the one hand, while raining down the most extreme compliments in order to obtain aid, on the other were seeking a basis for secret agreements to be made with the US, Britain and France. Two months after sending a request for aid to the USSR, M. Suphi and 14 of his comrades were brutally murdered. Furthermore, a campaign was launched against communists in Anatolia. For the Kemalist bourgeoisie calculated that if they went to the London conference meeting on 23 February 1921 having slaughtered communists they would win favour with their European patrons and that the deadly provisions of the Treaty of Sevres might be abandoned. Bekir Sami, the head of the delegation

at the conference, sought better conditions for agreement by saying that Turkey would join the anti-Soviet block. Again, while the Conference was being held the Kemalists demanded the Soviet Union leave Artvin and Ardahan and attempted to occupy Batum. However, when the efforts to ingratiate themselves with the Europeans failed and the Europeans insisted on the Treaty of Sèvres the Kemalists were obliged to again look to cosy up to the Soviet Union.

Immediately after the Greek armies were thrown out, as there remained no need for Soviet aid the Kemalists reintroduced the ban on communism.

Izvestia of 14 November 1922 reported that:

“The Kemalists government desires to win favour with the imperialist states by having communists followed”.

So the Kemalists government had entered collaboration with the European imperialist masters while the War of Liberation was continuing. Not as the Shafak revisionists assume, after the death of Atatürk. Hence, the War of Liberation ended in a short time of four years. The Shafak revisionists say “a long and bloody war”, but if compared to the Chinese or Vietnamese Revolutions it was brief. No one can deny that the positive feelings of the Allied imperialists towards the Kemalists bourgeoisie played a significant role in this.

### **3. With the War of Liberation the colonised territories were Liberated, the Sultanate was Abolished but the semi-colonial and semi-feudal structure remained in place:** 10

The Kemalists revolution liberated the occupied territories, abolished the sultanate and removed some of the privileges granted to imperialist countries (for instance, higher tax and customs duties began to be taken from goods imported from foreign countries, preferential rights for foreign capital were abolished). However, Turkey still remained a semi-colonial country. Schnurov says: “The railways, factories and mines remained in foreign hands for a further period. The large banks and com-

panies of Europe still today (that is, in 1929) work as they wish in Turkey”. Old loans were accepted under pressure from the imperialists. Foreigners were ensured freedom of trade. Schnurov again;

“It is true that foreigners no longer had any more or special rights than Turkish citizens, but then this was equality amongst the unequal. That is, how can powerful European capital be equal to Turkish capital? It is natural that there could be no question of equality. New installations were being established by both Turkish and foreign capital.”

In the same book Schnurov wrote:

“Turkey’s largest capitalists are foreigners. Apart from all the mining concerns, most of the railways and the factories that process agricultural products are in foreign hands. 1,100 million francs in foreign capital has been invested in the Turkish economy. 450 million of this capital is German, 350 million French, 200 million British and 100 million from other countries (pages 72-73)

In another part of his book Schnurov states that Turkey is a semi-colony.

“Turkey is an underdeveloped, semi-colonial country. French, German and British capitalists are securing fortunes from the backs of Turkish workers and peasants”... (page 57)

Both the Young Turks and the Kemalists came to power on the backs of the toiling classes. But both of them maintained Turkey’s semi-colonial structure untouched. While the Young Turk revolution conserved the sultanate, the Kemalists revolution abolished the Sultanate and liberated the occupied territories, that is, the **colonised** territories. In this way the colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal order became a semi-colonial and semi-feudal order.

### **4. After the Liberation War the Domination of a section of the Comprador Big Bourgeoisie and Landlords was replaced by the Domination of Another Section:**

We have indicated that the Kemalists bourgeoisie entered into col-

laboration with the Allied imperialists during the years of conflict. As for the alliance with landlords, this existed from the beginning of the war. Those who headed the war were the mercantile bourgeoisie, landlords, usurers and the industrial bourgeoisie, who at that time were weak, who had strong links to each other, as pointed out by Schnurov. Amongst these the dominant force was the mercantile bourgeoisie. This alliance replaced some of the old mercantile bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie of the minority nationalities (Armenian and Anatolian Greek)

Schnurov makes the same point thus: "The capital which owned the new installations and enterprises had been brought into existence partly by the take over of Armenian and Greek enterprises, the owners of which had fled the country, and partly from the pillaging of state institutions and bribery. Also, many Kemalists members of parliament and statesmen took advantage of being in power by taking over institutions abandoned by Anatolian Greek, Armenian and the other foreigners with Turkish nationality in the First World War, working these enterprises and establishing new ones with money saved from their salaries. (page 49)

We have learnt from enquiries we have made in various regions of Turkey that a section of the landlords and large landowners emerged in the same way, that is, by taking over abandoned Armenian and Greek properties. So the domination of a section of the old comprador bourgeoisie (the majority consisting of the minority nationalities) was replaced by another section of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords.

Of course, a significant section of the old landlords maintained their dominance. A part of the new Turkish bourgeoisie establishing power had from long before had a comprador nature. We have pointed this out. The comprador nature of another part of the bourgeoisie began immediately after the War of Liberation and gradually increased. The covert collaboration between the Turkish bourgeoisie and imperialism that began in the war years developed in the economic sphere after the war and the semi-colonial structure that remained in place rendered this collaboration even more inevitable. This was certainly not due to the ill

intentions of the Turkish bourgeoisie, but the natural rule of things. The Turkish bourgeoisie desires to be wealthy, but its capital is puny. Large and abundant capital is in the hands of Western Imperialist bourgeoisie. To compete with them is fatal, so the most advantageous and profitable route is to cooperate with them for a suitable share. The Turkish bourgeoisie took this path, mercilessly exploiting and crushing the working class and toiling people as it endeavoured to increase its capital and maintain its rule. Comrade Schnurov expresses this reality thus: "In the end many Kemalists became partners of various foreign companies. These foreign companies

also benefit from close contacts with government offices and from their partners. (p.49)

**5. The Comprador Big Bourgeoisie and Landlords were divided into two political camps after the War of Liberation. The Kemal Dictatorship represented the interests of one of these camps:**

In those years these two main camps amongst the ruling classes were comprised of the following elements: on the one hand the new Turkish Big Bourgeoisie that was increasing its collaboration with imperialism, a section of the old comprador big bourgeoisie, a section of the landlords and large landowners and the upper and most privileged public servants and intellectuals. On the other, another part of the comprador big bourgeoisie, another section of the landlords and large landowners, religious figures who had been the ideological props of the Sultanate and feudalism and the remnants of the Ulema class. We do not know which landlords were on which side for which interests. This would entail a separate, detailed study. This has little importance for the subject on which we are concentrating. What is important is the incontrovertible reality that while some landlords were partners in the administration, and possessed influence, others opposed the Kemal government. For instance, the Kurdish landlords and tribal chiefs in

eastern Anatolia were **generally** in the second camp. They were subsequently to support the DP and AP and oppose the CHP. But, as we have mentioned, some of the landlords were in the Kemalist government from the very beginning and had a say and influence in the state.

The CHP was the political party of the first camp and originated in the defence associations. As for the second camp, while the one-party system existed it was within the CHP and the political struggle between these two camps took place within the party. With the move to a multi-party system they established their own political parties. The Terakkiperver Firka formed in 1925, the Serbest Firka established in 1930 and the DP and AP set up later on were all, **essentially**, political parties of the second camp. We say "**essentially**" for various conflicts of interest, new situations etc could always lead to people leaving one camp for the other, or new elements joining. With the transition to the multi-party system in 1946 many parties appeared from within the CHP, a situation resulting from the fact that all sections of the ruling classes were present in the CHP. The Kemalist government was not a politically independent national bourgeois government, instead it was a government of the comprador big bourgeoisie, landlords and the upper elite of public servants and intellectuals who were part of the first camp, semi-dependent on imperialism. The Kemalist dictatorship even, to a certain extent, crushed the middle bourgeoisie who were not in collaboration with imperialism. The division between the comprador big bourgeoisie, whom the Kemalist government represented, and the middle bourgeoisie became increasingly clear. Just as in the era of the Committee of Union and Progress, in the Republican era, too, the part of the middle bourgeoisie that participated in the War of Liberation used the power of the state it had seized like a winch, in order to enrich itself, creating state monopolies, entering into collaboration with imperialism using their investments in their own interests, growing fat on bank credits and profiteering, and becoming inordinately wealthy by seizing the properties of Armenians and Anatolian Greeks who had

been murdered or had fled Turkey. They thus split off from the other sections of the middle bourgeoisie of a national character. These splits and metamorphoses gradually became more apparent. A section of the comprador Turkish big bourgeoisie which was from the Committee of Union and Progress and the new comprador Turkish big bourgeoisie. These were the dominant elements within the Kemalist government! The interests of the higher echelons of the Turkish bourgeoisie were almost identical to those of European capitalists and they entered into close collaboration with European imperialists.

Just as in China after the revolution of 1924-1927 power passed into the hands of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords, a similar event had already taken place in Turkey.

Comrade Stalin was of the same opinion, if expressed differently;

*"A Kemalist revolution is a revolution of the top stratum, a revolution of the national merchant bourgeoisie, arising in a struggle against the foreign imperialists, and whose subsequent development is essentially directed against the peasants and workers, against the very possibility of an agrarian revolution."*

The point we wish to emphasise here is this: the Kemalist government did not represent the interests of the middle, that is, the national bourgeoisie. It represented the section of the comprador big bourgeoisie that emerged from this class and developed and became wealthy during the era of the Committee of Union and Progress. The section of the middle bourgeoisie that could not develop was still kept in the CHP and supported against the workers and peasants. Just as after the First Revolutionary Civil War of 1921-1927 in China the middle bourgeoisie took its place in the ranks of the Kuomintang, those in Turkey took their place in the ranks of the CHP. The struggle within the ruling classes was not between the national bourgeoisie, the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlords, as supposed, but essentially, between two wings of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlords. The middle bourgeoisie of a national character was a secondary force in

one of these wings. To grasp this point is of the utmost importance in explaining both yesterday and today. The thing that gained the CHP a **relatively** progressive character was the middle bourgeoisie of a national character that existed from the outset as a social force but was not dominant in the party. The Kemalist government was not, as claimed by the TIP, D. Avcioglu, H. Kivilcimli, Shafak and TKP revisionists (in the past and today), a revolutionary and progressive government. To consider an alliance with the Kemalist government was to take refuge in the counter-revolutionary ranks, for the Kemalist government itself represented the counter-revolution. For the revisionists the overthrow of the republican order and a restoration of the Sultanate would have been a counter-revolution. But this would not have suited the younger sections of the bourgeoisie, or even the old Turkish big bourgeoisie. Developments in the world have reached such a point that no one can dare to put on the crowns that have been thrown out of office. An administration with a crown can no longer meet the needs of the ruling classes or protect their sovereignty. The bourgeoisie also knows this. The counter-revolution can only be a “democratic republic” with a fascist mask. And this has occurred.

**6. The Kemalist Dictatorship is a Military Fascist Dictatorship over the Workers, Peasants, Urban Petit bourgeoisie, low ranking public servants and democrat intellectuals:**

Comrade Schnurov says: “Although there exists the appearance of democratic forms (elected parliament etc.). **the essence of the existing order in Turkey today (1929) is a dictatorship that is far from all democracies. (ibid) (that is, fascism).** There is no party apart from the ruling party and no party is allowed to be formed. Even the Social-democrat party has been banned. Newspapers and magazines are under relentless control. Even the possibility of an article appearing in the future in these publications is enough for them to be closed down” (page

21) “Today’s Turkish government is certainly a dictatorship (should be fascism). For the ruling Turkish bourgeoisie is weak and has to crush the toiling people in order to develop. (page 22)

“...Unions are immediately banned; associations and federations permitted to open have to suffice with charity work and operate under state control. (page 24).” all manner of trade association is prohibited...” (page 25).” “...According to law, workers and public servants may leave a job, but all manner of demonstration or action that harms the freedom of work has been banned.” (page 26)

“...The Kemalists too, like the Young Turks, were only able to come to power through the support of the toiling masses.. Like the Young Turks, in the first months of the Kemalist revolution the national bourgeoisie was unable to prevent the formation of workers’ organisations. However, these unions were not of a solely class character; some of them were under the influence of the bourgeoisie.” (page 42)

“Once the Kemalist bourgeoisie had signed the peace pact with the imperialists...the bourgeoisie no longer needed the support of the toiling masses.. It was necessary to prevent the class conflict growing; this conflict was on the verge of becoming an open war against all exploiters and capitalists, whether native or foreign.”

The Kemalists harassed the Communist Party and the workers’ movement. The Communist Party had to go underground. Many of its well known members, such as Mustafa Suphi, were brutally murdered. Those who survived were pursued and imprisoned. In 1923 the Istanbul International Workers’ Association was closed down. The pretext for the closure was its distribution of leaflets to celebrate Mayday. The leaders of the association were arrested and, just as the Young Turks had established their own so-called workers’ organisations, now the Kemalists used their own bourgeois “unions” as a tool against workers’ actions”. (page 43)

Following the looting of the Amele Teali the Profintern Administration Council issued a statement:

“The Popular Party government (the Kemalists) have for a long time been trying to seize the union action and turn it into a fascist organisation (page 47) “Turkey is one of the most brutal countries as regards its treatment of the workers’ movement.” At the 3rd Congress of the Profintern (in 1924) a special resolution was passed protesting at the oppression of the Turkish working class, and a statement issued: “The Third Congress of the Profintern vehemently protests at the persecution being meted out to the Turkish working class. Turkey is one of the most oppressive countries towards the workers’ movement...” (page 59)

“...After the Kurdish rebellion of 1925 martial law was proclaimed for two years, with “independence tribunals” being established. ‘On the pretext of this incident the workers, peasants and toiling masses in general were subjected to severe repression. The Aydinlik and Orak-Cekic (hammer and sickle) newspapers were closed down. Turkish workers’ leaders, heads of workers’ associations and publishers of these newspapers were sentenced to 10-15 years imprisonment.”

“A recurrence of history! Just like this, the Young Turks, who had come to power on the backs of the toiling masses, did the same thing at the end of the revolution. But what happened? The Young Turks ended up as an obedient tool of German imperialism .” (pages 59-60)

“The Kemalist government is resorting to all means in order to crush the workers’ movement, everything is permissible. The police take progressive workers from their homes in the middle of the night and detain them for several days. The reason? Nothing. On such and such a date what colour was their tie? What symbols were on their caps, what did they discuss, I wonder?”

Didn’t the AP implement exactly the same policy to the letter? What difference is there between the above mentioned incidents and the arrest of the young man playing guitar under a red light? Isn’t the fascist Erim government following exactly the same path? Isn’t it banning strikes and closing down publications?

An example of the cruelty of the Kemalist government towards

the working class movement: In August 1927 the workers on the Adana-Nusaybin railway owned by the French went on strike. The reason was simple: they had not been paid the advance they had requested on the eve of the religious holiday. Prior to this workers’ representatives had drawn up a modest list of 31 demands and asked for them to be implemented.

“The capitalists did not respond for 6 weeks before rejecting the petition. The resulting strike lasted for 20 days with 850 workers taking part. No trains ran for 2 days. “Eventually, on the third day the company (French capitalist firm) sent a train to assist the strike breakers. Hundreds of workers and their families lay down on the tracks and closed the line. In response the Kemalist government officials dispatched a military unit which opened fire on the unarmed workers and their families. The rails were covered in blood, 22 ringleaders were arrested.

“The strike was crushed by foreign capitalists, with the participation of the ‘democratic’ Kemalist government. The class brotherhood of the capitalists mattered more than national enmity.” Schnurov continued:” This is not an isolated example. A strike at the Seyrusefayin company in 1926 was suppressed in the same way. The government sent marines as strike breakers to end the strike”. (pages 63-64)

Thousands of workers were sacked for the most basic reasons and the Kemalist government supported the bosses. In many cases the government was itself the boss. Schnurov’s book is fully of such examples. We do not feel it necessary to list them all here. Let us take a look at the situation of the peasants. Our witness is again Schnurov:

“... Peasants who have been robbed and their house demolished are reduced to being day labourers or moving to the cities to seek work. In the village the usurers, large landowners, landlords, wholesalers and merchants rob the peasants mercilessly.

The majority of peasant families in Turkey are poor. They do not have sufficient land, or machinery, or livestock. The impoverished

peasant leases land from the rich, that is, the landowner or landlord. He obtains the vehicle with a loan and in return both works as an unpaid day labourer on the owner's land and hands over a third or a half of his own produce. Since he cannot afford to buy a vehicle or to get by he borrows money at extortionate interest rates from the usurer. As the peasant does not own a horse and cart he cannot take his produce to market and is forced to sell to a wholesaler for peanuts. The wholesaler is very often the landowner from whom the land is leased or the landlord or usurer. The poor peasant masses are therefore loaded down with debt, under which they fall and are reduced to working as day labourers in the village or moving to the cities to find work. (page 35)

“Since exploitation in the villages is developed there is a village bourgeoisie class that lives on the labour of the toiling peasant. This is a **landlord, usurer and merchant class (ibid)**

[N.B. It is mistaken to call all these a village bourgeoisie]. The majority of peasants are either on the verge of poverty or have to work as day labourers for rich landlords and they swell the ranks of the proletariat. (page 76)

The Kemalist dictatorship took the side of the landlords, large landowners, usurers and merchants against the peasants, the state forces mercilessly crushing the peasants in their service. The Kemalist dictatorship also crushes the lower sections of artisans and public servants. Strikes by clerks, customs officials and telegraph operators were violently repressed.

Schnurov writes;

“...The activity of public servants is hard, because for them the government is a capitalist that directly employs a worker. And every struggle for better pay and conditions is immediately classified by the Kemalists as a political crime against the government. On the other hand the Kemalists are endeavouring to establish a state organisation that is loyal to the government, and reliable.

“The Kemalists sack people with different opinions...(page 67)

“...A strike by telegraph operators in 1924 for a pay rise was suppressed. The government alleged that communists were behind it and arrested the strikers. In Adana an order was implemented and many striking telegraph operators were sent to the Independence Tribunal in Ankara. The offence: a plot against the government! (pages 68-69)

**7. The Kemalist Dictatorship crushed the minority nationalities, particularly the Kurdish nation, with a policy of merciless national oppression, carrying out massacres, and with all its might fanned the flames of Turkish chauvinism:**

The Kemalist dictatorship usurped all the rights of the minority nationalities, in particular the Kurdish nation. It endeavoured to forcibly Turkicise them. It banned their languages. It crushed the Kurdish rebellions that broke out from time to time, joining with some Kurdish feudal lords. It then massacred thousands, women, children, young and old, and made life unbearable for the Kurdish people by declaring “military prohibited zones” and “martial law”. After the Dersim rebellion more than 60,000 Kurdish peasants were slaughtered. At Lausanne the Kurdish nation's right to self-determination was meanly trampled on. The Kemalists and imperialists, ignoring the wishes and views of the Kurdish nation, haggled and divided the region of Kurdistan amongst various states. The minority nationalities, particularly the Kurds, were subjected to humiliating treatment, all insults were considered acceptable. The Kemalist dictatorship endeavoured to fan the flames of Turkish chauvinism. It rewrote history, putting forward a racist and fascist theory claiming that all nations sprang forth from the Turks.

The nonsensical Sun Language Theory claimed that all languages had derived from Turkish. Chauvinist slogans such as “One Turk is equal to the world”, “How happy is one who says I am a Turk” were introduced into every corner of the country, into schools, offices, everywhere.

In this way it sowed the seeds of national enmity and animosity amongst the workers and toilers of various nationalities, sabotaging solidarity and unity. It wished to use Turkish workers and toilers as an instrument in its chauvinist policy.

The line followed by the Kemalist dictatorship on the national question was Turkish chauvinism in the full meaning of the word. And as is known, a characteristic of fascist dictatorships is to fan the flames of dominant nation chauvinism by creating and inciting national animosity to divide the toiling popular masses and pit them one against the other.

**8. The Kemalists relentlessly exploited the popular masses, establishing state monopolies and removing competition to a large degree. The government thus on account of these monopolies itself became an entrepreneur. The monopolies which combined membership of the government with enterprise brought a bureaucratic quality to the bourgeoisie:**

The Kemalists, who had entirely taken over the power of the state, used this power to enrich themselves as far as possible.

“...The government, having established several commercial monopolies, is constantly increasing taxes on goods sold. A prominent journalist says: the word monopoly means legalised robbery (for the Turkish people): The German newspaper *Berkwerk-Zeitung* published figures in its edition of 25 September 1927 demonstrating what a robbery the policy of monopolies is and the terrifying level of taxation. According to this the price of paraffin wholesale is 4.5 kuruş (a litre), whereas the retail price is 16.5 kuruş, nearly 4 times as much. The price of petrol rises from 7 to 11.5 kuruş (for factories, workshops etc.) The price of sugar increases by half. These taxes with the monopolies constitute three fifths of the state’s income in 1927-28. The merchants and capitalists are not adversely affected by these taxes as it is the consumer who pays them in the sale price. The toilers bear the entire burden of

these taxes, for a large proportion of the income of the poor goes on food and other essential goods.” (Schnurov, pages 31-32)

“The Kemalist government protects the owners of the factories and installations, because the Kemalist mercantile bourgeoisie invests its capital in the rapidly developing industrial sectors.. Many enterprises and commercial concerns have been established with money obtained from government banks. The capital of many an enterprise may only be considered partially private capital. The large proportion of the capital is provided by the government as there is not much capital in private hands.”

“The Kemalist government has established a series of monopolies; tobacco processing and export monopoly, sugar, paraffin, matches, salt, gunpowder, playing cards, ports etc...”

Due to these monopolies the government itself has become an entrepreneurial merchant. The railways are being constructed either from the state treasury or by foreign capitalists. The government has to provide good working conditions for these foreign capitalists. The situation is no different for companies working with foreign capital...” (page 49).

So it is not a question of “creating a national bourgeoisie by the hand of the state.” It is a matter of mobilising all the possibilities of the state to enrich and develop the Kemalist bourgeoisie. The state monopolies also served this purpose. The Kemalist bourgeoisie, by creating state monopolies and utilising them in their own service, eliminated most competition in these spheres and thereby mercilessly exploited the workers and peasants for **high monopoly profits**.

On the other hand monopolist-state capitalism, as indicated by Schnurov, combining enterprise with membership of the government, added a bureaucratic character to the bourgeoisie, that is, it brought forth a bureaucratic bourgeoisie. When the global capitalist crisis of 1929-30 made its presence felt in Turkey the CHP clung even closer to étatism and used it like armour in order to survive the crisis. This is the essence of the CHP’s étatism.

**9. What is the essence of the struggle waged between the two political camps of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords over “étatism”, “Free Enterprise”, “One Party”, “Multi-Party”:**

We have seen that the first camp that held power was in complete control of the state apparatus, creating state monopolies that served its aims, removing most competition by crushing its rivals and gradually developing and becoming wealthy.

As for the section of the ruling classes that was in the second camp, since it was weak within the state apparatus and was unable to use it as it wished, and was rendered incapable of competing by the “étatism” of the first camp, while it struggled to utilise the state apparatus for its own ends it also hoisted high the banner of “free enterprise” in the economic sphere against “étatism”.

The struggle manifesting itself in the economic sphere as “étatism” versus “free enterprise” was carried on in a similar manner in the political sphere.

The first camp was in absolute control of the state apparatus and its main prop, the army. It had therefore maintained its dominance by means of the army. The Kemalist dictatorship was in reality a military dictatorship. As for the second camp while it endeavoured to utilise the state forces and army in its own service, as its real power came from the landlords, usurer merchants and religious leaders in rural areas and because through them it controlled the broad peasant masses, it was in favour of the “multi-party system” and “elections”. Certainly, a proletarian party was not included in the “multi-party system” it wanted. What the second camp wanted was an ‘election’ that forced the people to make a preference between reactionary alliances. This is how the struggle in the economic sphere between “étatism” and “free enterprise” was reflected in the political arena. We can see a similar struggle today. The DP, and subsequently the AP, has operated in the main by mobilising the backward civilian forces. When Demirel talks of arming 200,000 people he means

the reactionary organisations nourished by the landlords, usurers and religious men in the rural areas and the fascist and similar forces raised in the religious schools and Koran courses. Whereas the clique of comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords that dominate the CHP constantly used the army as a threat against the AP. At this juncture let us point out that in recent years the AP’s influence in the army has increased significantly. But still, while the AP on the one hand is calling for a continuation of martial law, on the other it is in favour of a return to elections. It wishes for this because it wants to be in power alone, not because it is anti-fascist. And the origins of this are, as we have explained, far in the past.

We must remember this point: that absolutely no wing of the ruling classes is eternally “étatist”, or “pro-free enterprise”, or “pro-one party” or “pro-multi-party”. They will advocate whatever is to their advantage. The wing that has control of the state apparatus and utilises it in its own interests will be “étatist” as long as this situation persists, whereas the wing that is negatively affected will be “pro-free enterprise”. The reactionary wing that dominates the army is in favour of a military dictatorship that is camouflaged by cosmetic democratic forms, whereas the wing that takes its strength from civilian fascist forces naturally opposes this and advocates ways that will guarantee its own power. This is the crux of the question. This is the essence of the struggle between the ruling classes in Turkey that has been going on for a long time. The “socialist” who discovers progressiveness and revolution in the étatism of the CHP is a blind, ignorant fool who cannot see that Hitler fascism was also “étatist”.

**10. Kemalist Turkey, gradually becoming more and more a part of the semi-colonial and reactionary imperialist world had to throw itself into the arms of British-French imperialism:**

How did “Kemalist Turkey” progress and how far did it get? Let us learn the answer from Comrade Mao-Tse-Tung:

*“Besides, even Kemalist Turkey eventually had to throw herself*

*into the arms of Anglo-French imperialism, becoming more and more of a semi-colony and part of the reactionary imperialist world. In the international situation of today, the "heroes" in the colonies and semi-colonies either line up on the imperialist front and become part of the forces of world counter-revolution, or they line up on the anti-imperialist front and become part of the forces of world revolution. They must do one or the other, for there is no third choice."*

We have demonstrated above with quotes from Schnurov how the Kemalists, even during the war years, covertly were in the imperialist front, and afterwards openly and decisively became part of the global anti-revolutionary forces. Subsequently, in a similar way to how the chiefs of the Committee of Union and Progress became obedient tools of German imperialism, the Kemalists, too, became obedient instruments of British-French imperialism. This is, in short, the birth, development and nature of the Kemalist movement!

#### **Let us summarise:**

1. The Kemalist revolution was a revolution of the Turkish mercantile bourgeoisie, landlords, usurers, a small number of industrial bourgeoisie, a revolution of the upper sections of these. That is, the revolution's leaders were the Turkish comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords class. The middle bourgeoisie of a national character took part in the revolution as a reserve force, not as a leading force.

2. The leaders of the revolution were engaged in covert collaboration with the Allied Powers during the years of the anti-imperialist war. The imperialists showed goodwill to the Kemalists, consenting to a Kemalist government.

3. The Kemalists, after signing up to peace with the imperialists, continued this collaboration in an intensified form.

4. The Kemalist movement in essence developed against "the workers and peasants and the possibility of a land revolution."

5. As a result of the Kemalist movement Turkey changed from a

colonial semi-colonial, semi-feudal structure to a semi-colonial, semi-feudal structure. That is, the semi-colonial and semi-feudal economic structure continued.

6. In the social sphere the new Turkish bourgeoisie growing from within the middle bourgeoisie of a national character and involved in collaboration with imperialism, a section of the old comprador Big Bourgeoisie and the new bureaucracy replaced the old comprador Big Bourgeoisie consisting of national minorities, the old bureaucracy and the ulema. Some of the old landlords, large landowners, loan sharks and profiteering merchants maintained their dominance while others were replaced by new ones. The Kemalists as an entirety do not represent the interests of the middle bourgeoisie of a national character; they represent the interests of the upper classes and strata.

7. In the political sphere the constitutional monarchy administration whose interests were entangled with those of the dynasty was replaced by a bourgeois republic, an administration that best responded to the interests the new ruling classes. This administration was supposedly independent but in reality was politically semi-dependent on imperialism.

8. The Kemalist dictatorship was so-called democratic, but in reality was a military, fascist dictatorship.

9. *"Besides, even Kemalist Turkey eventually had to throw herself into the arms of Anglo-French imperialism, becoming more and more of a semi-colony and part of the reactionary imperialist world."*

10. In the years following the War of Liberation the Kemalist government was the main enemy of the revolution. In that period it was not the task of the communist movement to go into alliance (such an alliance was never realised) with the Kemalists against the clique of old comprador bourgeoisie and landlords that had lost its dominant position, its task was to overthrow the Kemalist government which represented another clique of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords, and replace it with a democratic popular dictatorship based on an alliance of workers and peasants under the leadership of the working class.

### -III-

We have indicated that following the War of Liberation two political camps emerged from amongst the ruling classes (comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords):

The first camp: the new Turkish bourgeoisie that was gradually developing its collaboration with imperialism and becoming wealthy, a section of the pro-Committee of Union and Progress comprador bourgeoisie, a section of the landlords large landowners, merchants and usurers and the elite of the public servants and intellectuals.

As for the second camp it was made up of another section of the old comprador big bourgeoisie, landlords, large landowners, usurers and profiteering merchants, palace members, religious men and remnants of the old ulema class.

The middle bourgeoisie of a national character was in the first of these camps, as a reserve force in the CHP and government ranks. When members of the second camp found the opportunity to associate they organised in the Terakkiperver Firka and the Serbest Firka, and when they didn't they found a place within the CHP. There were also elements that were pro-caliphate and pro-Sultan (former feudal bureaucracy, ulema remnants, religious men etc...) in the second camp. The dominant elements were the comprador big bourgeoisie and a section of the landlords, usurers and profiteering merchants. The same pro-caliphate elements were also to be found in the DP and AP as a secondary force. We all know that they subsequently established the MNP. The struggle between these two main camps was, from the beginning, **essentially** a power struggle between the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords on the basis of the republic. The struggle between those who wished to bring back the Sultanate and the caliphate and the republican bourgeoisie was not between supporters of the counter-revolution and the revolution. That period was in the past!

Let us reiterate: there were those with such aims, but they were weak and, as we have mentioned, were a secondary forced tacked on

to one of the camps. The struggle between revolution and counter-revolution would now be between those who wished to maintain the dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie within the framework of a bourgeois republic, and those classes with interests in this, and these who wished to establish a Democratic People's Republic and classes who had interests in that.

On the one hand the struggle between the two camps of the ruling classes, and on the other the struggle between the ruling classes as a whole and the popular classes continued. As the Second World War approached **the reactionary clique that dominated the CHP and the government, which had hitherto collaborated with the British and French imperialists, from 1935 onwards with the changing world conditions embarked on collaboration with the German imperialists.**

At the outbreak of war the situation was that the fascist German imperialists had assumed total dominance of Turkey. The clique ruling the CHP had become a toy in the hands of German imperialists, a tame slave. This clique attempted to implement the Hitlerite fascist methods of government in Turkey. **This clique took the side of German fascism in the global confrontation.**

Although it did not enter the war on the German side, for various reasons, such as the global balance of forces, the pressure of the socialist government in the Soviet Union, the war turning against German imperialism etc..., but if conditions had been favourable this clique would not have hesitated to enter the war on the German side, just as their predecessors in the Committee of Union and Progress had done. The global balance of forces prevented this. The establishment of the Saracaoglu government was the natural and inevitable outcome of this development, of the steps that had been taken since 1935 towards collaboration with Germany. With this development, the realisation of a German collaborationist government, it reached its peak. **Sefik Husnu correctly said that; the Saracoglu government "has fully**

**embraced the principle of protecting the interests of the profiteering layers of the Turkish bourgeoisie, most of which have German capital, and the large landowners”** adding that it had adopted this principle “as a cornerstone from the beginning”. Sefik Husnu again:” On the one hand the leading cadre of the Popular Party, first and foremost Saracoglu and his colleagues, is undoubtedly opposed to the Soviet and openly hostile to London’s policy of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union. Consequently, the two large Anglo-Saxon democracies have to support the democratic front within the country by using their influence and not attempting to extend the life of the Turkish government by even one day”. Although he was mistaken in his evaluation of the character of the “democratisation”, his diagnosis is correct.

We have now reached a very important point that the Shafak revisionists have been unable to grasp. Those who were subsequently to set up the DP were not the dominant pro-German clique in the CHP, but, on the contrary, were those who had been opposed to this clique since the time of the Terakkiperver Firka and the Serbest Firka. The slogans of “multi-party” and “free elections” which they advocated, in the new historical conditions in which the CHP became the firm collaborator of fascist German imperialism, gaining an even more fascist identity, became the best of a bad bunch. These demands, for a multi-party system and for free elections, were also the demands of the reformist middle bourgeoisie in those years. The TKP too, which was unable to develop beyond being a middle bourgeois movement, also desired similar things in those same years. In those new historical conditions a new event occurred in our history. The majority of the reformist middle bourgeoisie, which in the long-running battle of cliques between the ruling classes had been in the dominant, ruling wing of the CHP, moved over to the second camp. In this way a broad front came into being, stretching from the TKP to the DP and MP. This is what **Shefik Husnu** called the **Internal Democratic Front**.

This is the reason why members of the TKP and certain DP members (or future DP members) and Fevzi Cakmak, the first president of the MP, were able to be in the same organisations.

For a communist movement there is certainly no question of making a preference between two reactionary cliques. A communist movement will see both as enemies and wage a struggle to overthrow both of them; but will not turn a blind eye to the struggle between them. It will make a good evaluation of the two of them in order to guarantee maximum benefit for itself, isolating the more reactionary one and directing the initial and most vehement attacks on it while not neglecting to expose the nature of the other reactionary clique and to preserve the line of hostility between itself and the clique. It will know that this quarrel amongst the ruling classes may at any time turn into unity against the people and that the other clique may tomorrow take the place of the more reactionary clique. This is dependant on the continually changing balance of forces between the reactionaries, which clique is in charge of the government, whether there is a political and economic crisis and similar conditions.

In the period from the beginning of the Second World War until the first years of the DP administration the developments that occurred are briefly as follows:

**With the CHP going into collaboration with fascist German imperialism and shifting to an extreme fascism, the reactionary clique opposing the CHP came to play a comparatively more progressive role and the middle bourgeoisie broke away from the first camp and joined the second.**

In those years in Turkey the DP and other various opposition ruling class parties (while these parties did not exist, the circles that were to form them did) opposed German fascism and the CHP, playing a similar role to that played by the Kuomintang in China against Japanese imperialism and collaborators with the Japanese. Similar, we stress, because conditions in the two countries were quite different.

The line up of forces in the country bore parallels to that in the world. The British, French and American imperialists, opposed to the German and Japanese fascist imperialists, had to forge an alliance with the Soviet Union. Since the government in Turkey was in the hands of the lackeys of German imperialism a natural alliance was born between the opposition front in Turkey, British, French and American imperialists and the Soviet Union. This alliance was, of course, a contradictory one. In Turkey the US and British imperialists were to support the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords, whom they considered closest to themselves, against the other forces of the alliance as in China they had supported the Kuomintang against the Chinese Communist Party. During the Second World War and immediately afterwards just as US imperialism became a global disciple of "democracy", so in Turkey the DP and its cadres did the same. The DP raised the banner against the CHP's fascist practices and succeeded in winning over the middle bourgeoisie and some popular strata. The TKP's mistaken policy bears the bulk of the blame for this. In the same way that the TKP had previously tacked itself to the coattails of the ruling party, it now attached itself to the coattails of the large opposition party (DP). It was unable to create a popular movement! This played a role in the DP being able to win the support of the middle bourgeoisie and a section of popular layers in those years. The anger of the people at the puppet of German fascism, the CHP government, flowed into the DP's lake. In this way the clique of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords that was bound to German fascism was replaced in 1950 by another clique that was in collaboration with American imperialism. The fact that German imperialism had been defeated in the War and that US imperialism was amongst the victors of that war played a highly significant role in this.

In 1950 the DP's coming to power was neither a revolution nor a counter-revolution. It was a change of power in an ongoing struggle between two political cliques. On the other hand this change introduced

a "multi-party" dictatorship dependent on US imperialism with the support of more civilian reactionary forces, in place of a one-party military fascist dictatorship dependent on German imperialism.

It is definitely mistaken to claim that all the profiteering merchants who became wealthy during the Second World War, contractors, landlords and large land owners who had benefited from the policy of high agricultural prices joined hands and entered the DP together. A section of these, even if they supported the DP, were essentially within the CHP. We ourselves are witnesses to the fact that many of those profiteers are today some of the most fanatical supporters of the CHP in the countryside. If this were not the case **how could we have explained the fact that the MGP was born and despite it leading the CHP the continued existence of the representatives of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords in the CHP? After the DP seized power the reformist middle bourgeoisie remained in its ranks for some time. Nadir Nadi was one of the intellectuals that participated in the election propaganda of the DP. In those years many democrat intellectuals were supporters of the party.** In publications that reflect the view of the reformist middle bourgeoisie one frequently comes across articles that state the DP was "good" at the outset and subsequently went wrong. When the DP in the wake of US imperialism carried out an assault on the people and intellectuals similar to that the CHP had carried out, when it took Turkey into US imperialism's weapons of assault like NATO, when it sent our people to die in an unjust and reactionary war in Korea, the middle bourgeoisie of a national character and democratic intelligentsia began to cool towards the DP and distance themselves from it, and began to steer towards the CHP. Since there was no independent, strong popular movement the middle bourgeoisie and with them our toiling people were blown this way and that between two cliques of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords. This is the historical reality of Turkey. Although from time to time the middle bourgeoisie

has manifested itself as an independent political movement it has been unable to become a significant entity. Parties such as the **Turkey “Socialist” Party of Esat Adil, founded in 1946, and other similar parties are reformist bourgeois parties with a socialist facade. The TSEKP reflects a different hue of the reformist middle bourgeois parties, as does the Vatan Party, which emerged and declined in 1954. The communist movement, within the TKP, was stifled amidst the waves of bourgeois reformism.** The petit-bourgeois opposition, too, flowed into the pool of middle bourgeois reformism, which was ready at any moment to sell itself dirt cheap to the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords. The members of the class of which it was the political spokesman were anyway more than prepared to use any opportunity that came their way in order to join the big bourgeoisie ranks and a section of them did in time. The representatives of such a class will of course be indecisive and weak. Let us at this juncture make another point:

the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords of course do not just consist of two unchanging frozen political camps. Firstly, it is always possible to move from one camp to another, and this takes place, each camp is also not homogenous. The reactionaries have become splintered by multiple contradictions, and all the shards are ready to gouge out the eyes of others. But those with comparatively similar interests unite against those with whom they have more profound conflicts of interest. Reactionary political camps are made up in this way. When talking of the existence of two reactionary political camps in Turkey we bear this point in mind.

#### LET US SUMMARISE:

1. From the conclusion of the War of Liberation onwards the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords held sway over the government. But the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords were divided into two large political cliques. The clique that held sway over the government and state apparatus was initially in collaboration with British-French imperialism and from 1935 onwards with German imperialism. Until the eve of the Second World War the middle bourgeoisie was also in general in the ranks of this clique.

2. In the years of the Second Imperialist World War the dominant pro-German clique implemented a policy of intense fascism and profiteering. This clique took the side of German fascism against all democratic forces at home, including the working class, and abroad against the USSR and the British-French-American bloc. But the global balance of forces and the existence of the USSR prevented the clique entering the war in the ranks of the German fascists.

3. On the other hand the opposition clique of comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords that was later to organise in the DP and MP was joined by the reformist middle bourgeoisie and other democratic elements that until that time had been a secondary element in the ranks of the CHP. The TKP also clung to the coattails of this clique, which forged a global alliance with the American-British-French bloc and the Soviet Union. When the Second World War ended with the defeat of the German fascists and their allies this bloc gained strength in Turkey. With the support of US imperialism and with skilful use of the people's and democratic forces' loathing of the CHP's pro-German fascist dictatorship the DP was brought into power in 1950.

4. In this way the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord government which was the lackey of US imperialism replaced the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord government that was the lackey of German imperialism. It was not a question of “the big bourgeoisie

which grew rich from profiteering during the war,” going under the wing of international capital”, but a question of US imperialist “wings” replacing German imperialist “wings” and US lackey reactionaries replacing German lackey reactionaries.

5. The indecisive middle bourgeoisie which drowned the opposition of the proletariat and petit-bourgeoisie in its own pool, after attaching this opposition to the coattails of the DP for a time it returned to the opposition-CHP caravan in response to the DP’s fascist-like practices. The fact that it proved impossible to create a strong, independent movement under proletarian leadership led to the opposition of working class, toiling people and democratic elements being used like a winch to hoist sometimes one of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord cliques into power, and sometimes the other.

6. The comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord cliques which pose as beacons of “democracy” while in opposition, became determined enemies of the people once they attained power. These are in brief the realities of our country in the WWII years and in the post-war period. (See critique of TIKP Draft Programme, articles 8-10-17)

#### -IV-

The fascist pro-Hitler CHP of the 1940 s became from the mid - 1950s onwards a beacon of democracy and began to shout “rights”, “justice”, “freedom”. On the other hand the discontent of the masses crushed and condemned to poverty by the pro-American DP and the democratic intelligentsia and middle bourgeoisie who had had all their democratic rights usurped was rising. As the masses did not have a revolutionary leadership their opposition to the DP government was sporadic and inconsistent. There was even amongst the masses a tendency of not trusting anyone and of hopelessness on account of every government showing hostility to them and crushing and robbing them. There was no communist leadership that would combine the rebellious anger of the workers and peasants in the same pot, create a great force and mobilise it. The TKP had been smashed. The Vatan Party formed by H. Kivilcimli in 1954 from the pieces of the TKP had turned its back on the masses, and was busy applauding the cur Adnan Menderes as “our second national leader”! It was of course not possible to expect the masses deprived of leadership to carry out a spontaneous revolution. They merely gritted their teeth and stored up their anger, which boiled over from time to time.

As for the middle bourgeoisie, what they wanted did not go beyond very limited demand such as “freedom of speech”, “freedom of writing”. Despite the limited nature of these demands and their myopia, they were of course progressive demands. On the other hand, the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords’ clique in opposition wanted the same things, **for themselves**. In Turkey the middle bourgeoisie and democratic intellectuals who may be included in this class have considerable power. But they are short-sighted, indecisive and conciliatory. They are predisposed to peace. but the big bourgeoisie and **landlord clique that attaches this force to itself has a significant trump card to defeat its rival. The above conditions** led to the emergence of an alliance around the demand for “partial bourgeois demo-

cratic rights” **between the opposition clique of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the CHP and broad sections of the middle bourgeoisie.** The CHP took the leadership of the opposition and expertly channelled the enthusiasm of the middle bourgeoisie and youth for its own ambitions. It seized power with the military coup of 27 May. The leaders of the coup were loyal followers of İnönü. The people correctly identified who had come to power, saying: “geldi İsmet, kesildi kismet [İsmet arrived, prosperity went]

What the people meant was that the reactionary, anti -people clique symbolised in the person of İnönü had seized power. There were even amongst those who carried out the coup more extreme nationalists and would-be Hitlers like Turkes who represented a more reactionary clique of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords.

They were subsequently removed by the İnönü grouping. This fanatical nationalist fascist group were supporters of the establishment of a fascist dictatorship by the army that took direct power and dissolved parliament. For our revisionists like M. Belli the removal of this group and a return to elections was a retreat of the “revolution”. İnönü, the experienced, intelligent (!) enemy of the people and his supporters did not want to take this route, for to do so would have meant the immediate loss of the support of the middle bourgeoisie, which they needed. A fascist dictatorship would have had to sweep away the “partial bourgeois democratic rights” for which the middle bourgeoisie had struggled. Such a step would have deprived them of one of their strongest props. On the other hand, the middle bourgeoisie still had momentum. Those who were expertly utilising their advance for their own power did not confront them directly after taking power, as that posed a risk of damage. Instead they slowed this advance by preparing a constitution that included the limited demands of the middle bourgeoisie, thus preventing a further advance and preserving their power while maintaining the support of the middle bourgeoisie. Periods in which the ruling classes were split by political struggle and in which there were internecine armed

clashes were frightening for them. Their initiative and control is seriously weakened. They do not want such periods to be prolonged. This is why the reactionary clique that led the 27 May coup did what it did.

The TIP movement, a current of the middle bourgeoisie, emerged in such an environment where the middle bourgeoisie had yet to lose its momentum. The reformist demands of this current, which was later to attach the mask of “socialism” attracted wide interest and support from the masses, youth and intellectual circles. The CHP began to lose the support of the youth and intellectuals, whereupon the reactionary cliques became worried and began to trade accusations. The AP, which had replaced the DP, went on the offensive, claiming all the problems has been caused by İnönü. As for İnönü, the master spokesman of the big bourgeoisie and landlords, he proclaimed, in his own words, that “in order to build a wall to the left”, the CHP was on the left of Centre and had been there for 40 years”! It was in such an environment where the struggle between the reactionary cliques was raging, sometimes heating up and sometimes cooling, but flaring up in political and economic crises, that a new, fresh, lively popular movement began to send out shoots in the factories and villages.

The swiftly developing struggle of our heroic working class, self-sacrificing peasants and brave youth, the rapidly spreading Marxist-Leninist works, and world-shaking effects of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China under the leadership of Chairman Mao, all prepared a suitable environment for the springing up of a young communist movement that would provide leadership to the struggle of the masses in our country. (Which is passionately needed by the masses)

It is a communist leadership that will rescue the struggle of the masses from being a winch that brings sometimes one reactionary clique to power, and sometimes the other, and will transform this struggle into a victorious popular revolution.

### The Points on which Shafak Revisionism is mistaken:

1. Our National War of Liberation was not carried out, as Shafak revisionism assumes, under the leadership of the **national bourgeoisie**, but under the leadership of the comprador Turkish big bourgeoisie, landlords and usurers. **The middle bourgeoisie of a national character was not a leader in the War of Liberation, it participated as a reserve force of the comprador Turkish big bourgeoisie and landlords.** It also lost its influence and prestige step by step after the War of Liberation. The revolutionary power of the popular masses who bore the brunt of the war, its great potential, was feared like a bogeyman by the bourgeois and landlord leadership of the War, and was hampered and stifled, and bloodily repressed at every opportunity after the War.

2. Our War of Liberation took place not, as claimed by the Shafak revisionists, in the age of “proletarian revolutions and national liberation wars”, but in the “era of proletarian revolutions.” The October Revolution inaugurated this era all over the world. The bourgeoisie on a global scale, including backward countries, became terrified of revolution.

For this reason rather than the bourgeoisie leading any revolution, they actively endeavoured to stifle and prevent the progress of revolution. New-democratic revolutions and socialist revolutions began to occur with proletarian leadership in the world. For this reason the era initiated by the Great October Revolution was “the age of proletarian revolutions”, As comrade Mao Tse-Tung has indicated, despite the Kemalist revolution taking place in this era it was not part of the proletarian world revolutions but rather a part of the old style bourgeois-democratic revolutions. The Shafak revisionists, by adding the words “age of National Liberation Wars” to the “age of proletarian revolutions”, are trying to prove that the Kemalist revolution was a typ-

ical example, a natural and normal part of the revolutions that took place in that era. That is, they are trying to **disprove** comrade Mao Tse-Tung. In this way the adulation and flattery for Kemalism of the Shafak revisionists manifests itself.

3. Our War of Liberation did not give “courage and hope” to the “oppressed peoples of Asia”, but rather to the fearful bourgeoisie of Asia and the financial oligarchy of the imperialist countries. The fearful bourgeoisie of Asia saw that in the Kemalist revolution their own reactionary ambitions were realised. To remove the colonialist structure that discomfited the bourgeoisie and landlords without a radical anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, without the masses having a dominant role in the revolution, without the interests of the native ruling classes being harmed, while, on the other hand, maintaining collaboration with imperialist countries and the semi-colonial structure, looting the country together with the imperialists, and stifling and repressing the radical desire of the masses for revolution together with the imperialists. This was what the bourgeois and landlord classes of Asia, that were trembling in fear of a radical revolution, wanted. Hence the bourgeoisie and landlords in China eagerly wished to carry out a similar revolution to the Kemalist Revolution. But comrade Mao Tse-Tung indicated at that time that this path was a cul-de-sac. The financial oligarchy of the imperialist countries also took courage from the Kemalist Revolution, for in this way the possibility emerged of preventing radical popular revolutions and of maintaining the semi-colonial dependence of backward countries. Why should the “oppressed peoples” of Asia take “courage and hope” from a “revolution” in which the working-toiling masses continued to be crushed and exploited, where feudal exploitation and tyranny persisted unchecked and semi-colonialism and dependence on imperialist states continued? The revolutions that gave hope and courage to the oppressed peoples were the Chinese Revolution and the Vietnamese Revolution. **The Kemalist Revolution is an example of how the**

masses cannot be liberated, whereas the revolutions in China and Vietnam have been and are giving an example of how to achieve the genuine liberation of the masses.

4. The Shafak revisionists claim that with the War of National Liberation **the comprador bourgeoisie was entirely liquidated, which is contrary to the realities of Turkey. As we have indicated, it was only a section of the comprador bourgeoisie that was demolished, in particular those who belonged to the minority nationalities. Whereas another section of the comprador bourgeoisie (Turkish big bourgeoisie who grew wealthy with the Committee of Union and Progress), along with a section of the landlords, seized the leadership of the Liberation War and rose to high positions.**

5. The Kemalist government, was not, as claimed by the Shafak revisionists **“a politically independent national bourgeois dictatorship”, but rather a dictatorship of a section of the Turkish big bourgeoisie of a comprador nature and landlords which was semi-dependent on imperialism.**

The claim of the Shafak revisionists is contrary to both the general theory of socialism and conflicts with the realities of our country. It is contrary to the general theory of socialism because as a general rule politically independent national bourgeois dictatorships are not possible in backward countries.

Comrade Mao Tse-Tung said the following in 1926:

*“They (middle bourgeoisie) stand for the establishment of a state under the rule of a single class, the national bourgeoisie... But its attempt to establish a state under the rule of the national bourgeoisie is quite impracticable, because the present world situation is such that the two major forces, revolution and counter-revolution, are locked in final struggle. Each has hoisted a huge banner: one is the red banner of revolution held aloft by the Third International as the rallying point for all the oppressed classes of the world, the other is the white banner of counterrevolution held aloft by the League of Nations as the rally-*

*ing point for all the counter-revolutionaries of the world. The intermediate classes are bound to disintegrate quickly, some sections turning left to join the revolution, others turning right to join the counter-revolution; there is no room for them to remain “independent”. Therefore the idea cherished by China’s middle bourgeoisie of an “independent” revolution in which it would play the primary role is a mere illusion.”*

The words of comrade Mao Tse-Tung are generally valid for the era of proletarian revolutions that commenced after the Great October Revolution. The Shafak revisionists by portraying something that is “a futile dream” as if it is real, are shamefully trampling on the general theory of socialism.

The thesis of the Shafak revisionists that “the Kemalist government was a politically independent national bourgeois government” is also contrary to the realities of Turkey. The evidence of comrade Schnurov, which we have presented, proves that feudalism was an influential partner in the Kemalist government that was also involved in economic and political collaboration with imperialism. The Kemalist government protected the interests of imperialist countries against the workers and peasants. It attacked revolutionaries to gain favour with the imperialists. Imperialist investment continued, with most of the capital in Turkey belonging to British-French and German imperialists. Members of the government made joint investments with imperialist companies. This is the reality, whereas the claim of the Shafak revisionists is “a futile dream”.

**The Shafak revisionists do not stop at claiming the Kemalist dictatorship was an independent national bourgeois government. They also consider it is possible in the present day for national bourgeois governments to exist and even claim such governments are increasing in number. We shall not dwell on this point here. Let us just say that the Shafak revisionists are endeavouring with such claims as these to provide a basis for their covert military coup ambitions.**

6. The Shafak revisionists say: “The new Turkish bourgeoisie that seized power endeavoured to create a national bourgeoisie by means of the state in order to grow and become wealthy”. It is not a question of creating a national bourgeoisie by means of the state, but of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord classes in power using all facilities of the state to develop and enrich themselves. The Shafak revisionists, with the above analysis, are both on the one hand mistakenly evaluating the practices of the Kemalist government, and, on the other, trampling on the Leninist theory of the state by adopting word for word the critique of the Kemalist government of all the modern revisionists, TIP, D. Avcioglu and M. Belli. They are mistakenly evaluating the practices of the Kemalist government because what that government did was to consolidate the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord classes by mobilising all the facilities of the state, not “creating a national bourgeoisie”. They are trampling on the Leninist theory of the state because the state is a means of oppression and exploitation for the classes that control it. It can never be used to create another class; on the contrary it is used to oppress, crush and exploit other classes. The modern revisionists’ evaluation of the Kemalist movement and their critique of the Kemalist government is as follows:

**The military-civilian-intelligentsia class** exercised the leadership of the War of National Liberation on account of the bourgeoisie not existing (!) in Turkey. Some revisionists say “progressive democrats”, “national forces” or “robust forces” instead of military-civilian-intelligentsia class. This class leading the War of Liberation seized power (!). This class, just as it might adopt **the non-capitalist path of development**, and might go by this path to socialism (!), it **might also adopt the capitalist path of development**. The Kemalist government of the military civilian-intelligentsia (!), instead of adopting **a non-capitalist path to go to socialism (!)**, adopted the capitalist path of development and for this purpose endeavoured to create a national bourgeoisie by means of the state (!), and for this reason our Turkey

could not be liberated from backwardness and was unable to succeed in development (!). This is the revisionists’ chain of logic. What the revisionists call “attaining socialism by a non-capitalist path” is **the realisation of state capitalism** by bourgeois governments based on state ownership through the route of step by step forced nationalisation. What they call socialism is **state capitalism**, where the means of production and land is in state ownership. That is, the system that is in effect today in the Soviet Union and all the Eastern European countries. Engels drew attention long ago to the difference between socialism and this variety of capitalism.

What the revisionists call “the path of capitalist development” is **capitalism based on private enterprise**. So the revisionists are in reality criticising the Kemalist government for “not adopting the thing called state socialism”, adopting capitalism based on “private enterprise” and putting state facilities in the hands of private enterprise and putting state facilities in the hands of private enterprise. This is the real essence of the “creating a national bourgeoisie by means of the state” critique. This critique is based on the supposition “that a national bourgeoisie did not exist”, and the Shafak revisionists have indirectly adopted this. Secondly, this critique sees the state as something above classes, and as something that may serve the aims of a class while in the hands of another. the Shafak revisionists have also adopted this. Thirdly, this critique advocates state capitalism based on state ownership instead of capitalism based on private enterprise, and the Shafak revisionists have also adopted this indirectly.

You can see how the Shafak revisionists, who constantly waffle about the theory of the state, embrace the supra-class theory of the state when it comes to the resolution of a practical question. If they spent a little less time chattering about the theory of state and put a little more effort into understanding it they would not come out with this nonsense.

7. The Shafak revisionists say: “The Kemalist bourgeoisie’s dictatorship over the people compromised with imperialist and feudal-

ism as a result of its national bourgeois character". We have indicated that the Kemalist dictatorship was not a national bourgeoisie government, but a government of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords, therefore it is a question of **collaboration** with imperialism, not **compromise**.

As for the expression **compromise with feudalism**, this is complete nonsense, for the bourgeoisie was in **alliance** with feudalism from the beginning of the War of Liberation. The leadership of the War of Liberation was in the hands of this alliance, and the administration was from the start a shared government of the bourgeoisie and feudal lords.

The Shafak revisionists have consciously separated the words "compromise" and "collaboration". "compromise, as is known, is the making of **certain concessions by** a revolutionary and progressive class. **While compromise is correct and necessary in certain circumstances, in some conditions it is mistaken and harmful. In his book "Left Communism" Lenin separates these two varieties of compromise, advocating that according to the place and conditions the working class will and should make certain compromises, criticising those who reject compromise in principle, while condemning the second kind of compromise. In general the petit bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie, when they play a progressive historical role, often enter into such harmful compromises, as a consequence of their class character.** In such situations it is necessary to wage a struggle against such a tendency, to draw the petit bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie to a more decisive line and endeavour to establish an alliance with them and to protect this alliance. For these tendencies to compromise delay or strike a blow against the success of the revolution, which is contrary to the interests of the petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie (or at least, a significant section of them). However, the way it is used in Turkey **collaboration** is another thing altogether. **The collaborationist bourgeoisie** is the equivalent of the "comprador bourgeoisie" in Marxist-Leninist literature. The comprador bourgeoisie does

not have even a shred of revolutionary character. They benefit from the pillaging of the country by foreign imperialists as they take an appropriate share from it. The contradiction between them and their imperialist masters is not over the looting of the country but over the share that should accrue to them. They squabble with their masters to increase their share or join the ranks of the imperialist states or monopolies with which they are collaborating against the imperialist states or monopolies that are cooperating with another section of the big bourgeoisie. The contradictions between them come into the category of contradictions between enemies of the people. The contradictions between them and the people are called antagonistic contradictions whereas the contradiction between the proletariat and the petit bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie, that, although their interests are on the side of the revolution, balk at a determined and courageous struggle, that are eager to agreement, to make peace etc, that is, are compromising, is still in the category of contradictions amongst the ranks of the people.

The Shafak revisionists see the relationship between the Kemalist bourgeoisie and imperialism as a compromise. It is not clear until when it was a "compromise" and when it turned into "collaboration". Therefore, the contradiction between the Kemalist bourgeoisie and the proletariat and impoverished peasants is for a certain time (or, rather, an uncertain time) seen as being in the category of contradictions between the people (!). The task of the proletariat is thus not to struggle to realise the democratic government of the people by overthrowing the Kemalist government, but to forge an alliance with the revolutionary (!) Kemalist government against imperialism and feudalism.

This is the conclusion reached by the Shafak revisionists. This, as we have pointed out before, is to attach oneself to the ranks of the counter-revolution.

8. We can see that the Shafak revisionists have adopted M. Belli's theory of "counter revolution in Turkey". According to them the new, growing and fattening Turkish bourgeoisie, thanks to the policy of "cre-

ating a national bourgeoisie by means of the state“(!) after a time (not certain when) and **having developed** embarked on “collaboration”(!). This development and collaboration took place (!) in particular during the Second World War and their alliance (the word “alliance” is now being used instead of the word “compromise” with the landlords was also consolidated during these years. This “reactionary alliance” subsequently established the DP and maintained its power through this party. It therefore means that the CHP and the administration were until a certain date in the hands of the national bourgeoisie and despite the “compromises” of this class, were revolutionary(!). Furthermore, the collaborationist big bourgeoisie did not yet exist in Turkey. After a certain time (probably the death of Ataturk) the growing and increasingly collaborationist bourgeoisie came to dominate the party and the government (!). Since they established the DP in 1946 the CHP was cleansed of the collaborationist big bourgeoisie and landlords. Those who collaborated with the Germans and the Americans were the same ones. Since that time the CHP should be the party of the national bourgeoisie! Since the day it came into being the comprador big bourgeoisie is a single indivisible bloc! The theses of the Shafak revisionists reach these conclusions. All these are nothing more than the “counter-revolution” theories of M. Belli advocated in a more refined style. If what is being said is correct, it means M. Belli’s theory of counter-revolution must be correct. For, however compromising it is (and there is no other way), if a national bourgeois government is replaced by a comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord government this is a political counter-revolution. M. Belli gives 1942 as the date of the beginning of the counter-revolution, when the Saracoglu government came to power. As for the Shafak revisionists they leave the date unclear. While M. Belli advocates his theory more clearly and bravely, the Shafak revisionists advocate the same theory in a more hesitant, confused and indecisive language. This is the difference between them.

9. According to the Shafak revisionists Turkey was until the “2nd

World War free from the influence and exploitation of imperialism (look at this adulation of M. Kemal) “Imperialist capital’s free rein was after 1950.” This determination is only correct in this respect: a lot more imperialist capital entered Turkey after 1950 compared to previous years. But what the Shafak revisionists do not want to see, another truth they deny, is that imperialist capital was in Turkey from the beginning of the Kemalist administration. British, French and German imperialists had invested in many sectors. From 1935 onwards the influence and exploitation of German imperialism began to increase. This reached its peak with the coming to power of the Saracoglu government, whereas from the end of the Second World War onwards US imperialism stuck its nose into our country. From 1950 it was essentially the capital of US imperialism that had free rein in our country. (See TIHKP Draft Programme Critique, article 13)

The Shafak revisionists resort to all means to exonerate the Kemalist government period.

10. The Shafak revisionists say that after 1950 “imperialism and its collaborators used the reactionary parliament as a **means of domination**“ (ibid). Here we are witness to the fact that, first and foremost, the character of parliament has not been grasped, that is, that the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state has not been understood.

What is parliament according to the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state? Let us learn from comrade Lenin:

*“To decide once every few years which members of the ruling class is to repress and crush the people through parliament—this is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarism, not only in parliamentary-constitutional monarchies, but also in the most democratic republics.”* Lenin (State and Revolution, page 61)

*“...from America to Switzerland, from France to Britain, Norway and so forth—in these countries the real business of “state” is performed behind the scenes and is carried on by the departments, chancelleries, and General Staffs, parliament is given up to talk for the*

*special purpose of fooling the "common people". This is so true that even in the Russian republic, a bourgeois-democratic republic, all these sins of parliamentarism came out at once, even before it managed to set up a real parliament.*" (ibid, page 62)

This is the essence and function of parliament. Parliament is not, as the Shafak revisionists presume, a "means of domination". The state apparatus with its army, police, courts, police stations and prisons is the means of domination. The existence or otherwise of parliament changes **the form** of domination but never influences the existence of that dominance. The Shafak revisionists, according to the above logic, are prepared to applaud a fascist dictatorship **without a parliament** as a system (!) without the "means of domination" of the ruling classes. If you recall, this is the crude bourgeois logic of M. Belli. Gormless bourgeois such as M. Belli and D. Avcioğlu see parliament as the mother of all evil and think that once parliament goes everything will be fine. These gentlemen are even prepared to issue an invitation to a military fascist dictatorship without a parliament. A few words in the 12 March Memorandum of the gang of pro-American fascist generals attacking parliament excited them and they have all together called on the fascist generals to "beat, beat" and "shut down parliament". For these gentlemen the return to parliamentarism post 27 May was the "retreat of the revolution" (!). These gormless bourgeois are ready to proclaim the period of Kemalist government as "paradise on earth" and have a profound yearning for that period. The Shafak roosters who are becoming fat on the crumbs of theory on M. Belli's rubbish dump are now singing the same tune. Parliament is the means of domination of imperialism and its collaborators! If this is the case, if parliament disappears, the domination and order of the ruling classes will be destroyed (!)

The basis of all this nonsense is, undoubtedly, the anti-Marxist-Leninist understanding of the state that has permeated to these gentlemen's very souls. Plus the fact that they have been unable to grasp the essence and function of parliament, either from the general theory of

Marxism-Leninism or in particular from the point of view of Turkey.

Even in the most democratic bourgeois republics the hurling aside of parliament by the ruling classes will alter two things: firstly, the possibility of "deciding once every few years which members of the ruling class is to repress and crush the people through parliament" will disappear. Secondly, the representatives of the ruling classes will not be able "to talk for the special purpose of fooling the "common people... in parliament". But the means of domination will not disappear, for parliament is not the ruling classes' means to enforce their rule. Communists will, of course "make use even of the "pigsty" of bourgeois parliamentarism, especially when the situation is obviously not revolutionary".

Therefore they will make use even of the "pigsty" of bourgeois parliamentarism, especially when the situation was obviously not revolutionary (ibid page 61) and make use of the possibility of "deciding once every few years which members of the ruling class is to repress and crush the people through parliament", therefore "when the situation is not revolutionary" they will prefer and defend the democratic order to a fascist order, "but will be able to make a genuine proletarian and revolutionary critique of parliamentarism."

As for "situations that are revolutionary", communists will hurl to one side even the most revolutionary of bourgeois parliamentarism, they will mobilise the masses in order **to demolish** the existing bourgeois dictatorship, **whatever its form**.

These are the attitudes of communists to parliament. As for the Shafak revisionists' attitudes, they are those of the bourgeois M. Belli and D. Avcioğlu.

Let us make another point: bourgeois parliamentarism, in addition to being an indicator of bourgeois democracy, is not something that is irreconcilable with fascist dictatorship. Let us listen to comrade Dimitrov on this subject:

*"The development of fascism, and the fascist dictatorship itself, as-*

*sume different forms in different countries, according to historical, social and economic conditions and to the national peculiarities, and the international position of the given country. In certain countries, principally those in which fascism has no broad mass basis and in which the struggle of the various groups within the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie itself is rather acute, fascism does not immediately venture to abolish parliament, but allows the other bourgeois parties, as well as the Social-Democratic Parties, to retain a modicum of legality. In other countries, where the ruling bourgeoisie fears an **early** outbreak of revolution, fascism establishes its unrestricted political monopoly, either immediately or by intensifying its reign of terror against and persecution of all rival parties and groups. This does not prevent fascism, when its position becomes **particularly** acute, from trying to extend its basis and, without altering its class nature, trying **to combine** open terrorist dictatorship with a crude sham of parliamentarism."*

So it means that in some circumstances fascism "may not dissolve parliament", "it may turn a blind eye to other bourgeois parties, including social democrat parties, gaining a little legitimacy", "it may combine an open terrorist dicta with a crude and fabricated parliamentarism without changing its class structure."

Now let us look at the function of parliament in Turkey: the historical, social and economic conditions of our country have led to parliamentarism in Turkey being crude and fabricated from the beginning. In Turkey there is a weak bourgeoisie on account of the semi-colonial, semi-feudal structure. The weak bourgeoisie, in order to protect its power, has always opted for the path of crushing the struggle of the masses with force and violence; more precisely, it is compelled to do this in order to preserve its power and its existence. On the other hand, the wild landlord class, the remnant of the feudal period, is a partner in power with the weak bourgeoisie. This class is constantly endeavouring to replace bourgeois democracy with the cudgel and coercion, the law of feudalism; for a consistent bourgeois democracy conflicts with

the interests of feudalism. For these two reasons bourgeois democracy in Turkey has possessed a fascistic and feudal character from the beginning, including the period of the Kemalist government.

On the other hand the international situation is forcing the bourgeoisie and landlord class to adopt parliament, since an open terrorist dictatorship that abolishes parliament will expose its fascist visage both to the popular masses domestically and world public opinion and be isolated. In order to appear democratic to the masses and global democratic public opinion, and to deceive them, they have found "a crude fabricated parliamentarism" that conceals their fascist faces as more appropriate for their class interests from the beginning. This is the function of parliament in Turkey: **to mask fascism**.

Parliament in Turkey existed in the period of Kemalist government, too, and was even more "crude and fabricated". In reality the deputies were **appointed** by the CHP administrators, or even by M. Kemal himself, rather than being elected. Of course, the assembly was packed with the most ferocious enemies of the masses, the richest and most prestigious landlords, usurers, notables and high ranking bureaucrats from every region. The parliament was constituted in this way. The Şafak revisionists "innocently" (!) overlook these realities, seeing the "reactionary parliament", which they consider a "means (!) of domination", as something peculiar to the post-1950 period. Let us repeat: the reactionary parliament in Turkey is not something that is peculiar to the post-1950 period, rather, since the Kemalist period, even since the constitutional monarchy, it has existed and has always been "crude and fabricated", a "democratic" curtain to cover the face of fascism.

The particularity of the post-1950 period is not the replacement of an administration without a parliament by one with a parliament. While previously there had only been a party of the dominant clique of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords, now the party of the other cliques was permitted. This had in fact happened from 1946 onwards. Meanwhile, although reformist middle bourgeois parties like the

TSEKP and TSP had briefly made an appearance they were immediately crushed. And the “multi-party” system, in reality, had no other function apart from providing the opportunity to various political cliques of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords to establish a party. In our country the reason there was a transition to a “multi-party” system from the end of the Second World War was to give the DP clique that presented itself as the collaborator with American and British imperialism the opportunity to organise and to bring it to power in place of the pro-German fascist CHP clique. This is the essence of the matter. There was no “transition from fascism to democracy”, or the “imposition” of a “reactionary parliament” and thus a “consolidation of the counter-revolution”, as some fools assume.

Let us state that in Turkey there have been three short periods when there has been bourgeois democracy in which some crumbs, if limited, have been experienced. Firstly, the short period immediately after the War of Liberation when the TKP was still legal; secondly, the short period at the end of the Second World War when the TSEKP and similar parties and trade unions were free to organise, and, thirdly, the short period following the coup of 27 May [1960]. The reason there was a comparatively democratic environment during these three periods is as follows:

The activities of the masses and democratic bourgeois circles that had participated in the War of Liberation continued for a time afterwards. In the same way the influence and momentum of the anti-fascist struggle waged against the pro-German fascist CHP clique during the Second World War continued for a while after the demise of the Saracoglu government. Again, the momentum and effect of the democratic struggle against the fascist DP government continued after 27 May, but in all three cases the political cliques of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords that held the leadership, after using the struggle of the masses and reformist national bourgeoisie like a winch to attain power, first put a brake on the struggle and then realised step

by step a semi-fascist or fascist dictatorship by trampling on all kinds of democratic rights.

In Turkey parliament has been since the outset a mask for governments, that is, for the semi-fascist and fascist dictatorships of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords. Today, too, Turkey is under a fascist dictatorship, but the “crude and fabricated” parliament continues and it is the fascist cliques themselves, with certain exceptions, who wish this crude and fabricated parliament to persist.

The Shafak revisionists, who have the ability to reconcile such irreconcilable things as M. Belli’s fondness of military coups with comrade Mao Tse-Tung’s theory of popular war (!), have now managed to reconcile M. Belli and D. Avcioglu’s nonsensical “parliament is the mother of all evils” with TIP and Ecevit’s “parliamentary foolishness”. The Shafak revisionists on the one hand see the “reactionary parliament as a means of domination of imperialism and its collaborators”, while on the other hand they claim that parliament and fascism are irreconcilable and that “despite everything” parliament is a good thing and must be defended. (see PDA no 27 Editorial) In this way they become advocates of the “crude and fabricated” parliament along with the fascist cliques.

Let us summarise: first and foremost, parliament is not the “**means of domination** of imperialists and its collaborators”. The reactionary apparatus is the means of domination. the ruling classes may continue their dominance by abandoning parliament. Secondly, parliament did not emerge in Turkey after 1950. Parliament has existed since the constitutional monarchy period, but has always been a “crude and fabricated” affair, the “democratic” facade of fascist and semi-fascist dictatorships.

Thirdly, the particularity of the post-1950 period is not the transition from a dictatorship without a parliament to a parliamentary dictatorship, but rather the attainment of political organisation by all the cliques of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord classes.

The Shafak revisionists, just as they have not made a Marxist-Leninist evaluation of parliament, have also never been able to grasp the function of parliament in Turkey. These narrow-minded bourgeois, whichever question they get their hands on they make a mess of. (see TIHKP Draft Programme Critique article 20)

11. The Shafak revisionists say: “the **political and economic crisis concluded with** the overthrow of the American lackey DP government on 27 May 1960. This is a nonsensical claim not worth dwelling upon. The rule of the bourgeoisie and landlords is to continue, capitalism intertwined with feudal lords is to continue, but **the political and economic crisis concluded(!)**. The crisis stems from contradictions that exist in the structure of today’s economic order, and, connected to that, the social and political order. Without this structure being overthrown by a victorious popular revolution these contradictions will not end and neither the economic nor the political crisis will be concluded. The Shafak revisionists assume that they will be able to be liberated from all the ailments of the system without touching the foundations of that order. All the reactionary classes and their “scientists” are seeking such a recipe in order “to refute Marxism-Leninism”, but they have yet to find it. (See TIHKP Draft Programme Critique article 20)

12. The Shafak revisionists claim that the middle bourgeoisie led the 27 May movement and that after the coup they seized power, but subsequently “**left the administration to the collaborationist big bourgeoisie and landlords**”. This is not true. As we have mentioned before, it was the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords represented by the Inonu circle CHP clique which led the coup and seized power. The middle bourgeoisie and youth played a significant role in the realisation of the coup, not as the leadership but by attaching itself to the CHP clique. If the Shafak revisionists see the Inonu circle’s CHP clique as the representatives of the middle bourgeoisie they are again mistaken. In 1965 with the AP coming to power if it is meant that the middle bourgeoisie left office then it means that it is accepted that the

MBK government, and coalition governments represented the middle bourgeoisie. In reality both the period of MBK government and the period of coalition governments were periods when the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords were in power. What changed was that while one clique of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords was descending the other was on the rise. This is the crux of the matter. The Isci-Koylu masses, with their own experiences, made a more correct identification than the Shafak revisionists. (see Critique of TIHKP Draft Programme article 21)

13. Kemalism is the ideology of which class? According to the Shafak revisionists Kemalism is the ideology of the revolutionary wing of the middle bourgeoisie. In the pamphlet “The Political Situation in Turkey and the World after 12 March” it is said that “fascism wishes to mislead the **Kemalist sections** of the middle bourgeoisie.” (see *ibid* p.45) By saying “the Kemalist sections of the middle bourgeoisie”, it is abundantly clear that the revolutionary sections of the middle bourgeois are meant; that is, its left wing.

Again the Shafak revisionists claim that the tenets of M. Kemal will never be reconciled with fascism, adding: “the fascists assume that by distorting the principles of M. Kemal they will be able to portray them as part of their own fascist twaddle.” (*ibid*,p.45)

Again the Shafak revisionists say :” M. Kemal is part of the **progressive history of our people.**”

These claims bear not the slightest connection to the realities of Turkey. The Shafak revisionists are trying to put their own futile dreams in place of reality. In our country a whole heap of revisionist and opportunist cliques do the same thing, particularly regarding the question of Kemalism. The idealist opinions of the middle bourgeoisie that are contrary to reality regarding Kemalism have established such a monopoly in people’s heads that it has become virtually impossible to make a communist evaluation of it. We know well that our opinions on the subject of Kemalism will bring all the bourgeois and petit bour-

geois currents, from Cetin Altan, D. Avcioglu and Ilhan Selcuk to M. Belli, H. Kivilcimli, TKP, THKP-THKC, THKO to the Shafak revisionists, to their feet in anger. But rather than jumping up in anger isn't it necessary for them to look more seriously at Turkey's history, to endeavour to grasp it correctly? The realities of Turkey tell us that:

**Kemalism means** fanatical anti-communism. The Kemalists brutally drowned M. Suphi and 14 of his comrades. They mercilessly crushed the TKP after the death of M. Suphi, although the party was not worthy of that name. What the pro-American fascist martial law courts are doing today the Kemalists did many times. Every two years, very often at least once a year, there were general round ups, with hundreds tortured and left to rot in police stations and prisons. As long as it suited their interests they flattered the Soviet Union, the rest of the time they nourished an insidious and ferocious animosity towards it.

**Kemalism means** the bloody and violent suppression of the class struggle of the worker and peasant masses, of the urban petit bourgeoisie and rank and file public servants. Kemalism means for workers bayonets and gunfire, truncheon and rifle butt, court and prison and a ban on strikes and trade unions. For peasants it means the tyranny of the landlords, beatings by the gendarme, courts, prison and a ban on all organisation. All colleagues should recall the examples given by comrade Schnurov of how workers on the Adana-Nusaybin railway line were shot.

**Kemalism means** a chain being tied to all manner of progressive and democratic ideas. All publishing activity that does not praise Kemalism is banned. In future merely the possibility that an article might emerge against the Kemalist government will be sufficient reason for a publication to be closed down. Endless "martial law" is terrorising the country with every proclamation lasting for years. Parliament is a toy in the hands of a small coterie of administrators at the top of the CHP and their unchanging president M. Kemal. The Constitution and all laws are also like this, though in reality it is the army that runs the country.

**Kemalism means** the incitement of Turkish chauvinism in all spheres, the implementation of merciless national oppression towards minority nationalities and forced Turkicisation and massacres.

The "**Complete independence**" tenet of Kemalism means willingly consenting to semi-colonial conditions.

Kemalist Turkey is semi-colonial Turkey. The Kemalist government means a collaborationist government that was initially a lackey of British-French imperialism and subsequently of German imperialism. As Schnurov pointed out, the Kemalists class brotherhood with the imperialists was stronger than their national animosities.

The Kemalist government on many occasions, as it did during the Adana-Nusaybin railway strike, shot workers in order to protect the interests of British, French and German companies.

Now the revisionists who adulate Kemalism will ask us angrily: If this is the case, then why did the USSR and Lenin support the Kemalists? The answer is simple. In the same way that the USSR and Stalin supported the Kuomintang against Japan, they supported them for the same reason. The Chinese Communist Party and comrade Mao Tse-Tung are supporting the governments of comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords in the backward countries of Latin America for the same reason and for instance the fascism of Yayha Khan against the US imperialists and Soviet social imperialists. In that period the USSR and comrade Lenin supported the Kemalists for that reason, that is, in order to isolate the more reactionary and bigger enemies, British-French imperialism, they supported the Kemalists.

That is, the USSR and Lenin expertly took advantage of contradictions between the reactionaries for the benefit of the revolution.

The revisionists who admire Kemalism will shout angrily: "You are rejecting the national liberationist aspect of Kemalism." No! We merely correctly identify the "national liberationist" character of Kemalism. What Kemalism sees as national liberationism is the removal of the colonial structure, but the preservation of the semi-colonialist

structure; the ending of the direct domination of imperialism, but the continuation of its indirect domination; economic and political collaboration with imperialism and political semi-dependence on it. Why are the Kemalists opposed to colonialism? Let us read once again the answer to this question provided by comrade Schnurov:

"...The Turkish mercantile bourgeoisie took over the leadership of the revolution. Since Turkey was an agricultural country the merchants' main trade was in agricultural products. The mercantile bourgeoisie thus established strong links with the feudal gentry and landlords. In every Turkish village the lord and landowner was also a usurer and the main buyer and seller of the peasants' products. These gentry sometimes owned flour mills or small factories processing oil or dried fruit or other enterprises. The gentry also represented large firms that bought agricultural products wholesale.

"Under these conditions if Turkey had been defeated by the European capitalists, foreigners would in a short time have seized all trade and industry. The Turkish bourgeoisie faced a life or death struggle. If the parts under the occupation of the capitalists did not exist, if the state did not support them, if the privileges granted to foreigners continued and Turkey remained entirely dependent on foreign capital the country's trade and industry would sooner or later die. It was this threat that made the merchant, industrialist and large landlord and gentry that sold agricultural products to foreign countries into revolutionaries. The peasants, workers and small businessmen's discontent with the capitalists and landlords was expertly turned into a struggle against foreign capitalists."

The reasons that brought the Kemalists out against colonialism are those indicated by comrade Schnurov. However national liberationist and revolutionary Chiang Kai-shek and the classes he represented were for opposing the occupation of Japanese imperialism then M. Kemal and the classes he represented were national liberationist and revolutionary to the same extent.

Kemalism means, at the same time, being arm in arm with the landlord class, crushing the peasant masses with them side by side, unity of interest, class

fraternity. All these realities illustrate clearly the class character of Kemalism, the ideology of which class it is: **Kemalism is the ideology of the right wing of the Turkish comprador big bourgeoisie and middle bourgeoisie.**

Leaving aside the non-reconciliation of Kemalism and fascism, Kemalism itself means fascism. The Kemalist dictatorship was a military fascist dictatorship. According to a former revolutionary who listened to someone who had lived in the 1930s the TKP's slogan in those days was "Down with the Kemalists' fascist dictatorship." But this slogan was later, for whatever reason, abandoned. They say: "M. Kemal is part of the progressive history of our people." **The history of our people** is entirely progressive. But M. Kemal is not part of **our people's history**, he is part of the history of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords, and the right wing of the middle bourgeoisie that united with them, that is, of the **reactionary classes**. For instance, however much Sultan Mehmet the conqueror is a part of our people's history (!), M. Kemal is a part to the same degree (!). The Shafak revisionists compare M. Kemal to Sun Yat-sen, but M. Kemal resembles a Chiang Kai-shek of Turkey. Sun Yat-sen was in favour of an alliance with the communists. Many communists, including comrade Mao Tse-Tung, were on the central committee of Sun Yat-sen's party. Sun Yat-sen forged a sincere and close friendship with the Soviet Union. Sun Yat-sen was in favour of improvements in the standards of life of the worker-peasant masses and of their being granted the maximum rights and freedoms that bourgeois democracy could give. He waged a struggle for this as long as he lived. Sun Yat-sen was an implacable enemy of the landlord class, and in favour of the interests of the peasant masses. Sun Yat-sen was the spokesman of the peasant masses, not the capitalists and landlords.

“.....An intellectual spokesman of the militant and successful Chinese democracy that has attained a republic.....although a progressive Chinese democrat he thinks just like a Russian. He so resembles a Russian Narodnik, that in his fundamental ideas and in many of his forms of expression he is identical.” (National Liberation Movements in the East, p.62)

As is known, the Narodniks were members of a **petit bourgeois democratic movement that represented the interests of the peasant masses** in Russia.

Their aim was to end despotism, and for the large estates to be distributed to the peasantry. The Narodniks' error was in assuming that a consistent democratic programme of revolution was socialism.

*“Beginning with its distant and lone, forerunner, the nobleman Herzen and continuing right up to its mass representatives, the members, of the Peasant Union of 1905 and the Trudovik deputies to the first three Dumas of 1906–12, Russian bourgeois democracy has had a Narodnik colouring. Bourgeois democracy in China, as we now see, has the same Narodnik colouring.”*

And these are notes extracted from the same book;

*“All-Russian Peasant Union—a revolutionary-democratic organisation founded in 1905. Its programme and tactics were elaborated at its first and second congresses, held in Moscow in August and November 1905. ... Its agrarian programme provided for the abolition of private landownership and for transfer of the lands belonging to monasteries, the Church, the Crown and the government to the peasants without compensation.”*

*“Trudoviks - a group of petty-bourgeois democrats in the Russian Duma...the Trudovik Group was constituted in April 1906 from the peasant deputies to the First Duma.*

*The Trudovik agrarian programme proceeded from the Narodnik principle of equalised land tenure: the formation of a national fund*

*made up of state, crown and monastery lands, and also of private estates where they exceeded the established labour norm, with provision for compensation in the case of confiscated private estates.”*

Comrade Lenin compares Sun Yat-sen to **revolutionary democrats that represent the peasantry**. This similarity is such that Sun Yat-sen, like the Narodniks, gave the name “socialism” to his programme for a militant democratic revolution.

Let us continue to read comrade Lenin:

*“Every line of Sun Yat-sen's platform breathes a spirit of militant and sincere democracy. It reveals a thorough understanding of the inadequacy of a “racial” revolution. There is not a trace in it of indifference to political issues, or even of underestimation of political liberty, or of the idea that Chinese “social reform”, Chinese constitutional reforms, etc., could be compatible with Chinese autocracy. It stands for complete democracy and the demand for a republic... It expresses warm sympathy for the toiling and exploited people, faith in their strength and in the justice of their cause.”*

Comrade Lenin continues:

*“In China, the Asiatic provisional President of the Republic [Sun Yat-sen] is a revolutionary democrat, endowed with the nobility and heroism of a class that is rising, not declining, a class that does not dread the future, but believes in it and fights for it selflessly, a class that does not cling to maintenance and restoration of the past in order to safeguard its privileges, but hates the past and knows how to cast off its dead and stifling decay.”*

Comrade Lenin clearly indicates on which social class Sun Yat-Sen relied:

*“The chief representative, or the chief social bulwark, of this Asian bourgeoisie that is still capable of supporting a historically progressive cause, is the PEASANT.”*

Comrade Lenin also pointed to another section of the bourgeoisie in Asia.

*“And side by side with him there already exists a **liberal bourgeoisie** whose leaders, men like Yuan Shih-kai, are above all capable of treachery.”*

We shall explain a little later what comrade Lenin meant by **liberal bourgeoisie**. Now let us continue to read what Lenin wrote regarding Sun Yat-sen:

*“The real emancipation of the Chinese people from age-long slavery would be impossible without the **great, sincerely democratic enthusiasm which is rousing the working masses and making them capable of miracles, and which is evident from every sentence of Sun Yat-sen’s platform.**”*

In the same piece comrade Lenin separates the **three social forces** in China, explaining what sort of politics they pursued and what they might pursue:

*“The emperor will certainly try to unite the feudal lords, the bureaucracy and the clergy in an attempt at restoration. Yuan Shih-kai, who represents a bourgeoisie that has only just changed from liberal-monarchist to liberal-republican (for how long?), will pursue a policy of manoeuvring between monarchy and revolution. The revolutionary bourgeois democracy, represented by Sun Yat-sen, is correct in seeking ways and means of “renovating” China through maximum development of the initiative, determination and boldness of the peasant masses in the matter of political and agrarian reforms.”*

Eventually comrade Lenin identifies with great far-sightedness the attitude a proletarian party to be established would adopt towards the Sun Yat-sen movement:

*“It [the proletariat] will probably form some kind of Chinese Social-Democratic labour party [that is, the Chinese Communist Party] which, while criticising the petty-bourgeois utopias and reactionary views of Sun Yat-sen, will certainly take care to single out, defend and develop the revolutionary-democratic core of his political and agrarian programme.”*

The Sun Yat-sen movement, as has been seen, was a genuine, revolutionary, militant **peasant movement** based on the broad peasant masses, and which mobilised them.

The CCP was of course to embrace this inheritance. Is there a similarity between this and the movement of M. Kemal? There is not, but there is a complete similarity between M. Kemal and the liberal bourgeois movement of Yuan Shi-Kay.

What did comrade Lenin mean by the concept liberal bourgeoisie? (One Step Forward, Two Steps Back p.156)

In Russia, as is known, the Social-Revolutionaries were the continuation of the Narodniks. Since Lenin saw the Sun Yat-sen movement as the same as the Narodniks it means he evaluated the Sun Yat-sen movement as the **most democratic section of the liberal democratic tendency**, that is, it represented the middle peasantry. The Kemalist movement represented the **liberal** tendency, that is, the right wing of the middle bourgeoisie and the comprador big bourgeoisie. There is a great difference between these two movements and there is no comparison. The Shafak revisionists are closing their eyes to this significant difference.

14. The Shafak revisionists say: “We are the heirs to M. Kemal’s principle of ‘complete independence’, we cannot abandon this inheritance to the fascists, we must embrace it very tightly.” The reason communists will be unable to embrace this thing called “inheritance” has, we assume, become abundantly clear. M. Kemal’s comrade in arms, I. Inonu, continues this inheritance today, Nihat Erim does the same, those following his example are maintaining it. You know which classes and which tendency these persons and the organisations of which they are members represent. Even Bulent Ecevit was attacked by the Kemal Satir gang for making a mild criticism of the “inheritance” which the Shafak revisionists embrace.

The Shafak revisionists, embracing anything like greedy merchants saying “inheritance”, when evaluating the M. Kemal movement are to the right of Ecevit and approaching the Kemal Satir gang.

Communists know very well how to make history a weapon in the revolutionary struggle. But to embrace reactionary things by saying "inheritance" and joining the reactionaries in deceiving the popular masses is to be their accomplice in crime. To embrace reactionary things as "inheritance" will not enable us to fuse with the masses, on the contrary it will tear us away from them.

To embrace Kemalism as an inheritance will tear us away from the worker-peasant masses that were brutally crushed by the Kemalist government. Yes, there are worker and peasant masses whose heads have been stuffed with mistaken ideas regarding Kemalism by the ruling classes, and feel attracted to it. But if we do not wage a struggle against these mistaken ideas, if we do not uproot and throw away these incorrect ideas from workers and peasants' heads, then we will be unable to ensure unity, solidarity and confidence amongst the various sections of toilers and toilers belonging to various nationalities. Furthermore, in respect to today, we will not be able to wage a correct and successful struggle against the reactionary classes. We will leave the masses without weapons against the military fascist dictatorships that advocate and implement the tenets of Kemalism (we have seen what these tenets are). The Kemalist dictatorship is no different to the Yahya Khan dictatorship. We cannot portray such a regime as sympathetic. This is what the Shafak revisionists are doing.

Communists know how to use history as a weapon in the revolutionary struggle. There were popular heroes who created legends with their lives and their blood in the War of Liberation. For instance, there was Karayilan. We are the heirs of their struggle. We are the heirs of their inexhaustible energy, their miracle-creating genius and their endless revolutionary power. Not of those who attempted at every opportunity to bloodily crush the struggle of the masses and displayed hostility towards them! Some weapons exist where those who hold them possess an invincible force. For instance, Marxism-

Leninism -Mao Tse-Tung Thought is just such a weapon. The revolutionary experiences of the masses are just such a weapon.

There are some weapons that injure those who hold them. That is, the weapon recoils and shoots those that are holding it. Kemalism is just such a weapon! The Shafak revisionists may accuse us as much as they like due to our not wanting to take up such a weapon. But we will not refrain from explaining to the masses and revolutionary cadre the real character of this weapon that they advertise left and right.

**15.** The Shafak revisionists say "the analyses of Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung regarding M. Kemal should show the way to us." Yes, we are of the same opinion. They have a great need of such a beacon of light. They are like blind people trying to walk in the dark by feeling their way. But their blindness is a different kind of blindness: **Political blindness.**

**N.B: Written in January 1972. Following the split with revisionism it was rewritten in August 1972 remaining faithful to the original.**

*The National Question in Turkey*

*December 1971*

## **1-The theses of Safak revisionism on the National Question:**

“The large bourgeoisie, forming an alliance with the feudal landlords, have implemented a policy of national oppression and assimilation against the Kurdish people.”( article 10, draft programme)

“The Kurdish population of 6 million in our country have raised the flag of struggle against the bourgeoisie and landlords’ policy of national oppression and assimilation. It has stood up to the serious torture and oppression to which the pro-American governments have resorted. The struggle embarked upon by the Kurdish people for democratic rights, the equality of nations and for self-determination is developing rapidly. All Turkey’s workers and peasants support this struggle. The racist policy of imperialism to pit the peoples of Turkey against each other with the aim of crushing them is bankrupt and the links uniting the people on the revolutionary path are becoming stronger” (Draft programme, article 25)

“Our movement declares that it recognises the right of the Kurdish people to self-determination, and, if it wishes, to establish its own state.

“Our movement... works for the determination of the destiny of the Kurdish people towards the interest of the Kurdish workers and peasants.

“Our movement will pursue a policy of aiming for the uniting of the two fraternal peoples in Turkey possessing equal rights in a democratic peoples’ republic.

“Our movement will wage a struggle against the reactionary ruling classes (of all nations) and their divisive policies that encourage animosity towards the revolutionary and fraternal of the Turkish and Kurdish peoples.(Draft programme, article 52)

“The Marxist-Leninist movement is the most unyielding defender of the Kurdish people’s right to self-determination and at the same time will struggle for the destiny of the Kurdish people to be determined in a way that will be in the interests of the Kurdish workers and peasants.

In addition to this, the Marxist-Leninist movement will pursue a policy aiming to bring about uniting of the two fraternal peoples in Turkey, **possessing equal rights** in a democratic people's republic." (The political situation in the World and in Turkey following the 12 march (coup) page 74)

"We will defend unyieldingly the Kurdish people's right to self-determination." (page 72) "The Kurdish People's right of self-determination (subsequent liberation) cannot be separated from the struggle for a land revolution based on the poor peasants or the struggle against imperialism." (page 73)

"The policy of national enmity and being implemented against the Kurdish people..(Regarding the question of establishing red political power) "Struggle with national oppression of the Kurdish people..." ("we must insistently continue to defend the right of the Kurdish people to self-determination." These are almost all the theses on the national q. put forward by the organisation formerly known as the Proletarian Revolutionary "Aydinlik"(POA), now known as the Safak Revisionists, in the new period; that is, since martial law was declared on 26 April 1971. We shall not dwell on the line followed prior to martial law, as almost everyone concerned with the movement knows that an intense Turkish nationalism, a ferocious dominant nation nationalism bequeathed by the ideology of Mihri Belli, was influential. Now more subtle and deceptive forms of nationalism have been developed, which must be struggled against and refuted. Let us dwell upon these theories:

## 2. To whom is national oppression applied ?

According to Safak Revisionism national oppression is applied to **the Kurdish people**. This is to not understand the meaning of national oppression, National oppression is the oppression imposed by the ruling classes of ruling, oppressing and exploiting nations on the

downtrodden, dependent subject **nations**. In Turkey national oppression is the oppression applied by the ruling classes of the dominant Turkish nation on **the entire Kurdish nation**, not just the Kurdish people, and also not solely on the Kurdish nation, but on **all minority subject nations**. People and nation are not the same things. The concept of people today generally covers the working class, poor and middle peasantry semi-proletarians and the urban petit bourgeoisie. In backward countries, the revolutionary wing of the national bourgeoisie, which takes its place in the democratic popular revolution against imperialism, feudalism and comprador capitalism, is also included in the popular classes. However, the term **nation** includes all classes and strata, including the ruling classes. Quote from Stalin to be checked ( it's an easy one!) All classes and strata that speak the same language, live in the same territory, and are in the same unity of economic life and psychological formation are included within the scope of the nation. Within these are classes and strata that are enemies of the revolution and counter-revolution, just as there are classes and strata in the ranks of the revolution and whose interests are served by the revolution. The term people has, in every historical epoch, meant those classes and strata whose interests are served by the revolution and that take their place in the ranks of the revolution. The people are not a community that emerges in a particular historical epoch and then disappears, but are a community that exist in every historical age. However ,the nation has only emerged along with capitalism "in the age of the rise of capitalism."

At an advanced stage of socialism it will disappear. The extent of the term people changes at every stage of the revolution, whereas the scope of the term nation is not linked to stages of the revolution. Today Kurdish workers, Kurdish poor and middle peasants, urban semi-proletariat the urban petit bourgeoisie that will join the ranks of the national democratic revolution are all included in the concept of **Kurdish people**. Whereas; apart from these classes and strata, the

other sections of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and Kurdish landlords are also included in the concept of **Kurdish nation**. Certain smart and well-read persons claim that landlords cannot be deemed part of a nation. They even go as far as to claim that, since there are landlords in the Kurdish region the Kurds do not yet constitute a nation. This is a dreadful demagoguery and sophistry. Don't the landlords speak the same shared language? Don't they live in the same territory? Are they not part of the same unity of economic life and psychological formation? Furthermore, nations emerge at the **dawn of capitalism**, not when it reaches the ultimate limit of its development. When capitalism enters a country, when it moves into a region to a certain degree and unites the markets in that country in that region, to a certain extent, communities **that possess the other characteristics of being a nation** are then deemed to have become a nation. If this were not the case, it would be necessary to consider that all the stable communities in all backward countries and regions in which capitalist development is limited are not nations. Until the 1940s there existed a strong feudal division in China. According to this rationale it would have been necessary previously not to have accepted the presence of nations in China. Until the 1917 Revolution feudalism was very powerful in the broad rural regions of Russia. According to this understanding it would have been necessary not to accept the existence of nations in Russia. In Turkey, for instance, during the years of the War of Liberation feudalism was stronger than today. According to this logic it would be necessary to accept that there were absolutely no nations in Turkey during those years. Today feudalism exists in economically backward oppressed parts and regions of the world, in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, to varying degrees. According to this rationale it would be necessary to accept that nations do not exist in these economically backward regions and countries. It is abundantly clear that the theory which claims that the Kurds do not constitute a nation is nonsense, from beginning to end, contrary to the facts, and,

in practice, harmful, It is harmful on account of the fact that such a theory is only of benefit to the ruling classes of the oppressing, exploiting and dominant nations. They will thus find justification for the national oppression and cruelty that they inflict on oppressed, dependent and subject nations and the privileges and inequality that they provide for themselves. In this way the struggle which the proletariat should wage for the equality of nations, and the ending of national oppression, privileges etc; will come to naught. Nations' right to self-determination will disappear. The colonisation of backward nations by the imperialists and their interference in their internal affairs and blatant disregard for their right of self-determination will be legitimised by the argument that "they do not constitute a nation" In the same way, in multi-national states, all manner of oppression and tyranny of the dominant nation towards the subject nations will be legitimised, Those that claim that in the event that there are landlords it is not possible to talk of a nation are blowing the trumpets of imperialism and dominant nations. Those who claim that the Kurds in Turkey do not constitute a nation are blowing the trumpets of the Turkish ruling classes. As is known, the Turkish ruling classes also claim that the Kurds do not constitute a nation. These, by defending the privileges of the Turkish ruling classes, are sabotaging in a despicable way the confidence, solidarity and unity of the toiling popular masses belonging to various nationalities. A community living in entirely feudal conditions cannot of course be classed as a nation. But in today's world where does such feudalism exist? Capitalism quietly entered the life of oppressed eastern Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup>, uniting the markets there to a certain degree; achieving common economic life and opening the way to the formation of nations. There exist today in very limited areas of certain regions of the world **tribal** communities that have not become nations, but these are so few as to not merit a mention.

**If we summarize:**

It is abundantly clear to all who have not been affected by ferocious Turkish chauvinism that in Turkey the Kurds constitute a nation.

*N.B. This article was written in June 1972 at a time when the fascism of 12 March Martial Law was continuing at its violent height. Martial law had been officially declared in Diyarbakir and Siirt, but in reality it was implemented in the entire Kurdish region. The headquarters of Martial Law in this region were in Diyarbakir.*

Kurdish workers, poor and medium peasants, semi-proletarians, urban petit bourgeoisie, the entire Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords are included in the scope of the Kurdish nation. National oppression is not only implemented against **the Kurdish people**, but the entire Kurdish nation, with the exception of a handful of large feudal landlords and a few large bourgeois who have entirely coalesced with the Turkish ruling classes. The Kurdish workers, peasants, urban petit bourgeoisie and small landlords suffer from national oppression. Moreover, the real target of national oppression is the bourgeoisie of the oppressed, dependent and subject nation, for the capitalists and landlords want to own the wealth and markets of the country without rivals. They wish to retain the privilege of founding a state. They want to ensure "linguistic unity" which is absolutely necessary for the market, by banning the other languages. The bourgeoisie and landlords belonging to the oppressed nation are a significant obstacle to these ambitions, for they wish to possess their own market, control it as they wish and exploit its material wealth and the labour of the people. These are the strong economic factors that set the bourgeoisie and landlords of the two nations at each others' throats; for this reason the bourgeoisie and landlords of the ruling nation engage in ceaseless national oppression, which targets the bourgeoisie and landlords of the oppressed nation. Today, the fascist martial law authorities have filled Diyarbakir prison with democratic Kurdish intellectuals and youth who are the spokesmen of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords.

Today, small landlords and a section of Kurdish religious figures are in dungeons, or are being sought in order to be crammed into dungeons. (See above note) As for the handful of large landlords, their flatterers and the few large bourgeois; they have for a long time been in alliance with the Turkish ruling classes. All manner of privilege is open to them, as it is to the Turkish ruling classes. The army, gendarme and police are also at their service. Kemal Burkay puts it like this;

*"The feudal lords have abandoned their old claims to sovereignty, that is, they have given up their obstinate insistence on being the sole ruler of certain small kingdoms. Instead, they have established cooperation with the bourgeoisie. In the economic and political spheres, Landlords, religious leaders, even sheikhs, are involved in commerce, they work their land with tractors, they also have the lion's share of bank credit. They are also becoming local councillors, mayors, MPs and ministers. Political parties are at their command. There is not now a Sheikh Said pursuing the cause of 'Emirate of Kurdistan', but there are "assistant professor sheikhs" who undertake roles such as group spokesman in parliament... Now, there is no Seyit Riza ruling the mountains of Dersim, but there is his grandson who receives significant amounts in commission on the transportation of chrome ore from the same mountains to Iskenderun, then from there to Italy and then to America. And the eastern feudal remnants now get on very well with the bureaucracy. Since then they have become accustomed to ties and felt hats."*

The points made by Kemal Burkay are correct as regards the large landlords and a few large bourgeois and the sycophants, but are absolutely not correct as regards all the **"feudal remnants"** and the entire Kurdish bourgeoisie, as he wishes to indicate. The small landlords and a very large proportion of the Kurdish bourgeoisie suffer the national oppression of the Turkish ruling classes. They also even suffer persecution by the large Kurdish feudal leaders. A handful of large landlords obtain significant tribute from small landlords by means of coer-

cion and persecution. The reason small landlords and the Kurdish bourgeoisie feel anger towards the large feudal landlords and their hangers on is down to these two causes. The reaction displayed by Kemal Burkay is also due to this. Kemal Burkay mentions a homogenous “Eastern people”, aside from the “feudal remnants” integrated with the “Turkish bourgeoisie”, while expertly disguising the fact that the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords are included in this. (“I mean the entire people apart from backward elements such as landlords, religious figures and collaborationist bourgeoisie”) In this way, the contradiction between the Kurdish proletariat, semi-proletariat, poor and middle peasantry and the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords is ignored. The class objectives of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords are shown as if they are the same as those of the proletariat, semi-proletarian elements and the poor peasantry.

For now let us state the following in summary and move on; Kurdish workers, along with semi-proletarians, poor and middle peasants, the urban petit bourgeoisie and the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords are all subjected to national oppression. And these classes constitute the ranks of the Kurdish national movement. All these classes that unite against national oppression have, naturally, their own aims and goals. We shall point out later which of these we shall support and how far we shall support them.

“In claiming that national oppression is only applied to the Kurdish people the Shafak revisionists fall into one of these two errors: either the term KURDISH PEOPLE is being used correctly and the entire Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords are not included in this in which case the national oppression being implemented against the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords is being concealed, thereby indirectly approving this oppression, leading to the line of Turkish nationalism; or, the whole Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords are being included in the concept of the Kurdish people, in which case the class oppression suffered by the Kurdish people in addition to national

oppression is being concealed, the national movement is being portrayed as the same thing as the class movement, and in this way the line of the Kurdish nationalists is being adopted. Moreover, apart from the Kurdish people there are minority peoples that do not constitute nations and national oppression is applied to them in the form of prohibiting use of their languages etc. The Shafak revisionists leave this point entirely to one side.

### 3. What is the aim of national oppression?

According to the Shafak revisionists the aim of national oppression is “to intimidate the Kurdish people”. “The pro-American administrations have embarked on severe injustice and oppression **in order to cow the Kurdish people.**” (my emphasis) Certainly one of the objectives of the pro-American governments is to cow the Kurdish people. In fact, the aim of their oppression is to cow the Turkish people, Kurdish, Armenian, Greek, Arab, Laz etc.. all the people of Turkey. But is this the aim of national oppression? If this were the case how could the oppression of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords be explained? What meaning would banning Kurdish have? If this were the case what difference would there be between the oppression of the Turkish people by the pro-American governments and the oppression of the Kurdish people? For the pro-American governments also wish to cow the Turkish people and they engage in severe torture and oppression for this purpose. The Martial law tribunals are full of hundreds of revolutionary Turkish workers, peasants and intellectuals. After the events of 15-16 June hundreds of Turkish workers suffered torture at the hands of the police. Turkish peasants who occupied land were beaten to a jelly in police stations. The leaders were thrown into jail. In that instance the aim of the pro-American government did not consist of “cowing the KURDISH PEOPLE”. This is a policy implemented by all reactionary governments against all toilers regardless of nationality. Beyond this, “oppression and tor-

ture” is carried out against the entire Kurdish nation (except for a handful of large feudal lords), not just the Kurdish people and not just to intimidate” but to realise a more fundamental objective. What is this objective? This objective, in the most general terms, is to dominate the material wealth of all the country’s markets without rivals, to gain new privileges, extend existing privileges to their limits and utilise them. For this purpose the bourgeoisie and landlords of the dominant nation, in order to conserve the political borders of the country expend great efforts to prevent, at any cost, regions where different nationalities live splitting off from the country. One of the necessary conditions for commerce to develop to the broadest degree is linguistic unity. With this aim in mind the bourgeoisie and landlords of the dominant nation want their language to be spoken in the whole country and even use coercion to force its acceptance. In the words of comrade Stalin: “Who will dominate the market?” This is the essence of the matter. The slogans “National unity”, “the indivisible unity and integrity of the state, its land and people” and “territorial integrity” are an expression of the selfish interests of the bourgeoisie and landlords and their desire to dominate unconditionally “the market”. Comrade Stalin adds the following:

*“But matters are usually not confined to the market. The semi-feudal, semi-bourgeois bureaucracy of the dominant nation intervenes in the struggle with its own methods of ‘arresting and preventing.’ The bourgeoisie – whether big or small – of the dominant nation is able to deal more ‘swiftly’ and ‘decisively’ with its competitor. ‘Forces’ are united and a series of restrictive measures is put into operation against the “alien” bourgeoisie, measures passing into acts of repression. The struggle spreads from the economic sphere to the political sphere. Restriction of freedom of movement, repression of language, restriction of franchise, closing of schools, religious restrictions, and so on, are piled upon the head of the ‘competitor.’ Of course, such measures are designed not only in the interest of the bourgeois classes of the dominant*

*nation, but also in furtherance of the specifically caste aims, so to speak, of the ruling bureaucracy.”*

The national oppression used by the bourgeoisie and landlords of the dominant nation for the “market” and by the dominant bureaucracy for “caste objectives “ go as far as the usurpation of democratic rights and mass slaughter ( that is, genocide). There are many examples of genocide in Turkey. The oppression of the toilers of minority peoples in this way acquires a doubled quality. Firstly, there is the **class oppression** utilised against **the toilers** in order to exploit and suppress the class struggle; secondly, there is the **national oppression** implemented for the above mentioned objectives against all classes of minority nations and nationalities. Communists have to distinguish between these two forms of oppression, because, for instance, while the Kurdish bourgeois and small landlord oppose the second form of oppression, they support the first. As for us, we are opposed to both forms of oppression. In order for national oppression to be removed we support the struggle of the Kurdish bourgeois and small landlords, but, on the other hand, we have to struggle with them in order to end class oppression. The Shafak revisionists portray national oppression and class oppression as one and the same thing. There are two possibilities: either the Shafak revisionists do not include the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords within the concept of the Kurdish people, using this concept correctly, in which case they are reaching a conclusion, by denying the democratic content of the struggle of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords against national oppression, that will be useful to the cause of Turkish nationalism. Or, the Shafak revisionists consider, erroneously, the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords within the concept of people, in which case they are ignoring the struggle of the Kurdish workers and other toilers against the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords, thereby assisting the cause of Kurdish nationalism. One of these two! In both cases the unity of Turkish and Kurdish toilers is sabotaged and their struggle harmed.

It is of the utmost importance to separate the class oppression inflicted on the Kurdish people from the national oppression perpetrated against the Kurdish nation. As we have pointed out above, the character of the two forms of oppression, and their aims, are different.

#### **4. The Racist Policy of Imperialism. The Racist Policy of the Indigenous Ruling Classes:**

The Shafak revisionists confuse two different things, the racist policy of imperialism, with the racist policy of the indigenous ruling classes, one with the other. They talk about “the racist policy of imperialism aiming to create enmity between the peoples of Turkey and to crush them.” It is apparent that imperialism wishes to create hostility between the peoples of Turkey and crush them, and that it wants to take advantage of every opportunity to achieve these vile ambitions. The policy of racism in Turkey is a policy of the indigenous ruling classes, a policy of the political most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie and feudalism; feudal and feudal-bourgeois tendency. On account of its character the policy of racism is even the enemy of consistent bourgeois democracy. The most extreme representative of this current in Turkey is the Hitler-clone Turkes and his party. The racist policy and support for it also exists substantially in the AP, MGP and CHP and other similar parties. The racist policy is a policy of crushing, subduing and eradicating the other nations and peoples. In Turkey those who pursue a racist policy towards the Kurdish nation and other minority nationalities are these feudal and feudal-bourgeois classes and their political parties and governments. Imperialism, when it suits its interests, will encourage and support the racist policy of these classes, and, when it doesn't suit its interests, may oppose it. For instance, US imperialism, which is dominant in Turkey, having bound the Turkish ruling classes to itself, has an interest in encouraging and supporting Turkish racism and it carries out this duty (!) willingly and to excess. As Soviet social-imperialism is not dominant in Turkey it

opposes Turkish racism, but in Pakistan it unhesitatingly incites Bangladesh racism. As for Turkey, if tomorrow it cannot possess the whole of it, if it is able to break off a piece, there is no guarantee that it will not support a reactionary Kurdish nationalism or racism under its control, in the guise of supporting nations' right to self-determination or the liberation struggle of an oppressed nation.

The racism policy pursued by imperialism itself is something entirely different. The twaddle peddled by the fascist cur Hitler, claiming the German race was the most superior in the world and had been created to rule the world, the “great state chauvinism” of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, their belittling of the world's oppressed peoples and nationalities and their shameless interference in their internal affairs, their interventions, these are the manifestations of the racist policy of imperialism.

The Shafak revisionists have confused things. Who do they want to rescue by concealing the racist policy of the Turkish ruling classes?

Racism is not something brought in from outside, but it may be supported from outside. There are classes and layers on which racism relies. When it suits imperialism it encourages and supports the racist policy of these classes. These classes and layers do not just exist amongst the Turks, but also certainly amongst the Kurds, and as we have mentioned above, let there be no doubt that, when it suits it, imperialism will not hesitate to incite and support them. It is for this reason that the struggle to be waged against racism is first and foremost a struggle against these classes and layers, and one of the most important tasks of the proletarian movement is to expose them to the toiling people. Also, in relation to this, to expose the racist policy promoted by imperialism itself; to expose how it has shamelessly instigated and supported racism between various nations; and to spread “the international culture of democracy and the global workers' movement.”

Therefore, it is not solely the “racist policy of imperialism” that is failing, needs to fail and will entirely fail, but the racist policy of im-

perialism and indigenous reaction.

The wondrous formulation set out above will only serve to assist domestic racists, and to blunt the awareness of the proletariat...

### 5. The champions of national oppression in Turkey and their accomplices:

The real champions of national oppression in our country are the comprador large Turkish bourgeoisie and landlord class. US imperialism backs their policies of national oppression and racism and encourages them. But the Turkish medium bourgeoisie is also complicit in this crime, that is national oppression, with more insidious and subtle methods. In the words of comrade Lenin they are: *“The liberals approach the language question in the same way as they approach all political questions—like hypocritical hucksters, holding out one hand (openly) to democracy and the other (behind their backs) to the feudalists and police.”*

Look at Dogan Avcioglu, Ecevit and all our opportunists! Look at Mihri Belli, H.Kivilcimli. How they fit this definition of Lenin's. While on the one hand they oppose the feudal cudgel of government, saying it is useless; on the other they cannot resist recommending more subtle, polite methods of national oppression.

D.Avcioğlu attempted to defend the commando repression that even the rabid, fanatical Turkish chauvinists who have firmly grasped the feudal cudgel have not dared to do, publishing a vile article entitled: “A commando officer gives an account” (Devrim newspaper). He defends the repression thus:” The soldiers search women. A detector is used in the searching of women. It is not true that everyone apart from the landlord is publicly beaten. The allegations that the people have been made to strip and crawl on the ground en masse are baseless. But people have been made to obey orders to lie down and get up. It is also true that suspects in places where weapons and fugitives have not been handed over have been threatened with being forced to strip, along with

their wives, and exposed which is an effective method. But this has not gone beyond a threat”.

In response to the crude chauvinism and vile accessory to crime of D. Avcioglu and others, M. Belli and other similar people raise high the banner of Turkish nationalism (attempting to mask it with Marxism-Leninism) in a more clandestine way (but, again, evident) and deem this to be “the historic tasks of socialists.”

M. Belli, who even finds a positive aspect in the racist-Turanian fascism of Turkes, says the following regarding the Kurdish question: “We have stated for ethnic communities in Turkey, in particular for the Kurds, that we see it is necessary for there to be a centralised, secular, revolutionary republican government education in order for there to be mother tongue and cultural education... for the fraternity between Turks and Kurds, which has historical roots, **and the national and territorial integrity of Turkey to be sabotaged in whatever way, would result in an outcome contrary to the real interests of both the Turks and the Kurds and consolidate the situation of imperialism in this region of the world** “ (my emphasis). Is this not dominant nation chauvinism? Isn't appearing to be in favour of the equality of nationalities while in reality only recognising the privilege of founding a state to the Turks and removing the Kurds' **right** to found a state with demagogic bourgeois slogans such as “national unity” and “territorial integrity”, advocating the most blatant inequality between nationalities and the privileges of the Turkish bourgeoisie? Socialists are opposed to the tiniest privilege for any nation or any inequality. However, in Turkey it has always been the privilege of one nation, the Turkish nation, to establish a nation state and this is still the case. We, as communists, just as we defend absolutely no privilege whatsoever, we also do not defend this privilege. We defend, and continue to defend, with all our might, the right of the Kurdish nation to found a state. We respect absolutely this right; we do not support the Turks' privileged position vis-à-vis the Kurds (or other nationalities; we teach the masses to unhesitatingly

recognise this right and to reject the right of founding a state being the privileged monopoly of any single nation.

Comrade Lenin says:

*“If in our political agitation, we fail to advance and advocate the slogan of the right to secession, we shall play into the hands, not only of the bourgeoisie, but also of the feudal landlords and the absolutism of the oppressor nation.”*

Our medium bourgeoisie and social opportunists of a national character, while on the one hand giving the impression of being opposed to privileges, on the other they insidiously and jealously embrace the existing privileges that are in favour of the Turkish bourgeoisie. These hypocritical merchants, while opening extending one hand towards democracy, they reach out with their other hand (behind their backs) to reactionaries and police agents, ferocious and fanatical Turkish nationalism and feudal racism, abetting their crimes.

In the same way that it is erroneous to suggest that national oppression is only implemented on the Kurdish people, it is also incorrect to state that national oppression is only applied by the government of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords. The Turkish medium bourgeoisie and their representatives of a national character (Dogan Avcioglu, the Ilhan Selcuks, and Turkish nationalists in general following in their footsteps) and opportunists who are not in the least different (M.Belli, H.Kivilcimli, Aren-Boran opportunists and more insidiously the Shafak revisionists) are accomplices in the implementation of national oppression by the Turkish comprador bourgeoisie and landlords. Without a struggle with the insidious nationalism of these people, without eradicating the traces of this nationalism, reciprocal confidence, unity and solidarity between workers and toilers belonging to various nationalities cannot be achieved.

## 6- “Popular Movement” and National Movement:

The Shafak revisionists, who claim that national oppression is only

applied to the Kurdish people, and that the objective of national oppression is to intimidate the Kurdish people, view the Kurdish **national movement** developing against national oppression as a **popular movement**. “The **Kurdish people** have raised the flag of struggle against the policy of severe national oppression and assimilation “The **Kurdish people’s** struggle for democratic rights, the equality of nationalities and self-determination...”

However, popular movements and national movements are two entirely different things, A popular movement is the name given to struggles waged in every historical period by oppressed classes against higher classes that oppress them, both for partial demands and in order to overthrow these governing classes. A popular movement is a **class movement of the oppressed masses**. There have been popular movements since the first epochs of history. In the age of imperialism and in our age when “imperialism is headed for wholesale collapse and socialism is moving towards victory throughout the world”, popular movements are uniting with the politically aware leadership of the proletariat and progressing towards the definite liberation of the masses from exploitation and oppression. However, a national movement is, firstly, based within a historical area with clear boundaries. As comrade Lenin indicated, national movements in Western Europe cover a rather clear period, roughly between 1789 and 1871. “It is this period which is the period of national movements and the formation of national states.” As for Eastern Europe and Asia, national movements only commenced in 1905.

Secondly, the natural tendency of national movements is towards the formation of national states. Towards the end of the 1789-1871 period Western Europe had been transformed into a system of established bourgeois states, and these states (except Ireland) as a rule are states with a national integrity (Lenin). The natural tendency of the national movements beginning in Eastern Europe and Asia around 1905 was also towards the formation of national states.

“Throughout the world, the period of the final victory of capitalism over feudalism has been linked up with national movements. For the complete victory of commodity production, the bourgeoisie must capture the home market, and there must be politically united territories whose population speak a single language, with all obstacles to the development of that language and to its consolidation in literature eliminated. Therein is the economic foundation of national movements. Language is the most important means of human intercourse. Unity and unimpeded development of language are the most important conditions for genuinely free and extensive commerce on a scale commensurate with modern capitalism, for a free and broad grouping of the population in all its various classes and, lastly, for the establishment of a close connection between the market and each and every proprietor, big or little, and between seller and buyer.”

“Therefore, the tendency of every national movement is towards the formation of **national states**, under which these requirements of modern capitalism are best satisfied. The most profound economic factors drive towards this goal, and, therefore, for the whole of Western Europe, nay, for the entire civilised world, the national state is **typical** and normal for the capitalist period.”

“States of mixed national composition (known as multi national states, as distinct from national states) are ‘always those whose internal constitution has for some reason or other remained abnormal or underdeveloped’ (backward).”

Why is the natural tendency of national movements towards the formation of national states? Because national movements emerged together with the development of capitalism. And they moved towards meeting the needs of capitalism.

Thirdly, “in its essence it, national movement, is always a bourgeois struggle, one that is to the advantage and profit mainly of the bourgeoisie.” (Stalin)

“The bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation, repressed on every hand,

is naturally stirred into movement. It appeals to its “native folk” and begins to shout about the ‘fatherland,’; claiming that its own cause is the cause of the nation as a whole. It recruits itself an army from among its ‘countrymen’ in the interests of ... the ‘fatherland.’ Nor do the ‘folk’ always remain unresponsive to its appeals; they rally around its banner: the repression from above affects them too and provokes their discontent.

Thus the national movement begins.

The strength of the national movement is determined by the degree to which the wide strata of the nation, the proletariat and peasantry, participate in it.” (Stalin)

After comrade Stalin analysed the conditions under which workers and peasants joined the national movement and after saying “The class-conscious proletariat has its own tried banner, and has no need to rally to the banner of the bourgeoisie”, continues thus:

“From what has been said it will be clear that the national struggle under the conditions of rising capitalism is a struggle of the bourgeois classes among themselves. Sometimes the bourgeoisie succeeds in drawing the proletariat into the national movement, and then the national struggle externally assumes a “nation-wide” character. But this is so only externally. **In its essence it is always a bourgeois struggle, one that is to the advantage and profit mainly of the bourgeoisie.**” (Stalin Marxism and the national question pages 24, 25, 26)

As comrade Stalin immediately adds: “But it does not by any means follow that the proletariat should not put up a fight against the policy of national oppression.” No, the conclusion to be drawn from this is that a **popular movement** and a **national movement** are not the same thing.

If we summarise, a popular movement is a class movement of the oppressed and exploited masses. And in essence it always carries the mark of oppressed masses; it exists in every historical period, and today popular movements have moved towards realising the ultimate liberation of the masses by uniting with the leadership of the class

conscious proletariat and through democratic popular revolutions and socialist revolutions.

National movements emerged in the conditions of a **rising** capitalism. In the West during the period between 1789 and 1871, whereas in Eastern Europe and Asia this began after 1905 and in places is still continuing, National movements always bear the mark of the bourgeoisie and it is the natural tendency of every national movement to establish states with national integrity that best correspond to the needs of capitalism. The movement today in Kurdistan of Turkey, which is "developing rapidly", is both a Kurdish national **movement** led by the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords and also a class movement, that is, a **popular movement** of the oppressed and exploited Kurdish workers and peasants, increasingly showing a predisposition to unite with a communist leadership. The former of these only aims to end the national oppression of the Turkish ruling classes and at the same time seize control of the "internal market" on behalf of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords, while the latter opposes both the exploitation and oppression of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords, and national oppression and the policy of oppressing nationalities. The Shafak revisionists portray these two entirely different movements, as regards their character and objectives, as one and the same thing.

### **7. The Development of National Movements in Eastern Europe and Asia:**

We have already mentioned the fact that national movements in eastern Europe and Asia only began around 1905 and that the natural tendency of these movements was towards the formation of national states. The period when national movements began in Eastern Europe and Asia was the period when imperialism was formed, trade took on an international character and when the contradiction between international capital and the international working class became prominent.

Between 1905 and the end of the Second World War national states

(some of them multi-national states) were formed in Eastern Europe and Asia and colonies generally took on a supposed independent condition. However, in reality a new form of dependency spread, with semi-colonised countries taking the place of colonies.

The 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution ended the period of old-style revolutions under bourgeois leadership throughout the world, opening the period of new-democratic revolutions under proletarian leadership and the period of socialist revolutions. The bourgeoisie began to fear popular movements all over the world. For this reason, national movements in Eastern Europe and Asia were unable to go beyond changing the colonial structure into a semi-colonial structure, conserving the semi-feudal structure intact. The bourgeoisie and landlord classes established an alliance and collaboration with imperialism. At the conclusion of the 2nd World War, with the success of the neo-democratic revolution in China, the seizure of power by anti-fascist popular fronts with proletarian leadership in Eastern European countries and their immediate transition from democratic popular dictatorship to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism and the regression of imperialism all led to the bourgeoisie in backward countries becoming even more terrified of revolution.

In this new period, when imperialism is headed for complete collapse and socialism is moving towards victory all over the world the situation of national movements is as follows: the task of completing the national and democratic revolution in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries, that is, the task of liquidating completely imperialism and feudalism, is now on the shoulders of the proletarian class movement.

The bourgeoisie no longer has the power or ability to carry out these tasks, which are its own historical tasks. Only a wing of the national bourgeoisie, its revolutionary wing, may take its place as an ally in a united popular front, under the leadership of the proletariat. And then only constantly limping and in a faltering manner. This is the general, widespread and typical situation for our era.

On the other hand, the bourgeoisie of oppressed, dependent, subject nations and a section of landlords in a small number of old colonies and multi-national states are embarking on national movements against national oppression and with the objective of establishing nation states. These national movements in both these colonies and in subject nations are singular occurrences that have been passed down to our era from the previous period, are not widespread and do not characterise our age, but still have to be addressed by Marxist-Leninists.

In both these types of nation the natural tendency of national movements is towards the formation of national states. If anything is certain it is that these national movements possess a progressive and democratic character. But on the other hand, another certain thing is that these national movements, whether they conclude in the founding of a separate state or another form, they will not be able to complete the national and democratic revolution. The task of sweeping away and carrying off imperialism and feudalism in these nations will again rest on the shoulders of the class movement of the proletariat. The proletarian movement in both these kinds of nation must know that on the one hand it has the task of completing the national and democratic revolution while, on the other, it must support the progressive and democratic character of the bourgeois national movement.

Turkey is today one of the multi-national states. And in Turkey only the Kurds constitute a nation. In this respect, from the point of view of Turkey's communists, the Kurdish question constitutes the essence (not the entirety) of the national question. Now, let us take a look at the development of the Kurdish national movement.

### 8. Kurdish national movement:

National movements in Turkey are not new and are not comprised solely of the Kurdish movement. They began before the collapse of Ottoman society and have continued until the present day. Bulgarians, Greeks, Hungarians, Albanians, Kurds, Armenians, Arabs, Yugoslavs,

Romanians, rebelled against the dominant nation of the Ottoman state, the Turkish nation, on numerous occasions. History has, apart from the Kurdish movement, concluded the national movements with a certain resolution. Within today's borders of Turkey the only national movement which is yet to be resolved is the Kurdish movement.

In Turkey the natural tendency of the national movement has always been towards the formation of states with national integrity. Capitalism, which silently entered the life of Eastern Europe and Asia at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, set in motion the national movements in these regions. The other nationalities within the borders of Turkey separated from Turkey, organising within national (or multi-national) states, in accordance with the development of goods production and capitalism. With the exception of the Armenia movement, which suffered mass slaughter and forced exile in 1915 and 1919. The Treaty of Lausanne divided the Kurds between various states. The imperialists and the new Turkish government fixed the borders by means of haggling, violating the Kurdish nation's right to self-determination and ignoring its aspirations and wishes. In this way the region of Kurdistan was divided between Iran, Iraq and Turkey.

At this juncture let us make another point: it is undoubtedly an injustice that Kurdistan's **right of self-determination was trampled upon** and torn into pieces by the Treaty of Lausanne. And as comrade Lenin said on another occasion, it is the task of communist parties to constantly protest this injustice and shame all the ruling classes on this subject. However, it would be foolish to include the rectification of **such** an injustice in the programme, for there are many examples of historical injustices that have long since lost their topicality. As long as they are not a "historical injustice that continues **to directly impede** social development and the class struggle" communist parties cannot adopt a position that would divert the attention of the working class from fundamental questions, by ensuring their rectification. The historical injustice to which we have referred above has long ago lost its topicality,

no longer having a character that **directly impedes** social development and the class struggle". For this reason communists cannot be as foolish or lacking in discernment as to demand a rectification of this. The reason we make this point is the request of a colleague during discussion of a draft programme to put the unification of the Kurdistan region into the programme. The communist movement in Turkey is only obliged to resolve in the best, most correct manner, the national question within the borders of Turkey. If the communist parties in Iraq and Iran find the best solution to the national question from the point of view of their own countries, then the historical injustice in question will no longer have any worth or significance. For us to include the unification of the whole of Kurdistan would be unsound for this reason: this is not something we shall determine. It is something the Kurdish nation will determine **itself**. We defend the Kurdish nation's right of self-determination, that is, the right to establish its own separate state. Whether it will exercise the right or in what way we leave to the Kurdish nation itself. Since we shall subsequently return to this point we shall move on.

The Kurdish movement continued within the borders of Turkey established by the Treaty of Lausanne. From time to time there were uprisings. The most significant of these were the Sheikh Said rebellion of 1925, the Ararat rebellion of 1928, the Zilan rebellion of 1930 and the 1938 Dersim rebellion. In addition to the "national" character of these movements they also had a **feudal** character. Feudal lords that had had self-rule until that time clashed with the central authorities when the government began to threaten this self-rule. This was the main factor impelling the feudal lords to rebel against central government. The Kurdish bourgeoisie, wishing to dominate "its own" domestic market, united with the feudal lords desiring self-rule, against the central authority in the hands of the Turkish ruling classes. As for the reason for the broad participation of the peasant masses in these movements, it was merciless national oppression. As comrade Stalin pointed out, the policy of national oppression:

*"It diverts the attention of large strata from social questions, questions of the class struggle, to national questions, questions "common" to the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. And this creates a favourable soil for lying propaganda about "harmony of interests," for glossing over the class interests of the proletariat and for the intellectual enslavement of the workers."*

All these reasons united the Kurdish feudal lords, young Kurdish bourgeoisie and intellectuals, and Kurdish peasants against the new state's ruling Turkish bourgeoisie, landlords and ruling bureaucracy. The Turkish bourgeoisie, the ruling classes of the new state, and the landlords, attempted to spread and revive racism in every sphere. They rewrote history from the beginning, inventing a racist, nonsensical theory claiming that all nations came from the Turks. The source of all languages was also Turkish (!). The Sun Language Theory was manufactured in order to prove this. The Turks were the masters ( in reality, the "masters" were the Turkish ruling classes). As for the minorities, they were compelled to obey them. It was forbidden to speak any language apart from Turkish. All the democratic rights of the minority nationalities were usurped. All manner of torture and insult towards them were permitted. Demeaning words were used for the Kurds. Efforts were made to create Turkish chauvinism amongst Turkish workers and peasants, which were broadly successful. Martial law declared all over the country was doubly severe in the East. The Kurdish region was declared to be a "military prohibited zone". etc etc.. It was inevitable that all this would strengthen oppressed nation nationalism as a reaction to dominant nation chauvinism. It was inevitable that Kurdish peasants would be pushed into the ranks of the bourgeoisie and feudal lords of their own nationality. The Kurdish people, a large majority of whom did not even speak Turkish, in particular the Kurdish peasantry, naturally reacted violently to the officials of the new administration which oppressed and tormented them like a colonial governor. This just reaction of the peasants inevitably combined with the reaction of the feudal Kur-

dish landlords and Kurdish bourgeoisie. The Kurdish rebellions emerged in this way. Communists support the progressive and democratic aspect of these rebellions against tyranny, the policy of oppression of nations, inequality and privilege; but oppose the wish of the feudal landlords for self-rule and the struggle of the bourgeoisie for its own superiority. They do not defend the privilege and superiority of the bourgeois and landlord class of any nation. Since in those periods the TKP followed an erroneous policy it unconditionally supported the Turkish ruling classes' policy of national oppression. Instead of uniting the strong and just reaction felt by the Kurdish peasantry to the national oppression with proletarian leadership it attacked itself to the Turkish bourgeoisie and landlords, thereby inflicting great harm on the unity of the toiling people of both nationalities. This sowed the seeds of lack of confidence towards the Turkish workers and peasants amongst Kurdish toilers.

Those who applaud the suppression of the Kurdish rebellions by the new Turkish state and the subsequent massacres as a "progressive", "revolutionary" movement against feudalism are, pure and simple, incorrigible dominant nation nationalists. This sort of person ignores the fact that the new Turkish state did not only attack the feudal Kurdish chieftains but also the entire Kurdish people, women, children, men, massacring tens of thousands of villagers. They forget that the new Turkish state was friendly towards the feudal chieftains that did not oppose it, supporting and strengthening them. They ignore the significant difference between the factors that impelled the Kurdish peasantry to rise up and the reason that impelled the Kurdish feudal chieftains to rise up. Also, there are so-called "communists" who attempt to defend the policy of national oppression of the Turkish ruling classes based on the allegation that the British were behind the Sheikh Said rebellion. We shall not discuss here whether British imperialism was behind the Sheikh Said uprising. We shall discuss whether the policy of national oppression may be defended on the basis of such an allegation. Let us suppose that the hand of British imperialism was behind the Sheikh

Said rebellion. In these circumstances what should the attitude of a communist movement be? Firstly, to oppose absolutely the Turkish ruling classes' policy of suppressing and crushing the Kurdish national movement, to actively struggle against this, and to demand that the Kurdish nation itself determine its destiny, that is, to demand that the Kurdish nation decide whether to establish a separate state.

In practice, this means a plebiscite being held in the Kurdish region, without external intervention with the Kurdish nation itself deciding, in this or in a similar way, whether or not to secede. A communist movement would firstly have struggled for the withdrawal of all military units sent to suppress the Kurdish movement, the absolute prevention of all manner of intervention, the Kurdish nation making its own decision about its future, would have exposed the Turkish ruling classes' policy of suppression, persecution and intervention, and would have actively fought against it. Secondly, it would have exposed British imperialism's policy of pitting nationalities against each other and how this harms the unity of toilers from all nations, and actively fought the British imperialist policy of intervention in internal affairs.

Thirdly, it would have evaluated the secession of the Kurdish nation "as a whole from the standpoint of the interests of the proletariat's class struggle for social development and socialism" and reached a decision to support or not support secession. If it found not separating appropriate for the class interests of the proletariat it would have propagandised for this amongst Kurdish workers and peasants; in particular, Kurdish communists would have propagandised for unity amongst its own people and waged a struggle against those endeavouring to reconcile the struggle against national oppression with that of strengthening the position of landlords, mullahs, sheikhs etc. In spite of this, if the Kurdish nation decided to secede Turkish communists would have accepted this and definitely struggled against tendencies opposing the desire to secede. As for Kurdish communists, they would have continued to campaign for **unification** amongst Kurdish workers and

toilers, struggled against imperialist intervention and struggled with the Kurdish feudal lords, sheikhs and mullahs and the nationalist aims of the bourgeoisie.

If the communist movement decided the secession of the Kurdish nation was beneficial as regards the class interests of the proletariat, for instance, if the possibility of revolution in the Kurdish region was to increase in the event of secession, in that case it would have defended secession. Both amongst Turkish workers and toilers and amongst Kurdish workers and toilers it would have campaigned for secession. In both these cases warm and sincere ties would have been established between Turkish workers and toilers and Kurdish workers and toilers. The Kurdish people would have nourished great confidence and feelings of friendship towards the Turkish people and communists. The unity of peoples would have been firmer and the success of the revolution would have been easier to facilitate.

Let us repeat once more: those who endeavour to portray the Turkish governments' trampling on the Kurdish nation's right of self-determination and carrying out massacres etc. as just and progressive by alleging that British imperialism was involved in the Sheikh Said movement are incorrigible Turkish chauvinists. It is instructive that Metin Toker, who is today the vilest defender (and unappointed advisor) of the gang of pro-American fascist generals, clings to the attribution of "British imperialist involvement" in order to justify the massacres inflicted during that period on the Kurdish nation. It is again instructive that Dogan Avcioglu, who attempts to blatantly defend the commando cruelty that even fascist governments do not have the courage to defend openly, clings to the same allegation.

A nation's right to self-determination cannot be restricted or taken away on account of an allegation that it is, or may become, a tool of imperialism. On the basis of such an allegation a nation's "oppression and mistreatment" cannot be defended. Besides, during the period in question, the Turkish government was collaborating with the British and

French imperialists. The fundamental watchword of the proletariat regarding the national question is the same in all circumstances: "*Not a single privilege for any nation or any language! Not the slightest oppression of or unfairness to national minorities!*" (Lenin) Let us continue: the national oppression of the Turkish ruling classes has continued to the present day. In parallel with this the Kurdish national movement has also persisted. With this exception: a section of Kurdish feudal lords has joined the ranks of the Turkish ruling classes.

A very small number of Kurdish large bourgeois has also joined the ranks of the Turkish ruling classes. The Kurdish bourgeoisie has strengthened considerably, and the feudal influence on the Kurdish national movement has weakened proportionately. Today the strengthened Kurdish bourgeoisie, intellectuals who have adopted their ideology and small landlords lead the Kurdish national movement. Besides this, Kurdish workers and peasants are also proportionately less under the influence of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords than in the past. Marxist-Leninist ideas have begun to take root amongst Kurdish workers, impoverished peasants and intellectuals and are spreading rapidly. Under these conditions, what should the attitude of Turkish communists be to the Kurdish national movement? Now we are moving on to this point and we shall exhibit the erroneous line of the Shafak revisionists which damages the unity of peoples.

### **9-The Democratic content of the Kurdish National Movement:**

The Kurdish national movement possesses a general democratic content as one aspect of it opposes the coercion, tyranny, privileges and selfish interests of the ruling classes of the oppressor nation. The removal of national oppression, the securing of equality between nationalities, the removal of the privileges of the ruling classes of the dominant nation, the ending of bans and restrictions on language, equality between nations in every sphere and the recognition of equality in

the right to establish a nation state are all democratic and progressive demands. Comrade Stalin said:

*“Restriction of freedom of movement, disfranchisement, repression of language, closing of schools, and other forms of persecution affect the workers no less, if not more, than the bourgeoisie. Such a state of affairs can only serve to retard the free development of the intellectual forces of the proletariat of subject nations. One cannot speak seriously of a full development of the intellectual faculties of the Tatar or Jewish worker if he is not allowed to use his native language at meetings and lectures, and if his schools are closed down.”*

Let us recall Comrade Stalin’s writings;

*“But the policy of nationalist persecution is dangerous to the cause of the proletariat also on another account. It diverts the attention of large strata from social questions, questions of the class struggle, to national questions, questions “common” to the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. And this creates a favourable soil for lying propaganda about “harmony of interests,” for glossing over the class interests of the proletariat and for the intellectual enslavement of the workers.*

*This creates a serious obstacle to the cause of uniting the workers of all nationalities.”*

The policy of national oppression does not even stop with crushing dependent nations, but also in many instances turns into a policy of pitting nations one against the other. In this way, the seeds of enmity are sown amongst toilers of various nationalities. The ruling classes of dominant nations that “divide” workers and toilers in this way find it easier to rule.

The national movement of the oppressed nation, since one aspect of it is directed towards the policy of national oppression of the dominant nation, serves to secure unity between workers and toilers of various nationalities, the free development of the moral strength of the workers and toilers of the oppressed nation and the removal of obstacles preventing this.

Comrade Lenin says the following:

*“The bourgeois nationalism of any oppressed nation has a general democratic content that is directed against oppression, and it is this content that we unconditionally support, At the same time we strictly distinguish it from the tendency towards national exclusiveness.”*

But in no national movement do the demands of that nation’s bourgeoisie and landlords stop at the removal of national oppression and the equality of nationalities . Now let us come to this point:

### **10-Within the Kurdish national movement, the “positive” action of the Bourgeoisie and Small landlords aiming to strengthen nationalism:**

In general in every national movement, and in particular in the Kurdish national movement, the fundamental objective of the bourgeoisie is to secure its own superiority. To dominate the market; to monopolise the mineral wealth in its region etc. To secure privilege and inequality for its own benefit, and to guarantee its own national development. The bourgeoisie and, to the degree they participate in the national movement, the landlords, demand privilege and inequality for their own benefit. They wish to usurp the democratic rights of other nations to their advantage. They wish to implement national oppression towards those who are weaker than themselves. They wish to separate the proletarians of nations one from the other with national fences and to ensure that their own proletarians and other toilers unconditionally support their nationalistic aims. They want to replace the democratic international culture of the proletariat with their own national culture, to develop this national culture (that is, the dominant bourgeois culture), to nourish the proletariat and toilers with this culture, and by so doing make them unconditional supporters of their own class ambitions. The bourgeoisie and landlords resist the historical tendency for nationalities to coalesce, separate from forced assimilation, they resist this natural assimilation and natural disappearance of national differences; they re-

sist the unification of proletarians from every nationality in the state in the same organisations; wishing to separate them according to their nationalities and to unite their own proletarians in “national organisations”, instead of class organisations to further their own class ambitions.

Today it is not possible to fail to notice, alongside the general democratic character within the Kurdish national movement, reactionary ambitions aiming to strengthen nationalism similar to those above. These ambitions are those of the bourgeoisie and the landlords leading the Kurdish national movement.

The Shafak revisionists have entirely put to one side the “positive” action of the bourgeoisie and landlords within the Kurdish national movement aiming to strengthen nationalism.

According to the Shafak revisionists the movement developing in Turkey Kurdistan is not a national movement with its progressive and reactionary aspects, but an entirely **popular movement** against a **policy of national oppression and assimilation** for **democratic rights, the equality of nationalities and their self-determination (!)**

Thus, the Shafak revisionists support the nationalist and anti-proletarian ambitions and efforts of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords, sabotaging the unity of the two peoples by attaching the Kurdish proletariat and toilers to the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords. The Turkish nationalist line of Shafak revisionism has become reconciled with Kurdish nationalism.

If we are to sum up, as in all national movements the Kurdish national movement has two qualities. The first is its general democratic content, opposing the national oppression, privileges, monopoly on establishing a state, repression and persecution of the Turkish bourgeoisie and landlords.

Secondly, the reactionary content aiming to strengthen Kurdish nationalism, and thus to realise the dominance and privileges of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords.

## **11-What should the attitude of the class conscious proletariat of Turkey be to the Kurdish national movement?**

First of all let us point out that the conscious proletariat of Turkey, regardless of nationality, will not take its place under the standard of bourgeois nationalism. In the words of comrade Stalin: “*The class-conscious proletariat has its own tried banner, and has no need to rally to the banner of the bourgeoisie.*”

**Secondly**, the conscious proletariat of Turkey regardless of nationality, will endeavour to gather the workers and peasant masses around its own flag and will lead the class struggle of all toiling classes. Taking the Turkish state as a basis it will unite the workers and toilers from all nations in Turkey in joint class organisations.

**Thirdly**, the conscious proletariat of Turkey, regardless of nationality, will unconditionally support the Kurdish national movement’s opposition to the oppression, persecution and privileges of the Turkish ruling classes and general democratic content aiming for the removal of national oppression and the equality of nations. It will also definitely and unconditionally support similar movements of other oppressed nationalities.

**Fourthly** the conscious proletariat of Turkey, regardless of nationality, will remain completely impartial as regards the bourgeoisie and landlords of various nationalities waging a struggle for their own dominance and privileges. The conscious proletariat of Turkey will never support the tendency within the Kurdish national movement aiming to strengthen Kurdish nationalism; and will never assist bourgeois nationalism; it will definitely not support the struggle of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords for their own dominance and privileges. That is, it will only support the general democratic content within the Kurdish national movement, and not go beyond that.

I hope that, in order to get a better grasp of the question, the readers will be happy to put up with us quoting at length from comrade Lenin.

Comrade Lenin states thus:

*"The principle of nationality is historically inevitable in bourgeois society and, taking this society into due account, the Marxist fully recognises the historical legitimacy of national movements. But to prevent this recognition from becoming an apologia of nationalism, it must be strictly limited to what is progressive in such movements, in order that this recognition may not lead to bourgeois ideology obscuring proletarian consciousness."*

*"The awakening of the masses from feudal lethargy, and their struggle against all national oppression, for the sovereignty of the people, of the nation, are progressive. Hence, it is the Marxist's bounden duty to stand for the most resolute and consistent democratism on all aspects of the national question. This task is largely a negative one. But this is the limit the proletariat can go to in supporting nationalism, for beyond that begins the "positive" activity of the bourgeoisie striving to fortify nationalism."*

*"To throw off the feudal yoke, all national oppression, and all privileges enjoyed by any particular nation or language, is the imperative duty of the proletariat as a democratic force, and is certainly in the interests of the proletarian class struggle, which is obscured and retarded by bickering on the national question. But to go beyond these strictly limited and definite historical limits in helping bourgeois nationalism means betraying the proletariat and siding with the bourgeoisie. There is a border-line here, which is often very slight and which the Bundists and Ukrainian nationalist-socialists completely lose sight of."*

*Combat all national oppression? Yes, of course! Fight for any kind of national development, for "national culture" in general?—Of course not.*

*The development of nationality in general is the principle of bourgeois nationalism; hence the exclusiveness of bourgeois nationalism, hence the endless national bickering. The proletariat, however, far from undertaking to uphold the national development of every nation, on the*

*contrary, warns the masses against such illusions, stands for the fullest freedom of capitalist intercourse and welcomes every kind of assimilation of nations, except that which is founded on force or privilege.*

*The ...proletariat cannot support any consecration of nationalism; on the contrary, it supports everything that helps to obliterate national distinctions and remove national barriers; it supports everything that makes the ties between nationalities closer and closer, or tends to merge nations. To act differently means siding with reactionary nationalist philistinism."*

*Comrade Lenin continues;*

*"The bourgeoisie always places its national demands in the forefront, and does so in categorical fashion. With the proletariat, however, these demands are subordinated to the interests of the class struggle. Theoretically, you cannot say in advance whether the bourgeois-democratic revolution will end in a given nation seceding from another nation, or in its equality with the latter; in either case, the important thing for the proletariat is to ensure the development of its class. For the bourgeoisie it is important to hamper this development by pushing the aims of its "own" nation before those of the proletariat. That is why the proletariat confines itself, so to speak, to the negative demand for recognition of the right to self-determination, without giving guarantees to any nation, and without undertaking to give anything at the expense of another nation.*

*This may not be "practical", but it is in effect the best guarantee for the achievement of the most democratic of all possible solutions. The proletariat needs only such guarantees, whereas the bourgeoisie of every nation requires guarantees for its own interest, regardless of the position of (or the possible disadvantages to) other nations."*

*Comrade Lenin continues;*

*"On the plea that its demands are "practical", the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations will call upon the proletariat to support its aspirations unconditionally... The proletariat is opposed to such practi-*

cality. While recognising equality and equal rights to a national state, it values above all and places foremost the alliance of the proletarians of all nations, and assesses any national demand, any national separation, from the angle of the workers' class struggle.

To the workers the important thing is to distinguish the principles of the two trends. Insofar as the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation fights the oppressor, we are always, in every case, and more strongly than anyone else, in favour; for we are the staunchest and the most consistent enemies of oppression. But insofar as the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation stands for its own bourgeois nationalism, we stand against. We fight against the privileges and violence of the oppressor nation, and do not in any way condone strivings for privileges on the part of the oppressed nation.

If, in our political agitation, we fail to advance and advocate the slogan of the right to secession, we shall play into the hands, not only of the bourgeoisie, but also of the feudal landlords and the absolutism of the oppressor nation...

The bourgeois nationalism of any oppressed nation has a general democratic content that is directed against oppression, and it is this content that we unconditionally support. At the same time we strictly distinguish it from the tendency towards national exclusiveness...

We are fighting on the ground of a definite state; we unite the workers of all nations living in this state; we cannot vouch for any particular path of national development, for we are marching to our class goal along all possible paths.

However, we cannot move towards that goal unless we combat all nationalism, and uphold the equality of the various nations.

... propaganda against all state and national privileges, and for the right, the equal right of all nations, to their national state. This (at present) is cut principal task in the national question, for only in this way can we defend the interests of democracy and the alliance of all proletarians of all nations on an equal footing.

... The interests of the working class and of its struggle against capitalism demand complete solidarity and the closest unity of the workers of all nations; they demand resistance to the nationalist policy of the bourgeoisie of every nationality. Hence, Social-Democrats would be deviating from proletarian policy and subordinating the workers to the policy of the bourgeoisie if they were to repudiate the right of nations to self-determination, i.e., the right of an oppressed nation to secede, or if they were to support all the national demands of the bourgeoisie of oppressed nations. It makes no difference to the hired worker whether he is exploited chiefly by the Great-Russian bourgeoisie rather than the non-Russian bourgeoisie, or by the Polish bourgeoisie rather than the Jewish bourgeoisie, etc. The hired worker who has come to understand his class interests is equally indifferent to the state privileges of the Great-Russian capitalists and to the promises of the Polish or Ukrainian capitalists to set up an earthly paradise when they obtain state privileges.

In any case the hired worker will be an object of exploitation. Successful struggle against exploitation requires that the proletariat be free of nationalism, and be absolutely neutral, so to speak, in the fight for supremacy that is going on among the bourgeoisie of the various nations. If the proletariat of any one nation gives the slightest support to the privileges of its "own" national bourgeoisie, that will inevitably rouse distrust among the proletariat of another nation; it will weaken the international class solidarity of the workers and divide them, to the delight of the bourgeoisie."

Let us repeat:

The Kurdish national movement, as the struggle of an oppressed nation against the ruling classes of a dominant nation is progressive and has a democratic content. We unconditionally support this democratic content. We struggle in a decisive and relentless way against all manner of privilege and inequality that benefits the Turkish bourgeoisie and landlords (including the privileged right to establish a state). We

also unconditionally support the Kurdish national movement's demands in this regard. But on the other hand, we also struggle against the reactionary and nationalist ambitions of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords. While fighting against the inequalities and privileges that favour the Turkish ruling classes and the national oppression and persecution targeting national minorities, if a struggle is not waged with the nationalist ambitions of the bourgeoisie and landlords, in this case another nationalism, Kurdish nationalism, will be consolidated, and the class consciousness of the Kurdish proletariat will be blunted by bourgeois nationalism.

Kurdish workers and peasants will be pushed into the embrace of nationalism, and the unity and solidarity between Kurdish and Turkish workers and peasants will be sabotaged,

The Shafak revisionists, by presenting the Kurdish national movement, which has different elements within it, as a homogenous "Kurdish people's" movement, by portraying this movement as a whole and entirely **progressive**, and by not indicating until what point and from which aspects it is progressive, and after which points and from which aspects the reactionary ambitions of the bourgeoisie and landlords begin (more correctly, by not differentiating between them), it reaches the above conclusion that benefits the landlords and bourgeoisie. Thus, it is making concessions to the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords, to the detriment in general of the proletariat of Turkey and in particular to the Kurdish proletariat! We are curious as to what the Shafak revisionists will do in the future when the "positive action" of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords makes itself felt more strongly. But it is clear today what they will do! They will unconditionally join the ranks of the Turkish nationalists.

Let us stress this point: Communists always differentiate absolutely between the nationalism of an oppressed nation and that of a dominant nation, between the nationalism of a small nation and that of a large nation.

On this subject comrade Lenin says:

*"In respect of the second kind of nationalism we, nationals of a big nation, have nearly always been guilty, in historic practice, of an infinite number of cases of violence; furthermore, we commit violence and insult an infinite number of times without noticing it..."*

*That is why internationalism on the part of oppressors or "great" nations, as they are called (though they are great only in their violence, only great as bullies), must consist not only in the observance of the formal equality of nations but even in an inequality of the oppressor nation, the great nation, that must make up for the inequality which obtains in actual practice. Anybody who does not understand this has not grasped the real proletarian attitude to the national question, he is still essentially petty bourgeois in his point of view and is, therefore, sure to descend to the bourgeois point of view."*

Comrade Lenin continues thus;

*"for nothing holds up the development and strengthening of proletarian class solidarity so much as national injustice; "offended" nationals are not sensitive to anything so much as to the feeling of equality and the violation of this equality, if only through negligence or jest-to the violation of that equality by their proletarian comrades. That is why in this case it is better to over-do rather than undergo the concessions and leniency towards the national minorities."*

Is what the Shafak revisionists are doing that which is advocated by comrade Lenin? No, never! The Shafak revisionists are today basically following a Turkish nationalist line, defending the privileges of the Turkish ruling classes. As we shall see, they are trampling upon the Kurdish nation's right of self-determination in a cowardly way and with a lot of demagogy, choosing representatives of Turkish chauvinism as their standard bearers. What they are doing is something that is entirely different from that advocated by comrade Lenin. On the one hand while following a dominant nation nationalist line, on the other they are erasing the line between Kurdish workers and toilers and the Kurdish bourgeoisie

and landlords, taking a place on the standpoint of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords. This is not going to the extreme in making concessions and behaving tolerantly towards national minorities against dominant nation nationalism, it is supporting the nationalist ambitions of the exploiting classes of the minority nation as regards the dominant nation nationalists against the workers and toilers of the minority nation.

Another point is this: The Shafak revisionists state that the **Kurdish people** are struggling “against the policy of severe national oppression and assimilation”, for democratic rights, the equality of nationalities and **for self-determination**.”

For the Kurdish people to struggle for self-determination means the Kurdish people struggling to establish a democratic popular administration by overthrowing the ruling classes, for the **people** can only determine their own future by carrying out a revolution. To state that the Kurdish people are struggling for a revolution in an article dealing with the national question really necessitates a nimble brain(!). If the Kurdish nation is being alluded to then what the Shafak revisionists are saying is as follows: the Kurdish nation is waging a struggle for **secession**. For in today’s conditions of forced unity the Kurdish people struggling for self-determination (take note, not the right [of self-determination]) only implies a struggle for secession.

We have stated before that the general tendency of every national movement is towards the formation of states with national integrity, that these states best meet the needs of material production and the needs of capitalism and that the most powerful economic factors work in this way.

The general tendency of the Kurdish national movement too, is certainly towards the establishment of a state with national integrity. But the general tendency is one thing and the concrete demands formalised by a national movement are another.

Concrete demands do not contravene this general tendency, but every national movement will opt for this general tendency, that is, establishing a separate state, as a concrete goal.

There are numerous factors that influence this situation. Power relations, at the state level and on the international level, the interests of the bourgeoisie and landlords of different nationalities within the country, the character of national oppression, tactical concerns etc. All these factors determine the concrete objectives formulated by a national movement. For this reason while the general tendency of national movements is towards the formation of states with national integrity the concrete demands formulated by national movements vary greatly.

Let us listen to comrade Stalin:

*“The content of the national movement, of course, cannot everywhere be the same: it is wholly determined by the diverse demands made by the movement. In Ireland the movement bears an agrarian character; in Bohemia it bears a “language” character; in one place the demand is for civil equality and religious freedom, in another for the nation’s “own” officials, or its own Diet.”*

The Kurdish national movement in Turkey has yet to openly formulate a demand for **secession**. The demands that the Kurdish national movement have formulated today are freedom for the reading, writing and speaking of Kurdish, radio broadcasts in Kurdish, the removal of obstacles that prevent the free dissemination of “national culture” (in reality the culture of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords), an end to the policy of assimilation, schools offering tuition in Kurdish, the recognition of the right to self-determination etc. The various reasons we have cited above prevent the Kurdish national movement openly formulating a demand for secession. To state that not the Kurdish people, but the “Kurdish nation is (struggling) for self-determination”, is for this reason, at least for the present, incorrect. While saying this we are not ignoring the strong desire to secede that exists amongst the Kurdish bourgeoisie and small landlords. However, we are saying that this wish has not reached the stage of becoming an open demand of the national movement.

Today, for instance, the national movement in Northern Ireland has

openly formulated a demand for secession. And in the past the Kurdish national movement emerged with a demand for secession etc.. Because today the Kurdish national movement has not openly formulated secession does not mean it will not do so in the future. But various forms of reconciliation between the bourgeoisie and landlords of the two nations are possible. Let us not forget that. In Iraq the Barzani movement has been content to accept partial autonomy. Moreover, while one wing of the Kurdish national movement advocates secession another wing may oppose this. For these reasons let us not jump the gun.

### **12-Let us not deny the influence of dominant nation nationalism on Turkish workers and peasants:**

The Shafak revisionists say that **all Turkey's workers and peasants support** the Kurdish people(!)'s struggle [against the policy of national oppression and assimilation, struggle "for democratic rights, equality of nationalities and self-determination]. (my emphasis) The concrete reality here has been sacrificed to fancy sentences . Firstly let us correct this mistake: Apart from all Turkey's workers and peasants", **even Turkey's class conscious proletariat** will not unconditionally support the struggle " for self-determination". It will only support secession in a concrete situation when it is appropriate to the interests of the struggle waged by the proletariat for socialism. If it is not, then it will respect the Kurdish nation's desire for secession and accept it, but will not **actively** support it. We shall return to this point later.

On the other hand, we cannot claim that " all the workers and peasants of Turkey" support today all the most just and progressive demands of the Kurdish nation. This is merely something which is desired, but is, unfortunately, not true. The consciousness of Turkish workers and peasants has been extensively and negatively affected by the nationalist ideology of the Turkish ruling classes. Dominant nation nationalism has even negatively influenced the views of the most pro-

gressive proletarian elements, let alone the peasantry. That is, it is a specific task of Turkish communists to dismantle Turkish nationalism and to cleanse the workers and peasants of all manner of the remnants of bourgeois nationalism. All determinations that lead to neglect or underestimation of the importance of this task are only harmful from the standpoint of the class struggle. What comrade Lenin said for Russia has the same validity for us:

*"Even now, and probably for a fairly long time to come, proletarian democracy must reckon with the nationalism of the Great-Russian peasants (not with the object of making concessions to it, but in order to combat it)."*

The Shafak revisionists are not taking this reality into account and causing the communist movement to forget its task of waging a struggle with Turkish nationalism.

### **13-A people's right to self-determination, a Nation's right to self-determination:**

The Shafak revisionists have distorted the most fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism regarding the national question and rendered them incomprehensible. They have distorted the tenet "nations' right of self-determination" into a people's right of self-determination". These are two entirely different things. Firstly, a people's overthrowing of the reactionary classes in power, seizing authority and dominating the state, means, in short, to carry out a revolution, whereas the latter means for a **nation to have the right to establish a separate state**. The Shafak revisionists are declaring that they recognise the Kurdish people's right to carry out a revolution (!) Bravo.

What is instructive is that the formulation of a people's right to self-determination was advocated at one time by Bukharin against comrade Lenin and criticised for this by comrade Lenin. Let us read comrade Lenin's response to Bukharin:

*"I have to say the same thing about the national question. Here too the wish is father to the thought with Comrade Bukharin. He says that we must not recognise the right of nations to self-determination. A nation means the bourgeoisie together with the proletariat. And are we, the proletarians, to recognise the right to self-determination of the despised bourgeoisie? That is absolutely incompatible! Pardon me, it is compatible with what actually exists. If you eliminate this, the result will be sheer fantasy."*

*"...I want to recognise only the right of the working classes to self-determination," says Comrade Bukharin. That is to say, you want to recognise something that has not been achieved in a single country except Russia. That is ridiculous."*

Today in Turkey the Shafak revisionists, **"insistently"**, in their own words, defending the "Kurdish people's right of self-determination", are not only being ridiculous, at the same time they are the most expert theoreticians of a fearsome dominant nation nationalism. Today in Turkey the right to establish a state is a privilege of the dominant Turkish nation. The Kurdish nation's right to establish a separate state has been usurped. Communists defend absolutely no national privileges. They advocate absolute equality between nations. Certainly they are aware that under the conditions of capitalism absolute equality between nations cannot occur, but despite this, even if it is only hypothetical. they oppose all manner of national privilege and inequality in order to secure the unity of workers and toilers from various nationalities and come out in support of the broadest, most progressive and most coherent democracy possible. What are the Shafak revisionists doing? They remove the Kurdish nation's right to establish a state by granting (!) the Kurdish people the right to carry out a revolution. They are insidiously and viciously defending the dominant Turkish nation's privilege to establish a state. This is what is "terrifying" in addition to being "absurd".

#### **14."Nations' Right of Self-Determination" means nothing less than the right to establish a separate state.**

The Shafak revisionists, by saying : "...self determination and if it wishes the right to establish a separate state" see the "right of self-determination" as something different to the right to establish a separate state. The above expression would only be correct in the following form: "...the right of self-determination, that is the right to establish a separate state..." For the right of self-determination is, in essence, the right to establish a separate state.

Comrade Lenin stated on numerous occasions that the right of self-determination was nothing less than the right to establish a separate state:

*"Quote missing"*

*"Consequently, if we want to grasp the meaning of self-determination of nations, not by juggling with legal definitions, or "inventing" abstract definitions, but by examining the historico-economic conditions of the national movements, we must inevitably reach the conclusion that the self-determination of nations means the political separation of these nations from alien national bodies, and the formation of an independent national state."*

*"Later on we shall see still other reasons why it would be wrong to interpret the right to self-determination as meaning anything but the right to existence as a separate state."*

*"...self-determination of nations" in the Marxists' Programme cannot, from a historico-economic point of view, have any other meaning than political self-determination, state independence, and the formation of a national state."*

*"...self-determination of nations has been understood to mean precisely political self-determination, the right to form an independent national state..."*

*"To accuse those who support freedom of self-determination, i. e.,*

freedom to secede, of encouraging separatism, is as foolish and hypocritical as accusing those who advocate freedom of divorce of encouraging the destruction of family ties. Just as in bourgeois society the defenders of privilege and corruption, on which bourgeois marriage rests, oppose freedom of divorce, so, in the capitalist state, repudiation of the right to self-determination, i. e., the right of nations to secede, means nothing more than defence of the privileges of the dominant nation and police methods of administration, to the detriment of democratic methods."

"Social-Democrats would be deviating from proletarian policy and subordinating the workers to the policy of the bourgeoisie if they were to repudiate the right of nations to self-determination, i.e., the right of an oppressed nation to secede..."

"Let us state first of all that however meagre the Russian Social-Democratic literature on the "right of nations to self-determination" may be, it nevertheless shows clearly that this right has always been understood to mean the right to secession."

"The reader will see that at the Second Congress of the Party, which adopted the programme, it was unanimously understood that self-determination meant "only" the right to secession."

"As far as the theory of Marxism in general is concerned, the question of the right to self-determination presents no difficulty. No one can seriously question the London resolution of 1896, or the fact that self-determination implies only the right to secede..."

"...to combat nationalism of every kind, above all, Great-Russian nationalism; to recognise, not only fully equal rights, for all nations in general, but also equality of rights as regards polity, i.e., the right of nations to self-determination, to secession..."

"This article had been set up when I received No. 3 of *Nasha Rabochaya Gazeta*, in which Mr. Vl. Kosovsky writes the following about the recognition of the right of all nations to self-determination: Taken mechanically from the resolution of the First Congress of the

Party (1898), which in turn had borrowed it from the decisions of international socialist congresses, it was given, as is evident from the debate, the same meaning at the 1903 Congress as was ascribed to it by the Socialist International, i.e., political self-determination, the self-determination of nations in the field of political independence. Thus the formula: national self-determination, which implies the right to territorial separation, does not in any way affect the question of how national relations within a given state organism should be regulated for nationalities that cannot or have no desire to leave the existing state."

"It is evident from this that Mr. Vl. Kosovsky has teen the Minutes of the Second Congress of 1903 and understands perfectly well the real (and only) meaning of the term self-determination."

What is the meaning of continuing to put concepts in confusion, despite these indisputably clear statements of Lenin? Rendering Marxist literature incomprehensible and messing it up requires great talent!

On the one hand a nation's right of self-determination is being turned into a people's right of self-determination in the twinkling of an eye (we have seen that a people's self-determination means nothing apart from a people carrying out a revolution, for a people gaining the right to establish a separate state is only possible through overthrowing reactionaries), and on the other the right of self-determination is deemed to be something apart from the right to establish a separate state.

If we apply the real meaning of concepts the Shafak revisionists are saying the following; "Our movement declares that it recognises the Kurdish people's right to (revolution) and, if it wishes, to establish a separate state!"

Thus we have the wonderful solution (!) a Marxist-Leninist movement has brought to the national question. It is clear that this solution (!) means nothing less than defending the dominant Turkish nation's existing privilege to establish a state.

### 15. "Self-Determination". Right of Self-Determination":

"Self-Determination" and the "Right of Self-determination" are different things. Self-determination" means **secession, to establish a separate state**. However, "the right of self-determination" mean, as we have indicated above, **the right of secession, the right to establish a separate state**. What communists defend in all circumstances unconditionally is the "**right** of self-determination", that is, the **right** to establish a separate state. "The right to self-determination" should never be confused with "self-determination", or, in other words, "the right to establish a separate state" with "establishing a separate state". Communists in all circumstances defend the former while they defend the latter dependent on conditions. Although, communists uphold the first under all circumstances, the communist movement, in Comrade Lenins words, *must decide the latter question exclusively on its merits in each particular case in conformity with the interests of social development as a whole and with the interests of the proletarian class struggle for socialism*.

Comrade Lenin compares "nations' right of self determination" to the right of divorce. While the right of divorce is unconditionally defended in all circumstances, a personal question of divorce, as is known, is defended in certain conditions while in others it isn't. In the same way as a family union is a forced union without recognition of the right of divorce, without recognition of the "right of self-determination" the unity of nationalities is also a forced unity. It is not a unity based on reciprocal trust and will. It is a rotten unity based on reciprocal enmity and on coercion. Communists cannot defend such a union. They wish for and advocate a sound unity based on reciprocal trust and friendship willingly entered into. Again, communists in general prefer to be organised in large states to being organising in numerous states, as large states founded in a broad area possess more advantageous conditions as regards the class struggle, large scale production and the construction of

socialism. However, communists are absolutely opposed to the organisation of large states being based on oppression and coercion of nationalities, as we have mentioned above. Unity between nationalities must be a unity based on free will and reciprocal trust. The duty of unconditionally defending the nations' right of self-determination stems from this. And what is the attitude of the Shafak revisionists regarding this important matter of principle? To advocate the people's right(!) to carry out a revolution, and to trample upon nations' right of self-determination.

Furthermore, by saying "the Kurdish people's right of self-determination cannot be separated from the land revolution struggle based on the impoverished peasantry and the struggle against imperialism", they are attaching conditions to the **right** of self-determination. Do not forget that this nonsensical sentence is the solution (!) the Shafak revisionists have brought to the national question. The revisionists, after criticism, were forced to substitute the word "liberation" for "right of self-determination" but this is and has been no obstruction to continuing to defend dominant nation nationalism in the national question.

The Shafak revisionists say:" Our movement ...works for the determination of the Kurdish people's destiny **in the interests of the Kurdish workers and peasants** (my emphasis)

From whichever angle you look a sentence full of errors! Let us repeat once again, first and foremost, it should be the "Kurdish nation", not the "Kurdish people", as the question of Kurdish people's self-determination is not related to the national question, and is something with no connection to the subject we are discussing. Also, if the Kurdish people determine their own future it will certainly be "in the interests of the Kurdish workers and peasants." It would not be possible to be otherwise, as a **people** determining its own future means a people establishing its own revolutionary state. A people will found **its own** revolutionary state, that is, determine its own destiny and this might not be "in the interests of the workers and peasants(!). This is utter nonsense.

“The **determination** ...of the Kurdish people’s destiny” is mentioned. This expression is more erroneous from another angle. Not “the **determination** of its destiny”, it should be “they **themselves** determining their own destiny. “It is abundantly clear that the expression “the **determining** of the Kurdish people’s destiny” implies that the determining will be carried out **from outside**. It means an external force drawing the Kurdish people’s destiny. The Shafak revisionists have turned the national question into a confusion. They have violated whatever is progressive, revolutionary and correct in the concept “nations’ right of self-determination”. They have made unbelievable distortions to this concept, turning it into a form that serves the interests of the dominant nation bourgeoisie and landlords.

If in the above expression “nation”, had taken the place of the word “people” the following two errors would still have been perpetuated: the sentence: “our movement works for the **determination** of the Kurdish [nation’s] destiny towards the interests of Kurdish workers and peasants.” In this case, too, the fate of the Kurdish people would be determined by “our movement” not by the Kurdish people themselves. Therefore, the most important aspect of the national question, a nation’s right of self-determination would be taken away from the nation and this fundamental right trampled upon. The above sentence would mean: “Our movement works for a “separate Kurdish national state” in the interests of Kurdish workers and peasants.”

It is abundantly clear that this expression takes the right to establish a state away from the nation and gives it to the thing called “our movement”. Secondly, a communist movement never includes the question of whether or not a national state should be established in its programme. It never makes an advance judgement regarding the founding of a separate national state. A communist movement, as we have pointed out above, gives a guarantee of “a nation’s right of self-determination” and puts this in its programme. On the question of whether or not to secede it makes a decision according to concrete conditions.

The Shafak revisionists, as a result, have, in general destroyed the right of self-determination of nations and, in particular, that of the Kurdish nation. If you destroy this then nothing will be left of the principle of “equality of nations”. You will not only have extended your hand in friendship to the bourgeoisie of the dominant nation, but also to its police chiefs and fascist generals.

### **16-When will Turkey’s class conscious proletariat support the secession of the Kurdish nation and when will it not support it?**

Regardless of nationality, the class conscious proletariat of Turkey will address the question of the Kurdish nation founding a separate state from the standpoint of the development of the revolution. If the Kurdish nation’s establishing a state will increase the possibility of the development and success of a democratic popular revolution under the leadership of the proletariat in Kurdistan of Turkey the class conscious proletariat of Turkey will support secession. If secession will delay and hinder the development and success of such a democratic popular revolution then the class conscious proletariat of Turkey will not support secession. Let us suppose that the communist movement developing in our country rapidly puts down roots amongst the peasantry in Kurdistan, that the struggle for land reform rapidly spreads and the revolutionary movement develops faster in Kurdistan than it does in the Western region. Under these conditions, the Kurdish region remaining within the borders of Turkey will only lead to the hobbling of the revolution by obstructions set up by the state of the dominant Turkish nation’s bourgeoisie and landlords. Or let us assume that red political administrations have emerged in various areas of the Kurdish region and that the revolution in the West is developing more slowly, Under these conditions, again, the Turkish ruling classes and their state’s oppression would delay and hinder the development of the revolution in

the East. In this case the secession of the East would speed up and strengthen the development of the revolution. This would also add momentum to the revolution in both West and East and certainly positively affect the development of the revolution in other countries in the Middle East. In such a situation the class conscious proletariat of Turkey, regardless of nationality, would want and advocate the secession of the Kurdish nation and for the rapidly developing revolution in Kurdistan to attain the possibility of progressing at a faster rate.

On the other hand, if the revolution in Turkey's other regions were to develop at a more rapid rate than in the Kurdish region and if the secession of Kurdistan were to slow the development of the revolution in this region and consolidate the dominance of feudal lords, sheikhs, mullahs etc.,, and if the revolutionary struggle in the East were to be weakened by being deprived of Western support, then in this case the class conscious proletariat of Turkey, regardless of nationality, would not support secession. If after the success of the revolution in Turkey a movement for secession under the leadership of the Kurdish bourgeoisie began the proletariat of Turkey would not support secession etc.

These things we are saying are obviously based on hypotheses but there is great benefit in dwelling on these suppositions as regards the attitude to be taken by the communist movement, in which conditions it would support secession and in which conditions it would oppose it. Moreover, these hypotheses relate to real, feasible things, not unreal, impossible things.

+

### **17-If the Kurdish nation decides to secede, how will the Class conscious Proletariat of Turkey react?**

In the event of secession two situations are possible: Firstly, as mentioned above, in the event of secession favourably affecting the development of the revolution then it is a simple matter. The proletariat of Turkey would definitely advocate and support secession.

Secondly, the negative effect of secession on the development of

the revolution. If in such a situation the Kurdish nation wished to secede, despite this, what would the class conscious proletariat of Turkey do? The answer given by the Shafak revisionists to this question in verbal discussions is this: To prevent secession by all means, including force. The answer our movement gives to the same question: Communists would absolutely reject the use of force in such a situation. While disseminating propaganda in favour of "unity" amongst Kurdish workers and toilers they would never use force in opposing the desire for secession. To recognise "nations' right of self-determination" means to never oppose when a nation wishes to exercise this right, that is, to secede, communists will entirely and absolutely leave the decision as to whether the Kurdish nation founds a separate state to the Kurdish nation itself. If the Kurdish nation wishes it will establish a separate state, if it doesn't it won't. It is the Kurdish nation that will make this decision, not others. Just as communists will themselves not obstruct a nation's desire to secede they will also actively struggle against the efforts of the government of the bourgeoisie and landlords to forcibly prevent this. They will also struggle against all manner of external intervention. If the Kurdish proletariat and toilers were aware that secession would undermine the revolution they would do all they could to ensure unity. Even if they were not aware, no one has the right to intervene externally on their behalf. External intervention, the use of force, obstructing the desire for secession on whatever grounds, are all in violation of "the right of self-determination of nations". Such a violation would sabotage the unity of workers and toilers, shake their confidence in each other, stoke national enmity, and in the long term do great harm to the cause of the proletariat as a result. After the revolution had succeeded in the Soviet Union the Bolsheviks unhesitatingly agreed to the secession of the Finns, at their request (31 Dec.1917). If the Finns hadn't wanted to secede and if Finland had organised as a people's republic in the USSR this of course would have been better, but the Finnish nation wanted to secede. In this situation

it was necessary to either agree to secession or to adopt a really harmful policy of suppressing the aspiration by force.

The Bolsheviks agreed to secession, not placing the smallest obstacle in the way of the desire for secession. This attitude was to the benefit of both the Finnish people and the revolution in the Soviet Union. This attitude consolidated the trust of the Finnish workers and peasants in the Soviet proletariat. In the year 1918-20 when the civil war continued in the Soviet Union the imperialists' plans to attack the Soviet Union through Finland met with the resistance of the Finnish people. If the secession of the Finnish nation had been prevented despite their wish to do so this attitude would have only created a deep-rooted hostility between the peoples of the two countries. At Smolni comrade Lenin said:

"I very well recall the scene when, at Smolny, I handed the act to Svinhufvud which in Russian means "pighead" — the representative of the Finnish bourgeoisie, who played the part of a hangman. He amiably shook my hand, we exchanged compliments. How unpleasant that was! But it had to be done, because at that time the bourgeoisie were deceiving the people, were deceiving the working people by alleging that the Muscovites, the chauvinists, the Great Russians, wanted to crush the Finns. It had to be done."

Comrade Lenin's attitude on the Finnish question is a thoroughly instructive example. The attitude of the Shafak revisionists is diametrically opposite to that of comrade Lenin. Our attitude is in complete accordance with that of comrade Lenin.

### 18. "Divisiveness" Demagogy:

The Shafak revisionists say: "Our movement struggles against the ruling classes of every nationality that is hostile to the revolutionary unity and fraternity of the Turkish and Kurdish people, and their **divisive policy**." (our emphasis)

Their term "divisive policy" has been borrowed from the politi-

cal dictionary of chauvinistic nationalists and feudalists of the Turkish ruling classes.

The ruling classes attach the label of "divisive" to everyone who opposes their nationalist policies. They call not only Kurds who wish to secede, but also all those who defend the right of secession or oppose national oppression to this or that degree "divisive". The meaning of divisiveness in Turkey is "division of territory", "the division of the state's unity and its integrity".

In this sense, to say that the ruling classes and, even while being a little more progressive politically, the middle bourgeoisie, who (openly) extend one hand to democracy and the other (from behind) to the ruling classes, are "divisive", is absurd. What divisiveness? They are the merciless enemies of "divisiveness". Morning to night they curse "divisiveness". They are in favour of the state's unity and opposed to the division of its territorial integrity at any price! That is, they are in favour of **forcibly** keeping the Kurdish nation and other minority nationalities within the borders of Turkey. Whereas communists are opposed to such a "unity"; communists defend the union of workers and toilers from all nationalities. When it is in the interests of the revolution they defend non-separation of territories and organisation in a single state (and even when defending this their fundamental goal is the unity of workers and toilers); when it is not in the interests of the revolution they advocate the division of territory and the state and secession. The slogans "unity of territory" or "unity of the state" are slogans of the bourgeoisie and landlords of the dominant nation. Communists have to distinguish with thick lines between their slogan "the unity of workers and toilers from all nationalities" and the slogan "unity of territory and state".

To attack "divisiveness" with the language of the bourgeoisie and landlords of the dominant nation instead of taking the above position will only confuse minds and make it easier for the Turkish ruling classes. You cannot oppose national injustice in a frighteningly dema-

gogic manner saying “they are the real divisive ones”, attributing a meaning to the concept of “divisiveness” that in reality does not exist.

People still remember how, in the newspaper “Worker-Peasant”, amongst a load of such demagoguery and sophistry, under the headline “Who is Divisive?” the Kurdish nation’s right to secession was ruined and how the ruling classes’ slogan of “unity of state and territory” was insidiously supported. The Shafak revisionists in reality defend the “unity of territory and the state” in an indirect way, by attacking “divisive policy” with the vocabulary of the ruling classes; that is, they adopt the official view of the state. The slogan of the class conscious proletariat, regardless of nationality, is this:

“Unconditional equality for all nationalities, right of nations to self-determination; unity of workers and oppressed people of all countries...”

### **19. Shafak revisionism makes M. Kemal and I. Inonu’s dominant nation nationalism a cornerstone:**

The Shafak revisionists approve of the national oppression inflicted on the Kurdish nation and other minority nationalities in history. They applaud the fact that M. Kemal said: “In Turkey there are Turks and Kurds”. They greet fervently the fact that at Lausanne Ismet Inonu said: “I am the representative of the Turks and Kurds,” and base their own views on this. It is as if they are saying to the Turkish ruling classes: “look, Ataturk and Inonu recognised the **existence** of the Kurds. This is what we are doing! What is there to be angry about in this?”

The revisionist traitors assume that they are resolving the national question by recognising the existence of a people (even though they are yet to recognise the existence of the Kurdish nation, only recognising the existence of the Kurdish people (!)).

On the national question communists defend the absolute equality of all nationalities and languages, and oppose all manner of inequality and privilege between nationalities and languages. On the subject of

forming a state, too, they want the equality of nationalities. The unconditional advocating of “the right of nations to self-determination” stems from this. Whereas the bourgeoisie wants at every opportunity inequality in favour of its own nationality; wants privilege and tramples on the natural rights of other nationalities etc. The bourgeoisie of the dominant nation may recognise the existence of other nations and even grant some rights to them when obliged to do so, such as the Arab bourgeoisie in Iraq. But at every opportunity they will trample on these rights and wish to oppress other nationalities. It is not the recognition or non-recognition of the existence of minority nationalities that separates communists from the bourgeoisie. And, anyway, M. Kemal, by discussing the existence of the Kurds in a spurious manner at the Sivas Congress, when central authority did not exist or had entirely collapsed, wanted in reality to prevent a possible separatist movement of the Kurdish nation. He wanted to ensure that they would accept the yoke of the Turkish bourgeoisie and landlords. The whole of M. Kemal’s life is full of examples of oppression and persecution of the Kurdish nation and other minority nationalities. If there is someone in Turkey whose support cannot be secured that person is M. Kemal. Furthermore, the nationalism that needs to be struggled with first and foremost in Turkey is M. Kemal nationalism, which is dominant nation nationalism. Inonu’s claim to be the representative of the Kurds at Lausanne was also an open attack on the Kurdish nation’s right of self-determination. A despicable determining of the Kurdish nation’s destiny from outside. The cunning to include the regions where the Kurdish nation lives within the borders of Turkey, that is, of the field of domination of the Turkish bourgeoisie and landlords, through haggling with imperialists! And the most ferocious manifestation of Turkish nationalism. This is what the revisionist traitors use as a basis for their ideas!

### **20- A summary of Shafak revisionists’ theses regarding the National Question:**

The Shafak revisionists ignore the national oppression of other mi-

minority nationalities and languages. The Shafak revisionists do not see the Kurdish movement as a national movement. They evaluate it as a “popular” movement that **merely** opposes national oppression. Just as they are unable to distinguish between the class movement and the national movement of the Kurdish people, they also do not distinguish between the general democratic content of the Kurdish national movement opposing oppression and persecution and its backward content strengthening Kurdish nationalism, thereby erasing the difference between the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords, and the Kurdish proletariat and toilers.

The Shafak revisionists mistakenly analyse the profound economic and political reasons for the national oppression and persecution implemented against the Kurdish nation by the Turkish ruling classes. They portray national oppression and class oppression, and national contradiction and class contradiction as one and the same.

The Shafak revisionists, ignoring the profound evidence of Turkish nationalism amongst the Turkish workers and peasants, are sacrificing the truth to fancy words! They are undermining the importance of the activities we have to carry out amongst workers and peasants to counter Turkish nationalism.

By distorting the concept of “nations’ right of self-determination” in an unbelievable way, initially transforming it into a Bukharinite formulation, then subsequently violating this Bukharinite formulation, the Shafak revisionists are rendering impossible the Kurdish nation’s right of self-determination and demolishing concepts regarding the national question.

Using the demagoguery of “divisiveness”, the Shafak revisionists are defending the unity of territory and the state in an insidious way. They utilise M. Kemal and I. Inonu, representatives of dominant national nationalism in Turkey, as props, assuming that by recognising the existence of a nation the national question will be resolved. The result is this: the line followed by the Shafak revisionists on the na-

tional question is an effort to reconcile Turkish nationalism, a nationalism inherited from the current represented by Mihri Belli [see note], with Kurdish nationalism.

The Shafak revisionists are, on the one hand, Turkish nationalist, while, on the other, they have extended the hand of friendship to Kurdish nationalism. It is as if the following message was being conveyed between the lines: ‘Our brothers the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords! Put aside this secession idea! Come, join forces with us! Look, we also oppose the persecution to which you are subjected. Those who oppress you are “divisive”! But if you wish to secede you will too become “divisive”! And, as you know, we are the enemies of “divisiveness” etc...’

A Turkish nationalism that makes concessions to Kurdish nationalism! Here, a summary of all the prattle and charlatanism regarding the national question!

#### **21- A summary of the Marxist-Leninist movement’s views regarding the national question:**

The Marxist-Leninist movement is today the most relentless and determined foe of the national oppression inflicted on the Kurdish nation and minority nationalities by the Turkish ruling classes, and is in the forefront of struggles against national oppression, persecution of the other languages and national prejudice. The Marxist-Leninist movement unconditionally supports, and has always supported, the right of self-determination of the Kurdish nation, oppressed by the Turkish bourgeoisie and landlords; that is, its right of secession and to establish an independent state. As regards the right to found a state, too, the Marxist-Leninist movement is opposed to privilege. The most fundamental tenets of people’s democracy render this absolutely necessary. The unprecedented national oppression inflicted upon the minority nationalities in Turkey by the Turkish bourgeoisie and landlords also render this imperative. This is at the same time made absolutely necessary

by the freedom struggle of the Turkish workers and toilers, for, if they do not demolish Turkish nationalism, liberation will be impossible for them.

Nations' right of self-determination should never be confused with the necessity for a certain nation to secede. The Marxist-Leninist movement considers the question of secession concretely in every particular case., "it judges and determines as a whole for social development and socialism and from the viewpoint of the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat." The Marxist-Leninist movement rejects absolutely the use of force and creating obstacles in the event of decisions of secession of which it does not approve. Borders should be fixed by the will of the nation. This is imperative as regards the reciprocal confidence, sound friendship and willing union of the working and toiling masses belonging to various nationalities.

The Marxist-Leninist movement supports the struggle of oppressed nationalities in general and the Kurdish nation in particular against national oppression, persecution and privilege, and absolutely supports the general democratic content of the national movement of the oppressed nation.

The Marxist-Leninist movement also directs and administers the class struggle of the Kurdish proletariat and toilers against the bourgeois and small landlords that make up the leadership of the Kurdish national movement. It warns the Kurdish workers and toilers against the actions of the Kurdish bourgeois and landlords that aims to consolidate nationalism. The Marxist-Leninist movement remains indifferent regarding the struggles for supremacy of the bourgeois and landlord classes of various nationalities.

The Marxist-Leninist movement wages a struggle against the efforts of landlords, mullahs, sheikhs etc to reconcile the struggle against national oppression with their attempts to strengthen their own positions.

## *The Origin And Development Of The Differences Between Ourselves And Shafak Revisionism*

### *A General Critique of TIIKP (Turkey Revolutionary Worker Peasant Party)*

*June 1972*

The struggle continuing within the Shafak movement, previously the PDA (Proletarian Revolutionary Daylight?), between the two wings, sometimes in the open, sometimes clandestine, sometimes hardening, sometimes softening, but continuing without a break has finally reached the point where it is no longer possible for the two wings to exist within the same organisation. The proletarian wing has now cut all ties with the revisionist-bourgeois clique and embarked on reorganising on Marxist-Leninist bases. However, due to the talents of the revisionist clique that is at the head of the movement, many comrades have been in the dark as regards the struggle between the two lines. The revisionists, hiding behind the curtain of "party discipline" concealed the struggle from cadre. They dishonourably opted to suppress correct revolutionary ideas, and were partially successful in this. Today many comrades are shocked at this "sudden", "unexpected" "split". They are trying to find out what is going on from scratch. The revisionists, taking advantage of the bewilderment of the cadre are trying to fish in muddied water, trying to blacken our name with baseless gossip, slander campaigns, personal attacks, endeavouring to conceal the essence of the question and their own low actions. They will of course cling to the method of struggle which suits them-slander, lies, gossip, personal attack and vulgar criticism, and there is no surprise about this.

Proletarian revolutionaries will also of course pursue the path which befits them. The path of giving prominence to the essence of the question while demonstrating the ideological, political, organisational and tactical line of the bourgeois clique. For two reasons there is an urgent need for this. Firstly, to ensure that the militant cadre who are bewildered correctly grasp the struggle between the two lines and take their place in the ranks of Marxism-Leninism. Secondly, at this time when we have embarked on reorganisation, to ensure unity by establishing the correct ideological, political, organisational and tactical principles on which our organisation will be formed.

For these reasons we consider it essential to summarise briefly the

line of treachery which the revisionist clique has maintained, changing its outward appearance but without any essential change, and the past of the struggle between us and this line.

### **The Emergence of the Revisionist Clique: Aydinlik Socialist magazine and Isci-Koylu**

At the end of 1965 and the beginning of 1966 the struggle between the pacifists, parliamentarist TIP ruling clique and the clique of Mihri Belli, which pinned its hopes on a military coup, was continuing in an increasingly intense way. There was absolutely no difference, in essence, between these two cliques. Both of them agreed basically with the “non-capitalist path” of modern revisionism. The single difference was that while one relied on elections and parliament the other’s hopes were tied to a military coup. The TIP clique was making all its calculations on the basis of the votes it would get in elections and was shamefully assailing the active struggle of our working class, impoverished peasantry and youth out of fear that the parliamentary path would close.

As for the bourgeois clique of M.Belli that was gathered around Turk Solu, in November 1967 they were concocting a plan along with Dogan Avcioğlu to use the actions of university youth like a winch to trigger a military coup. The M.Belli clique had turned its back on the broad toiling masses, working class and peasants. It had turned its back on the world communist movement and on Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse-Tung Thought. It was confusing the consciousness of the working class, impoverished peasants and revolutionary intellectuals and youth with the nonsense of “Algerian socialism”. It was trying to palm off a reformist bourgeois dictatorship as a proletarian government and socialism. It rejected the independent political organisation of the proletariat and proletarian leadership. It was promoting dominant nation nationalism and descending to the extent where it claimed even fascist racism had a “positive” side, becoming an accomplice in the Turkish ruling classes’ policy of national oppression. Both the TIP movement and the M.Belli

movement were, as regards class character, political currents of the national bourgeoisie. They had covered their faces with the mask of socialism. Since the fate of these two currents is well known there is no need to dwell on them. Present day Shafak revisionism appeared on the scene at a time when the struggle between these two bourgeois cliques had intensified, with the Aydinlik Socialist magazine (ASD) in November 1968, tailing M.Belli. It followed a line faithful to M.Belli on every question. It thoroughly developed the coarse theories and nonsense of M.Belli, embellishing his revisionism with Isci-Koylu literature.

The publication of the Isci-Koylu newspaper is claimed to be evidence of a separate movement from M.Belli and of the following of a revolutionary line. This is absolute nonsense. What determines the line of a movement is not the publication of this or that journal. What is important is the content of a publication. “we inclined towards the workers and peasants. “Yes, but like a bourgeois, not like a communist... Where do you get the idea that the bourgeoisie do not incline towards the workers and peasants. The political line of the Isci-Koylu newspaper which emerged with the pressure of the rising worker and peasant movement was just like that of M.Belli. Its task was “to convey national consciousness (i.e. bourgeois ideology) to the workers and peasants” and “to introduce the worker-peasant movements to the military-civilian intellectuals.” The bourgeois officers who took power must have been aware of the worker and peasant movements (!), and after coming to power they should have been so kind as to incline to their problems! This was the wonderful logic which led to the launch of Isci-Koylu! Everyone who examines the ideological line of Isci-Koylu will see clearly that it is entirely the bourgeois line of M.Belli. To the extent that the “ban on socialism” of M.Belli also affected Isci-Koylu and great care was taken in the first editions of the paper to avoid using the word “socialism”.

Today, Shafak revisionism is endeavouring to conceal these realities as a cat covers up its excrement.

## Revisionism's First Change of Appearance: Proletarian Revolutionary Aydinlik

With the deepening of the economic crisis and the intensification of contradictions amongst the ruling classes and connected to this the rise in violent actions by workers, peasants and youth, the revisionist clique attempted to pacify these actions by donning a new mask. A new contradiction emerged in the M.Belli ranks. On the one hand youth leaders who represented the spontaneous struggle of the youth and in this context advocated activism, and on the other passive bourgeois elements who rejected all manner of active struggle. M.Belli and the current Shafak revisionists constituted the leadership of the second group. At the TDGF general meeting the struggle came into the open and this was followed by the publication dividing into two and the emergence of the PDA magazine. PDA revisionism followed M.Belli's rightist line for a long time against the petit-bourgeois leaders who interpreted the spontaneous actions of the youth. In PDA's first edition they wrote: "We have marched on the path opened by Turk Solu", and "Turk Solu and PDA are two publications that meet the different needs of our movement." In this way they openly proclaimed their adherence to the line of M.Belli.

As for M.Belli, at one time he adopted a centrist stance. When the majority of the youth mass came out against PDA revisionism with an expert manoeuvre he adopted a position alongside the TDGF administrators which he considered more appropriate for his ambitions for a "military coup". In such a way the alliance between M.Belli and youth leaders who were typical petit-bourgeois was born. They came to dominate the youth mass. The PDA revisionist clique was betrayed by M.Belli, whose ideas they had faithfully embraced. They therefore had to make some minor changes in their views, but the Mihri essence did not change. Of course, the youth movements had a series of weaknesses and drawbacks on account of their petit-bourgeois character. This is natural, and only a communist party leadership that had roots amongst the worker

and peasant masses would have been able to remove these weaknesses and unite the struggle of the youth with that of the broad toiling masses, but a communist leadership did not yet exist. Various revisionist cliques, first and foremost the M.Belli clique, did all they could to use the youth for their own ambitions and were influential in the youth movements! With the natural weaknesses of the youth movements combining with the shortcomings of the influence of revisionism, the revolution potential of our country's heroic offspring was squandered.

The PDA clique sufficed with watching from the sidelines as the youth suffered martyrs in the intensifying militant struggle against fascist persecution, and with cursing it. This led to it being completely isolated from its youth support.

On the other hand PDA revisionism rejected the idea that the land revolution was the essence of the democratic revolution. It rejected the revolutionary role of the peasantry. It rejected the armed struggle on the grounds that "conditions are not yet suitable". It rejected Marxist-Leninist theories of the state and revolution. It rejected the right of nations to self-determination. Its bourgeois nationalism continued, but some of the crude theories of M.Belli, such as: "a proletarian party cannot be established in conditions of Philippine democracy", "proletarian leadership is not essential in the democratic revolution", "it cannot be said that there will be a transition from a democratic revolution to socialism without a pause", were abandoned. Apart from these, M.Belli's analysis of Kemalism, of history and his theory of counter-revolution in Turkey were maintained.

On the other hand, as happy as someone who has come into a fortune they embraced the revisionist ideas of Hikmet Kivilcimli in a way that would be appropriate for bourgeois politicians! They put his writings in their publications and created a Kivilcimli-Belli mixed anti-Marxist-Leninist analyses of feudalism that would suit the thoughts of the Thinkers" column in Milliyet of Korkut Boratav appeared and they reached the point of denying the existence of feudalism in Turkey.

In the international sphere they adopted a centrist position as regards the situation between the world communist movement and modern revisionists. The fact that in the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries the revisionists had once again taken power and that proletarian dictatorship had turned into bourgeois dictatorship was rejected. They particularly dismissed the idea that in the Soviet Union revisionism had turned into social-imperialism. They rejected the experiences of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. They adopted the path of maintaining friendly relations with both socialism and modern revisionism led by the Soviet revisionist clique. It was accepted that the USSR and other revisionist parties had committed the occasional error (!). (Like the ones they committed!). The bourgeois club that was later to be called the TIHKP emerged on this ideological basis. While on the one hand following a modern revisionist line on main questions, the PDA clique subsequently resorted to Mao Tse-tung Thought (MTTT). How was this possible? Of course, by putting the essence of MTTT to one side...

What is the meaning of MTTT in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries? Comrade Mao Tse-tung reached the following conclusions by implementing the Marxist-Leninist theory of permanent and phased revolution to the conditions of semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries. The struggle being waged against feudalism in these countries and the struggle against imperialism are connected with unbreakable links. The essence of the democratic popular revolution is the land revolution, which will achieve success with a popular war under the leadership of the proletariat. Popular war is, in essence, a peasant war. The party of the proletariat should launch armed struggle in the rural areas based on the impoverished and middle peasantry, create liberated zones in these areas, broadening these zones by means of a **prolonged war**, besieging the cities, and eventually seizing power country-wide by taking the big cities. The party of the proletariat and popular army should be constructed step by step during this prolonged war. Also during this prolonged war a united front of all popular classes, the working class,

peasants, urban petit-bourgeoisie, and national bourgeoisie should be realised against feudalism, imperialism and comprador capitalism.

This united front may be established under the leadership of the working class based on a fundamental alliance of workers and peasants. The government that will be established with the resulting success of the popular war will be a popular dictatorship under the leadership of the proletariat, not a bourgeois dictatorship. After the democratic popular dictatorship has been realised the proletariat which holds the leadership should go on to realise the dictatorship of the proletariat without a pause, by uniting with the impoverished and middle peasantry, and embark on the construction of socialism. These are the general outlines of what is taught by Mao Tse-tung and the experience of the Chinese Revolution.

The PDA revisionist clique rejected all of this. It used the correct idea of comrade Mao Tse-tung, i.e. "the revolution will be the work of the masses", to oppose the armed struggle, and accuse every wish to take up arms of "losing contact with the popular masses" and rejecting the idea that "the revolution will be the work of the masses". This treacherous cliques's loyalty to Mao-Tse-tung spread as hostility to the armed struggle in Turkey. The PDA revisionist clique's (which made such a fuss about "the revolution will be the work of the masses") attitude to mass movements was as follows:

To extol the spontaneous struggle of the worker-peasant masses, to prostrate themselves in front of the spontaneous struggle! To crawl behind the worker and peasant masses! But what the popular masses and especially the peasants need for an armed struggle for power is a dynamic, decisive, consistent communist leadership advancing on a correct path. And this is what is lacking. The objective conditions were ideal for launching a people's war. The spontaneous struggle of the worker and peasant masses was mushrooming and reaching the level of armed clashes in places. PDA revisionism did not have the ability to take the leadership of this struggle, uniting the spontaneous struggle of the people with a conscious political struggle. The treacherous clique had nei-

ther the belief nor the preparation or ability to lead the popular masses who wished to take up arms. This clique, first and foremost, did not believe that the armed struggle and revolution would develop in an unbalanced way, growing in some places before others, and did not believe in the prolonged armed struggle. This clique had established its task as “preparing the social and psychological conditions of the revolution”. In order to do this it was necessary to “organise and politicise” the masses! The workers and peasants should be organised in broad mass organisations, trade unions etc! Their organisational policy consisted of this. More copies of Isci-Koylu, which consisted of applauding (??) the spontaneous movement of the masses, should be printed and distributed in order to “politicise”! The task of “politicisation” consisted of this. Mass meetings, demonstrations, strikes, etc. should be organised to demand reforms. This is all they understood by the term class struggle. Instead of revisionist organisations and armed struggle, legalism, reformism, only peaceful forms of struggle were implemented. In reality organising mass meetings, demonstrations, strikes, establishing unions etc ... remained on paper (they, of course, could not be rejected as serving the armed struggle and of being part of revolutionary organisation). They went to movements of the masses’ own initiative, selling newspapers, the events being written in the newspaper that was it...Most of the time the revolutionary rage of the masses was pacified on the rationale: “Don’t go into action before organising and politicising the workers and peasants all over the country. This would be “adventurism””. This revisionist clique compromised completely with reformist bourgeois trade unions such as DISK and TUTUS and pushed our working class and impoverished peasants into the lap of reformism, extolling the struggle of these trade unions for a few kuruş pay rise in their publication without even once criticising them.

In reality, there was nothing as regards illegal activity. The members of the supposedly illegal party were busy from morning to night keeping an eye on the sales and distribution of the publication and chattering about

the political issues of the world and Turkey! These bourgeois gentlemen were stupid and pompous enough to assume in the warm corners in which they sat that they gave direction to global politics.

Editorial commissions, committees, a heap of offices! Add the policy of taking over the TIP and these constituted the backbone of organisation. With this organisation not even a tree could be toppled, let alone the government of the ruling classes.

Days passed in endless bureaucracy and stationery activity, in debater on “revolution” with bourgeois gentlemen and ladies fleeing reactionary attacks in the universities and the intensifying repression of the government, and educational meetings.

Very few of the cadre were professional. Most of them continued their private affairs and maintained their lifestyles while attending educational meetings and newspaper sales in their spare time. The content of the practical activity generally gathered the bourgeois cadre in the ranks of the movement. While activity was carried out with these cadres it was impossible to attempt a brand new, dynamic, revolutionary activity. This bourgeois clique uttered squeals of “revolutionary unity of forces” as it was pressurised by reactionary attacks. It endeavoured to establish a unity of forces with the CHP, independent senators (??), TIP, DISK and other reformist bourgeois organisations, making the “front” policy a basis, and to revive the Mihri Dev-Guc disgrace. “Our weapon is our revolutionary unity of forces” \*\*\* was the heading, putting to one side two of the weapons of the people, the party and popular army, and, moreover, replacing the united popular front with a vague thing called “unity of forces “. This was a disgrace, as, for a communist party advancing on a correct path establishing a stable alliance with the bourgeoisie is a futile dream, leaving to one side the construction of popular armed forces under the leadership of the party. Temporary and partial agreements are only possible on certain concrete questions. The result of all the chatter in the name of unity of forces did not go beyond the publishing of the occasional joint signed statement. Even this is not an agree-

ment between the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie. It consisted of agreements between various bourgeois and petit-bourgeois cliques. The PDA revisionists advertised their successes (!) in this by exaggerating in their publications. It declared the struggle of revolutionary youth to defend themselves against reactionary oppression as "arson against the unity of forces"

The outcome of this revisionist line was this: to remain behind the worker and peasant masses and to be unable to establish any serious link with the masses. To be entirely isolated from the revolutionary youth. To be stuck around a few legal publications in Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir! \*\*\* PDA issue no.18

To be unable to go beyond the bounds of amateur activity! To throw themselves into the arms of the bourgeoisie in the face of ferocious reactionary assaults!

### **The great Workers' Resistance of 15-16 June, The Taking shape of the struggle between Two Lines and Another Change of Appearance by PDA Revisionism**

On 15-16 June the spontaneous struggle of our working class reached its peak. The workers defeated and left behind all the bourgeois and petit bourgeois cliques. The 15-16 June Great Worker's Resistance and subsequent martial law created a significant leap forward in the consciousness of some cadre. These colleagues learned important lessons from the workers' movement and the harsh days of struggle that followed.

The workers' movement demonstrated, firstly, that the revolution would be based on violence and that this was inevitable. It inflicted a severe blow on the opportunism of Aybar-Aren and all pacifists, parliamentarist views.

Secondly, the workers' movement inflicted a severe blow on bour-

geois state theories. It demonstrated clearly to what degree it was a foolish dream to expect the liberation of the people to come from the army of the ruling class, for the workers' resistance was suppressed with tanks, bayonets and martial law. The bosses, sheltering in the shadow of bayonets, sacked hundreds of workers together with the martial law authorities. Hundreds of revolutionary workers and intellectuals were tried in the martial law courts. All this set forth the idiocy of the pro-coup dreams and anti-Marxist-Leninist state and army analyses of M.Belli, D.Avcioğlu and H.Kivilcimli.

Thirdly, the Great Workers' Resistance of 15-16 June illustrated once again that the real heroes are the masses. And dealt a serious blow to the individualist petit-bourgeois currents that imagine carrying out a revolution based on an elite group of the intelligentsia.

Fourthly, the suppression of the 15-16 June resistance demonstrated that the revolution will be unable to succeed at the outset in the cities and that the workers' uprisings that break out from time to time in the cities are bound to be suppressed as long as they are not drawn to the rural areas. It inflicted a severe blow on the dreams of the PDA clique of seizing power by means of a general uprising in the cities at an uncertain time in the future.

Fifthly, the martial law that followed 15-16 June and lasted 3 months demonstrated that continuing the struggle even under the harshest conditions would only be possible with a genuinely revolutionary organisation, having an illegal foundation on which it is constructed. It showed that reliance on legality, and revisionist organisation, in circumstances of an intensifying class struggle would succeed in doing nothing more than inflicting harms on our people.

Sixthly, the 15-16 June Resistance was concrete evidence of how objective conditions for revolution in our country have matured.

A section of cadre who participated in the great workers' resistance, who maintained the struggle under the conditions of martial law and had experience of working amongst the masses, took the necessary lessons

from the great workers' movement. They grasped the fact that the line that had been followed previously was a rightist and capitulationist line, a revisionist line. But a section of bourgeois elements who watched the struggle from afar and who do not know the masses were unable to draw the necessary lessons from the Workers' movement. They even drew the wrong lessons. They were carried away by hopes of easy success. In this way a new contradiction began in the PDA ranks.

The bourgeois elements ensconced at the head of the movement, instead of entirely abandoning the previous rightist line and constructing a movement on a correct line, endeavoured to conceal their faces with a new mask by making minor changes on some questions.

The struggle between the two lines made its presence felt initially in an assessment of the future. The bourgeois elements claimed that martial law would soon end and that a return would be made to the old "democratic" (!) environment. A.N., in particular, championed this view. The Marxist-Leninist cadre advocated the position that even if martial law were to end fascist oppression would continue and increase, as the economic and political crisis would exacerbate the violence by the day, and that comparatively stable periods would be temporary and short lived. The consequences of the revisionists' analysis were to restore the rightist practice that had been shaken somewhat by martial law. As for the Marxist-Leninist cadre they were of the opinion that previous activity should be entirely and fundamentally changed, and that organisation and struggle should continue on the illegal path onto which martial law had partially impelled us.

In the days of martial law which followed the workers' resistance of 15-16 June we had engaged in no little revolutionary and illegal activity based on our own forces, which superseded the old publication activity. More correctly, by force of circumstances we had been pushed into such activity, particularly in Istanbul. This activity of course had many weaknesses and shortcomings. Cadres were not mobilised. All manner of amateurishness occurred in the illegal work. There was no clear perspective

in organisation. The struggle was not subject to the land revolution etc.... But in spite of all these significant weaknesses, for the first time an illegal path of organisation and struggle had been established. This, despite everything, was a good thing, and it was necessary to leave the old path and advance on this track, defeating all the weaknesses with a conscious effort. But it didn't work out like that. With a slight relaxation of martial law illegal activity also relaxed. Groups working clandestinely came out into the open. They then became legitimised in the form of Isci-Koylu offices. The entire cadre returned to the magazine and at just that time the watchword became "Socialist Congress". Despite all objections the decision was taken to once again publish the magazine on a weekly basis. However, the monthly PDA and fortnightly Isci-Koylu had absorbed the entire cadre. Right at that time the slogan "Let's establish Isci-Koylu Working Committees" was coined.

These things were, of course, not coincidental. They were the bourgeois class instinct and bourgeois class attitude expressing itself as soon as conditions were seen to be favourable. The slogans and decisions were wrong, for in reality a return had been made to the old ways of working that had been shaken by martial law. They were based on the mistaken assumption that the "democratic environment" would continue for a long time. Even if this assumption had been correct the above slogans and decisions would still have been wrong, for in every period and under all circumstances the proletariat has to lay an illegal foundation around which it must construct all other organisation and work. When conditions for armed struggle have thoroughly matured and in parallel with this when the ruling classes have stepped up their fascistic measures the above slogans and decisions would be entirely mistaken.

The revisionists were saying that a legal party provides countless advantages! At the head of these countless benefits was the distribution and sale of the legal publication, that is, the isci-koylu newspaper that appeared with the permission of the ruling classes. Mr A.Z., the head of revisionism, said exactly the following in a debate during those days: "If

we don't found a legal party, in a month we won't be able to bring out Isci-Koylu." Did this gentleman assume he was going to bring out Isci-Koylu for ever?

The "Socialist Conference" that was to gather together all the revisionist cliques had become the cure of all ills. It was to resolve the proletarian movement's (!) problem of organisation! It was to liberate the revolutionary movement in Turkey by uniting all "proletarian circles" (these gentlemen now called all reformist-revisionist cliques like themselves by this name) from dispersion.

It was to create the pre-conditions (!) for "a people's war" by ensuring organisation on a national basis. In fact there was only one way to prepare for popular war: that was to send a significant proportion of the cadre to the rural areas, to organise the peasants for armed struggle in guerrilla formations, and to make all other forms of illegal organisation and activity subject to the armed struggle in the rural areas. Not to consolidate with nonsense like the Socialist Conference already existing legalism.

If the Socialist Conference had been feasible it would have been a conference of betrayal, for it would have served the purpose of presenting the entire cadre as if fruit on a tray to the growing appetites of the ferocious fascist assailants. Not to create the preconditions for armed struggle or to lead it.

As it was, the Socialist Conference slogan was at the same time a futile dream. The reactionary onslaught had pitted the revisionist cliques one against the other. Revolutionary Workers, peasant and intellectual cadre were vacillating in a perplexed manner between these cliques. Uniting the revolutionary cadre around a correct line and isolating revisionism could not have been achieved by a discussion meeting like the Socialist Conference. Such discussion meetings occurred frequently in those days and did not go beyond intensifying arguments. Only a **revolutionary practice** directed by a sound nucleus founded on Marxist-Leninist foundations accompanied by an **ideological struggle**, could

have been possible in a comparatively lengthy process, not all at once. It was seen in practice that the Socialist Conference would not be feasible. It merely whetted the appetites of the unprincipled and pacifist elements who wanted peace between the revisionist cliques.

Why was it necessary to bring out a legal weekly publication again? In order to repeat more frequently the calls for a socialist conference! Since the cadres were struggling to bring out the existing two legal publications the revisionists subsequently were forced to turn the monthly magazine into a weekly.

The task of the Isci-Koylu working committees was **to read the magazine and newspaper, criticise them, and write articles for them and nothing more.** "Every isci-koylu working committee **should work like an editorial board**" (ibid) it was said. That is, all activity had the purpose of strengthening legal publishing activity. They tried to persuade us they took "village work as primary" by sending a few spare cadres not needed in publishing work to villages to write ostentatious village work reports for the magazine. Village work consisted of temporary legal propagandising and polling activity-still, a significant section of the cadre participating in this work in time turned and are turning against the revisionist administrative clique.

Newspaper sales and distribution also constituted the essence of work amongst workers. The reformist DISK and unions affiliated to it were supported unconditionally. Those who opposed this policy were accused of sectarianism. The spontaneous struggle of the working class was again being followed, lagging behind. There was no clear, definite organisational plan, policy or activity. There was absolutely no thought of drawing promising workers into professional political work. Amateur work was primary. Students participating in work today were tomorrow returning to their courses, with all the product of that work and all relationships going with them. Due to unstable and amateur work relations established with many revolutionary workers and peasants were ruptured.

The revisionist clique, for the reasons we have mentioned above, had also become isolated from the youth.

The bourgeois leadership had begun to shout the most radical slogans in order to conceal its rightist practice and free itself from isolation, and to repeat the most primitive truths of Marxism-Leninism against the revisionism of M.Belli. Plentiful hot air was generated and chatter about the people's war rose to the skies.

This was the new mask of PDA revisionism.

With what kind of organisation were the radical slogans and popular war rhetoric engaged in to conceal rightist practice to be implemented? With editorial committees? With isci -Koylu working committees? With translation and I don't know what offices? The "party" dominated by bourgeois intellectuals was not of any use apart from serving this legal publishing activity.

The bourgeois leadership had abandoned its former rightist views on subjects that are the A, B, C of Marxism-Leninism, such as the class character of the state, army and martial law. The revisionists had begun to criticise modern revisionism with a low voice and embarrassed language. They had slowly begun to get used to the term Soviet social imperialism. They appeared to accept as true the concept of power being achieved by people's war directed from the rural areas to the cities. But even this change was opportunistic and false. They avoided self-criticism by adopting an arrogant attitude as if they had been advocating the same things since a long time ago.

On the other hand they embarked on trying to prove that Kivilcimli ideas were compatible with Mao Tse-tung, that there were no contradictions between the two; on the contrary, that Kivilcimli's ideas were the adaptation of Mao Tse-tung to the conditions in Turkey. They claimed that Kivilcimli had grasped Mao Tse-tung since 1967 and, as evidence, advertised his article "Red Guards", which swears at Stalin and shows he never understood the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, in PDA. They made great efforts to rescue the Vatan Party experience with the

varnish of Marxism-Leninism (see PDA, critique of Vatan Party Programme, issue no.24)

They tried to read to everyone the "Socialist Conference" fable that Kivilcimli had whispered in their ears with a Mao Tse-tung impression. Together with him they shouted: "No Anarchy, Great Gathering!" In the magazine they launched a campaign to read and understand Kivilcimli. They became so ludicrous as to proclaim he was "one of the world's greatest Marxist-Leninists."

On the other hand they continued to advocate the Boratavist nonsense that all but denied the existence of feudalism in Turkey and, consequently, the land revolution. The theses of Kivilcimli denying feudalism and the revolutionary role of the peasants and Boratav's theory that there was five per cent feudalism corroborated each other.

Initially they advocated the idea that the main contradiction was between the **ruling classes** and the people. Later, they abandoned this idea with the masterpiece of artificial logic and idealism "imperialism, means of Production and the main Contradiction." They supposedly adopted the idea that the main contradiction was between "feudalism and the popular masses". We say supposedly because they had not grasped the essence of the question (we shall see this later).

By claiming that the **working class** and **peasants** were the fundamental force of the revolution they engaged in doublespeak and demonstrated that they had not understood the essence of the democratic revolution. Mr. R.T. was also championing these centrist theses. Today, too, as we shall see, they have not achieved clarity as regards the fundamental force of the revolution.

In particular on the question of Kemalism and in general as regards the evaluation of the history of Turkey, and on the subject of the national front, they maintained their Mihriist views.

The revisionists were forced to step back when they were pressurised, but when they were forced to adopt a correct idea they only did it in abstract.

For instance, they said work in the villages was primary while continuing their bureaucratic activities in the cities. They said clandestine work was primary while swimming in the morass of legalism. They said the armed struggle was primary while trying to stifle any desire for such a struggle, labelling them “Guevarist”. They said people’s war was primary, while trying to incite a “military coup.”

These disgusting bourgeois, while on the one hand saying “ yes, people’s war is primary,” on the other they would add: “ But,” and do all they could to make the “Socialist Congress”, legal publishing activity, pacifism and capitulation compatible with Mao Tse-tung and with the line of people’s war.

#### Circular of February 1971

In February 1971 a circular was sent to party members. In this circular the same hypocritical attitude was maintained: “The Central Committee condemns the metaphysical bourgeois perception that isolates the struggle in rural areas from that in the cities, placing a barrier between them, and does not grasp the dialectic integrity between the two.”

These scoundrels, while there was no serious work in the villages and all activity was stuck in Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir, convicted those cadres who called for “work in the villages to be primary, and in the cities to be secondary”.

In the same circular they utilised comrade Lenin’s absolutely correct teaching, i.e. “parties **not restricting** themselves to illegal work”, in support of their **entirely legal** magazine activities. With grand Marxist-Leninist posing they decided to **consolidate legalism, saying**: “The Central Committee, in the light of these revolutionary principles, has deemed it necessary to make known to the entire party organisation the importance of **strengthening our publications** that convey to our people Mao Tse-tung Thought.”

The same circular also condemned (!) as a “reproducing tendency” the Marxist-Leninist wing’s championing of the lessons taught to revolution-

aries in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries by the experience of the Chinese Revolution that “revolution would develop from the villages to the cities” and that “power would be achieved bit by bit”. The revisionist gentlemen called their line of making compatible (!) “People’s war” with encouragement of a “military coup” as “cutting our cloth according to our own country, not another country’s model “, and praised it.

M.Belli, D.Avcioğlu and H.Kivileimli openly proclaimed their reliance on a military coup. In this respect they should be deemed more sincere than the PDA revisionists, who were doing the same thing in a more insidious way.

Let us examine the circular in question:

1) “Ambitions for fascist dictatorship are increasing”.

2) “Opposed to this the reformist bourgeoisie is intensifying its efforts to seize power through a military coup or by the parliamentary path.”

3) “The **moment** it seizes power is fascism’s weakest moment”.

4) “**We must organise and mobilise popular resistance** before fascist forces gain all key posts (that is, at the moment they seize power”. (Author’s emphasis)

5) “Let us be prepared to act speedily.....**to move into action immediately**”,

6) “Where contradictions are at their sharpest, where we will ignite the fire of resistance amongst **the most aware masses....**”

7) It will spur on all the anti-fascist forces, **including the democratic bourgeoisie and may mobilise the democratic forces**”

8) “**In the event that the reformist bourgeoisie takes power**, our party’s response will be to mobilise the popular masses against the most reactionary and chauvinist enemies that are the most loyal to imperialism and to unite the concrete demands of the people with revolutionary propaganda.” (ibid)

These are the theses;

These theses are part of the theories developed at that time regard-

ing fascism and the struggle against fascism. What I want to mention in particular is the question of **encouragement of a military coup**.

The above theses completely separated the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist struggle and the anti-fascist struggle one from the other. The anti-fascist struggle is seen as a struggle to be waged in the cities as a **momentary struggle**. By “where contradictions are at their sharpest” Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir are implied, for it is considered that fascism will seize power with a coup that it organises in these cities. By the “most aware masses” the youth, workers and intellectuals are implied. The anti-fascist struggle is therefore something entirely different from a land revolution struggle that will develop from the rural areas to the cities, the power of which peasants will constitute; it is a **counter-coup movement** to be developed against a **fascist coup in the cities**.

The theses have, secondly, separated the anti-fascist struggle and the struggle for power one from the other. The anti-fascist struggle should have a programme for power, but this is not mentioned in the theses. The revisionist gentlemen are thinking of the following two options; either a fascist dictatorship or a dictatorship of the reformist bourgeoisie. So the bourgeois gentlemen’s anti-fascist programmes for power are, in reality, a reformist bourgeois government. They are making all their calculations according to the two above possibilities “to move into action immediately”, “to organise and mobilise popular resistance”. This nonsense has a single aim: “to spur on all the anti-fascist forces, including the democratic bourgeoisie” and “to mobilise the democratic forces! By these means “the seizure of power by the reformist bourgeoisie will be secured. And in the event of the reformist bourgeoisie taking power a struggle will be waged against “the most reactionary and chauvinist enemies that are the most loyal to imperialism. “Against the reformist bourgeoisie that are in power “uniting with revolutionary propaganda”, the people’s concrete demands “will be championed.

In the January 1971 edition of PDA they wrote: “The aim of the anti-fascist struggle is not to establish a revolutionary government.” (Issue no

186) Today in Turkey a revolutionary administration could be a joint government under the leadership of the working class of the revolutionary wing of the national bourgeoisie, urban petit-bourgeoisie, working class and peasants. Since this is not the aim of the anti-fascist struggle the aim must be to bring the reformist bourgeoisie to power. This real intention that the bourgeois gentlemen are attempting to conceal with disgusting hypocrisy. There is other evidence that give away this intention. The issue of Isci-Koylu with the headline “Let us be prepared to take up Arms against Fascism” was in particular required to be thrown into officers’ houses. And for the first time this issue was sold to students at the military high school. Also at a time when the possibility of a reformist military coup had increased, a list of urgent demands in the character of a programme presented to the reformist bourgeoisie was published. There was no other force that PDA revisionism could rely on apart from the reformist bourgeoisie. It is even incapable of defending itself against increasing fascist repression, let alone beat fascism. The reformist clique has no independent power, or armed units on which it can rely. It does not work amongst the peasants. In the cities it works in an amateur way amongst the workers but has no influence. The working class is dominated by reformist and fascist trade unions. We have mentioned previously that it was isolated from the youth. In that case with what organisation and who is to be mobilised? In these condition isn’t the call “to take up arms” absolute baloney or what? When Mr. A.Z was asked this very question he replied:” There are forces apart from us who will fight fascism. As the most progressive revolutionaries we have the obligation of showing them the way.” That is, the “obligation” to “encourage” the reformist bourgeoisie by saying “Come on lads, take up arms and beat this fascism that is threatening us”. The “obligation” to invite a military coup!

If this is not relying upon the bourgeoisie instead of their own forces then what is it?

We recommend that these frauds read once again and more carefully these words of Dimitrov, whose name they constantly mention:

*“There are two ways of settling the present political crisis: the capitalist solution of the crisis and the popular one, i.e., a solution indicated by the masses. There is no and there cannot be any middle road today.*

*The capitalist solution of the political crisis, however, is bound to lead to a military or fascist dictatorship, with all its incalculable internal evils for the people and the country, as well as external perils for their liberty and independence, and for peace.*

*The other, the popular solution of the political crisis means handing over power to the working people, to the great popular majority, which alone has the right to govern itself, and the country and to dispose of its fortunes. This solution means also to direct the economic, cultural and political life of the country, as well as the social development, in such a way as to satisfy the needs and secure the rights, liberties, life, well-being and peace of the working people, subordinating the selfish interests of capital and the capitalistic minority to this great goal.”* (Dimitrov, the United Front and the Political Crisis)

What comrade Dimitrov means is the **administration of the anti-fascist popular front**. And in the article he goes on to point this out clearly.

Comrade Dimitrov, in a report entitled “The tasks of the Third International regarding Fascist Assault and the struggle of the Toiling class against Fascism” he draws a definite line between the “social democrat government” of the reformist bourgeoisie and the “united front government”!

*“We even prefer not to use the term ‘workers’ government,’ and **speak of a united front government**, which in political character is something absolutely different, **different in principle**, from all the Social-Democratic governments which usually call themselves ‘workers’ (or labour) government.’ While the Social-Democratic government is an instrument of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie in the interests of the preservation of the capitalist order, a united front government is an instrument of the collaboration of the revolutionary vanguard of the pro-*

*letariat with other anti-fascist parties, in the interests of the entire working population, a government of struggle against fascism and reaction. Obviously there is a **radical difference** between these two things.”*

Georgi Dimitrov: The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle of the Working Class against Fascism - Main Report delivered at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International.

In another article comrade Dimitrov says:

*“... The proletariat ... will the movement of the united proletarian front and the anti-fascist Popular Front at the particular stage be in a position only to suppress or overthrow fascism, without directly proceeding to abolish the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie? In the latter case it would be an intolerable piece of political shortsightedness, and not serious revolutionary politics, on this ground alone to refuse to create and support a united front or a Popular Front government.”*

(Georgi Dimitrov: The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle of the Working Class against Fascism: Main Report delivered at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International)

That is, comrade Dimitrov does not see the defeat of fascism as sufficient. He sees it as essential that the class that is the social base of fascism (in Europe the bourgeoisie and in Turkey the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords) be overthrown and a united front government be established in its place.

In the same article comrade Dimitrov says:

*“...It would be wrong to imagine that the united front government is **an indispensable stage** on the road to the establishment of proletarian dictatorship. That is just as wrong as the former assertion that there will be **no intermediary stages** in the fascist countries and that fascist dictatorship is **certain to be immediately superseded** by proletarian dictatorship.”*

(Dimitrov: The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist

International in the Struggle of the Working Class against Fascism: Main Report delivered at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International)

These words undoubtedly applied to European countries where proletarian revolution was on the agenda. In Turkey an anti-imperial, anti-feudal united front government, regardless of the existence of fascism, is "an inevitable stage" on the path of forming an administration of the proletariat. In the event of the existence of fascism this government will also have an anti-fascist character.

Let us summarise the passages we have cited from comrade Dimitrov:

1- Anti-fascist struggle is at the same time a decisive struggle on who seizes the power.

2- Fascism and political crisis are related to each other. Ruling classes strive to solve political crises shifting to fascism.

3- The second solution to political crisis is that power is seized by anti-fascist united front. There is no third solution.

4- Government of Anti-fascist popular front and reformist bourgeois government are totally different phenomena. The former is an instrument of the struggle against fascism and other reactionaries. The latter is an instrument of class collaboration with reactionaries to protect capitalism.

Those who recall the doctrine on fascism of comrade Dimitrov will know that there is no place in the united front for the right wing of social democracy.

The lessons we shall learn for our country from all these are as follows:

Firstly, that the class content of the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist front in Turkey is the same as that of the anti-fascist front: **Workers, peasants, urban petit-bourgeoisie, and revolutionary wing of national bourgeoisie.** The struggle to realise the united front between these classes is at the same time in our conditions the struggle to re-

alise the anti-fascist front.

The revisionist leadership, by placing the anti-fascist struggle against the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle has distorted the tenets of comrade Dimitrov. They have hobbled the realisation of the united front and thereby assisted fascism.

Secondly, the anti-fascist power struggle in Turkey is at the same time an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal power struggle. Comrade Dimitrov favours: the second option of "fascist dictatorship or anti-fascist united front government" to either of the two options in "fascist dictatorship or reformist bourgeois dictatorship."

The revisionist leadership, by endeavouring in reality to concoct a reformist bourgeois government under the banner of anti-fascist struggle, have once more distorted the doctrine of comrade Dimitrov. They have attempted to impose government that will be the means for collaboration with reactionaries instead of a war government against fascism and reaction.

On all the above points we have summarised - the Socialist Conference, prioritising legal publishing work, Isci-Koylu organising in working committees and offices, the keeping village work secondary, the constant hobbling of the armed struggle, the pushing of illegal activity into the background, reliance on bourgeois democracy, mistaken identification of the main contradiction and fundamental force, the advocacy of Boratavist views on feudalism and the land revolution verging on denial, Kivilcimist views, the adoption of the Mihri Dev-Genc perception and Kemalism, the propagation of anti-Marxist-Leninist theories of fascism, attempting to make compatible military coup and people's war, and similar subjects, that is, on the most important questions of our revolutionary struggle - there has been a constant struggle between the bourgeois leadership and the Marxist-Leninist wing.

The struggle between the two lines emerged once again two weeks before martial law, at a meeting held on 10-12 April, regarding all the important questions of the revolutionary struggle.

## April Meeting

The agenda of the meeting was a self-criticism of the line of the movement up to that time and the Socialist Conference and the question of publications. On the question of self-criticism we analysed the past in detail, indicating that PDA revisionism constantly changed appearance and did not behave honestly... (See "let us be brave and sincere in self-criticism"). We wanted the past revisionist vileness to be thrown out with a detailed, sincere self-criticism. The revisionists defended their past errors in a systematic way. They stated that the isci-koylu working committees and offices were the correct way of organising. They said the temporary polling work carried out in villages was attaching importance to the villages. They claimed against Erdost that defending Boratav's views was a revolutionary (!) stance. They said that the slogan "our weapon is the revolutionary unity of forces" not containing the two weapons of the people, the party and people's army, was correct (revolutionary unity of forces was not the people's united front, a question on which we shall dwell later). They defended the work amongst workers that was amateur, lacking in perspective and unrevolutionary, and their unconditional support of reformist trade unions. They even went so far as to claim that the work carried out up to that time had been based on illegality, distorting the reality. This fake bourgeois clique, faced with Kivilcimli's blatant cursing of comrade Mao Tse-tung and attack on them, and the constant criticism of the Marxist-Leninist wing, was forced to abandon Kivilcimli. At the meeting they told us without shame, looking us in the eyes, that "they had never adopted Kivilcimli but had tried to win him over." Mr A.N. even boasted of struggling against Kivilcimli, despite the fact he had been at the head of those who had been as loyal as a dog to the revisionist Kivilcimli. Although they had previously accused those who criticised Kivilcimli of "arrogant sectarianism", this time they preferred to claim they had "struggled less".

They explained their past tailing of M.Belli thus: In that period the

M.Belli line represented communism (!) against the TIP movement. M.Belli subsequently deviated from the line of Turk Solu. So M.Belli, of whom these gentlemen were disciples, was a communist (!) in those years.

The evidence of their fakery is the three large volumes of Turk Solu magazines. Their lack of sincerity in self-criticism has taken them as far as defending M.Belli.

There were also debates on the theories on "fascism and struggle against fascism". The revisionist clique's theory was, in summary, thus:

1- In Turkey fascism is the dictatorship of **monopoly capital**. (PDA, issue 27, pages 177-178)

2- Fascism will take power by means of a reactionary military coup (ibid)

3- Fascist dictatorship is never compatible with parliament. "Fascism means the bourgeoisie removing the parliamentary order." (ibid)

4- The anti-fascist struggle should be carried on based in the cities by establishing unity of forces".

5. The **moment** fascism takes power proletarian revolutionaries "should spur on all the anti-fascist forces, including the democratic bourgeoisie." and "mobilise the democratic forces" (February 1971 directive)

6- "The aim of the anti-fascist struggle is not to establish a revolutionary government". (PDA, issue no.27)

7- The task "in the event of the reformist bourgeoisie taking power" is struggle with the reactionaries and to advocate the government of workers and peasants and the concrete demands of the people against the reformist bourgeoisie (February 1971 directive)

8- If fascism comes there will be no possibility of working in the villages. Our urgent task is to disperse the threat of fascism. "All progressive and democratic forces: we must realise as soon as possible the democratic unity of forces against fascism. We must fight with all our strength against the monopolist bourgeoisie, and isolate fascism....let us

unite with all anti-fascist forces. Let us struggle determinedly against fascism. **These are our urgent political tasks (ibid)** without dispersing the threat of fascism the armed struggle of the peasants for a land revolution cannot be organised. (February 1971 directive)

9-The reformist bourgeois administration that will emerge after the dispersal of the threat of fascism will increase the possibility of work in rural areas. "Such periods may occur when priority will be given to the cities which will dialectically affect work in the villages." (This was a sentence frequently uttered by Mr A.Z. and implied that a military coup planned in the cities would increase the possibility of work in the villages.)

In order to prove the views put forward in 8 and 9 the example of Iran was given. It was said that if fascism had been prevented in Iran the land revolution struggle in the villages today would have been easier.

From whichever angle you look this is a theory full of nonsense. For a start the class content of fascism in our country has been erroneously identified. Fascism is not the dictatorship of the monopolist bourgeoisie, as it is in any imperialist country. In Turkey, and in semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries like Turkey, fascism is the dictatorship of the **comprador big bourgeoisies and landlords**. The gentlemen, as a result of their Kivilcimli and Boratavist perceptions, have completely ignored the landlords. Moreover, they have erased the dividing line between imperialist countries and semi-imperialist countries, putting to one side the comprador character of the monopolist bourgeoisie. The natural consequence of this was of course to see the anti-fascist struggle as one to be waged in the cities against the monopolist bourgeoisie and to deny the role of peasants in the anti-fascist struggle (or, at, least, to underestimate it. The revisionist clique did from time to time mention the peasants but underestimated the role of the peasants in the anti-fascist struggle).

These gentlemen had forgotten the existence of the landlords to the extent that they denied the existence of landlords within the CHP and even the AP. "The CHP gathers within it some sections and representa-

tives of the monopolist bourgeoisie that wishes to expand" (PDA, issue 27, pages 182)

"The AP (Justice Party) administration, Demirel and the clique around him essentially advocate the interests of the monopolist bourgeoisie" (ibid, p.184).

The fact that the landlords were partners in the government was rejected: "The existing monopolist oligarchy is in power". (ibid, p.183)

Secondly, it was thought that fascism would take power with a military coup, an extremely shallow view. Just as fascism might come to power by means of a military coup, it could also happen in different ways. Hence in Turkey it came with the 12 March memorandum. In Italy Mussolini took power with a coup from below. The "Yahya Khan Formula" is another example of how fascism can take power. In Greece the ruling party crushed all opposition with a military coup and realised fascism. The seizing of power by fascism varies according to the particular conditions of a country and to the period. It is the task of communists to correctly analyse the particular conditions in their country. The PDA revisionists were struck dumb at the 12 March Memorandum as they had not considered anything but a reactionary military coup. They applauded, saying: "The reformist bourgeoisie appears to have strong influence". (PDA issue 34 page 4). This shallow understanding of fascism's coming to power naturally saw the anti-fascist struggle as a counter coup (reformist bourgeoisie's military coup).

Thirdly, they disseminated the claim that fascist dictatorship was completely incompatible with parliament. However, in many countries today where fascism is in power, for instance in Indonesia, South Vietnam, Pakistan, India and Spain parliament exists. Fascist cliques consider it to be in their interests to make parliament an instrument of fascism, rather than abolishing it, both in order to deceive the masses at home and to deceive world public opinion. Hence in Turkey, too, fascism has a parliamentary mask. The function of parliament is to raise their hands according to the sign on the bayonets of the fascist generals' gang. All the

fascist cliques of the AP, DP, MGP and CHP, while supporting the massacre of revolutionaries and the removal of all democratic rights on the one hand, on the other want the preservation of parliament. The AP, DP and MGP fascist cliques even find the repression of the fascist generals' gang insufficient. They shout "more, more!" at the tops of their voices. Despite this they want to protect parliament carefully.

We do not deny the existence of the more ferocious forms of fascism that also abolish parliament. We are drawing attention to how nonsensical it is to see fascism as a form of administration that is completely incompatible with parliament, and that such a perception is contrary to the realities of Turkey and the world and deceives the cadre and masses. It is not enough to look at whether parliament exists, to understand the existence of fascism, it is necessary to look at **what kind of parliament** exists. A parliament that is decoration for fascism or a democratic parliament in the bourgeois sense?

Comrade Dimitrov described the forms of parliament that decorate fascism, or, in other words, the parliament-masked forms of fascism, years ago:

*"The development of fascism, and the fascist dictatorship itself, assume **different forms** in different countries, according to historical, social and economic conditions and to the national peculiarities, and the international position of the given country. In certain countries, principally those in which fascism has no broad mass basis and in which the struggle of the various groups within the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie itself is rather acute, fascism does not immediately venture to abolish parliament, but allows the other bourgeois parties, as well as the Social-Democratic Parties, to retain a modicum of legality. In other countries, where the ruling bourgeoisie fears an **early** outbreak of revolution, fascism establishes its unrestricted political monopoly, either immediately or by intensifying its reign of terror against and persecution of all rival parties and groups. This does not prevent fascism, when its position becomes **particularly** acute, from trying to extend its basis and, without*

*altering its class nature, trying to **combine** open terrorist dictatorship with a crude sham of parliamentarism."* (**Dimitrov, United Front against Fascism**)

The PDA revisionists have become so fixated on the idea that fascism is incompatible with the existence of parliament that their anti-fascism perceptions involve defending all manner of parliaments even those that are masks for fascism.

*"The toiling masses, youth and intellectuals possess certain limited rights and freedoms under the parliamentary dictatorship of the bourgeoisie **despite everything**."* (PDA *ibid*).

In that case "despite everything it is necessary to defend parliament, even if it is the toy and veil of fascism (!). This understanding, under certain circumstances, will bring a person to the same point as the fascist cliques. Hence PDA revisionism, in defending the parliament that masks fascism, has united with the AP, MGP and DP fascist cliques.

The revisionist leadership was pressurising us to choose one of two options: either a fascist dictatorship without parliament or a dictatorship with a parliament (this may be a fascist dictatorship with a parliamentary mask, which has been the case in Turkey since the very beginning.)

Communists will defend the broadest bourgeois democracy **against all forms of fascist dictatorship**, whether with a parliamentary mask, or with the mask thrown to one side. They will defend a parliament elected with the most democratic systems even if it is bourgeois, and the right of the proletariat to free association etc., against fascist dictatorship. For such a dictatorship will create better conditions for the proletariat to achieve its ultimate goals in comparison to a fascist dictatorship.

But when a bourgeois parliament's "time is up for the masses" communists will hurl aside even the most democratic one.

Our bourgeois gentlemen, in the same article, deem the DP and the Inonu clique that was at the head of the CHP at the time as anti-fascist and progressive, since they are in favour of the protection of parliament, regardless of what kind of parliament it is.

*“The rural agencies, merchants and profiteering elements that have become rich from building and land speculation and have cooled towards the AP on account of being treated badly as regards the distribution of bank loans, are gathering around the DP. Since the economic interests of this wing conflict (!) with that of the monopolist bourgeoisie, they now have a parliamentarist appearance”. “There are significant contradictions between the CHP and monopolist capital circles plotting fascism.” The CHP leaders are essentially in favour of the protection of parliamentary forms” (ibid, page 182)*

However, we later saw that the Inonu clique at the head of the CHP was the dominant power in the first and second Erim governments that implemented fascism. And the DP was the main supporter of all the fascist repression.

Again our bourgeois gentlemen thought that the AP would cook up “a military dictatorship” and abolish parliament. However, we saw that although the AP supported all the fascist repression joyfully, it advocated the preservation of parliament. Since the PDA revisionists were unable to distinguish between fascist dictatorships they ended up defending fascist dictatorship with a parliamentary mask.

In Turkey parliament has been from the very beginning the facade of the fascist and semi-fascist dictatorships of the landlords and comprador big bourgeoisie. Our country has never experienced a true bourgeois democracy; it has merely tasted a few crumbs of it. This is the case in the multi-party period, as it was in the one-party era. It is the same today. In AP government periods a semi-fascist administration existed. The economic and political crisis forced the ruling classes to step up repression. Fascism advanced step by step. Martial Law was the natural result of this development and became a more advanced stage of this. It was not a transition from bourgeois democracy to fascism, but from a milder fascism to a more extreme fascism, while preserving the parliamentary mask. According to PDA revisionists, since a parliament exists, today’s system should not be fascism. But this

sees today’s Martial Law administration as the last form and boundary of fascist repression and persecution and endeavours to deceive the people and its cadre in this way.

Fascism may become more extreme and barbaric while, according to conditions, preserving or abolishing parliament. The way to prevent this is not to defend the milder forms of fascist dictatorship against the more severe forms, or to defend a reformist bourgeois government which is a vehicle for collaboration with reaction as soon as conditions are deemed suitable. It is to advocate an anti-fascist popular front government against all forms of fascism, to wage struggle for this and to realise this government. This goal is also the goal of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist struggle, that is, the democratic popular revolution. In today’s conditions in our country the democratic popular revolutionary struggle, the essence of which is a land revolution, also has an anti-fascist character. The struggle, which will eradicate fascism along with feudalism and imperialism, is an armed people’s war, the main force of which the peasants will constitute, under the leadership of the proletariat. The people have 3 weapons against fascism, just as against imperialism and feudalism; Party, people’s army and united people’s front. The people will defeat all their enemies, feudalism, comprador big bourgeoisie, imperialism and fascism with these three weapons.

Lastly, the PDA clique’s perception of anti-fascist struggle constantly hobbles the struggle for a popular war. If “the anti-fascist struggle’s purpose is not to establish a revolutionary administration “then it is either to defend the milder forms of fascism or to defend the reformist bourgeois government. As we have mentioned above when it deems conditions suitable for a military coup PDA revisionism defends the second of these, when it thinks this is not possible it defends the first, Since in neither the first nor the second situation can the danger of fascism be got rid of, the “urgent task is to get rid of the fascist threat; the land revolution comes later” perception leads to the following consequences: the organisation of the peasants’ armed struggle for the purpose of realising

a land revolution, that is, the organisation of a people's war, is postponed indefinitely. The historic role of the working class is being reduced to supporting and encouraging a reformist, bourgeois government.

Why is the threat of fascism not a temporary threat? For firstly, in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries like Turkey the **weak bourgeoisie** always endeavours to crush the struggle of the people bloodily and to stay in power in this way. That is, the weakness of the bourgeois impels it to fascism. Secondly, **the existence of the landlords** gives a feudal character to bourgeois democracy. The landlords who are partners in the administration constantly expend efforts to replace bourgeois freedoms with violence and coercion, the law of "feudal democracy". These are the reasons "democracy" in Turkey has had a fascistic and feudal character from the very beginning. Comrade Dimitrov states that the "main reasons" for "the reality that bourgeoisie unavoidably drifted towards fascism due to some specific historical, economical and political reasons" and for "this to be more valid in Balkan countries and Hungary" is because in these countries "bourgeois-democratic revolution has not yet completed" and these countries being "semi-colonies of imperialism". So he attributes to the presence of feudalism and the weak and powerless state of bourgeoisie.

Thirdly, in our era when imperialism is moving towards total collapse and socialism is advancing to victory all over the world, reactionaries are being dragged from crisis to crisis and are dying and disappearing. Imperialists and reactionaries on the brink of ceasing to exist are stepping up their repression and assaults all over the world, and endeavouring to spread fascism everywhere. For these three reasons the threat of fascism cannot be got rid of without the foundations of the current order being demolished and without the administration of the classes that are the social prop of fascism being brought down. It may be a popular war struggle under the leadership of the proletariat that will ensure the government is taken over by the popular classes and end the threat of fascism.

At the April Meeting the PDA's anti-Marxist-Leninist theories regarding fascism and the struggle to combat it were criticised for postponing people's war. The perception: "First let's get rid of fascism, then we'll engage in a people's war in rural areas" was condemned. Mr. A. Z. accused us of seeing fascism as preordained. We do not believe that the comprador bourgeois and landlord class will bring democracy or that even bourgeois democracy could exist under their dictatorship, especially in today's conditions. But the different hues of fascism are possible. Communists will not force the masses to choose between the different tones of fascism. On the other hand, the way to prevent the intensification of fascism is to embark on a people's war under the leadership of the proletariat, not to tail the reformist bourgeoisie in the cities.

The revisionist gentlemen, as with other questions, insisted on their mistaken stance regarding fascism. On the other hand they did make a cosmetic self-criticism. "In some groups educational meetings were not held regularly, the question of proletarianisation-that is, the proletarianisation of the cadre, the large majority of which are bourgeois (!) -was insufficiently grasped, errors in editing the publications were not corrected..." Secondary matters were thus given prominence. They also did not fail to attack the proletarian revolutionaries struggling against revisionism. They accused them of "completely rejecting urban work", "entirely rejecting legal activity" and "completely rejecting all forms of struggle apart from armed struggle". However, the Marxist-Leninists had long before drawn the necessary line between the above nonsensical views. They presented their Marxist-Leninist views to the meeting summarised in the form of 11 principles in response to the baseless accusations. They asked for a vote to see whether they were approved by everyone. We suffice here with listing these principles, the vote on which was obstructed by the revisionists on the grounds that "they needed explanation".

1-Activity in the village areas is primary; activity in the cities is secondary.

2-Armed struggle is primary; other forms of struggle are secondary.

3- Illegal activity is primary, legal activity is secondary.

4-As long as the enemy is stronger than us on a national level strategic defence is primary.

5-Within strategic defence tactical attacks are primary, tactical defence is secondary.

6-In this period in the villages within the armed struggle the guerilla struggle is primary; while other forms of struggle are secondary.

7-In the cities (large cities) in the strategic defence period consolidation and awaiting opportunities is primary, organising uprisings is secondary.

8-In organisation party organisation is primary, other organisational work is secondary.

9-Within the other organisational work armed struggle organisation is primary.

10-Reliance on our own force is primary, reliance on allies is secondary.

11-Conditions exist for armed struggle in our country.

### **Socialist Conference**

The Socialist Conference soup was cooked up once again at the April Meeting and presented to us. The Marxist-Leninists opposed it on the grounds that it would strengthen existing legalism, would serve to delay the armed struggle in an environment which was favourable, would sacrifice the cadre to increasing fascist persecution; moreover, it would not bring a solution to the problem of organising the proletarian party, furthermore, that the conference was a futile dream. They demanded that a significant proportion of the cadre be sent immediately to selected rural areas to organise the peasants and commence the armed struggle, with other forms of organisation to be based on support for this. They pointed out that with a Socialist Conference organising a legal party would not be taking advantage of legal opportunities but would be sinking in the

morass of legality, and that at present there was absolutely no serious illegal organisation or activity.

The claims of the revisionists were as follows:

In order for the armed struggle to commence it was necessary to organise on a national level! "A spark will set the steppes ablaze" but "the steppes need to be dry" (!) ... The Socialist Conference was to sort out the problem of nationwide organisation and of drying out the steppes in a flash (!) . And would create the most suitable conditions for armed struggle (!) . Mr. B.Y. championed all these views. These ideas had been set forth in many previous debates. These views went into the minutes of the meeting, but since we do not have a copy it is not possible to give footnotes. In order to justify his perception that "without nationwide organisation the armed struggle cannot be launched, to say otherwise is Guevarism", the traitor B.Y distorted the condition of "a sound party organisation" in Mao Tse-tung's "How can the Red Political Administration Survive in China?" article, into "a party organised on a nationwide basis". At that time and even until very recently these gentlemen perceived the conditions for the survival of a red political administration and the conditions for the commencement of the armed struggle as one and the same thing. They thus, by changing comrade Mao Tse-tung's condition of "a sound party organisation" into "a party organised on a nationwide basis", tied the launching of armed struggle to this condition. In this way the correct thesis that as a consequence of the unbalanced economic, political and social structure of the country the revolution, that is, the armed struggle, will develop in an uneven way, in some regions before others, was rejected.

### **The Question of Publications**

The question of whether it was necessary for legal publications to be brought out was put to a vote after a debate. The Marxist-Leninists voted for the PDA to cease publication, while saying Isci-Koylu could continue to appear for a while. They also advocated the immediate com-

mencement of preparations for an illegal publication. Wasn't an ideological-political publication like PDA much more necessary than a mass newspaper like Isci-Koylu? It was. In reality in those circumstances it was much more correct to abandon Isci-Koylu and produce a monthly publication containing short, ideological-political articles. In this way the best advantage would have been taken of the available legal possibilities and it would have been feasible to dispatch a significant section of the cadre to work amongst the peasants in the villages. But since we were in the minority and our votes would be unable to alter the outcome we found it more correct to use our votes as a sign of opposition to the PDA, which had become a symbol of the rightist line of the revisionist clique.

The revisionists, at the meeting in question, that is, two weeks before martial law, took their treachery to new heights by passing resolutions on the Socialist Conference and to strengthen legal publishing.

However, their victory (!) over the proletarian line did not last long. The martial law declared a fortnight later closed down the publications and hurled the dream of a reactionary Socialist Conference into the rubbish bin. A new period was thus commenced, in which insidious PDA revisionism again changed its appearance.

Before moving into the new period let us dwell on the "Liquidationists" question which is an inheritance from the previous period.

### **"Liquidationists" question**

In the struggle in which we were involved against PDA revisionism some "colleagues" subsequently separated from us both in theory and in practice and opposed all manner of struggle. These cowards who absconded were for a time more dangerous than PDA revisionism. The entirely rejected struggle in the cities. They rejected legal activity on principle. They rejected the principle of concrete analysis of concrete conditions, that is, the essence of Marxism. In this way they assisted the cause of PDA revisionism, by providing them with the opportunity to

justify their rightist errors with demagogy. These narrow-minded, pacifist and cowardly bourgeois would later descend to a level where they would claim that it was an unnecessary and even harmful intellectual effort to read Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. They became ridiculous, claiming it would be harmful to organise a centralised proletarian party in conditions of fascism. During a period when the persecution and repression of the ruling classes was intense they went as far as to say "our current task is to disperse and forget ourselves". Just as they had abandoned the struggle with PDA revisionism they also abandoned the struggle with the ruling classes. In fact they became even more revisionist, returning to their homes, schools and own cosy corners. Their theories of betrayal came to the aid of many bourgeois elements. These elements embraced the above theories in order to abandon the rising class struggle, in the meantime confusing some militant colleagues. Taking advantage of the turbid atmosphere of martial law they pacified them and tore them away from the struggle. We broke off relations with traitors S.U. and L.U., who were the ringleaders of this, prior to the April meeting. As for traitor T.N., a trusted figure of PDA revisionism, while previously he had opposed PDA revisionism together with us he subsequently compromised with it. At the April Meeting he attached himself to PDA revisionism, voting in favour of the convening of the Socialist Conference, the formation of a legal party and for the strengthening of legal publications. With the proclamation of martial law he vanished from the scene.

Now the PDA revisionists accuse us of having acted together with these people. They are trying to claim their nonsensical theories are ours. This is taking falsification to the limit.

Because firstly, while in the ranks of the "liquidationists" there were those who at first acted with us there were also some who were with the PDA revisionists and others who were in the middle.

Secondly, we never agreed with the mistaken views of these people. But since at the beginning we saw the struggle with PDA revisionism as more important we did not consider it appropriate to start an

uncompromising struggle with them. Also, these persons took time to develop their nonsensical theories. The unity between us against the right wing line of PDA revisionism on certain points later turned into a parting of the ways as their erroneous theories and practice emerged. Just as the distance between two sides of an angle is small at the beginning and gets larger the further one moves away from the angle, so did the distance between us and them grow as they moved on their track. We confronted them with their cowardness, treachery, telling them they were pacifist, narrow-minded, idealist bourgeois.

Now the PDA revisionists are attempting to conceal these truths. By attempting to apply to us views and attitudes we do not advocate or agree with they wish to achieve positive results for their past rightist line and on the other hand undermine our current critique. This fox-like cunning will only harm our bourgeois gentlemen, not us.

Let us address the factors that led to the deviation in question. The first and determining factor is the class character of these absconders from the struggle. Most of them are bourgeois, as regards their origin and life style. They are intellectual gentlemen who are disconnected from the class struggle, alien to the worker and peasant masses, who have developed by learning by heart sentence by sentence books the essence of which they have entirely failed to grasp. It is natural that they should abandon the arena of struggle when the class struggle intensifies. They put forward the nonsense we have briefly listed above in order to meet the need for a theoretical cloak for their disappearance.

Mr. A.Z. holds us responsible for their disappearance on account of the fact it happened in Istanbul. He says: "It is a warning that divisiveness should emerge in particular where these mistakes were committed. The errors of the Istanbul administration are large." (See text on "Liquidationists"). No, Mr Revisionist! These are not the only ones to disappear! If you just look around you will see! Didn't lots of your followers in Ankara totally abandon the struggle when Martial law came in? How many people are left from the hundreds who attended the education meet-

ings? Furthermore, weren't some of those who disappeared in Istanbul in your ranks right to the end?

In that case, why did so many people flee from the arena of struggle when martial law came in? Because they were bourgeois elements that were ensconced around legal publishing activity that did not necessitate their abandoning the bourgeois way of life. As we have mentioned above, the content of the activity gathered them around it. When martial law demolished with a single swipe the activity that resembled a house of cards their function ceased. While the bourgeois elements in Istanbul found a theoretical cover for their fleeing the struggle, if those in Ankara left, saying, "I'm not up for the struggle", what is the difference? The essence of the question is the sneaking away from the arena of struggle by the bourgeois elements grouped around the revisionist line on the introduction of martial law! As you revisionist gentlemen you carried out this sneaking away in a more insidious way. We will dwell on that later.

We have said that the first and determining reason for the deviation that emerged particularly in Istanbul was their bourgeois character. The external cause that created a suitable environment for their emergence is PDA revisionism. The deviation in question was born as a reaction to the PDA line, as a punishment of it. If attention is paid it will be seen that the deviation of the gentlemen who fled from the struggle is on nearly all questions exactly opposite to the deviation of PDA revisionism. No slander can alter this reality.

## **26 April 1971 Martial Law and Organisational Separation**

The Marxist-Leninists were of the opinion that the bourgeois leadership was hopeless several months before martial law. But sufficient struggle had yet to be waged in order to isolate the bourgeois leadership and gather the militant cadres around Marxist-Leninist principles. Moreover, the proletarian revolutionaries had not yet found the necessary op-

portunity to implement their ideas. It was essential both to maintain the struggle against the bourgeois leadership around correct principles and to strive to put correct principles into practice. The Marxist-Leninist cadre, too, were to emerge from within the struggle against revisionism and practical activity. Martial Law demolished the old style of work. This coup could have knocked some sense into the heads of some cadre and assisted the bourgeois leadership to comprehend the revisionist line. For these reasons the Marxist-Leninists concentrated their struggle against the bourgeois leadership around self-criticism. The only guarantee that the same rightist line would not be followed in the new period was such a self-criticism.

The bourgeois leadership constantly played for time, promising that preparations were being made and that a self-criticism would take place. But in verbal debates it became clear that they had absolutely no intention of making a self-criticism. They were jealously embracing all the vileness of the past. For instance, in one debate A.Z. heatedly defended the Socialist Conference, saying "If you hadn't sabotaged it, the Socialist Conference would have been successful and extremely useful." At the time he said this TIP had also been closed down, or was on the verge of being closed down, and its activists had been thrown into prison.

The bourgeois leadership attempted to place all the responsibility for the blow inflicted by the coup on the Marxist-Leninist cadre. Furthermore, they maintained their former ideological and political line in the new publication that came out, adapting it to new conditions. Practical activity again, as before, followed a rightist and capitulationist path, with this difference: it was to some extent illegal and although primarily in the cities, relatively more activity was directed towards the villages.

That is, PDA revisionism, adapting itself to new conditions, was transformed into **Shafak revisionism**.

Verbal and written criticism was infuriating the bourgeois leadership. They did not learn the necessary lessons from this criticism. They were hostile towards it and tried to suppress it, concealing it from cadres.

(For written criticism see: letter regarding "Liquidationist", let us Grasp correctly the Red Political Power Ideas of Chairman Mao, DABK February 1972 resolution)

The February resolution of East Anatolia Regional Committee, which was dominated by Marxist-Leninists, thoroughly agitated the bourgeois leadership. They immediately decided to confiscate the critique and hurriedly published a circular in response to it.

### **A Circular that is an illustration of hypocrisy and opportunism**

This circular was a new illustration of hypocrisy and opportunism. The bourgeois leadership was writhing like a snake amongst various ideas without recognition of anything like principle or stability. In this circular it appeared to accept many of the things that the Marxist-Leninists had constantly championed up to then, but had failed to get accepted. Moreover, it acted brazenly, as if it had maintained these from the start, accusing the Marxist-Leninists of "factionalism", "careerism" and "Trotskyism".

This circular was a model of hypocrisy and opportunism, for many of the correct ideas in it had been taken, **word for word**, from the critique of the Marxist-Leninists. If they had sincerely adopted these it would not have been necessary for them to attack the Marxist-Leninist cadres, and they should have been pleased.

For instance, some of the errors refuted in this circular existed in the February 1971 circular, which was recommended to cadre in this circular. Ideas that conflicted with those in this circular were still being advocated in other publications. If they had been sincere then they should not have embraced the vileness in other publications, and instead corrected it with a self-criticism. Since they did neither the former nor the latter it demonstrates that the purpose in publishing the circular was to stifle criticism and thoroughly conceal their revisionism.

They had been forced to follow a new and more insidious revisionist line, for some cadres who had read the DABK Resolution had wel-

came it warmly, seeing in it an escape from their cul-de-sac. Mr C.X. (A.N), a disciple of the bourgeois leadership, and the cadre in his region had vehement debates. Due to this person's bureaucratic and passive leadership the activity in the region was facing the threat of becoming disconnected from the revolutionary peasants. Cadre in the region criticised this person and the rightist line of the bourgeois leadership. They also made a self-criticism for participating in mistaken resolutions. This was the factor that impelled the bourgeois leadership to hurriedly publish the above circular. The events in Mr A.N.'s region could have been repeated in another region. They attempted to prevent such an occurrence with this circular which is an illustration of opportunism and hypocrisy.

Gentlemen! You are experts at lying, hypocrisy and fraud! But this expertise is worthless in the ranks of the proletariat! If you go and demonstrate your talents in the parties of the bourgeois and landlords, be sure they will warmly take you to their hearts. Don't waste your talents! Run as soon as you can to the side of those who will appreciate you! Great successes and triumphs await you!

The latest circular also continues to defend certain long term errors in addition to the opportunist denial and hypocrisy. This is the essential character of the circular that they keep extending towards us.

### **Who is "factionalist" or "divisive"?**

It is those who insist on the revisionist line that are the factionalist and divisive ones. Those who do not correct their mistakes and insist on not correcting them, despite all the criticism. Those who are factionalist and divisive are those who camouflage the revisionist essence with a new form only when they are forced into a corner, instead of making a sincere self-criticism.

Those who are factionalist are those who deny the facilities of the organisation to those cadres who criticise them while assisting in all ways those who flatter them.

Those who are factionalist and divisive are those who encourage blind obedience, flattery and fawning within the organisation. Those who are factionalist and divisive are those who endeavour to suppress internal criticism, those who conceal criticism of themselves from the cadre. Those who attempt to wear down those cadres who criticise them with a campaign of slander and gossip and to isolate them from other cadres. Those who are factionalist and divisive are those who prepare insidious plots for such cadres. Those who are factionalist and divisive are those who wish to implement the most extreme democracy for themselves, violating the principle of centralism, while wishing to implement the most extreme centralism on Marxist-Leninists. The bourgeois leadership has demonstrated with all these particularities a typical example of factionalism and divisiveness.

For instance, when there were arrests in a region where one of the Marxist-Leninist colleagues was active they made a fuss, saying: "disgraceful" but when there were arrests in a region where one of their disciples was in charge they say: "nothing much has happened, the revolution has its ups and downs", in an effort to save their disciples.

For instance, when the Marxist-Leninists asked for 3 thousand lira they caused a fuss, saying: "let us not rely on the membership fees of intellectuals in the cities", whereas on one occasion they did not hesitate to send 35 thousand lira to their own disciples.

For instance, they concocted insidious plans to expel Marxist-Leninist cadre, and after separation was confirmed they explained this factionalism by letting slip the words: "they were going to be thrown out anyway."

They stooped as low as to organise a treacherous armed plot for two colleagues whom they called to a discussion on 26 March 1972 "on protecting unity (!)".

They have given countless examples of factionalism and divisiveness. Today they pose innocently, attempting to convince the cadre that they always behaved with good intentions (!), did what they could to

prevent a split, and that it was us who insisted on factionalism and divisiveness (!). They make dramatic speeches on the subject of unity. They rain curses down on us. All this is to conceal from the cadres the fact that they have committed the worst acts of hypocrisy, fraud and betrayal. All this comes from the discomfort of guilt. In parties where incorrigible bourgeois are dominant it is not factionalism for Marxist-Leninists to unite amongst themselves and struggle against them. This is a historical task, and an indispensable obligation towards the proletariat and toiling people. It is the incorrigible bourgeois who are the factionalists, for on behalf of the interests of their own small cliques they have turned their backs on the interests of the proletariat and the toiling people, and wrecked their unity. When the interests of the people and the interests of the party conflict, Marxist-Leninists take the side of the interests of the people. This is not factionalism. To oppose the interests of the people in the name of party interests is factionalism.

The Marxist-Leninists wanted the people's interests and the interests of the party to be the same. This was only possible by separating the party from the path of capitulation and betrayal on which it had been put by the bourgeois leadership. Since it was impossible to correct the bourgeois leadership by means of criticism and persuasion what had to be done was to isolate the incorrigible ones, leave them alone on the paths leading to betrayal and unite the party and cadre on the path of revolution. Whoever deems this effort to be factionalism considers it as acceptable to betray the people. Yes, we want unity; this is our most exalted goal. But what kind of unity? A "unity" on the path of betrayal of the proletariat and toiling people? We will not be part of such a "unity". However much such a unity is divided, the better for it. The more the ringleaders of such betrayal are isolated the better. If the revisionist clique is accusing us of "divisiveness" for wrecking such a "unity" we will accept such an accusation gladly. We desire a unity that serves the proletariat and the people. We are the most relentless enemies of the wreckers of such unity. One of the reasons for the struggle we have

waged against the bourgeois leadership is its constant wrecking of such a unity, its wish for a "unity" on the path of betrayal of the people.

At the last discussion meeting at which organisational separation became final, the bourgeois leadership asked for a self-criticism from the Marxist-Leninists for "perpetrating factionalism". Marxist-Leninists do not make a self-criticism for waging a struggle against revisionism. On the contrary, they will make a self-criticism when they do not wage a struggle against revisionism or wage an insufficient struggle, or when they fall into revisionist errors. For this reason the bourgeois leadership's request was rejected. The accusation of factionalism was also rejected.

The bourgeois leadership demanded the Marxist-Leninists unconditionally obey the results of a congress that would gather in the future. In proletarian parties such things cannot even be discussed. But revisionism had ensconced itself around the head of our party. These revisionist bourgeois elements had selected the delegates of the congress in a factionalist manner. Nearly all of them were themselves and their disciples. Only one or two of the Marxist-Leninists were to be able to attend the congress. They wanted this factionalist stance to be changed, and for the names they nominated to attend the conference. On this condition they said they would accept unconditionally the outcome of the congress. Their proposals were rejected. The benefits expected from the Congress by the Marxist-Leninists were as follows: to convey revolutionary ideas to all the cadre, and either to get rid of the incorrigible revisionist leadership and establish a revolutionary leadership, or go to a new organisation with cadres won to the ranks, because it was not possible for two ideologies and policies separated by definite lines to live in peace under the roof of the same organisation. Either one was to dominate, or the other. As it was not possible to correct or persuade the deviationists, that is, as they had proved by their behaviour that they were incorrigible opportunists, there remained a single path to serve the people: that was to take the internal power of the organisation from the incorrigibles and cleanse the organisation of them. This is a power struggle

between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Those who recognise this right to the bourgeoisie but not to the proletariat are open or covert enemies of the people.

The congress would not have provided any benefit for the Marxist-Leninists. The bourgeois leadership would have made the revisionist line the final resolution of the Congress, relying on the majority it had ensured. The Marxist-Leninists would not even have been able to express their ideas to such a noisy majority. Even if they had been able to these ideas would have been stifled and remained between the four walls.

Furthermore, the Marxist-Leninists no longer had any rights within the organisation. The revisionist leadership had perfected the art of taking away their right of criticism, resorting to all means to prevent this criticism reaching the cadres, plotting insidiously against them, trampling on the principles of democratic centralism. What was called party discipline was in fact bourgeois disciplining of the ideas of the proletariat.

Under these conditions it was both impossible and of no use to remain within the organisation and continue the struggle. The path of service to the proletariat and the people was to separate from the revisionist clique organisationally. And the Marxist-Leninists did this. They rejected bourgeois discipline and decided to struggle against it from the front.

Bourgeois gentlemen who say we are "divisive and factionalist"! First of all prove you are not incorrigible revisionists. Prove that the thing you call party discipline does not conflict with the interests of the proletariat and toiling people! As long as you cannot prove this your accusations of divisiveness and factionalism will be no more than slander and your name will remain as common slanderers.

This is the challenge!

## The Main Points on Which We Disagree With Shafak Revisionism

As the DABK February Resolution concisely expresses certain theoretical and practical questions regarding which we differ from Shafak revisionism and also since it led to long debate we are including it in full.

### DABK February Resolution

The DABK which assembled on 7-8 February 1972 passed the following resolutions:

**1- In general in the world and particularly in Turkey objective conditions are now ideal for the revolution. Imperialism and the reactionaries are being dragged from crisis to crisis all over the world, as a result they are engaging in ferocious assaults on the working class and all revolutionary peoples; as for the working class and the revolutionary peoples, including the peoples of Turkey, they are rising to their feet and responding to reactionary violence with revolutionary violence. Many oppressed peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America are waging armed struggles under the leadership of the working class.**

**2- In our country, too, the struggle of the workers, impoverished peasants, and other revolutionary classes and strata has rapidly grown in the last few years, become increasingly violent and, in places, armed clashes have occurred. Now a large majority of our working class and impoverished peasantry have understood that their liberation will only come about through armed struggle. Today a communist movement that does not lead the peasant masses in the rural areas and organise a decisive, consistent and determined armed struggle cannot be worthy of the adjective communist and will become isolated from the revolutionary masses. Today a current that does not take the revolutionary struggle in our country to a very significant point, the path of the armed struggle, will be iso-**

lated from the masses, even if by name it is a communist movement.

3-In these circumstances, our movement, instead of moving to the head of the peasant masses in a bold and decisive way and mobilising them for an armed guerrilla struggle, is continuing its rightist errors, giving them a new form appropriate to the new conditions. Since legal educational work at the magazine is no longer possible this has been replaced by clandestine and semi-clandestine educational work which is becoming increasingly systemic. As for armed struggle, it is merely talked about, as before. The clandestine reading activity is not developing as an activity that serves the armed struggle, that strengthens and develops it, but as one that hobbles, prevents and regress' it. This is because the education groups, just as they are not organs to direct an armed struggle, are also not in a position to maintain their existence under counter-revolutionary attacks that will occur with the commencement of the armed struggle, on account of their flabby and semi-legal structure. In this case the concern that they will be dispersed leads to a rightist error in the form of postponing the armed struggle. In this way we are weaving barbed wire in front of us with our own hands. In future we shall either trample on this barbed wire and advance or be imprisoned behind it.

4-On the other hand this rightist error, the mistake of postponing the armed struggle to an unknown date in the future, is being supported and consolidated with new proof. This is reactionary proof such as: in order to launch the armed struggle "it is necessary to organise nationwide", "to first dry out the steppes, then set them alight". All this is a denial of the thesis that both the party and the army will be constructed, developed and may become steely within the armed struggle. An organisation that does not develop within the armed struggle will today be a hollow organisation condemned to be demolished by a few reactionary blows. Again this proof is a covert denial of the thesis that the revolution will develop in an un-

balanced way, developing in some places earlier than in others, with power being seized bit by bit. It is also a denial of the stupendous role of the armed struggle commencing in some rural areas in drying out the other areas of the plains.

A disciplined party with roots in the masses, freed of subjectivism, revisionism and opportunism, that implements self-criticism, will develop and grow within armed conflict. In this way it will throw out the stale, take on fresh blood and free itself of bourgeois elements. In this way it will gather around it the most progressive elements, communist leaders and militants.

The people's armed forces, from small to large, from weak to strong from irregular guerrilla units to regular army units, will develop along with the armed struggle. On this subject comrade Mao Tse-tung says the following:

*"In these years the development, consolidation and bolshevization of our Party have proceeded in the midst of revolutionary wars; without armed struggle the Communist Party would assuredly not be what it is today. Comrades throughout the Party must never forget this experience for which we have paid in blood."* (Mao Tse-Tung, Selected Works II)

5-The organisation of reading and peaceful education work also shows itself in the policy of cadres. Instead of breaking the reactionary links of local militant cadre and drawing them into the professional struggle compromise is made with their reactionary ties, such cadre are being blunted and their energies extinguished. With advice such as "wait a little," "also read this book" or "make contact with such and such a person" people with the gift of the gab cut off from the class struggle are being produced. However, with the latest martial law 90 per cent of these cadres have been discarded. Consequently, neither these cadres developing sufficiently, nor can the cadre needs of our movement be met.

6-On the question of "People's United Front" the old rightist, ca-

pitulationist perception is still current. The people's united front cannot be realised without a fundamental alliance of workers and peasants under proletarian leadership and in one or in several areas the forming of red political power. To argue to the contrary is to rely on the bourgeoisie, lose independence and give the initiative to the reactionaries, instead of "being self-reliant, preserving independence and holding the initiative". What is lacking in our country in order for red political power to be born is "a strong party pursuing a correct line" and "a powerful red army". All the other conditions for red political power in the various rural areas of our country exist - a strong mass base, economic resources for self-reliance and terrain suitable for military activity. In this respect our main, primary task today is the construction of the party and army within the armed struggle.

7- *"Fight, fail, fight again, fail again, fight again . . . till their victory; that is the logic of the people, and they too will never go against this logic. This is another Marxist law. The Russian people's revolution followed this law, and so has the Chinese people's revolution."* (Mao Tse-Tung, Selected Works IV)

The revolution of the peoples of Turkey will also follow this law. In our ranks there is a long-existing and still influential perception of achieving victory without any failure and without suffering even a nose bleed. This is one of the reasons for the view that: "let us first organise nationwide, then commence the armed struggle", or else we'll fail, or "first let us dry out the plain, then set it alight" or else we'll fail. This perception constantly drags our movement to the right, constituting the ideological source of passivity, lack of action, inertia and the constant putting to the fore of peaceful methods. The fact that people's war is a long, harsh, difficulty struggle, although often repeated has, in reality, not been grasped. This also means that a series of defeats and failures is passed through. We should firstly endeavour not to make mistakes and not to suffer failure emanating from these mistakes.

Secondly, we should not fear suffering failure and accept this risk.

Thirdly, we should know how to take lessons from failures. To avoid active struggle out of fear of failure is a passive position.

8-Revolution will be the work of the masses. This truth does not justify the rightist view that "the armed struggle cannot be commenced without all the masses along side us", and does not mean that every individual who participates in the revolutionary struggle entirely grasps the meaning, importance and all the consequences of the revolution, and that they "consider all the possible outcomes".

Lenin accused this perception of "being stupid and stuck up", continuing:

"So one army lines up in one place and says, "We are for socialism", and another, somewhere else and says, "We are for imperialism", and that will be a social revolution!" (Lenin collected works Vol. 22)

This is to make the social revolution impossible. Again Lenin says that many of those who join the revolution will bring their petit-bourgeois prejudices with them and that these will not disappear immediately after the revolution. He says that many different people joined the 1905 revolution, those who received money from Japan, adventurers, all for different reasons but they all attacked the same target. The vanguard role of the proletariat is to unite these various elements and to direct their joint attacks, he says. Whereas in our ranks the perception exist of a "mass line" which makes the social revolution impossible whereby it is expected that every individual who joins the struggle will know socialism and understand the aims of the revolution and all its consequences, and "need to accept all possible results from the beginning", just as Lenin criticised, and this is not a "revolutionary" line, it is a line that "hobbles" the revolution and should not be permitted.

9-Our urgent tasks should consist of: rural areas that have a strong mass base, self-sufficient economic resources and terrain that

is suitable for military activity should be selected and most of the professional cadre of the party mobilised in these areas. In these areas the link to be grasped is that armed struggle organisations, that is, guerrilla units should be established from the start. After a short propaganda and agitation activity, if necessary, guerrilla actions should be embarked upon. All the other forms of organisation, illegal reading groups, cells printing, transporting and distributing publications etc. etc ... should be addressed in a manner that responds to the needs of guerrilla activity and to support and consolidate it. The most progressive elements in the areas selected for this purpose should immediately be disconnected from all reactionary ties and drawn into professional activity.

Progressive workers and leading cadre in the cities (not useless, wavering, dependent, backward and inexperienced elements), the great majority of them should be sent to the rural areas to organise the peasants' armed struggle. All of the movement's means should be mobilised for this purpose.

**10-This meeting calls the attention of all party comrades and the Central Committee to the rightist errors we have summarised. The committees under DABK and other comrades should re-evaluate their activities in the light of the resolutions of this meeting, launch a relentless war against errors, defeat them and advance with decisive, bold, obstinate and appropriate steps on the correct path. This is what our people expect of us.**

As we have mentioned previously, the Shafak revisionists appeared to accept a significant section of the above criticisms in the circular which constituted a response to this resolution. On the other hand, they claim that all publications that conflict with this circular are correct. "The Shafak newspapers, publications, Party Circulars and other articles constitute our ideological and political line," they say. In that case, when criticising Shafak revisionism we have the right to cite all these publications.

### **1. Shafak Revisionism Defends in its Entirely the Rightist Line of the Past.**

The Shafak Revisionists see the struggle between the TIP and M.Belli cliques, the struggle between two revisionist cliques, as a struggle between opportunists and **proletarian revolutionaries!** According to the Shafak revisionists, M.Belli represented the proletarian revolutionary line against the TIP (see: Our country Turkey is a semi-feudal, semi-dependent country under fascist Tyranny, pages 6-7-8). The bourgeois leadership is thus trying to exonerate its Mihriist past.

The same pamphlet presents the rightist line being followed in subsequent periods as a correct line. The same things are also being defended verbally.

What is clear is that Shafak revisionism has learned not even one tiny lesson from the past. It is tied to its rightist and capitulationist former line by thousands of links. It is prepared to defend the same things as soon as it deems conditions are right. It means that Shafak revisionism assumes it can make M.Belli's theory of a non-capitalist path compatible with proletarian revolutionary ideas. It accepts M.Belli's dominant nation nationalism as correct and revolutionary. It deems his supra-class theories on the army and state to be revolutionary. It sees his efforts to utilise the struggle of the youth for his junta ambitions as proletarian revolutionism. It does not consider his rejection of the revolutionary role of the peasantry, his rejection of people's war, rejection of the party of the proletariat and his applause of Soviet social-imperialism as socialism as contrary to proletarian revolutionism.

It sees its former legalism, amateurishness, tailing of the bourgeoisie, belittling of activities in the rural areas, pacifist animosity to all active action, unconditional support of reformist trade unions, following of spontaneous mass actions, Boratavism, rejection of land revolution and people's war, and slavish pursuing of Kivilcimli as the natural necessity of proletarian revolutionism (!).

Shafak revisionism praises its anti-Marxist-Leninist analyses of fascism and its tactics (!) for struggle against fascism as “being entirely correct and also valid today” (see booklet p.14)

Shafak revisionism finds the Socialist Conference and efforts to form a legal party correct. We have indicated above how vehemently Mr. A.Z extolled the Socialist Conference. During the debate in which organisational separation become final Mr B.Y. said: “The Socialist Conference initiative was correct, if the same conditions return this slogan may again be used and a legal party may be established.” Mr. L.R. also agreed with them. In another debate Mr. A.N, going even further, maintained that in the event of a return to pre-martial law conditions a legal party could be formed and that this party could even go into parliament. As is known the pre-martial law conditions were conditions where the revolutionary wave had swollen and, in parallel to that, fascist oppression was out of control. That is, ideal conditions for the armed struggle.

In a rag attacking us the Socialist Conference clowning was defended thus:

“The Socialist Conference was carried out for the purpose of gathering together revolutionaries and local cadres on the basis of Mao-Tse-tung Thought. In order to ensure this unity during a period when the working class and revolutionaries desired unity...”

If the first sentence had read:” The Socialist Conference was held for the purpose of rescuing revolutionaries and local cadre from the morass of legalism and stifling it” it would have been much more correct. The second sentence is complete nonsense. In which period do the working class and revolutionaries not want unity? To attempt to justify the Socialist Conference on such grounds is equal to not defending it at all. Since you still consider the Socialist Conference and attempts to form a party correct disproves the following allegations: 1) The Socialist Conference is to sink into the morass of legalism. 2) The Socialist Conference is a call for peace between opportunist cliques. 3) Unity amongst revolutionaries can never be achieved by means of a Socialist Confer-

ence. 4) The Socialist Conference is a barrier set down in front of the armed struggle. 5) It is akin to serving up cadres on a plate to the swelling appetite of fascism. That is, betrayal. 6) To pass a resolution calling for a Socialist Conference two weeks before martial law is, at the very least, lacking in far sightedness.

The consequences that are to be attributed to Shafak revisionism from all of the above are these: firstly, Shafak revisionism still carries in its body the microbes of its pre-martial law illnesses. These have not been got rid of. As soon as it sees suitable conditions it is inevitable that these will reactivate and the whole body will be disabled by its former illnesses.

Secondly, Shafak revisionism shamefully trampled on one of the primary tenets of Marxist-Leninist parties, the principle of self-criticism. The attitude a party takes to its own mistakes is a measure of that party’s loyalty to the proletarian cause. The Shafak revisionists, by jealously defending their errors, documented once again the fact that they saw their own small clique interests as more important than the interests of the people, that they did not take seriously the cause of the people and that they were not the party of broad working masses but the party of a small interest network. The fate of such parties is to collapse and disappear.

## **2. The Organisational Policy of the Shafak Revisionists is to organise the workers and peasants in the form of Study Groups.**

The formerly legal educational work carried out at the magazine has now commenced in a semi-clandestine way amongst workers and peasants. They have embarked on raising intellectuals disconnected to the class struggle by organising the workers and peasants in study groups. These groups cannot be organs of armed struggle and in the event of a launching of the armed struggle will lack the strength to protect themselves against the increasing reactionary repression. For this reason, the concern that these groups will disappear, they have constantly hobbled

the armed struggle.

“The study groups will, on the one hand, ensure the Marxist-Leninist training of progressive elements of our people, supporters and backward workers and, on the other, fulfil the practical tasks necessitated by our revolutionary struggle.”

This is the organisational policy of revisionism in the new conditions! This is the manifestation in the organisational sphere of a perception that constantly delays the armed struggle.

The Marxist-Leninists maintained the following, criticising this reactionary organisational policy: the link we must grasp in organisation is to establish guerrilla units under the leadership of the party. All other groups and cells must take on a supportive role of the guerrilla activities. And everyone must organise around clear tasks appropriate to the needs of the movement and their own talents.

An organisation that is not based on specialisation, where everyone does everything, is contrary to the tenets of Leninist organisation. Such organisations are of no use except for making a lot of noise.

Study groups, in addition to having a cumbersome and passive character that hobbles armed struggle, also possess this speciality: “On the other hand they will fulfil the practical tasks necessitated by our revolutionary struggle.”

In response to these criticisms the Shafak revisionists swerved, saying “(names such as) ‘Study Group’ and Education Group should be abandoned, as such titles may awaken backward consciousness!” And they suggested the title “peasant committees” instead of “study groups.” The bourgeois gentlemen assume that the character of a thing will change along with its name. Changing the form rather than the essence! This is the policy Shafak revisionism has followed from the start.

Some members of this revisionist clique make the following listing with a mechanic mind fitting of bourgeois:

“Initially study groups should be established. Those attending these groups should be provided with a general grasp of Marxism-Leninism,

experience in struggle against the police should be ensured, they should be tried out in these groups and only those who are deemed worthy should be subsequently organised in guerrilla groups.”

It’s the limit! From whichever angle you look it’s a nonsensical theory. If one must adhere to this theory it means it will be necessary to reject peasants who are full of anger at their class enemies and wish to join the armed struggle, accepting party and organisational discipline saying:” No! First learn Marxism-Leninism, gain experience against the police!” If hundreds of thousands of illiterate peasants, deadened by feudalism, wish to take up arms against the landlords, gentry and central authority it will fall to us to immediately take their weapons, slap them about the face a few times for their insolence (!), and then drag them by their collars to study groups. The reactionary essence of the above theory is evident. Furthermore, by means of pacifist education work very few peasants will be developed in a few years time. Since a section of them will drop out very few will remain to join the guerrilla groups. Isn’t this making the armed struggle impossible? If this is not standing in front of peasants who wish to take up arms, calming their anger, blunting their resentment and pacifising them then what is it?

Besides, it cannot be claimed that a person who is successful in study groups will definitely be any use in the armed struggle. That is, trying out in education groups is not a correct method of testing. In general literate, better off peasants, intellectual elements, teachers etc. are prominent and the impoverished peasants are unsuccessful.

Because we reject this rightist, bureaucratic, cumbersome and passive organisational policy they claim we say “there is no need for revolutionary mass work”. We have learned that **by revolutionary mass work** they understand having intellectual chats with well off peasants and the literate group which are disconnected from the class struggle. Yes, we are saying there is no need for such revolutionary mass work (!).

This bunch of frauds also claims that we reject the principle i.e. “Political work is the vital part of all work”. No! We reject intellectual gar-

rulousness that is disconnected from the class struggle. We say that ideological and political work should be linked to practical struggle, that it should serve it and light up its path. There is no clear limit or end to ideological and political work. Every task group, every cell, every guerrilla detachment should on the one hand carry out practical activity in its sphere, and on the other be subjected to constant education. And this education should continue after the success of the revolution, under the proletarian dictatorship and during the construction of socialism. Education should not happen just for the sake of it. The crude mechanical logic of the bourgeois gentlemen may not be able to grasp this, but it is the truth.

### **3. The Shafak Revisionists are turning the vague “Village Committees” into a remedy for all ills.**

“Treasury land will be distributed to peasants or be made into popular farms under the supervision of village committees “(Draft Programme).

“We should establish village committees to direct the peasants’ struggle in every village.” (Land Revolution Programme)

“Village committees will direct the implementation of the Land Revolution Programme and distribution work. Farm labourers, impoverished peasants and middle peasants will elect village committees in every village...Forests, lakes, streams and pastures will pass into the direction of the village committees...”

Are the “village committees” village party committees, organs of armed struggle, study groups, distribution groups? It is not clear.

The revisionists, as can be seen, are sorting out all the problems of organisation by means of “village committees” at a stroke (!).

This demonstrates that the Shafak revisionists are completely ignorant on the subject of how to organise the peasants. On this most important question of our revolution they are helpless and in a pitiable state.

The Marxist-Leninists’ policy regarding organisation amongst the

peasants is clear. To organise village party committees in every village. Also to organise armed struggle detachments, that is, village militias, linked to production, from revolutionary impoverished peasants both party and non-party. To organise various groups and cells that will serve the armed struggle from party and non-party elements linked to the village party committee. Also, to organise professional guerrilla units connected to the party committee in the area, not based on the village. The purpose of all this organisational activity is to construct the party and popular armed forces amongst impoverished peasants and agricultural labourers.

This construction will be within the armed struggle, not within peace. And the link that the party organisation should understand in organising the peasants is to organise guerrilla units and village militias. Village organs of power are a completely different thing and are not a question for the present.

The bourgeois gentlemen accuse us of Guevarism, focoism and following the THKP-THKC and THKO.

In order to prove this they need to show a resemblance between our organisational plan and that of those organisations. If they cannot do this they will remain as low slanderers and we will have the right to spit in their faces.

### **4. The Shafak Revisionists make it a condition in order to launch the armed struggle that there is nationwide organisation and that it is in command of all the masses.**

We have indicated above that Mr. B.Y., one of the ringleaders of the revisionist clique, in an article summarising the experience of the Chinese Revolution, distorted comrade Mao Tse-tung’s condition for the survival of a red political administration “a sound party organisation”, into a party organised on a nationwide basis”. The bourgeois leadership, since it sees the existential conditions for red political power as one and the same thing as the conditions for the launching of the armed struggle,

places the above distortion as an obstacle in front of the wish to commence the armed struggle. We have mentioned the fact that the thesis “without nationwide organisation the armed struggle cannot be launched” was defended with emphasis at the April Meeting.

The latest document of this rightist, pacifist perception which delays the launch of the armed struggle for years is an article headed “On the Question of the Establishing of Red Political Power”.

This article has been crammed with nonsense, distortions and contradictions. There is the following:

### “The Rise of the Revolutionary Movement Nationwide”

...Comrade Mao Tse-Tung points out that the survival of red political power depends on the nationwide development of the revolutionary movement. “What we will dwell upon in particular at this juncture is the rise of the revolutionary movement on a **national scale**. Some colleagues imagined that by dispersing the revolutionary movement and with work in a few villages as if going into a mouse hole the revolution would be accomplished. However, the existence of a political current that makes itself heard all over the country is essential. This can only be the political party of the proletariat...The denial of the party means a denial of the necessity to unite the struggle on a **nationwide basis** and direct it to a single goal. They assume that the people will spontaneously follow an armed struggle launched by a handful of intellectuals disconnected from each other..

**The presence of a revolutionary movement nationwide does not mean that it carries out work everywhere in the country or gives the same emphasis to each region.**

It is making its existence as a political party felt and demonstrated to all the people of the country and orienting itself towards the goal of establishing a revolutionary administration on a national basis. For instance, a peasant movement not supported by a struggle in the cities would be inevitably suppressed. For instance, a peasant uprising in the

Eastern region, if it were not supported by a struggle of the peasants in the Aegean and Cukorova regions and a working class movement in our main industrial cities under the leadership of a proletarian party it could not realise red political power. For only a revolutionary movement growing nationwide will smash and defeat reactionary government and its main force, the army...

“In conclusion we can say that red political power may only be established by a struggle directed and united by the proletarian party on a nationwide scale, not by a political struggle waged from emplacements”

In this article:

1. One of Comrade Mao Tse-tung’s conditions for the “existence of red political power”, the rise of the **revolutionary situation (ibid)** nationwide”, has been deliberately distorted into the form of “the rise of the **revolutionary movement nationwide**.”

2-The expression “**the rise of the revolutionary movement nationwide**” has been distorted a second time, into the form, “organisation of the communist party nationwide”. As is known, the term “revolutionary movement” includes the political movements of popular classes outside the proletariat and spontaneous mass actions.

3-Conflicting views have been put forward regarding “organising nationwide”. A nonsensical theory was invented in the form of both “not carrying out work everywhere in the country”, “being heard nationwide”, “to make its existence felt and demonstrated to all the people of the country and to **orient** towards the goal of establishing a revolutionary government nationwide”, and in reality with the examples given the idea has been expressed of organising everywhere in the country. .

4-The condition “organising nationwide and reaching the state of being in command of all the masses” has been set forth as a condition both for the launch of the armed struggle and the existence of red political power . In this way, comrade Mao Tse-tung’s doctrine on the “existence of red political power” has been distorted once more. There is only one aim of all this distortion and nonsensical theories full of

contradictions: This is to try to justify the rightist view “armed struggle will not be launched without nationwide organisation” by relying (!) on comrade Mao Tse-tung. Since Mao said that red political power could not exist without the communist party organising nationwide (!), and since the condition for commencing the armed struggle is the same as for the existence of red political power, it means that the armed struggle cannot be commenced without the communist party organising nationwide (!). This is the logic. However, what comrade Mao Tse-tung said was entirely different: he said: “one of the conditions for the existence of red political power is the continuing rise of the revolutionary situation nationwide.” The distortion we have pointed out in articles one and two are clear. Let us dwell on the distortion and fabricated theories in articles three and four.

#### **What is nationwide organisation?**

For Marxist-Leninists “nationwide organisation” has only one meaning: that is organisation in every, or nearly every, province and district of the country. For instance, it is said that the RSDIP was organised in this or that province on such an such a date, and in those provinces on such and such a date, and in those provinces on such and such a date. For instance, the TKP was organised in such and such places etc..

The person at the head of revisionism is capable of distorting even such a clear truth. “Organising nationwide is “not carrying out work everywhere in the country”, “being heard nationwide”, “making its existence felt and demonstrated to all the people of the country and to **orient** towards the goal of establishing a revolutionary government nationwide”.

This is such a nonsensical theory that, with this logic, in the event of half a dozen people publishing a joint statement it would be necessary to deem them as organised nationwide. For even a single statement is enough to “make heard” or “make the existence felt” nationwide or even worldwide. Also, however organised any party may be, “it directs itself

towards establishing political power country wide”, as hardly any party will **direct itself** towards a different goal.

A party, even if it consists of only a handful of people, once it has been established, will “orient towards the goal of forming a political government”. Does our gentleman think that a party **might orient** towards any other goal?

According to the above recipe (in Turkey), all groups “that have made known and demonstrated their existence”, including a small group that carried out a four and a half million robbery, is organised (!) throughout the country. Mr A.N. went as far as to claim that at the time the article was written “the Shafak movement was organised nationwide” in order to support this nonsensical theory. Revisionism is thus becoming ridiculous and pitiful.

The revisionists are now trying to worm their way out of this nonsense: “The THKP and similar groups’ voice has been heard in the form wanted by the police.” Let us accept that this is the case, what will it change? We are debating in general what is meant by a party organising nationwide, not whether the THKP is organised nationwide. It is even beyond the subject of this debate whether a party is revolutionary or reactionary, because the meaning of nationwide organisation is the same for every party.

But the revisionists do not themselves believe what they say. However demagogic the disguises they try to make up they do not conceal the fact that by nationwide organisation they mean organising in every place in the country.

“The denial of the party implies a denial of the need to unite the struggle nationwide and orient towards a single goal.”

With this sentence it emerges that they see being organised in every part of the country within the concept of Party. “The uniting of the struggle countrywide” is only possible with organising in every part of the country and being in command of the masses. If denial of the party is denial of this it means it **includes the concept of party, organising all**

**over the country and being in command of the masses.** This view is at least as nonsensical as the above theory, because it is a denial of the party spreading to every corner of the country after a long period of struggle and its being in command of the masses.

On the other hand look at these examples:

“For instance, a peasant movement without the support of the **struggle in the cities** is bound to be suppressed. For instance, a peasant uprising in the **Eastern region**, if it were not supported by a **struggle of the peasants in the Aegean and Cukorova regions and a working class movement in our main industrial cities under the leadership of a proletarian party** it could not realise red political power. For only a revolutionary movement growing nationwide will smash and defeat the reactionary government and its main force, the army...

Demagogy cannot conceal the real meaning of these words. If the support of the **struggle in the cities** is necessary in order for a peasant movement not to be suppressed, then **the party should be organised in the cities and furthermore should be in command of the masses.** Again, in order for a peasant rebellion in the East to achieve success, **it is necessary to be organised in the villages of Cukurova and the Aegean and in the main industrial cities and be in command of the masses.** The conclusion reached by this series of logic is clear. For the success of any peasant movement **it is necessary in all cities, in the main industrial cities and in rural areas to be organised and to become in command of the masses.** However, if a revolutionary movement smashes the reactionary government and brings it down it **should be organised in every corner of the country and be in command of the masses.**

The person at the head of revisionism, however much he tries to squirm and prevent the truth from emerging, with his phrase “organising nationwide” he means organising everywhere or almost everywhere in the country and becoming in command of the masses. He, even, as we have mentioned above, sees this meaning as within the concept of party.

and in this way rejects that the party will spread to all parts of the country and become in command of the masses within a comparatively long struggle. He is thinking of the party in its most perfect state and thus rejecting the laws of dialectic development.

Following this accusation some of the revisionists will leap to their feet, pointing their fingers towards our eyes, and say, and try to mention evidence, that “We have written that the party will be constructed in struggle.” So, gentlemen, what does this demonstrate? That you are on the right road? No! Only that you are vacillating in inconsistencies, bent under contradictory ideas and are unable to distinguish the straight from the crooked.

So what is the reason for this fabricated theory, which is not adopted by even the author of such nonsense as “organising nationwide” and “being heard nationwide”, being put forward? It is this: an effort to justify the rightist and pacifist line that says: “the armed struggle cannot be launched without organisation nationwide and being in command of the masses. In this way, they will rescue themselves from being responsible for the rightist theory that delays the armed struggle for years by saying “We didn’t mean this; we meant that, when saying organisation nationwide”. That is, the person at the head of revisionism wished to prepare an escape bridge for himself and his disciples in the face of intensive attacks by the Marxist-Leninists on this point. But as you can see, this bridge is so rotten that whoever crosses it will fall into the morass of revisionism. As we shall see a little later Mr A.Z. realised how rotten the bridge was and abandoned it.

Let us come to the fourth point: the condition of “organising nationwide and coming to command the masses” has been set forth as a condition both for the launching of the armed struggle and for the existence of red political power, we have said. In the article, it is said that: “they assume that the people will spontaneously follow an armed struggle launched by a disconnected handful of intellectuals.” What is the question that our revisionist gentlemen are debating here? Isn’t it the

**launching of the armed struggle?** Yes, the people will not spontaneously follow an armed struggle launched by a handful of intellectuals who are disconnected from each other. This is not a proper way of doing things, but this is not the point the revisionist gentlemen are dwelling upon.. By caricaturing the worst opposition view they are trying to justify their own dodgy theories and as can be understood from the sentence they are directly making “the launching of the armed struggle” the subject of argument.

In the article it is said that “**a peasant movement** unsupported by a struggle in the cities **is doomed to be suppressed**”. What is meant by “a peasant movement”? Of course an armed peasant struggle. In that case, **without organisation in the cities and becoming in command of the masses**” “a peasant movement”, that is, an armed peasant movement, “is bound to be suppressed”. Since it would be stupidity to embark on an action that was doomed from the start, there should never be a peasant movement without organisation in the cities and command of the masses. This is abundantly clear.

In the article it is said: “For instance, a peasant uprising in the Eastern region, if it were not supported by a struggle of the peasants in the Aegean and Cukorova regions and a working class movement in our main industrial cities under the leadership of a proletarian party it could not realise red political power.”

The meaning of this opportunistic phrase is as follows:

1- The revisionists are considering “a peasant movement” only as a total peasant rebellion.

2- They are thinking of an armed peasant rebellion immediately leading to a red political administration and enabling it to survive.

3-They are laying down as a condition for a peasant rebellion immediately leading to a red political administration and enabling it to survive the support of peasants’ struggles in other areas and of the workers in the main industrial cities under the leadership of the proletarian party. “Because only a revolutionary movement rising on a country wide level

will smash the reactionary government and its main force, the army “.

The revisionists do not consider that for a red political administration to be born, a protracted guerrilla activity, developing from small to large, from weak to powerful, from simple to complex, involving the step by step construction of a people’s army, from guerrilla units to a regular army, is necessary.

They don’t even think about this. For a red political power to be born in a region they see it as a condition that there is a mass peasant uprising in that region. And in order for such an uprising to result in a “red political administration” it is **necessary to be organised in the other rural regions of the country, in the main industrial cities and to be in command of the popular struggle in all these places (!)**

A “peasant rebellion” in a single region cannot “bring about red political power (!)”. In that case peasants should on no account attempt revolt (!) and we should not try to create a peasants’ revolt (!) etc.

On the other hand it is a condition that there is a party in order to launch the armed struggle. As for the party, “it is something that unites the struggle countrywide and directs it toward a single goal.” In that case, without such a party an armed struggle cannot be launched. The author says this in an opportunist style!

The revisionist logic that both claim an armed struggle cannot be embarked upon without “nationwide organisation and command of the entire popular struggle”, and that connected to this red political power cannot exist, works like this.

The Shafak revisionists, since in the founding years of the party and for a comparatively long period there will not be organisation on a nationwide scale and, consequently, the party will not be able to unite it, only being able to gain this **quality** during an armed struggle, therefore reject being able to launch an armed struggle in advanced rural areas in a period when this quality has yet to be attained.

Of course we wish for the party to be organised all over the country and for it to come to command the masses.

The revisionist leadership, after defending the above rightist and pacifist thesis for a long period both verbally and in writing, in response to the attacks of the Marxist-Leninists began to seek escape routes. As we have mentioned before it wanted to save its neck by distorting the concept of “nationwide organisation “. It didn’t work. Now it has found a new route, with a **“circular that is an example of opportunism and hypocrisy “**.

In the circular in question is said: “To wait for an organisation to be established countrywide in order to embark on armed struggle is not a Marxist-Leninist position”. If they have begun to think like this isn’t it necessary for them to make a sincere self-criticism? No! On the one hand they say this and on the other they claim the views in the article we are examining are entirely correct.

What disgusting falsification!

We wish to ask these gentlemen with the above sentence do they mean that “it is not a Marxist-Leninist position **to wait until it is heard of on a countrywide basis** before embarking on an armed struggle?

The revisionists have in reality not changed their ideas. The rag that they published in order to criticise us is proof of this. In this rag they claim we support a “localised” struggle: “since the ruling classes will mobilise all their forces to that area and **as these force have not been smashed by the struggle in other places and in the cities it will lead to the destruction of the struggle being waged.**”

For a start we are not **in favour** of waging a regional struggle, it is that the conditions in which we find ourselves render such a struggle obligatory. Today, since it is not possible to organise in every corner of the country and since it will do more harm than good to disperse our forces to regions where the revolution will be unable to develop initially we advocate organising as far as our strength permits in areas where the revolution will develop first and embarking on armed struggle. We have explained this many times. Being organised on a countrywide scale will of course positively affect the development of the armed struggle.

The fact that our organisation has yet to spread all over the country will of course negatively affect the development of the armed struggle. But to embark upon armed struggle without being organised nationwide will not, as the revisionists claim, lead to the inevitable destruction of our forces. On the condition of following a correct policy we may commence armed struggle while our organisation is still very limited and expand and consolidate both our forces and our organisation within the armed struggle. A sound organisational form will come into being in this way. Organising in peace is hollow. Such an organisation, even were it to embrace the whole country, would be unable to provide leadership to the popular struggle or direct the armed struggle and would collapse like a house of cards when the white terror intensified.

With their above expressions the revisionists accept that without a struggle in “other places and cities, that is, without organising **in other places and cities** and coming to command the popular struggle the destruction of an armed struggle embarked upon in certain advanced regions is inevitable. Like a fox that wanders off and returns to the fur shop the revisionists too, are hung up on the idea that the armed struggle cannot be launched without nationwide organisation and command of the masses.

The revisionist frauds claim we have said: “professional cadre everywhere...should be mobilised to one place” and put these words in quotation marks as if we expressed them. Such a thing has never been said anywhere. They possess written texts. Why are they scared of quoting our views honestly?

We said that a **significant proportion** (not all) of our cadre should be mobilised to rural areas (not a single area) with a strong mass base, self-sufficient food resources and terrain suitable for military activity. The number of our cadre and our possibilities will determine how many areas we will be able to work in. The more active cadre we have the more areas they will be mobilised to. We have not given a figure on this subject. And of course it would be a good thing to have numerous

areas being worked in. But even if we mobilise the entire cadre today we cannot become organised in the entire country and cannot command all the masses. Are we not to commence the armed struggle because this is the situation? This is the question. We say that however many areas we have managed to mobilise to we should launch the armed struggle there. As for the Shafak revisionists, despite all their squirming, they have come back to saying “without nationwide organisation and command of the masses the armed struggle cannot be launched”. In this way they are postponing the armed struggle for years. This is the essence of the question.

### **5. The Shafak Revisionists are Distorting the Leninist Doctrine of “Revolutionary Situation”**

The Shafak revisionists, in order to prove their thesis that “without nationwide organisation and command of the masses the armed struggle cannot be launched”, have committed distortion after distortion.

1) They distorted comrade Mao Tse-tung’s condition for the “existence of red political power” i.e. “the upsurge of the revolutionary situation nationwide” into “the upsurge of the revolutionary movement nationwide”. 2) This was then distorted a second time into “the communist party’s organisation nationwide”. (See “On the Question of Establishing Red Political Power”). The concept of “Revolutionary movement” includes the political movements of popular classes outside the proletariat and spontaneous mass actions. In this way, the condition: “upsurge of the revolutionary situation nationwide” has been made in a trice: “organisation of the communist party nationwide”.

Moreover, they have set forth the thing which comrade Mao Tse-tung put forward as a condition for the “existence of red political power”, as a condition for the launching of an armed struggle and the condition for the existence of red political power, after subjecting it to the above distortion. Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: “One of the conditions for the emergence and survival of red political power on a national scale is

the continuing upsurge of the revolutionary situation.” The Shafak revisionists have turned this thesis into the following state: “Without the communist party organised nationwide and in command of all the masses neither an armed struggle can be launched nor red political power exist.” Has such loyalty (!) to Mao Tse-tung ever been seen before?

Let us read what comrade Lenin said about the “revolutionary situation”:

Defining the revolutionary situation, Lenin said: “What, generally speaking, are the symptoms of a revolutionary situation? We shall certainly not be mistaken if we indicate the following three major symptoms: (1) when it is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their rule without any change; when there is a crisis, in one form or another, among the ‘upper classes’, a crisis in the policy of the ruling class, leading to a fissure through which the discontent and indignation of the oppressed classes burst forth. For a revolution to take place, it is usually insufficient for ‘the lower classes not to want’ to live in the old way; it is also necessary that ‘the upper classes should be unable’ to live in the old way; (2) when the suffering and want of the oppressed classes have grown more acute than usual; (3) when, as a consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses, who uncomplainingly allow themselves to be robbed in ‘peace time’, but, in turbulent times, are drawn both by all the circumstances of the crisis *and by the ‘upper classes’ themselves* into independent historical action.”

*“Without these objective changes, which are independent of the will ... The totality of all these objective changes is called a revolutionary situation. Such a situation existed in 1905 in Russia, and in all revolutionary periods in the West.”* (Lenin collected works Vol. 21)

As can be seen the “revolutionary situation” and the revolutionary movement are entirely different things. The “communist movement” in particular is a completely different thing. It is only possible to confuse “revolutionary situation” and “communist movement” in two ways; Firstly, to be completely ignorant of Marxism-Leninism; Secondly, to

be a low distorter. Let our bourgeois gentlemen decide to which category they belong. In our opinion it is the second, because in response to criticism how they change colour in order to justify their absurdness.

“If the revolutionary movement (you may understand communist party) is not organised nationwide the revolutionary situation will not rise nationwide.” The revolutionary situation is the **objective conditions of the revolution**. The revolutionary situation is an objective factor independent of groups, parties and classes. For this reason it is not linked to the existence of the communist party or its organisation in the country. The party’s existence and level of organisation is only related to the subjective conditions of the revolution, and influences the revolutionary situation but does not determine it. This is the alphabet of Marxism, but the Shafak revisionists are trampling on these truths. They resemble so much a liar who in order to conceal one lie resorts to new lies and after every lie has to utter more. In the rag they penned in order to criticise us they say: “They are exploiting the fact that in some places the term “revolutionary movement”, which is synonymous, has been used instead of “revolutionary struggle” in the sentence “the upsurge of the revolutionary struggle (!)”. What a “correction”! So we gather it is not “revolutionary situation”, it is “revolutionary struggle”! This is not distortion, it is blatant chicanery! Or the struggle of someone floundering in a swamp. Our gentlemen are becoming ever more sunk in the morass the more they struggle.

#### **6. The Shafak Revisionists are laying down the condition that all the plains be Dried Out in order to Launch the Armed Struggle.**

This thesis, which they put forward at the April meeting held two weeks before Martial Law, in order to justify their Socialist Conference initiative, they subsequently put in writing in the masterpiece of false logic, idealism and idle talk called “Long Live the Revolutionary Mass Line”.

“Before the vanguard sections of the fundamental worker-peasant masses are prepared for the armed struggle and before the idea of armed struggle has gained certain prevalence **an armed struggle cannot be launched, even if it is directed to correct targets.**” (ibid) “In order for the plain to be set alight it must be dry.” This expression cannot be misrepresented or denied. Our gentlemen are laying down the condition that in order to launch the armed struggle all the land must be dried out. This is another theory invented in order to delay the armed struggle for years. Against this rightist theory the Marxist-Leninists maintained the following: the plain should be set alight from the dry regions (we are not saying from one region.) That is, the armed struggle should be launched from the regions where conditions are suitable and launched immediately. The regions of the plain that are not yet dry will be scorched by the fire of the armed struggle in other regions. And as our organisation grows and gets stronger it will extend its arms into these regions and commence armed struggle there, too. It is wrong to wait until the whole plain is dry. It is also contrary to the reality that “revolution will develop in an uneven way”: Furthermore, the armed struggle will be a hundred, a thousand times more effective than peaceful propaganda and education work. Both comrade Lenin and comrade Mao Tse-tung have pointed out many times how the armed struggle leads to leaps in the consciousness of the masses.

After these criticisms the revisionists ate their words: “In order to embark on the armed struggle it is not necessary first for all the people to become aware and organised”, they wrote. Were these bourgeois frauds that change colour more than chameleons sincere in the above declaration? No, they said this only to stifle the criticism directed at them. If they were sincere it would have been necessary to correct their mistakes with self-criticism. It is proof of their insincerity that they both defended their explanations in the Long Live the revolutionary Mass Line booklet and said the above. On the other hand, these brazen scoundrels who attempted to defend themselves with sentences they had taken word for word from our criticisms, accused us of saying, “as soon as the guns

go off the people will organise spontaneously.” Such a thing has never been advocated anywhere. It has only been maintained that armed struggle will be a lot more effective in making the masses aware than pacifist propagandising and educational work. This is stated openly in the written criticism texts which they possess.

Why don't they show the courage to quote honestly? Despite all their squirming the revisionists defend their rightist thesis “without the drying out of the entire plain the armed struggle cannot be launched.” And their distorting of our ideas is in order to justify these theses. After saying: “the views regarding our revolutionary struggle's launch of armed struggle are entirely different from these adventurers and are as follows”, the third paragraph and first sentence of the fourth paragraph they quote have been taken word for word from the criticism we directed at them. If the gentlemen had adopted these ideas there would have been no need of all this debate. But no, they trample on the ideas they quote from us at every opportunity. They just keep them in storage and use them from time to time to stifle our criticisms.

### **7. The Line of the Shafak Revisionists is not a “Revolutionary Mass Line”, it is a Line that Hobbles the Revolution.**

The Shafak revisionists are adapting themselves to the people of backward regions, not the people of advanced regions. Let us say that today in some rural regions of Turkey the peasants are ready for armed struggle, whereas in other regions the peasants are not yet ready. The mass line perception of the revisionists requires conforming to the backward region and becoming disconnected from the people of the advanced region. This is the conclusion of the theory of drying up the whole plain.

In regions where the peasants are impatient to take up arms the revisionists are trailing the advanced peasants and adapting themselves to the backward elements.

To hobble the peasants who are ready for armed struggle with the logic: “**first** learn Marxism-Leninism, **and then** you can join the armed struggle”, will of course lead to becoming disconnected from them and falling to the level of backward elements. We saw with our own eyes how in work in village region A they hobbled the advanced peasants. As these treacherous bourgeois gentlemen opposed the peasants who wanted to immediately destroy their class enemies they became disconnected from them and were dallying with the backward and passive elements.

Such a mass line is undoubtedly one that hobbles the revolution, “it is not revolutionary.” The revolutionary mass line is as follows: to unite with the most advanced regional people amongst all the regions, to raise the level of the middle regions and endeavour to win over the backward regions. In the most advanced region to unite with the most advanced elements, to raise the level of the midlevel elements and endeavour to win over the backward elements. That is, to always be at the head of the most advanced masses, while not becoming disconnected from the masses behind, and to draw them forwards.

### **8. The Shafak Revisionists are Defending Reformism under the Name of Urgent Demands.**

In article 40 of the Draft Programme is the following: “Our movement, championing **all** urgent demands and needs towards the regression of imperialism, people gaining democratic rights and an improvement in living conditions...”

It is clear that this understanding will, **in certain conditions**, drag a person to the lowest depths of reformism. If tomorrow the reactionaries attempt to implement a partial land reform in order to stifle the peasants' armed struggle the Shafak revisionists will support this, because such a thing will be a step back by imperialism - for the purpose of not being thrown out of all deployments. This would provide a **partial** improvement in life conditions. When the ruling classes see that their power is

under threat they often go for partial improvements that do not harm the system (they obviously will not do such a thing). Most of the peasant revolts in our history have been suppressed in this way. Today in Turkey the fascist martial law emerged with the slogan "land reform" and in order to protect itself from greater dangers it may distribute a little land. A reactionary government under the influence of Soviet social imperialism may do more than this. This is not impossible; in fact there is a strong possibility. Why shouldn't the reactionaries sacrifice a part in order to save the whole? Why shouldn't they sacrifice a small portion of their privileges, capital and wealth, land and property, in order not to lose the entirety? In conditions and places where the masses have taken up arms to overthrow the present system, to hide behind a showy slogan like "to champion urgent demands and needs" would be a blatant reformist and reactionary stance. It would be to fall into parallel with the reactionaries by giving the people a spoonful of honey in order to calm them down and to save all the bee hives. On the other hand, in conditions in the cities where conditions are suitable for masses of workers to rise up, to take up arms etc, to tell the workers such tales of "urgent demands" would be blatant reactionary fraud. It would be like standing in front of peasants who have grasped the evils of the system of slavery and set out to destroy it saying: "your conditions of life will be improved!" The class aware worker will push aside such know-it-all charlatans with the back of his hand, saying "Out of my way!!"

The revisionist traitors, on the eve of martial laws, with demagogy of "urgent demands", creating the impression that the Erim government would meet these, supported Martial Law's efforts to appear as "friends of the people". When the cur Erim's reform "cabinet" was established they behaved like **real reformists**, saying "we support all kinds of reforms that benefit the toiling people". (PDA, issue no.40, page 2) Despite all the Marxist-Leninist varnish the same understanding, the same rightist line, continues.

Urgent demands should never be defended and supported **in all cir-**

**cumstances**. Marxist-Leninists will defend and support urgent demands on the condition of **linking them closely to our general political demands and our revolutionary agitation within the masses** and on condition that **partial demands never take priority over revolutionary slogans**.

Firstly, "urgent demands" should not be contrary to our general political demands and revolutionary agitation. That is, while the masses are waging a struggle for more advanced goals they should not be pushed back for the sake of "partial improvements".

Secondly, the struggle for urgent demands should always remain secondary and not replace revolutionary slogans. These are the criteria that separate revolutionaries and reformists one from the other, on condition that they are appropriate to these principles communists will certainly defend and support "demands that will improve the conditions of the people in general and the working class in particular".

Not like the revisionist, reformist traitors do, under all conditions!

### **9. The Shafak Revisionists Defend the Phased Consciousness Theory of Economism.**

In article 40 of the Draft Programme it states: "Our movement... will, by advocating all urgent demands and needs, dispatch the masses to struggle, raise their consciousness and endeavour to win them for the ranks of the armed struggle."

The sophistry that the consciousness of the masses will be raised by championing "urgent demands and needs" is, in comrade Lenin's words "an old folk song", a song of economism. The lyrics of this folk song emerged at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century and belong to the deceased Russian economists that went to the other world with the anti-venom of comrade Lenin's, "What is to be Done?" Our friends (!), adapting the song to present conditions, are again putting it on the market.

What a pity! What a waste of their energy! Because no one gives them any credibility. By championing “urgent demands and needs” of the masses for “their dispatch to the struggle, raising of their consciousness and winning for the ranks of the armed struggle” is really the “stage by stage raising of awareness” theory of economism. In the past the revisionists defended a cruder version of this theory thus: “In our opinion the gaining of awareness by the masses will occur stage by stage.” (PDA, “The Proletarian Revolutionary Line and certain Erroneous Tendencies”).

Let us also say, in order not to do an injustice to them: economists claim that they will make the masses aware (!) by championing only economic demands, that is, “concrete demands”. Our revisionists claim they will raise the awareness of the masses by championing “urgent demands and needs “that are a little broader in scope than economic demands”. But they are not aware of the difference in scope between “economic demands” and “urgent demands and needs” and in many places use the two concepts in the same meaning.

The gaining of consciousness of the masses will not come about through the championing of either “urgent demands and needs” or “concrete demands”. The masses can only **be made aware by exposing all political realities**, with campaigns that expose every aspect and sphere of social life.

Comrade Lenin, in his work “What is to be Done”? Treats with contempt the Economists’ perception of raising consciousness, saying: “the phased theory of awareness is an opportunist stance”, adding:

*“Why do the Russian workers still manifest little revolutionary activity in response to the brutal treatment of the people by the police, the persecution of religious sects, the flogging of peasants, the outrageous censorship, the torture of soldiers, the persecution of the most innocent cultural undertakings, etc.? Is it because the ‘economic struggle’ does not ‘stimulate’ them to this, because such activity does not ‘promise palpable results’, because it produces little that is ‘positive’?”*

But the Social-Democratic worker, the revolutionary worker (and the number of such workers is growing) will indignantly reject all this talk about struggle for demands “promising palpable results”, etc., because he will understand that this is only a variation of the old song about adding a kopek to the ruble.”

Later Lenin gives this response from an aware worker to the Economist gentlemen:

*“The ‘activity’ you want to stimulate among us workers, by advancing concrete demands that promise palpable results, we are already displaying and in our everyday, limited trade union work we put forward these concrete demands, very often without any assistance whatever from the intellectuals. But **such** activity is not enough for us; we are not children to be fed on the thin gruel of “economic” politics alone; **we want to know everything that others know, we want to learn the details of all aspects of political life and to take part actively in every single political event.** In order that we may do this, the intellectuals must talk to us less of what we already know.<sup>49</sup> and tell us more about what we do not yet know and what we can never learn from our factory and ‘economic’ experience, namely, political knowledge.” (ibid)*

Let us summarise: The theory that “by championing all urgent demands and needs the awareness of the masses will be raised “is entirely inspired by the economists’ theory of “Elevating Workers’ actions” and “making them aware” “by putting forward concrete demands that promise tangible results”, and there is not the slightest difference between them in essence.

#### **10. The Shafak Revisionists are also following a Rightist line in Cadre Policy.**

The Shafak revisionists compromise with the reactionary ties of the cadre. Instead of breaking all the reactionary ties of progressive worker, peasant and intellectual cadres and drawing them into active political struggle, they preserve these backward ties.

Comrade Lenin said: "we should not permit a promising worker to work for 10 hours in a factory. We should draw them into active political struggle and turn them into professional revolutionaries."

However, the Shafak revisionists are following a completely contrary path. Rather than withdrawing advanced workers and peasants from production and turning them into professional revolutionaries, they place their small number of professional cadre into work here and there, making them amateur revolutionaries devoting their spare time to the revolutionary struggle. We do not deny that **for specific aims** professional cadre may be put into various jobs, but this cannot be made the general policy of a communist movement. If this happens, amateurishness and instability will affect all activity. The general policy will be to draw all promising people into professional political activity as much as possible.

The person at the head of the Shafak revisionists invented the following theory of betrayal to justify his being on very friendly terms with bourgeois circles instead of the worker-peasant masses: "there are also sound working class revolutionaries that do not have personal links with the masses on account of particular revolutionary tasks" ("Liquidationists" article). Which "particular revolutionary tasks" does the gentleman think will conflict with a "mass link"? There is no such thing! On the contrary, **every** revolutionary task will demonstrate a need for a broad, strong "link to the masses". It is obvious that our bourgeois gentleman has invented this theory in order to exonerate himself. His position is the clearest evidence that persons without a "mass link" cannot be "sound working class revolutionaries".

## 11. The Shafak Revisionists are making Revolution Impossible

In one of the issues of Aydinlik, in an article entitled "The perception of Scientific Socialist Revolution" was a view that **every individual** who takes part in the revolution should be aware of all the potential outcomes of the revolution and have grasped the meaning and character

of it etc. The same idea was continued. The perception of initially training cadre who have grasped Marxism-Leninism in study groups, then endeavouring to organise them in armed groups was a reflection in practice of the above idea. The Marxist-Leninists criticised this understanding of the revisionists relying on Lenin. Comrade Lenin said:

To imagine that social revolution is conceivable without revolts by small nations in the colonies and in Europe, without revolutionary outbursts by a section of the petty bourgeoisie with **all its prejudices**, without a movement of the politically non-conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against oppression by the landowners, the church, and the monarchy, against national oppression, etc. **-to imagine all this is to repudiate social revolution.** So one army lines up in one place and says, "We are for socialism", and another, somewhere else and says, "We are for imperialism", and that will be a social revolution!

Only those who hold such a ridiculously pedantic view could vilify the Irish rebellion by calling it a "putsch".

Whoever expects a "pure" social revolution will never live to see it. Such a person pays lip-service to revolution without understanding what revolution is.

The Russian Revolution of 1905 was a bourgeois-democratic revolution. It consisted of a series of battles in which *all* the discontented classes, groups and elements of the population participated. Among these there were masses imbued with the crudest *prejudices*, with the vaguest and most fantastic aims of struggle; there were small groups which accepted Japanese money, there were speculators and adventurers, etc. But *objectively*, the mass movement was breaking the hack of tsarism and paving the way for democracy; for this reason the class-conscious workers led it.

The socialist revolution in Europe cannot be anything other than an outburst of mass struggle on the part of all and sundry oppressed and discontented elements. Inevitably, sections of the petty bourgeoisie and of the backward workers will participate in it -without such par-

ticipation, mass struggle is **impossible**, without it **no** revolution is possible-and just as inevitably will they bring into the movement their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their weaknesses and errors. But **objectively** they will attack capital, and the class-conscious vanguard of the revolution, the advanced proletariat, expressing this objective truth of a variegated and discordant, motley and outwardly fragmented, mass struggle, will be able to unite and direct it, capture power, seize the banks; expropriate the trusts which all hate (though for different reasons!), and introduce other dictatorial measures which in their totality will amount to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the victory of socialism, which, however, will by no means immediately “purge” itself of petty-bourgeois slag.

(Lenin collected works Vol. 22)

The view of our revisionists is just as comrade Lenin said: “so ridiculous, so stupidly stuck-up.”

Our revisionists are just as comrade Lenin said: nominal revolutionaries who have not understood what revolution is.

As we criticised them summarising the above lines of comrade Lenin regarding their “ridiculous” and “stuck up” views, the revisionists went on the offensive against us, with lies and slanders. They claimed that the Marxist-Leninists had said: “It is unnecessary that those who join the first guerrilla units have knowledge about the possible outcomes of the revolution. People from various classes with varying ideas may join.”

The criticism of these gentlemen in fact targets comrade Lenin, as they knowingly criticise the quotes we have made from comrade Lenin. But since they possess not a trace of revolutionary honesty they attribute them to us and, moreover, distort them. The above statement has not been used anywhere. It has been said a condition that “in general, everyone who joins the revolution must have a complete grasp of Marxism-Leninism and know the possible outcomes of the revolution”, could not be laid down as such a condition would render the

revolution impossible. This is entirely correct and corresponds to the thoughts of comrade Lenin.

Since these brave (!) gentlemen have attempted to criticise comrade Lenin by attacking us it means they maintain the same “ridiculous stuck up” view. When it comes to who may join the guerrilla groups, gentlemen, even if they have yet to grasp Marxism-Leninism, those who have hate for the reactionaries and wish to fight against them, who accept organisational discipline, who comply with secrecy, whose age and health are appropriate militant worker, peasant, intellectual, whoever may join. And they are a lot more worthy of the guerrilla detachments than ignorant intellectuals like you who have digested many books. What is important is initially to ensure the leadership of the organisation. Secondly, to ensure the Marxist-Leninist ideological education of those who join these groups in a constant, systematic way within the course of the armed struggle, serving it and casting light on it.

Thirdly, to mobilise the worker and peasant masses for the war.

As for you, you expect a “pure” social revolution. You will never attain your desires!

**12. The Shafak Revisionists oppose the armed struggle with the Political struggle. Under the banner of “Political Struggle” they reject the armed forms of the political struggle. They reject armed propaganda and Agitation.**

Since we advocate that the link that the party will grasp while organising the peasants should be guerrilla groups, that it is necessary for the other groups and cells to meet the needs of the armed struggle and in order to develop this should be addressed within the course of the armed struggle, they accuse us of rejecting the political struggle. They say we have a solely military point of view.

“According to them, since the ideological and political aspect of the

question has been grasped by our people this has been dealt with and now the entire question is military operation.”

This nonsense they are attempting to attribute to us has never been defended anywhere or at any time. Since the revisionists have drawn this conclusion from our championing of the armed struggle as primary, they give away the fact that they see the armed struggle as the antithesis of the political struggle. They give away the fact that they consider the armed struggle and political struggle as things that conflict one with the other. The “solely military” point of view is that of those who have the view of **fighting for the sake of fighting**. We want to fight in order to fulfil the political tasks of the revolution. We champion the armed struggle in order to create a people’s army in rural areas under the leadership of the party, smashing the local and central authority step by step, and to realise a people’s administration. Comrade Mao Tse-Tung says:

*“Some people ridicule us as advocates of the “omnipotence of war”. Yes, we are advocates of the omnipotence of revolutionary war; that is good, not bad, it is Marxist. The guns of the Russian Communist Party created socialism. We shall create a democratic republic. Experience in the class struggle in the era of imperialism teaches us that it is only by the power of the gun that the working class and the labouring masses can defeat the armed bourgeoisie and landlords; in this sense we may say that only with guns can the whole world be transformed.”* (Mao Tse-Tung, Selected Works II)

Is there a “solely military” point of view here? Don’t these gents know that the armed struggle, that is, war, is a form of the political struggle? The armed struggle is not the only form of the political struggle, but it is a form. *“War is politics continued through special tools”* and *“since old times there is no war that did not carry a political characteristic”* (Mao Tse-Tung) These are the alphabet of Marxism-Leninism.

The Shafak revisionists also reject armed propaganda and agitation. They also deduce from our wishing to make the armed struggle primary that we reject propaganda and agitation activity amongst the masses.

This means that they consider that armed struggle conflicts with propaganda and agitation activity. No, bourgeois gents! Armed struggle does not conflict with propaganda and agitation activity. They are not opposites. Comrade Mao Tse-Tung says:

*“The Chinese Red Army is an armed body for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution. Especially at present, the Red Army should certainly not confine itself to fighting; besides fighting to destroy the enemy’s military strength, it should shoulder such important tasks as doing propaganda among the masses, organizing the masses, arming them, helping them to establish revolutionary political power and setting up Party organizations. The Red Army fights not merely for the sake of fighting but in order to conduct propaganda among the masses, organize them, arm them, and help them to establish revolutionary political power. Without these objectives, fighting loses its meaning and the Red Army loses the reason for its existence.”* (Mao Tse-Tung, Selected Works I)

In our country too, the guerrilla groups that will constitute the nucleus of the people’s army will not suffice with merely fighting. At the same time it will also fulfil important tasks such as carrying out propaganda and agitation amongst the masses and organising and arming the masses. These gents, as they see the armed struggle as opposed to the political struggle and as they see the political struggle only as publishing house activity, they accuse us of rejecting political activity, mass work and propaganda and agitation activity. Actually, it is they who only accept the pacifist forms of political activity, and in particular propaganda and agitation. They reject the armed forms of political activity and armed propaganda and agitation activity.

If we summarise, we advocate that it is necessary in the relationship between armed struggle and other forms of struggle for armed struggle to be primary and other forms of struggle to be secondary. As for the revisionist clique it appears to accept this, but accuses us of rejecting other forms of struggle. In this way it is attacking the idea of

armed struggle in reality. And in practice it rejects anything other than “other forms of struggle”.

We consider armed struggle in general as a form of political struggle and in particular as a form of propaganda and agitation. As for the revisionist clique it places the armed struggle in opposition to political struggle, propaganda and agitation. In this way it rejects the armed forms of the political struggle and rejects armed propaganda and agitation.

### 13. The Shafak Revisionists Reject Guerrilla War

In the collection of distortion entitled “on the question of the Establishment of Red political Power” is the following:

“For instance, a **peasant movement** without the support of the struggle **in the cities** is bound to be suppressed. For instance, a **peasant uprising** in the Eastern region, if it were not supported by a struggle of the peasants in the Aegean and Cukorova regions and a working class movement in our main industrial cities under the leadership of a proletarian party **it could not realise red political power.**”

We previously noted above three points from this vague expression specific to opportunism:

1- The revisionists are considering “a peasant movement” only as a total peasant rebellion.

2- They are thinking of an armed peasant rebellion **immediately** leading to a red political administration and **enabling it to survive.**

3-They are laying down as a condition for a peasant rebellion immediately leading to a red political administration and **enabling it to survive** the support of peasants’ struggles in other areas and of the workers in the main industrial cities under the leadership of the proletarian party.

We have dwelt on the third point. A little later we shall dwell on the second point. Let us look at the first point:

The revisionists do not consider that for a red political administration to be born, a protracted guerrilla activity, developing from small to

large, from weak to powerful, from simple to complex, involving the step by step construction of a people’s army, from guerrilla units to a regular army, is necessary. They don’t even think about this. They see it as a prerequisite that in order for red power to emerge in a region there must primarily be a mass peasant revolt there.

Yes, when talking of an armed peasant struggle we are always using a different language to the revisionists. What they have understood by an armed peasant struggle is for any period a total peasant rebellion in any rural area. Out of concern that such a revolt would be suppressed immediately they have claimed that without organisation in other regions and command of the masses an armed peasant movement will not be commenced. Their organisation is suitable for this perception. Instead of organising peasants in study groups in order to prepare them for a total revolt!

The revisionist gents have got so carried away with these views that in the past; too, they have based all their plans on these dreams. They nourished great hopes of a military coup concocted by the reformist bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie seizing power in a coup was to embark on land reform etc. The peasants were to seize the landlords’ land. Since the reformist bourgeoisie would be involved in struggle with the landlords they would not oppose this, and would even assist (!) the arming of the peasants. In this way the peasants rebelling en masse would take power in the rural areas under the leadership of the revisionists (!). The gents nourished such dreams of easy success. For this reasons they eagerly awaited a military coup along with M.Belli, H.Kivilcimli and D.Avcioğlu. They even developed the theory of encouraging a coup under the name of struggle against fascism in order to create the environment for such a coup. Today the same understanding continues in a slightly more refined way. For instance, in the TIHKP Draft Programme there is not one word regarding guerrilla activity. It is impossible to come across the idea that today the primary form of armed struggle will be guerrilla war-

fare. There is merely mention of a vague struggle that village committees (?) will manage and direct.

Revisionism, which is pressed into a corner by the constant systematic criticism of the Marxist-Leninist wing, deigned to mention guerrilla war in a circular in which they quoted verbatim from the Marxist-Leninist's' written critique.

The Shafak revisionists behave like a greedy merchant who has every sort of wares in his shop. If a product on the market does not sell, or is found to be fake, they immediately withdraw it and replace it with something new. Their appearing to accept guerrilla war is a precautionary measure of this kind. In reality they have never believed in the necessity and importance of guerrilla war. The sentences we have quoted above are evidence of this. Marxist-Leninists reject no form of struggle, either eternally, or provisionally. They merely separate primary forms of struggle from secondary forms of struggle, rendering the secondary dependent on the primary. Today we see guerrilla war as the primary form of struggle within armed struggle. Guerrilla war is the form of struggle of a weak force against a superior enemy. At the same time peasant guerrilla war is the natural conclusion and highest form of the peasants' class struggle. Peasant guerrilla war, in the region where it is carried out, is a means of preparing the peasants for uprising. And is one of the most important means.

Ultimate victory cannot be won with guerrilla warfare. Guerrilla warfare wears down and weakens the enemy and destroys his morale. The final blow will be inflicted on the enemy by a regular army. Guerrilla war is also a means of transition to a regular army. Peasant revolts should be transformed into guerrilla war in situations in which there is as yet no regular army and in which conditions are not suitable for its emergence. Rebellious peasants should be organised in guerrilla units. If conditions are suitable for the emergence of regular units, or if a regular army has been organised, rebellious peasants may be organised in units. After regular armies have been established in various regions

guerrilla warfare will certainly continue, but will no longer be the primary form of struggle.

Until a regular army is established guerrilla warfare will be the primary form of struggle of the armed peasant struggle. All other forms of this struggle will be subject to it. The regular army will be established after a relatively long struggle as a result of guerrilla units transforming into regular units step by step. The revisionist clique dreams of founding a regular army at an indefinite date in the future after organising nationwide, gaining command of the masses and drying out (!) the plain, and of establishing red political power linked to this, all at a stroke. This is the actual product revisionism wishes to put on the market, marked fraudulently as Mao Tse-tung's Thought.

#### 14. The Shafak Revisionists Reject Protracted War.

We quote in a summarised form article 47 of the Draft Programme and our critique of it: "47. A democratic people's government will abolish the army whose profession is to guard the ruling classes, and consolidate the people's army based on the general arming of workers and peasants ..." All manner of inequality, rank and title in the army will be abolished...". Persecution and beating of soldiers will be definitely banned..."

It is as if the masses will in a moment rise up and takes power, the revolutionary government will take the old reactionary army's weapons away and arm the people etc. However, the "abolishing of the army whose profession is to guard the ruling classes", is not something that will happen over night after the seizure of power. During a protracted **people's** war the reactionary army will be destroyed bit by bit and wiped out, divested of its weapons etc...The revolutionary government will get rid of the **last remnants** of this reactionary army. This meaning does not emerge from the draft programme.

"People's army based on the general arming of the workers and peasants"! Undoubtedly, the people's army will advance in this direc-

tion under revolutionary power, but neither at the beginning of armed struggle (that is, today) nor when power is seized by the democratic revolution will the people's army be made up by a general arming of workers and peasants. That is, the army and the people will not become one and the same thing. This will be possible in the future. On the one hand, we say that the people's army will develop from small to large, from weak to strong, and on the other, that the people's army, even prior to the seizure of power, will be based on the general arming of the people and the task of the "people's government" will be to consolidate it? How is this possible? It is abundantly clear that the writer dreams of the **entire people** rising up at one moment, arming and organising the people's army.

In our conditions where it is necessary for the people's army to be constructed step by step during a protracted war these sentences are entirely wrong... The army and the people will not be one and the same thing even in the socialist order, let alone prior to the revolution. From the moment the army and the people begin to emerge the army will have begun to lose its status as an army and the state its existence as a state. That is, communism will have been attained.

As for "All inequality, ranks and titles in the army will be **abolished**", since the army in question is a people's army these will not have existed since the beginning anyway. The draft assumes they exist and the same is apparent in the phrase "Persecution and beating of soldiers will be prohibited".

It is evident that the author of the draft does not consider that the people's army will be constructed earlier during a protracted war, step by step, far from inequality, rank, title and persecution and beatings. He thinks that the revolutionary army will be established after the reactionary army is destroyed, after power has been seized, under a revolutionary administration. In this way he rejects the protracted war and the step by step construction of the people's army during this war.

## 15. The Shafak Revisionists are trimming the Armed Struggle.

The mechanic bourgeois mentality and false logic shows itself on the question of armed struggle, as it does on many questions. The Shafak revisionists assume they will be able to make the popular masses advance on the path of armed struggle by showing them where to step like trained monkeys! It's forbidden to step there! Don't touch there! Don't strike this! Don't break that! Not armed struggle, walking on a high wire!

The revisionist clique rejects bank robbery (the words "appropriate money" should be used instead of "robbery") in principle. Without looking at which politics this action serves it rejects the **action itself**. However, just as both working class revolutionaries and representatives of the bourgeoisie may publish magazine, bourgeois revolutionaries too may rob a bank, as may representatives of the working class....

The revisionist clique claims that representatives of the working class may never rob a bank and that whoever carries it out "bank robbery" is a mistaken thing.

"Because, first and foremost, such actions are not in themselves **revolutionary** actions. (YIKC, page 20)

"These actions do not respond to the real needs and demands of the people. This is the reason such acts are **always** destined to be disconnected from the masses." (ibid, page 37).

"organisations such as the THKP-THKC and THKO... are attacking the **wrong targets**." (ibid, page 40)

"Such **actions** are an expression in fact of a spontaneous perception of struggle which is the exact opposite of the Marxist-Leninist method of work. (ibid, page 49.)

"Such actions waste, spoil and divert the revolutionary strength of the masses and cadre". There is nothing surprising about the defeat of so-called military actions such as bank robbery and kidnapping by the ruling classes. This is the natural consequence of these **actions** remaining

entirely disconnected from the popular masses, **because these actions are not real revolutionary actions.** They express an ideology, a petit-bourgeois political line.”

“Actions that are not directed at the target of political power; **that are not directed at the ruling classes;** that do not assist the **masses** to clearly understand **their real enemies** and the goal of political power”... (ibid, pages 75-76).

As can be seen, the leaders of the revisionist clique accuse the action itself. There is no way of misrepresenting these sentences. They are clear and definite! These gents have gone so far that they have even distorted comrade Lenin.

“It is not possible to find even one word in Lenin that supports the idea that revolution may be perpetrated with actions such as bank robbery and kidnapping.” (ibid, page 19)

Comrade Lenin certainly does not say that revolution may be carried out with these actions, but he does not reject these **actions** in principle either. He even defends them. Revolution cannot be accomplished with strikes but can strikes be rejected? These gents are not aware of comrade Lenin’s article on “**Partisan War**”. This article is in their own list of translations. Also, the head of revisionism quoted these sentences from this article:

“... Marxists do not reject any form of struggle provisionally, let alone eternally. They render all forms of struggle dependent on the path of revolution.”

These scoundrels, who choose to utilise these absolutely correct sentences of comrade Lenin in order to justify their own activity consisting only of publishing, have not seen that comrade Lenin supports “bank robberies” in the same article? Did comrades Lenin and Stalin follow “a petit-bourgeois political line, an ideology foreign to Marxism-Leninism”, when they supported and put in train bank robbery? Did they take a non-revolutionary path contrary to the mass line? Did they waste, divert and spoil the revolutionary strength of the masses and

cadre? Did they in this way attack “wrong targets”? Did they get carried away in an anarchist and spontaneous form of work? Is this what the revisionists are saying in a covert way? They say that “back robbery” does not respond to the real needs of the people and that it replaces them with false demands. We ask these gents: Isn’t becoming armed a real demand of the people? Why shouldn’t arming by appropriating the money in the bank serve the struggle for power? Doesn’t it serve the struggle for power more directly than the struggle they are waging instead of the revolutionary struggle for “concrete demands”, that is, “wages, working hours, job security etc...?”

We are asking these gents: aren’t the bankers part of the native ruling classes that are currently in power? Why is attacking them assaulting the “wrong targets”? Or do you see them as friends of the revolution? However grateful the bankers are for your favour it will not be sufficient.

As for “kidnapping” (it would be more correct to call this taking the enemies hostage or seizing them), proletarian revolutionaries do not reject this either! Such and such a robbery may be mistaken, just as certain “kidnapping” incidents may be considered wrong but as a principle “kidnapping” cannot be rejected. For instance, to abduct and take prisoner an important officer of the enemy army, or to abduct landlords who deserve it and similar enemies of the people and shoot them etc...is not wrong, it is correct, revolutionary and conforms to the Marxist-Leninist line.

What is mistaken is not the form of the action itself. Those who are carrying out that action, that is, THKP-THKC and THKO, have entirely mistaken ideologies and political lines. It is wrong that the actions in question have replaced the struggle for power, that these actions constitute the backbone of the struggle.

In our country the armed struggle should primarily be directed towards the overthrow of local and central authority in rural areas and its replacement with peasant domination under the leadership of the proletariat. At the present phase the form of this struggle is guerrilla

war. Guerrilla activity includes the elimination of landlords, bureaucrats who are enemies of the people, informers, usurers, their punishment in various ways, appropriation of their money and weapons, raids on military posts and seizure of their weapons and attacks on a broad range of targets. But all the attacks have a common goal, to undermine the reactionary authority, smash it and in its place impose revolutionary authority! This is what armed struggle should be essentially about in our country today! But as we have stated above, actions such as "bank robbery and kidnapping" in support of this struggle cannot be rejected on principle.

The revisionists gents say: "the reason for defeat is **class based and ideological**. Being unable to mobilise the popular masses and being defeated by the ruling classes is the inevitable result of having an opportunist petit-bourgeois ideology". So, gentlemen, is every movement that achieves success Marxist-Leninist? Does it have proletarian ideology? With this logic you are ready to prostrate yourselves in front of every successful bourgeois movement! To only look at the result without looking at the ideology of that movement which manifested itself in various spheres in order to decide whether it was Marxist-Leninist is very apt for bourgeois minds like yours.

Look at this logic!

"The people's armed struggle will be strengthened by defeat and overwhelm the enemy. **But it will be entirely different (?) from the defeat of our angry petit-bourgeois intellectuals**. The defeats of the people's struggle contain the seeds of victory within them. The masses learn to win by learning lessons from every defeat. **But the lesson we shall learn from the defeat of petit-bourgeois movements, is to not engage in such movements again.**" (ibid, pages 84-85)

Is it possible to spout such nonsense!

For a start, every defeat has two causes. The first is the objective cause. If objective conditions are weighted in favour of a certain force and against another then **in these conditions** defeat for the weak force

is inevitable. Secondly there is the subjective cause. Even if objective conditions are favourable as regards achieving success, the one that makes mistakes, that is, fails to grasp the laws of the outside world and adapt its ideas and behaviour to it, that is, acts contrary to reality, will be defeated. Whichever class, group, organisation or person is defeated; the cause will be one or both of the above. The defeat of petit-bourgeois intellectuals and of workers and peasants will come from these two causes. What is entirely different?

Secondly, "the defeats of the people contain the seeds of victory within them" they say. Yes, but why? Because the workers and peasants have the possibility of winning **objectively**. Once they have grasped reality and waged the struggle appropriate to that then **subjectively** there is no reason they should not prevail. Defeats help the people understand the reality and to think and act according to it.

As for petit-bourgeois intellectuals, they do not **objectively** possess the capabilities of defeating the enemy alone. But their defeats also serve the grasping of realities and our adapting our ideas and behaviour to these realities.

For instance, we understand this reality from their defeats: Workers and peasants do not have the capability of defeating the enemy before being pressed into action. In this context their defeats contain within them the seeds of victory, because they lead to an understanding of the objective reality and to the uniting of petit-bourgeois intellectuals with the people.

The idealist gentleman reaches an entirely different conclusion, that banks should no longer be robbed! Moreover, he creates a brand new theory, to the effect that petit-bourgeois intellectuals are not considered part of the people.

The THKO and THKP-THKC are two petit-bourgeois currents. Since they wish to replace the class struggle of the masses with the plotting of a handful of angry intellectuals and their ideologies are in all respects contrary to proletarian ideology and the universal tenets of

Marxism-Leninism they are not communists! To say they are not communists because they rob banks and are unsuccessful is to apply the lancet to the wrong place! For a communist movement too, as we have pointed out above, may engage in bank robbery to support the struggle for power, and may be unsuccessful on account of making mistakes or for other reasons. But your brains which have become accustomed to thinking mechanically cannot take this in.

Again the revisionist clique, in the masterpiece of nonsense and chatter that is the YIKC (Long live the Revolutionary Mass Line), rejects embarking on guerrilla struggle in the cities in principle! Guerrilla activity to be initiated in the cities should be dependent on the land revolution struggle in the rural areas and be carried on in a manner that supports that struggle. But to reject guerrilla activity in the cities in principle is an expression of a perception that pours the armed struggle into molds (a), (b) or (c). As long as the enemy is stronger than us as an entirety on a country-wide scales our policy in the cities will be primarily "to gather force and to lie in wait for an opportunity". And from time to time organise uprisings and withdraw to the countryside.

Apart from this, firstly, **in order to support the struggle in the rural regions**; secondly, as a means of **active defence** against reactionary assaults! Thirdly, as a means of building up strength guerrilla actions in the cities may and should be initiated. For this purpose, just as banks may be robbed, that is, the government or reactionaries' money may be appropriated, class enemies may be eliminated. For instance, police agents, fascist officers, police torturers, ringleaders of fascist organisations, brutal bosses and their lackeys, scabs, agent provocateurs, informers, those who shoot revolutionaries and impose death sentences on them, agents of imperialism etc ... may be shot. Also communication lines may be sabotaged, ammunition stores and military depots may be raided or sabotaged, important documents appropriated or destroyed. People may be sprung from prison. Sabotage

may be carried out at certain military bases and headquarters, police headquarters, fascist organisations' main buildings etc...

Our revisionist gentlemen reject all of these. Is there a better example than this of the fact that they understand the armed struggle in the manner criticised and condemned by comrade Lenin as "stuck up and stupid"?

Let us repeat once more in order not to give an opportunity to demagoguery: **while we adopt the above actions in principle, we never forget that the armed struggle to be carried on in the rural areas for the land revolution must be primary and that the struggle in the cities and all other forms of struggle must be bound to it.**

But the revisionist clique is constantly neutering the armed struggle by making all sorts of excuses to hobble it, seeing it not as a complex, colourful, up and down thing, but as a simple, straight forward thing like their writing an article at their desks!

"There can be no question of banning this kind of action when it is necessary to meet certain requirements of the communist movement". These revisionist traitors recognise nothing of revolutionary morality, stability or principle. After slamming the actions themselves they now appear to accept that they may be perpetrated "in order to meet certain requirements". Have they begun to think correctly on this question? No, (because if that were the case they should have burnt the rag called "Long Live the Revolutionary Mass Line")! Only in order to protect their tender bodies from the arrows of criticism! Furthermore, they have still not grasped the meaning and importance of guerrilla activity in the cities. As we have mentioned, the aim of guerrilla actions in the cities does not consist of meeting certain requirements. Guerrilla activity to be undertaken in the cities has importance as one of the means of **supporting the struggle in the rural areas**, of **active defence** against reactionary attacks and of **building up strength**. The revisionists gents have still not grasped the essence of the question.

## 16. The Shafak Revisionists are distorting the Red Political Power doctrine of Chairman Mao.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung links the possibility of the existence of red political power in China to the conditions below:

1. China being economically backward, a semi-colonial country and consequently there being conflict between the warlords.
- 2- The existence of a strong mass base.
- 3- The continuing rise of the revolutionary situation nationwide.
- 4- A strong, regular red army.
- 5- A strong communist party following a correct policy.
- 6- Self-sufficient food resources.
- 7- A terrain suitable for military action.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung previously saw the fact the white regime was involved in internecine conflict as the most important condition for the emergence of red political power in China. He linked this internecine conflict to China's semi-colonial structure, because the quarrels between imperialist countries over domination of China led to conflict between the warlords cliques linked to various imperialist countries. Whereas in countries that were colonies under the direct domination of imperialism, since only one imperialist country was dominant there would be no armed conflict between reactionary cliques in the country.

During the Second World War conditions changed. Imperialism suffered a severe blow and new socialist countries emerged. The periodic crises of the imperialist system became more frequent and severe. In the Far East peoples going into armed struggle inflicted heavy blows on imperialism and established armed forces. As a consequence of all this, the balance of forces worldwide changed completely to the disadvantage of imperialism and reaction.

In the new conditions in **colonised** countries it became possible to create liberated zones in the rural areas of the country, from there besiege the large cities and seize power nationwide by waging protracted

wars. Comrade Mao Tse-tung, too, complying with the new conditions, made changes in his views regarding the survival of red political power. We may express comrade Mao Tse-tung's first necessary condition for the survival of red political power thus:

**Red political power is possible in all backward countries, whether they are colonies or semi-colonies.**

It is only impossible in imperialist countries. We also understand from comrade Mao Tse-Tung's article on **struggle in the Ching kang mountains** that once red political power has emerged, on condition of following a correct policy, that it may survive even in periods where the revolutionary situation regresses relatively, where a relative peace is secured amongst the ruling classes, that is, when comparative stability replaces economic and political crisis, and as long as there are no other objective causes that lead to defeat. Comrade Mao Tse-tung does not link the August defeat to the fact the revolutionary situation was no longer rising. On the contrary, he links it to the fact some people in the party implemented the tactics of the crisis period during the period of stability. That is, he says that if a correct policy had been followed for a temporary period there would not have been defeat, despite the regression of the revolutionary situation. And he indicates that while in periods where there is a continuing upsurge in the revolutionary situation a relatively more "adventurist" policy is necessary, in periods when the revolutionary situation regresses it is necessary to have a policy of consolidating the liberated zone rather than gaining more territory.

The upsurge in the revolutionary situation nationwide will facilitate the survival of red political power and the broadening of the liberated zone. The temporary and relative regression of the revolutionary situation will adversely affect the "survival of red political power." But by pursuing a correct policy red political power can be protected and even extended.

In the event of the revolutionary situation not existing for a long time red political power cannot survive. But "in our era where imperial-

ism is advancing towards victory all over the world”, for imperialism and reaction prolonged periods of stability are now a dream. The revisionists accuse us thus: “They claim that comrade Mao Tse-tung abandoned the condition of the revolution rising nationwide in his article on **struggle in the Chingkang Mountains.**”

First of all, it is not “the rise of the revolution nationwide” but “the rise of the revolutionary situation nationwide”. Secondly, the above claim is a slander. First of all, it has been stated that after the establishment of red political power, despite the temporary regression of the revolutionary situation and its adverse effects, red political power may be kept intact as long as a correct policy is pursued. This is one thing; the claim being made is another thing.

What is the situation in our country as regards the “existence of red political power”?

1- Our country is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. Therefore the possibility exists for red political power.

2- In many regions of our country, but not every region, there is a strong mass base. The peasants have experienced many democratic struggles in recent years. In our rural regions an unprecedented accumulation has come into being. In this regard the conditions for red political power in our country are unprecedentedly ideal.

3- The revolutionary situation is ideal both worldwide and nationwide. Despite temporary and short periods of stability essentially the upsurge of the revolutionary situation continues. This is the most obvious, typical characteristic of our era “in which imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing to victory all over the world”. In this regard conditions for red political power are ideal.

4- Self-sufficient food resources primarily exist in the economically backward regions of our country which have yet to become an inseparable part of the capitalist market. Even in the event of these regions being encircled and relations with the large cities, that is, the markets, being severed relations of production and consumption can continue

without disruption. Whereas the encirclement of regions that are closely linked to the markets, that is, that sell their products in the large markets and secure necessities for consumption there, and cutting off of relations with the large cities, would lead to economic paralysis and collapse of red political power.

In addition to the possession of self-sufficient economic resources by the economically backward regions, these regions are also those where central authority is weak and communication networks are limited. Local feudal authority dominates in these regions. The military concentrations, intelligence networks etc of the reactionary government and imperialism are in the large cities and economically developed regions.

Revolutionaries should withdraw to primarily economically backward areas, rely on them, turn them into revolutionary bases and fortresses of the revolution and attack the economically developed regions where the enemy is based and the big cities from there. This point is a significant element of the theory of people’s war developed by comrade Mao Tse-tung and of the experience of China and Vietnam.

The Eastern and South-eastern regions of our country, in particular, are ideal as regards “self-sufficient economic resources”. Although this condition exists partially in other rural areas it is weaker than in the Eastern and South-eastern regions.

5- “Terrain suitable for military operations.” This is one of the factors, although not determining, that influences the existence of red political power. And our country has endless possibilities in this regard.

Today in Turkey what is lacking for the existence of red political power is “a strong communist party following a correct policy” and a “regular red army”. In that case the conclusion to be reached by a communist examining the question of the existence of red political power in our country is this: in order to establish red political power it is our task to construct “a strong communist party that pursues a correct policy” and a “regular red army”. Essentially, in the regions where the other necessary conditions for red political power exist, i.e. a sound mass base,

sufficient food resources and terrain suitable for military operations, in **the event of a party and army being constructed by embarking on armed struggle from today, red political power may be established.** That is, the party and army should be constructed within the armed struggle. During the process of armed struggle, which will be a relatively long process, when the party attains certain strength and the people's armed forces are substantial and are transformed into regular units, red political power will become a reality in some regions in our country. And once red political power is established, even in periods of temporary and partial stability, as long as a correct policy is pursued it can be kept intact.

"They say red political power may be established by carrying out a struggle based on emplacements". The Marxist-Leninists have never claimed such a thing anywhere at any time!

But they also have not set forth a condition thus: "Unless there is struggle under the leadership of the proletarian party in every corner of the country, in all the villages and towns, red political power is impossible", a condition also not put forward by comrade Mao Tse-tung. They only said that in the event of the seven conditions listed above all being met red political power would be possible.

As for the revisionists, they have put forward conditions that make it impossible for red political power to exist in our country by distorting the doctrine of chairman Mao Tse-tung on this question. These are the conditions the revisionists put forward:

- 1- Divisions within the reactionary regime.
- 2- Peasant revolts having occurred in the past.
- 3- **Mass struggle having commenced in every corner of the country, in all villages and towns, under the leadership of the communist party.**
- 4- A regular red army.
- 5- A strong communist party.

The revisionists transformed comrade Mao Tse-tung's doctrine on red political power into this form. The conclusions they have reached

regarding our country while examining these conditions are as follows:

1- Instead of saying that in our era red political power is possible in all backward countries, both colonial and semi-colonial, and only impossible in imperialist countries, they have attempted to implement comrade Mao Tse-tung's thesis on "War between the warlords" in Turkey. They have not taken into account the fact that the new situation that emerged after World War Two led to comrade Mao Tse-tung making changes to his views in accordance with the changed situation. In the collection of distortion entitled "On the Question of the Founding of Red Political Power", the author tries really hard sweating buckets as he attempts to make Turkey's conditions fit this view abandoned by Mao, and to make this view fit Turkey's conditions. He also lists the contradictions that are natural in all semi-colonial countries and endeavours to prove that the condition of "war within the white regime" has manifested itself in Turkey in this form.

The revisionists, by insisting on the conditions which comrade Mao Tse-tung abandoned and trying to make Turkey fit this condition, are arousing doubts regarding the emergence and survival of red political power in our country. It is also arousing the same doubts for other **semi-colonial countries**, not just Turkey, and particularly for colonial countries.

"Comrade Mao Tse-tung said the following which is valid for all semi-colonial (and colonial) countries: one of the conditions for red political power is for the white regime to be in pieces and in conflict."

This expression is entirely of the revisionists' own manufacture, because comrade Mao Tse-tung did not see in colonial countries divisions in the white regime and war like in China as being possible. Later on the possibility of red political power in colonial countries was not due to wars breaking out within the white regime in these countries, but due to the **worldwide weakening and collapse of imperialism and reaction. This situation has created ideal conditions in colonial countries for revolutionary forces.** Also, whether in colonial or in

semi-colonial countries, **another characteristic that renders a red political power encircled by a white regime possible in these countries is their having an economically backward structure.** This is one reason why red political power can survive despite being completely encircled. Since these conditions do not exist in imperialist countries (even when there are divisions within the reactionary regime) red political power is not feasible.

2) Comrade Mao Tse-tung states that in regions where red political power emerged and survived there had previously been peasant revolts and that the peasants participated en masse in the democratic revolution. The essence of this condition is this: red political power may come into being in regions with **a sound mass base.** This is because in regions where there are peasant movements a strong mass base exists meaning that red political power may exist there. The revisionist author pushes the essence of the question to one side and remains bound to form. He lists peasant revolts from the Seljuk and Ottoman periods like a historian, but does not address the essence of the question, which is whether a strong mass base exists **today** in the regions where these peasant uprisings took place! The revisionists have really not grasped the conditions for the birth and survival of red political power. They have removed the essence of the question amongst a heap of verbiage.

3) The revisionists, as we have indicated above, transformed the condition “upsurge of the revolutionary situation nationwide” into “upsurge of the revolutionary movement”. Subsequently, they have turned this condition into one where a party is organised nationwide and commands the masses, and there is mass struggle under the leadership of this party in every corner of the country, and all towns and villages. They have claimed that without this the birth and survival of red political power are impossible. They have also put forward this condition for the launching of the armed struggle. This theory must be our bourgeois gentlemen’s pathetic contribution (!) to comrade Mao Tse-tung’s doctrine of red political power or they must be “correcting” Mao!

To be organised nationwide and to have the communist party’s leadership accepted by the masses of workers and peasants, and to direct their struggle is obviously a good and desirable thing, and the victory of the revolution **nationwide** will only be possible when we have secured this. If the above conditions existed, both the armed struggle and the birth and survival of red political power in suitable regions would be a lot easier. But to claim that red political power cannot exist without nationwide organisation and command of all the worker-peasant masses is equivalent to making red political power impossible. Today Marxist-Leninists are not organised nationwide. Workers and peasants in all towns and rural areas do not yet follow the Marxist-Leninists. But if the party and army are constructed within the armed struggle, if “a strong party pursuing a correct policy” and “a strong red army” is built, in a period when the party has yet to gain the most excellent characteristics listed above, in regions where other conditions are present red political power is possible. Firstly, in order for red political power to be born and survive, **it is a good thing** to be organised in all rural regions and to command the masses, **but is not obligatory.** “If a strong party pursuing a correct policy” and “a strong regular army” have been constructed, then red political power may emerge and survive in suitable regions in a period when the party has yet to cover the whole country and embrace all the masses. Secondly, to lay down the condition of gaining support from all the big cities in order for red political power to exist in certain rural regions, or to lay down a condition for support under party leadership in the **main industrial cities,** is again to render red political power impossible. Such support is a good thing but not essential. Peasants, under the leadership of the communist party, may establish red political power solely relying on their own forces and maintain it, but cannot seize power nationwide. According to the claim of our revisionist gentlemen, unless support under the leadership of the party in the main industrial cities has been gained, red political power cannot exist. Just think, the main industrial cities are always the biggest cities of a country. They are the

cities where the enemy is strongest and retains power until the last period of the revolution. The reactionaries may be able to have domination for a long time here and be able to suppress the workers' struggle to a certain extent. In this way they may be able to deprive the peasants' armed struggle of this valuable support to a degree. In this case it will not be possible to establish red political power in rural regions (!). This is one of the theses of the revisionists that render red political power impossible. In reality the revisionists, however much they say the opposite, see the existence of red political power encircled by the white regime as one and the same thing as seizing power nationwide. They deem the conditions necessary for the seizure of power nationwide and certain victory as also obligatory for red political power.

4) The revisionists completely ignore the condition "self-sufficient food resources", one of the conditions for the existence of red political power. They do not understand that "revolutionary ranks turning backward villages into advanced, strong bases making them great military, political, economic and cultural fortresses of the revolution and relying on these to engage in long wars with the enemies based in the cities, and taking the revolution to total victory" is a condition. In order to maintain the war, to develop and consolidate the revolutionary forces, and to avoid war with the enemy when the forces of revolution are still insufficient it is essential to make economically backward regions bases and to rely on these. This possibility does not exist in the big cities and the economically developed regions.

Since the terrain suitable for military action is not of great importance we shall not dwell on it. But, the revisionists are ignoring the fact **that the link to be grasped in order for red political power to be established in Turkey is the construction of the party and army within the armed struggle**, and that these two conditions for red political power in Turkey today are lacking. The bourgeois gentlemen accuse the Marxist-Leninists of "being poor copiers of the Chinese Revolution". We admit that we are not as good at copying as them. But please let them ac-

cept that on the question of red political power they have failed to gain a single point.

### **17. The Shafak Revisionists are Voluntary Missionaries for the Ruling Classes Theory that! The State is Strong!"**

"Turkey, having a tradition of a relatively strong central state and the existence of a strong army compared to other semi-colonial countries..."

(On the Question of the Forming of Red Political Power) "The relatively strong central state edifice and ruling classes' army."

"The fact that the centre (?) Of the state of the ruling classes is strong on account of the characteristics of our country, is a reality that these adventurers are constantly trying to overlook!"

These are ideas that the bourgeois agents have endeavoured to advocate with the zeal of a pious missionary. These sentences borrowed from the statements of Martial law commanders are extremely mistaken and definitely harmful. They are mistaken because the measure of an army's strength is not just its numbers. The army's armaments, other equipment, morale, mass support, experience of war and ability, unity and solidarity in the ranks, all these may be the criteria of an army's strength or weakness.

In Turkey the reactionary army is, yes, numerically large. But its arms and ammunition are generally junk, leftovers from American imperialism. They are not for long term use and the morale of the army is zero. They try to back it up with an inoculation of nationalism, but the effect of this inoculation has almost worn off. Conscripts, NCOs and lower ranking officers in general carry out their duties with fascist discipline, not belief.

In particular amongst conscripts who are from worker or peasant backgrounds there is a rapidly rising tendency of reluctance to use weapons against workers and peasants. The barbarities of martial law and the army's **blatant** protection of the tycoons against the worker and

peasant masses have rapidly isolated the army from the masses, On account of it being a means of national oppression it has become completely isolated from minority nationalities. The Kurdish people in particular. On the other hand the army in Turkey has not seen warfare since the war of liberation. Even the highest ranked and most experienced (!) officers developed at a desk and amongst books without seeing combat. The reactionary army was most recently found wanting

In Korea, where its heroism nonsense was deflated like a balloon. There is no unity or solidarity in the ranks of the reactionary army. It was previously split between various reactionary cliques. Then there is intense dislike between conscripts and officers. The rapidly growing revolutionary struggle in our country in recent years has shaken the masses considerably. Many conscripts join up having already grasped revolutionary ideas. Democratic tendencies amongst NCOs and low-ranking officers are increasing with the influence of the developing revolutionary movement etc...

All these and similar factors are evidence that the reactionary army is not strong, as revisionism would like to portray it, and that despite its appearance of strength is in reality hollow. Despite all this, the reactionary army is not going to fall apart spontaneously. What will smash it is the active struggle of the popular masses.

Certainly, Marxist-Leninists, while disdaining the enemy strategically, take them seriously from a tactical view point. But they do not do as the revisionist clique does and declare it is "strong", merely by looking at its numerical strength. They also look at the morale, whether it has ensured mass support, whether there is unity and solidarity in the ranks and combat experience and ability, which is much more important than numerical strength. This is what taking the enemy seriously all is about.

The revisionist clique speaks like disciples of the reactionary army of the ruling classes! It is trying to frighten the people with demagogy that would grace the language of fascism, such as, "the army is strong",

"and the state is strong".

One of the reasons for their constant hampering of the armed struggle, and their theories that see red political power in Turkey as impossible, is the fear of the army that has penetrated to the very marrow of the revisionists.

In fact, even the latest armed clashes, most of which concluded in failure, created a collapse in morale and fear. Troops cannot sum up the courage to search caves or enter houses from the front. In order to capture two people they have to bring a whole military detachment. The people's armed struggle under the intelligent leadership of the proletarian party will be much more frightening and destructive of morale for the reactionaries.

The revisionist clique's exaggeration of the strength of the reactionary army drags it into the morass of opportunism from another aspect. It leads it to put its hopes in a military coup plotted by the reformist bourgeoisie, rather than the strength of the popular masses, for the destruction of the reactionary army- (since we dwelt on this matter when addressing the questions of fascism and the struggle against fascism we shall not do so again here.)

### **18. The Shafak Revisionists are Rendering Invalid the Strategy of encircling the cities from Rural Areas.**

The Revisionist traitors, while on the one hand apparently accepting this strategy, on the other are endeavouring in an insidious way to undermine its importance and value and wreck it.

According to them, the strategy of encircling the cities from the rural areas is **only** dependent on peasants constituting the majority of the population and their being within feudal and semi-feudal relations of exploitation.

"However, the reason the revolution has developed from the rural regions, where 70% of the population live is the existence of millions of oppressed peasants who constitute the essence of the people's army. This

situation comes directly from the fact that Turkey is a backward agricultural country". (The Political situation in the World and Turkey after 12 March).

"Since the land revolution is essentially a strategy that emerges from the fact that the social structure, that is, that the large majority of oppressed and exploited popular masses live in feudal and semi-feudal relations in rural areas and not as a solely military obligation arising from the relative weakness of state authority in rural areas compared to the cities..." (On the Question of the Forming of Red Political Power)

On the one hand, the encircling of the cities from the countryside is being linked to the peasant population being in the majority, and on the other the anti-Marxist-theses Boratav inherited from Arenism are preserved.

This quote from an issue of the PDA on the question of youth committees is instructive: "The make-up of Turkish society is changing rapidly. If this change continues at this rate, it is inevitable that within 10 or 15 years the proportion of the population of Turkey living in urban areas will be well above 50%."

The youth committee then asks this question: "What form will the fundamental arena of struggle and its fundamental force take?"

The reason the revisionist gentlemen have rendered the strategy of "encircling the cities from the countryside" invalid and cast a shadow on it is now clearly understood. Because according to them:

1) In order for the cities to be encircled from the countryside the peasants should constitute a majority of the population; 2) In Turkey "the economic and social structure is changing rapidly, i.e. the peasant population is rapidly shrinking.

In that case the strategy of encircling the cities from the villages is naturally, from the point of view of Turkey, "rapidly" losing its significance and validity. This is really how these gentlemen think! But as they do not possess the courage and honesty to champion these views they opt for demagogy! They accuse us of addressing "people's

war **unilaterally** as something that develops from the village to the city". They claim that they see the question "multi-laterally", that cities have great significance and that **particularly in Turkey**" it is important to be active in the cities. (see: on the Question of the Forming of Red Political Power, page 8)

We learn and take as a warning self-criticism by the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party that the same claim was made before the massacre by the revisionist leadership denounced at the head of the party. They are trying to justify with this nonsense regarding the importance of work in urban areas their moving of everything to the cities and their rightist pacifist practice in the form of magazine work. They are trying to justify their attempts to concoct a coup under the banner of anti-fascism. And they are still trying to justify their amassing most of the cadres and all the material property of the movement in the cities while treating the rural areas unfairly. The basis for all this is the mistaken perception which we have summarised above in two sentences. As long as they do not rid themselves of this perception it will be impossible to do away with the inevitable consequences of this in practice.

The revisionists are now trying to immunise themselves against criticisms and save the situation with a new wriggle. "Yes, the land revolution is a strategy that will be determined by the social structure. But let us not see this as a basis that will lose its truth as soon as the peasant population falls to 49%. Let us not slip into a point of view that forgets the remaining factors in the second situation", they say. Who else apart from you sees things like this, I wonder? And as long as your above theories continue is it possible to see any differently? If you consider that the strategy of encircling the cities from the countryside will still be correct when the peasant population falls to 49%, isn't it necessary for you to explain the reason? All your theories justify the opposite view. Shouldn't you first throw away these theories with a self-criticism and then explain what the "secondary factors" are? As long as you don't do this the

poisonous seeds you have sown will continue to bear fruit and poison the environment.

The strategy of “encircling the cities from the rural areas” is not **only** dependent on the existence of feudalism and peasants constituting a majority of the population. It is **at the same time** linked to being a semi-colony or colony of imperialism. In a country under the actual occupation of imperialism the national revolution (regardless of the existence of feudalism or the peasant population in that country) will develop essentially from the countryside to the cities, as the occupying imperialist forces will initially seize the country’s large cities, main roads and communications etc..., but will not be able to control the broad rural areas.

Semi-colonial countries are countries under the semi-occupation of imperialism. In such countries, although imperialism maintains its domination primarily by means of native reactionary classes, it offers support to them through its bases, facilities, troops, fleets, weapons aid... For this reason the strategy of “encircling the cities from the countryside” in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries is not **just** due to the existence of feudalism and to the fact that peasants constitute the majority of the population, but also to the semi-occupation of imperialism. What is peculiar to semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries is that the national revolution against imperialism and the democratic revolution, the essence of which is the land revolution against feudalism, are united. The degree of existence of feudalism and the proportion of the population consisting of peasants (these things are interconnected) will influence the programme of the democratic revolution but will not change the strategy of “encirclement of the cities”.

“Rather than it being a question of the belly of imperialism being soft in the rural regions it is more one of the revolutionary movement being strong there on account of millions of peasants. If the fact that villages are the primary sphere of struggle was due to the attributes of the countryside, then the villages would also have “needed to be the primary arena of struggle in imperialist countries, too.”

These gentlemen see strength and weakness not as a relative thing but as something absolute. They see them as immutable, not things that changes. To say “The belly of imperialism is weak in the countryside” implies **at the same time**, that in rural areas the people are stronger. These gentlemen state one aspect of a contradiction while rejecting the other. They accept that “the revolutionary movement is strong in these areas due to millions of peasants”, but reject the fact that “imperialism’s belly is weaker in the countryside”! In fact, one’s strength is **relative to the other, and** the latter’s weakness is **relative to the former**. There is no such thing as absolute immutable criteria of strength or weakness.

The revisionist gents imagine in the above expression that “the belly of imperialism is soft in the countryside” in imperialist countries, too. However, this is **not** the case, for “softness-hardness”, “strength-weakness” is **relative** terms. In imperialist countries the strength of the counter-revolution is higher in the cities than in the villages, but the same is also true for the strength of the revolution. The situation regarding the balance of forces is that compared to the villages it is favourable to the revolution in the cities. But this situation is not immutable. Since this question is not relevant to the matter in hand we shall not dwell on it.

If we summarise: the thing that determines the strategy of “encircling the cities from the countryside” it is that the relationship of forces between the revolution and the counter-revolution is, relative to the cities, more in favour of the revolution in the villages. **The weakest link in the chain of counter revolution is in the rural areas.** Consequently, the revolution front is stronger in these areas. A country’s containing feudal relations within it influences this force relationship in the following way: the existence of feudalism leads in general to a large peasant population and as an entirety to the peasant mass being revolutionary. This situation affects the balance of forces in the rural areas in favour of the revolution (democratic revolution). Also, the existence of feudalism, since it will lend to industry, and, consequently, the working class, being weak, it affects the relationship of forces in

the cities adversely for the revolution. A country's being semi-colonial or colonial also adversely affects the relationship of forces in the cities for the revolution. These two conditions together necessitate the rural regions being the primary sphere of struggle and the pursuing of the strategy of "encircling the cities from the countryside". Even in the event of a gradual dissolution of feudalism and the shrinking of the peasant population linked to it, this strategy will still be valid, because the conditions of semi-colonialism (or colonialism) have changed the relationship of forces in the big cities in favour of counter-revolution. Instead of looking at the question with a dialectical materialist eye from the point of view of the balance of forces, these gents are looking at it from the perspective of a formula with no meaning in certain conditions (for instance, in Tsarist Russian conditions) like "the peasant population being a majority" and rejecting situations that do not comply with this formula. And as a result they are creating the impression in cadres' minds that in the event of the peasant population shrinking the strategy of "encircling the cities from the countryside" will not be correct! The Youth Committee's question is entirely the product of the seeds sown by these gents.

The theories of the revisionists are also defective in this respect: they say "the structure of Turkish society is undergoing rapid change", but this is not the case. This claim is that of the Arenists in Turkey and the Trotskyists worldwide. According to them, imperialism rapidly develops the productive forces in countries it penetrates, dissolves feudalism, strengthens the working class and matures the conditions for the socialist revolution. This revisionist-Trotskyist claim has been put forward against the Marxist-Leninist wing in debates on the question of giving primacy to work in villages in order to justify concentrating on the cities, to reject the fact that the peasants are the fundamental force and to reject that the principal contradiction is between feudalism and the popular masses. The revisionists have abandoned some of the results of this claim but have not abandoned the claim itself.

## 19. The Shafak Revisionists are putting forward contradictory views on the main Force of the Revolution

Comrade Mao Tse-tung listed the classes that take part in a revolution in a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country thus:

"The leading force in our revolution is the industrial proletariat. Our closest friends are the entire semi-proletariat and petty bourgeoisie. As for the vacillating middle bourgeoisie, their right-wing may become our enemy and their left-wing may become our friend but we must be constantly on our guard and not let them create confusion within our ranks." (Mao Tse-Tung, Selected Works I)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung also stated that the peasantry (that is, poor and middle peasants) was the main force of the revolution. The meaning of the peasantry being the main force of the revolution is as follows: the democratic popular revolution is in essence a peasant revolution. The peasants constitute the primary human source of the backbone of the struggle against feudalism and imperialism. In the democratic popular revolution the proletariat must rely principally on the peasants. The question of the peasantry being the main force is one of the most important elements in comrade Mao Tse-tung's theory of the democratic popular revolution. It is impossible to achieve victory in the struggle against feudalism and imperialism without grasping this question. What is the stance of our bourgeois gents on such an important question? They previously disseminated the sophistry that the proletariat was the main force.

In the period of martial law following the Great Workers' Resistance of 15-16 June, when a struggle began against revisionism in the ranks, the revisionists made a quiet manoeuvre and, with bourgeois juggling, endeavoured to claim that on account of the peculiar conditions (!) of Turkey both the proletariat and the peasants were the main force.

What is the situation now? The revisionist gents are now on the question of main force in a state of uncertainty, vagueness and lacking principles, as they are on many questions. On the one hand they write in

some publications that the peasantry is the main force, while on the other they write in other publications, or even the same publications, that the workers and peasants are the main force! Let us read from Long Live the Revolutionary Mass Line:

“The main force of the revolution the worker peasant masses” (page 5)

“The main force of the revolution is the workers and peasants” (page 31)

“The worker peasant masses that are the main force of the revolution” (page 35)

Their insidious attitudes that reject the fact the peasants are the main force of the revolution also manifests themselves in other forms. At the 10-11 April Meeting the person who is the head of revisionism claimed the thesis he had put forward in an article that “in a party of the proletariat the proletariat has an absolute majority” was correct. On this question he rejected as “unjust” a cosmetic self-criticism stuck in a corner of the magazine. According to this person workers should have an absolute majority in the party of the proletariat. This idea is directly related to the question of the main force of the revolution. In semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries where the peasants are the main force of the revolution it is inevitable that the peasants will constitute the majority in the proletarian party. To reject this is in reality to reject the fact that the peasants are the main force of the revolution. This is the point these gents have eventually arrived at after much meandering! But insidiously! But by hiding behind a subtle (!) bourgeois politics!

## **20. The Shafak Revisionists identify the Principal Contradiction in an Idealist Way.**

The revisionist clique’s line on the question of “principal contradiction” zigzags like a snake. In the period when they were tailing Mihri they saw the principal contradiction as being between imperialism and the nation. They included a significant section of the comprador bour-

geoisie and landlords in this concept of nation. Later on the contradiction between the “native ruling classes (!) And the people of Turkey” became the principal contradiction! And they defended this against the Marxist-Leninist wing for a long time! On being pressurised, in an article that was a masterpiece of idealism, mechanical materialism and false logic entitled “Imperialism, mode of Production, Classes and the Principal Contradiction”, they declared the contradiction between feudalism and the people to be the principal contradiction! But the person who is the head of revisionism and some of his disciples objected to this for a long time! They continued to claim that the principal contradiction was between the native ruling classes and the people. They now appear to have accepted that the contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses is the principal contradiction. However, they have still not grasped the essence of the question. They have only changed their tune because they were no longer able to defend their former ideas!

We read these sentences from the Draft Programme:

“Only by grasping this contradiction (the contradiction between feudalism and the people) as the principal link of the revolution can we organise the broad worker-peasant masses in the people’s army, accomplish the democratic people’s revolution and destroy the domination of imperialism.

“For this reason, amongst the four main contradictions in our country today, the contradiction between the popular masses and feudalism is the principal contradiction”.

A shameful wretchedness of ideas! The gents are even incapable of separating the cause from the effect. The contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses “the principal link to be grasped” is the effect, the outcome of the contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses being the principal contradiction. It is not the cause of the principal contradiction as they are trying to portray it. The gents are moving from effect to cause, from the end to the start. They are trying to reverse dialectical development! In this way a link will be grasped, saying this

is the link of the revolution to be grasped, then "so this is the principal contradiction" will be announced! This is their logic and method of thinking!

Comrade Mao Tse-tung says:

"Hence, if in any process there are a number of contradictions; one of them must be the principal contradiction playing the leading and decisive role, while the rest occupy a secondary and subordinate position. Therefore, in studying any complex process in which there are two or more contradictions, we must devote every effort to finding its principal contradiction. Once this principal contradiction is grasped, all problems can be readily solved." (Mao Tse-Tung, Selected Works I)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung says in complete contrast to the thinking methods of the revisionist gents that it is first necessary to find the principal contradiction and then to understand it. Two logics! "As I have grasped this contradiction it is the principal one", "as this contradiction is the principal contradiction I have grasped it". The former is the logic of revisionism, the latter the logic of Marxism-Leninism.

What is the principal contradiction? In any process in which numerous contradictions exist, the contradiction "which plays a directing and determining role" is the principle contradiction. In his book *New Democracy* comrade Mao Tse-tung says the following, which has the same meaning: \*\*\*Quote from *New Democracy* \* this was formulated in your draft... please insert here

In our country today since the contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses "has an influence and determining effect on the resolution of other contradictions" and "plays a directing and determining role it is the principal contradiction. The development of the labour-capital contradiction, or, in other words, proletariat-bourgeoisie contradiction, depends on the development and resolution of the "contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses", to the degree that this contradiction develops and is resolved the proletariat and bourgeoisie emerge and develop. The falling into place, sharpening and maturing of

the proletariat - bourgeoisie contradiction depends on feudalism being completely uprooted and swept away by the popular masses. This is why the proletariat is determinedly in the vanguard of the struggle against feudalism, because as feudalism is swept away by a determined peasant struggle the bourgeois-proletarian contradiction emerges and ideal conditions for the proletarian class struggle and for socialism come into being. It is this idea that is the basis for the Marxist-Leninist theory of continuous and phased revolution.

In semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries the contradiction that plays a "directing and determining role" over the contradiction between imperialism and the people of the country is "the contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses." Imperialism maintains its existence and dominance in such countries by relying on principally feudalism. Imperialism continues its existence and dominance by supporting and consolidating feudalism particularly in political and ideological spheres and by slowing the dissolution of feudal property relations. The social prop of imperialism in the cities is the comprador bourgeoisie, whereas in the rural districts it is landlords, usurers, tribal leaders, semi-bourgeois, semi-feudal land owners and the ideological supports of feudalism such as sheikhs, religious teachers etc.... That is, members of the feudal classes. Although feudal property relations, that is, essentially the system of landlordism, are slowly dissolving, they have still preserved their forms of feudal exploitation for long years. Forms of exploitation such as sharecropping, feudal forms of letting, usury and other such semi-feudal methods of exploitation continue. Usury is encouraged by means of imperialist banks. Feudal relationships are particularly prominent in the superstructure, where they continue violently. Bourgeois democracy is always arm-in-arm with the whip of feudalism. Democracy always possesses a feudal character. A significant section of the bourgeoisie has a semi-bourgeois, semi-feudal quality. All these feudal relationships facilitate the indirect dominance of imperialism and become their prop. The step by step cleansing of feudalism, that is, the resolution of the con-

tradition between feudalism and the popular masses will deprive imperialism of a significant prop. It will affect the contradiction between imperialism and the people of the country and lead to the step by step resolution of this contradiction. But the principal contradiction is not immutable. The principal contradiction within a process containing more than one contradiction may become secondary with a change of conditions, and a secondary contradiction may become the principal contradiction. For instance, in a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country that suffers an actual imperialist occupation and colonisation the contradiction between imperialism and the people of the country will become the principal contradiction that determines and influences the process of development. But in the event of the imperialists mounting an attack on socialist China the contradiction between the socialist system and the imperialist system will become the principal contradiction, as it will be this contradiction that determines and influences the process of change and development worldwide. The other contradictions will become secondary and dependent on the principal contradiction.

If we summarise, the leaders of the revisionist clique have not been able to grasp the reason for one contradiction in a process containing multiple contradictions being the principal contradiction. They have not been able to understand why in our country the principal contradiction is that between feudalism and the popular masses. Since they have had to they give the appearance of accepting it, but they are not aware of its real meaning.

### **21. The Shafak Revisionists are maintaining the Dev-Guc Perception**

The revisionists at one time were in the forefront of the Mihrist Dev-Guc perception, which rejects the independent political organisation of the proletariat, that is, it rejects the proletarian party, the people's army, the alliance of workers and peasants, and makes the working class, poor peasants and revolutionary youth into docile instruments of the bour-

geoisie. It means having the cunning to utilise these forces as a winch for a bourgeois coup! It means acting for, in the name of proletarian revolutionism (!), representatives of the reformist middle bourgeoisie, and even of the comprador bourgeoisie such as Inonu and a section of anti-communist elements like Kadri Kaplan.

Just as Dev-Guc was not a **people's united front under the leadership of the proletariat**, it was also not a **provisional and partial agreement** that may be made from time to time between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. **It was bourgeois tailing and capitulationism.** The revisionists declared such a treacherous initiative to be a people's united front. They publicised it, saying: "we can not say that some CHP administrators may not join the common front. Let anyone who is pro-national join (!). **The revolutionary unity of forces which is an interclass alliance** has made headway (see ASD.no.7, page 18)

"Revolutionary Force [Dev-Guc], as the first concrete unity of forces movement of socialists and Kemalists since the War of Liberation, has an historical significance." (ASD no.13, page9)

The Dev-Guc initiative did not survive, but the Dev-Guc mentality survived in the heads of a section of hardened revisionists. When the revolutionary cadre grasped the fact that the people's united front would essentially be an inter-class alliance, and that worker-peasant alliances should constitute the main force of this alliance, the revisionists changed direction and tried to use a new mask to conceal their bourgeois tailing and capitulationism, saying: "The people's united front is one thing, the revolutionary unity forces is another thing." (See ASD, nos12-14). In this way they tried to revive the moribund Mihrist Dev-Guc. Hurling to one side the three weapons of the people, the communist party, people's armed forces under its leadership and the people's united front, also under party leadership, with the slogan "our weapon is revolutionary unity of forces". (see PDA, no19.). As we mentioned above while examining the theories invented by the revisionist clique on the question of fascism and struggle against fascism, they made the slogan of "revolu-

tionary unity of forces” into a prop for encouraging a military coup. That is, “revolutionary unity of forces” had the meaning of support for putting the reformist bourgeoisie in power.

The revisionists are still maintaining the same perception today. Under the banner of anti-fascist struggle they are still endeavouring to tail the reformist bourgeoisie in the cities. Let us summarise the mentality of the revisionist clique in order for it to be better understood: revolutionary unity of forces (they sometimes call this “democratic unity of forces”) is a vehicle of struggle against fascism. This will happen in all periods. Revolutionary unity of forces is not based on a fundamental worker-peasant alliance. It is carried out with bourgeois and petit-bourgeois organisations and individuals.

“We are always prepared to engage in unity of forces” (YIKC.p.105). “Unity of forces can occur in every period. It is mistaken to say unity of forces cannot be entered into before becoming stronger”. (Political Situation in the World and Turkey after 12 March, page 95). The people’s united front is a vehicle for anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle. “The people’s revolutionary front is founded and develops on the basis of a worker-peasant alliance.” (Political Situation in the World and Turkey after 12 March, page 95).

“Views such as ‘without red political power being established in one or several areas a front is not feasible’ are remnant of one-sided bourgeois thinking and by their very nature are erroneous.” The front may materialise from today, because “the front expresses the correct identification of the friends and foes of the revolution. It is a fundamental question at every stage of the revolution to correctly identify friend and foe and pursue politics that comply with that”. (Example of opportunism and hypocrisy from the circular).

These are the views of revisionism on the question of democratic unity of forces and front.

The first error is this: The sophistry of “revolutionary unity of forces” is not the “vehicle of struggle against fascism”, as the revisionists wish

to portray it. That is the “people’s united front”. That is, an alliance of all revolutionary classes and strata founded on a fundamental worker-peasant alliance under proletarian leadership. There is not a word in comrade Dimitrov’s works on the anti-fascist struggle being waged by a vehicle of tailing and capitulation called “revolutionary unity of forces”. Comrade Dimitrov always talks of an **anti-fascist popular front** and this is the people’s front itself under the leadership of the proletariat. And the aim of the anti-fascist struggle is to realise popular front power.

The second error is this: Proletarian revolutionaries have a single front policy and that is the people’s united front under the leadership of the proletariat. Apart from this communists and the proletariat have no time for sophistries like democratic unity of forces or revolutionary unity of forces”. The invention of the slogan of “revolutionary unity of forces” is in order to justify the Dev-Guc initiative, as we have indicated above. In order to justify marching behind bourgeois democrats in the name of “alliance” (!) without taking into account the main masses, party, people’s army and people’s united front. To justify their policy of tailing and capitulation with the sophistry and demagogy of “this is not the people’s united front, it is revolutionary unity of forces”. It is to find justification for becoming subject to the reformist bourgeoisie by pushing the working class leadership and fundamental alliance of workers and peasants to one side. These are the reasons for inventing “democratic unity of forces” as a separate and contrary slogan to the “people’s united front”.

The emergence of this slogan came after it had been understood that the Dev-Guc initiative has absolutely nothing to do with the “people’s united front”. The revisionists thus invented a theory that would justify their policy of tailing and capitulation, saying yes, Dev-Guc was not the people’s united front but it was a revolutionary unity of forces”. And they are maintaining this theory, developing it further. In this way they have masterfully made compatible (!) Mihriism and Mao Tse-tung Thought, the “Dev-Guc” perception of “united people’s front”, two completely opposite perceptions. And these revisionist traitors accuse us of

saying "unity of forces is only engaged in when we are strong". And they also slander us by calling us "Trotskyist". Trotskyism in fact exists in abundance in your Boratavist analysis of 5% feudalism in Turkey, in your attitudes looking down on the revolutionary role of the peasants and the perception that places the worker-bourgeois alliance ahead of the worker-peasant alliance. "Trotskyism" is essentially to reject the revolutionary role of the peasants or to look down on it, as you do. It is to reject the worker peasant alliance and give prominence to the alliance of the workers and bourgeoisie (that is, to have the Dev-Guc outlook). It is to have dreams of total uprising. Those who are most worthy of being Trotsky's agents in our country, who are most suitable, are you, who have pursued a semi-Trotskyist line until today.

We do not recognise a thing called "revolutionary unity of forces". Therefore, it is not possible for us to have said "revolutionary unity of forces" is only engaged in when we are strong". And we have never advocated such a thing anywhere either verbally or in writing. We have adopted and pursue the policy of establishing a "people's united front", the only correct policy of alliance. We identify our task as being to construct the three weapons of the people: the communist party, the people's army under the leadership of the party and the people's united front, also under the leadership of the party. Apart from this we do not recognise a "revolutionary unity of forces". As for you, you are constantly hampering the realisation of the people's united front with your tailing and capitulationist policy under the name of "revolutionary unity of forces". Have you understood bourgeois demagogues?

The revisionists' third error is this: "The front signifies the correct identification of friends and foes of the revolution". No, gentlemen! The front does not signify this. What you have done is incredible demagoguery. **The front signifies the fact that ALL REVOLUTIONARY CLASSES AND STRATA have united against imperialism, feudalism and comprador capitalism under the leadership of the communist party and based on the fundamental worker-peasant alliance.** As

long as classes and strata with interests in the revolution do not **actually unite** the front will not come into being. As the revisionist traitors say, the front does not materialise with **the identification** of friends and foes of the revolution. If this were the case then once they had been correctly identified all would be accomplished. And as long as this identification were preserved the front would not have collapsed (!).. Chinese Communist Party comrades correctly determined the friends and foes of the revolution way back in 1927. Did the front materialise immediately? How many times did the people's front break down and be reformed in the process of the class struggle? To say that the "front signifies the correct identification of the friends and foes of the revolution" is as nonsensical as saying that once the goal of democratic people's dictatorship has been identified this goal will be spontaneously and immediately attained. In order for the front to come into being it is not sufficient to identify the friends and foes of the revolution correctly; at the same time **it is necessary to wage a relatively long struggle towards uniting the friends of the revolution under the leadership of the proletariat, which will necessitate a patient and hard struggle.** Without such a struggle it will not be possible to bring the working class together, let alone unite the different strata. The revisionist gents sort out everything with one designation! They assume that once this is done all the classes and strata will take their place and await our gentlemen's orders!

It is as if it is not class struggle but a ceremony, and those opposite us are an honour guard!

"It is a fundamental question at every stage of the revolution to correctly identify friend and foe and pursue politics that comply with that" (Example of opportunism and hypocrisy from the circular).

We have nothing to say regarding this correct sentence. But let us remind the revisionist gents that this is not the subject of debate. Just as it is an incontestable truth that at every stage of the revolution it is necessary to correctly identify friend and foe and pursue politics that comply with that", so too is it an incontestable truth that the people's united front

**cannot be realised** as soon as the friends and foes of the revolution are established. To wish for something is one thing, for it **to be realised** is another. The revisionist gents are making a tiny (!) error in confusing the **subjective intention** with the **objective fact**. In order for the subjective intention which is not contrary to the laws of nature and society to become an objective fact there is a need for a **process**. **At the end of this process** certain conditions will come together and ensure the emergence of the objective fact. The realisation of the people's united front is like this. Today we wish for this front to be realised. **This is our subjective intention**. And this intention complies with societal laws because the popular classes have interests in the realisation of this front. There are strong economic, social and political factors that will bring them together. But in order for this to happen there will be a **process of struggle**. We cannot attain the objective fact without this process. The revisionist gents assume this period does not exist. It is like confusing a child starting primary school wishing to be an engineer with someone who is an actual engineer. In order to realise the people's united front under the leadership of the proletariat based on the fundamental worker-peasant alliance we must firstly correctly identify the friends and foes of the revolution. Secondly, we should start the struggle today to unite the friends of the revolution. Thirdly, we should be aware that without this struggle reaching a certain point, without passing through a **certain process of struggle**, the front will not become a fact. The revisionist gentlemen reverse this clear truth with an incredible demagoguery and the skill of a juggler. They sort everything out by saying: "the front signifies the correct identification of the friends and foes of the revolution."

The claim of the Marxist-Leninists that so enrage the revisionists is this: the people's united front which we shall establish under the leadership of the proletariat and based on a fundamental worker-peasant alliance **cannot come to a real state of being** without red political power being realised in one or several areas. These are clear and in no way means let's not work to realise the people's united front. Only retards

who do not understand what they read and those out of spite who have bad intentions can claim this.

The meaning of the above phrase is this: let us struggle from now on in order to realise the people's united front, but let us be aware that without reaching the point of attaining red political power in one or several areas the united front of the entire people cannot be achieved.

You ask: "Aren't the activities we are carrying out today in rural areas in order to realise the worker-peasant alliance that is the basis of the people's front?" This question is only proof of your bad intentions and demagoguery, because the worker-peasant alliance is not even a subject of debate for Marxist-Leninists. What is up for debate is the alliance to be founded on the worker-peasant alliance, that is, the alliance to be made with the revolutionary wing of the national bourgeoisie. And the starting point of the debate was a criticism of your policy tailing the reformist national bourgeoisie. Why is an **alliance** with the national bourgeoisie not feasible without the rise of red political power in one of more areas? Because prior to that the national bourgeoisie will not accept the leadership of the proletariat. It will maintain obstinately and persistently its own compromising capitulationist reformist line that will never take the popular masses to revolution and liberation. Alliance will not be possible because the bourgeoisie will not go along with such an alliance, not because the proletariat does not want alliance with the bourgeoisie. Isn't this abundantly clear?

Doesn't it comply with the current realities of our country? Aren't the representatives of the national bourgeoisie, from the far right to the most left, endeavouring to seize power by election or a military coup, and to smooth down the rough edges of the present order and establish their own dictatorship over the workers and peasants? Aren't they wagging their tails at fascism most of the time? Is it possible to establish a popular front with them aiming for a people's democratic dictatorship under the leadership of the proletariat under current conditions? Has it been possible up to now?

With the formation of red political power in one or more than one areas what is not feasible today will become feasible, as the working class, poor peasants and the communist party will possess a people's army that is the real guarantor of real freedom and of maintaining and protecting their existence. As comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "Quotes from Mao this was also formulated on your draft. Secondly, the worker-peasant alliance, that is, the fundamental alliance, will have been realised to a certain extent. These extremely significant changes will draw the national bourgeoisie, which from time to time is indecisive and steers towards the enemies of the workers and peasants, to a large degree towards the revolutionary front led by the proletariat. We say to a large degree as prior to that some representatives of the national bourgeoisie and certain elements may join the ranks of the revolution, but this will not be considered an alliance with the national bourgeoisie.

The revisionist traitors consider an "alliance" (!) with the national bourgeoisie is feasible today! Yes, it is possible, but only in one form: instead of a front under the red flag of the proletariat based on a fundamental alliance of workers and peasants aiming to establish a people's democratic dictatorship, in a "front" (!) behind the bourgeoisie, aiming to smooth out the jagged edges of the present order with certain reforms and to establish a bourgeois dictatorship.

Since the revisionist traitors' perception of "front" falls into the second category they see an alliance (!) with the national bourgeoisie as feasible from today. In our opinion, today, as comrade Lenin says: only "temporary and partial agreements" with the bourgeoisie are possible.

Comrade Lenin says:

At the League Congress Comrade Martov also adduced the following argument against Comrade Plekhanov's resolution: "The chief objection to it, the chief defect of this resolution, is that it totally ignores the fact that it is our duty, in the struggle against the autocracy, not to shun alliance with liberal-democratic elements. Comrade Lenin would call this a Martynov tendency. This tendency is already being manifested in

the new Iskra" (p. 88).

For the wealth of "gems" it contains this passage is indeed rare.

1) The phrase about alliance with the liberals is a sheer muddle. Nobody mentioned alliance, Comrade Martov, but only temporary or partial agreements. That is an entirely different thing. 2) If Plekhanov's resolution ignores an incredible "alliance" and speaks only of "support" in general, that is one of its merits, not a defect.

Yes, an alliance with temporary and partial agreements is a completely different thing. The sophistry of "...Democratic unity of forces" which is the basis of the Dev-Guc perception, and temporary and partial agreements based on that perception are entirely different, too.

Firstly, it is temporary and **partial**. Whereas the second, including the demand for permanency and for the bourgeoisie to seize power with a coup, is directed at **supporting** all their demands. It is abundantly clear that the first is to make provisional agreements that are suitable to the interests of the proletariat on certain questions and appropriate to their principles, while the second is an effort to make the proletariat tail the bourgeoisie.

Let us point out the following: When communists determine their policies they separate the primary from the secondary. This is extremely important, and a condition for advancing on the correct path. For instance, today we say that the armed struggle is primary and the other forms of struggle are secondary. Accepting the other forms of struggle does not necessitate making them primary. Again, for instance, today we say struggle in the rural areas is primary, while struggle in the big cities is secondary. Accepting struggle in the big cities does not necessitate making it primary. In the same way it is primary to rely on our own forces and secondary to rely on the allies. The united front is a contradictory unity. Every contradiction has a primary and a secondary facet. The primary facet of the united front is the proletariat and peasantry, while the secondary facet is the national bourgeoisie. Accepting the united front with the national bourgeoisie does not imply acceptance of

it as the primary facet. In the struggle to realise the front Marxist-Leninists will primarily work to establish the worker-peasant alliance and give prominence to that, while attaching **secondary** importance to the alliance with the bourgeoisie. In more concrete terms this means: they will concentrate **primarily** on constructing the party and people's army while giving **secondary** attention to the alliance with the national bourgeoisie. The betrayal of the revisionist traitors displays itself here: they are constantly and without let up attempting to give priority to alliance (!) with the bourgeoisie, while relegating the construction of the party and people's army to a secondary level.

This is all irrefutable proof that the Shafak revisionists have entirely adopted the Mihriist Dev-Guc perception, its bourgeois tailing and policy of capitulation, and are perpetuating it.

## **22. The Shafak Revisionists consider long lasting National Bourgeois Governments in Backward Countries as Feasible**

The Shafak revisionists champion the idea that the Kemalist government was a "national bourgeois" regime and that it continued until about 1935. They claim that in today's world national bourgeois administrations exist and are on the increase. It will be useful to recount a debate that took place amongst us.

The debate arose from a sentence in an article entitled "The Political situation in the World and Turkey after 12 March", i.e. "Arab countries where the national bourgeoisie is in power". The countries referred to here were Syria, Libya, Sudan, Egypt etc. We maintained that the national bourgeoisie was not in power in these countries and that it was the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords who were in power. We went on to say that the reason these classes took a relatively neutral stance between various imperialist blocs was due to their having achieved a balance between the influences of various imperialist countries. In particular their achieving a balance between the influence of US imperialism and Soviet imperialism has prevented the comprador bourgeoisie and land-

lords in power in these countries from relying definitely on either side. These classes find it more advantageous to continue collaboration with both of them, using their collaboration with one as a trump card against the other as a way of increasing their share of exploitation. When one imperialist country increases its influence at the expense of the other the relatively "neutral" stance of the classes in power will certainly end. Also in the countries in question there are sections of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords that advocate dependence on either US imperialism or Soviet social imperialism.

The Shafak revisionists continued to maintain that in these countries there are politically independent national bourgeois governments. They even said the global tendency is for an increase in national bourgeois power. However, in the age of imperialism independent national bourgeois governments are in general not possible in backward countries (some special situations may occur). This is because in the era of imperialism markets have united on a global scale. The giant imperialist monopolies have extended their tentacles like an octopus into every corner of the world. There is absolutely no possibility of the puny capital of the national bourgeoisie in backward countries competing with them. For them the way out is to immediately go into collaboration with the imperialists and be content with a suitable share of the exploitation of the country. For this reason the national bourgeoisie that seizes power in backward countries will either immediately become comprador bourgeoisie or will be removed from power by economic, social, political and military pressure from imperialism and native reactionaries, to be replaced by a government of the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords.

Back in 1916 comrade Lenin said:

*"In a commodity producing society, no independent development, or development of any sort whatsoever, is possible without capital... The colonies have no capital of their own, or none to speak of, and under finance capital no colony can obtain any except on terms of political submission."* (Lenin collected works Vol. 22)

The words which comrade Lenin uttered for the colonies are also valid today for semi-colonial countries with the necessary changes. For, in a commodity producing society, no independent development, or development of any sort whatsoever, is possible without capital...

Semi-colonial countries, too, capital of *their own*, or none to speak of. We are also "in finance capital conditions" and in these conditions backward countries "cannot find capital" without conforming to the condition of political dependence". Consequently, even if a national bourgeoisie seizes power for a time, it will in a very short time have to throw itself into the arms of an imperialist country.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed to the same reality in 1926. .

*"The middle bourgeoisie. This class... Politically, they stand for the establishment of a state under the rule of a single class, the national bourgeoisie... But its attempt to establish a state under the rule of the national bourgeoisie is quite impracticable, because the present world situation is such that the two major forces, revolution and counter-revolution, are locked in final struggle. Each has hoisted a huge banner: one is the red banner of revolution held aloft by the Third International as the rallying point for all the oppressed classes of the world, the other is the white banner of counterrevolution held aloft by the League of Nations as the rallying point for all the counter-revolutionaries of the world. The intermediate classes are bound to disintegrate quickly, some sections turning left to join the revolution, others turning right to join the counter-revolution: there is no room for them to remain 'independent'... therefore the idea cherished by China's middle bourgeoisie of an "independent" revolution in which it would play the primary role is a mere illusion."* (Mao Tse-Tung, Selected Works I)

The revisionists have not abandoned their claim that in our age politically independent national bourgeois power is possible and that the tendency is for this to increase. But they have opted to camouflage this claim insidiously. They have replaced the phrase "Arab countries in which the national bourgeoisie is in power" with the term "nationalist

Arab regimes". And they claim that the "nationalist Arab regimes" are "showing reactions" to the influence of US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism in the Middle East. (The Political situation in the World and Turkey after 12 March, pages 22-23)

The revisionists also consider a national bourgeois government is possible in Turkey. This is one of the reasons they are so keenly courting the middle bourgeoisie. But as comrade Mao Tse-tung says: they are chasing an empty dream"!

### **23. The Shafak Revisionists reject the idea that the Middle Bourgeoisie "may be able to co-exist with the comprador big bourgeoisie and Landlord cliques.**

In "The Political situation in the World and Turkey after 12 March" booklet they say:

"The big bourgeoisie and middle bourgeoisie cannot co-exist in the same place" (page 56)

This is a generalisation. What may be true in certain particular circumstances becomes entirely erroneous when generalised. This is to deny the class character of the middle bourgeoisie. It is not possible that these revisionists do not know the judgement of Marxism-Leninism on the middle bourgeoisie, i.e. : "the middle bourgeoisie from time to time joins the ranks of the revolution and from time to time the ranks of the counter-revolution etc." The revisionists in a trice trample on the worldly experience and replace it with their own reactionary utopias. The realities of our country, too, give countless examples of how, in periods when there was not a strong revolutionary political movement, the middle bourgeoisie of a national character for long years attached itself to the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord cliques. The claim that "the big bourgeoisie and middle bourgeoisie cannot co-exist" is contrary to the realities of our country. Mao mentions that the middle bourgeoisie in China often followed the Kuomintang reactionaries. Therefore, the above claim also contradicts the objective realities of the Chinese Revolution.

To attribute to the middle bourgeoisie a quality they do not deserve is another image of the revisionist traitors' tendency to rely on the middle bourgeoisie.

#### **24. The Shafak Revisionists are Driving Dominant Nation Nationalism and making the Kurdish Nation's Right of Self-Determination impossible.**

Since we have criticised the revisionists' views regarding the National Question in a separate booklet we shall only briefly touch on the question here.

The Shafak revisionists do not see the Kurdish movement as a national movement. They evaluate it **only** as a popular movement that is acting against national oppression and persecution. They are erasing the great difference between popular movement and national movement. (See Draft Programme articles 10-25). They portray national oppression and class oppression, national contradiction and class contradiction as one and the same thing. In this way, by pushing to one side the class contradictions of the Kurdish bourgeoisie and landlords they are lending support to efforts to deceive the Kurdish working class and toilers.

On the one hand the Shafak Revisionists, by distorting the concept of "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination" in an incredible way, are making this right impossible. They came up with the form "People's right of self-determination", a formulation once advocated by Bukharin against Lenin, then tied this "People's right of self-determination" to all kinds of conditions, shamefully trampling on the "Kurdish nation's right to self-determination". (See Draft Programme, article 52)

"The Marxist-Leninist movement is a defender of the **Kurdish people's** right to self-determination."

(The Political situation in the World and Turkey after 12 March, page 74)

"We shall defend the Kurdish people's right to self-determination without concessions" (ibid, page 72)

"We should continue to insistently defend the **Kurdish people's right of self-determination**" (On the question of founding of Red Political Power)

The "People's Right of Self-Determination" advocated by Bukharin and "right of nations to self-determination" advocated by comrade Lenin are two entirely different things. The first means the **people's right to make a** revolution, whereas the second means a nation's right to establish a separate state. The Shafak Revisionists defend the Kurdish people's right to make a revolution (!). This is their resolution of the national question. And this is nothing else but to defend insidiously the continuation the Turkish nation's existing privilege to establish a state. It is to be an accomplice of the Turkish ruling classes. It is to approve the existing inequality that is to the disadvantage of the Kurdish nation.

We are including a section from our booklet on the national question that documents the dominant nation nationalism of the Shafak revisionists.

The Shafak revisionists approve of the national oppression meted out to the Kurdish nation and other minority nationalities in history. They applaud M.Kemal's stating at the Sivas Congress that "In Turkey the Turks and the Kurds live." They warmly welcome Ismet Inonu saying at Lausanne that "I am the representative of the Turks and the Kurds", and make it a prop for themselves. It is as if they are saying to the Turkish ruling classes "Look, Ataturk and Inonu also recognised the existence of the Kurds. This is what we are doing, too! What is there to get angry about?"

The revisionist traitors assume that by recognising a nation's existence they have resolved the national question. Communists, on the national question, champion the absolute equality of every nationality and language and oppose all manner of inequality and privilege. On the question of establishing a state, too, they demand the equality of nations. Their unconditional defence of "the right of Nations to

self-determination” comes from this. However, the bourgeoisie at every opportunity wants inequality to the advantage of its own nationality and privilege, and tramples on the most natural rights of other nations etc....

The dominant nation bourgeoisie may recognise the existence of other nations, and even, when it has to, grant them certain rights. Like the Arab bourgeoisie in Iraq. But at every opportunity it will trample on these rights and wish to oppress other nationalities. What separates communists and the bourgeoisie is not whether or not they recognise a minority nationality’s existence.

Besides, M.Kemal’s real purpose in mentioning the existence of the Kurds at the Sivas Congress in conditions where there was little or no central authority was to prevent a possible separate Kurdish movement and to block the right of self-determination. He wished to ensure they would consent to the yoke of the Turkish bourgeoisie and landlords. The whole life of M.Kemal is full of examples of oppression and persecution of the **Kurdish** nation and other nationalities. In Turkey if there is one person whom communists should not enrol in their support on the national question it is M.Kemal. And in Turkey the nationalism that needs to be struggled against first and foremost is M.Kemal nationalism, which is dominant nation nationalism. Inonu’s claim to represent the Kurds at the Lausanne Conference was a blatant attack on the Kurdish nation’s right to self-determination. A shameful determination of the Kurdish nation’s destiny from outside. The craftiness to haggle with imperialists to include the region where the Kurdish people live within the borders of Turkey that is the area of domination of the Turkish bourgeoisie and landlords! And the emergence of the most ferocious forms of Turkish nationalism. This is the thing the revisionist traitors have made a base for themselves!

A Turkish nationalism that makes certain concessions to Kurdish nationalism. This is the summary of all the prattling and charlatany perpetrated by the Shafak revisionists on the national question.

## 25. The Kemalist inheritance

We are going to deal with how the Shafak revisionists evaluate the history of Turkey and their flattery of Kemalism in a separate booklet. Let us point out briefly here that the Shafak revisionists are to the right of Ecevit, a spokesman of the reformist bourgeoisie, and closer to the Kemal Satir group, in their evaluation of the Kemalist movement. The Shafak revisionists eagerly embrace the inheritance that even Ecevit is reluctant to accept, and endeavour to publicise this “precious” inheritance in all directions. The Kemalists’ tenet of “complete independence” implies willing acceptance of the semi-colonial structure and there is absolutely nothing in this that communists should wish to possess. This is an inheritance that is worthy of Kemal Satir. As for us we are the heirs of the struggles of the toiling peoples of every nationality and of our heroic workers and peasants. We are the heirs of the inexhaustible energy, epic-creating heroism, endless determination to struggle and intense class resentment of the masses that were dulled and subsequently brutally oppressed by the Kemalists who took the leadership of the Liberation War. The toiling masses know well the true nature of the thing that the Shafak revisionists cherish as an inheritance. That inheritance is the gendarme rifle butt on the necks of the peasants, beatings at the military post, the whip of the landlords and everything that brought hunger and disaster for the masses. It was oppression for the minorities. It was a mark of “class fraternity” with the British, French and German imperialists! As long as you retain that inheritance the toiling masses will regard you with a terrible anger that they have carried for a long time.

## 26. TKP Inheritance

The Shafak revisionists do not relinquish to anyone the inheritance of revisionist history of the TKP that is worthy of M.Belli, H.Kivileimli and Yakup Demir. Since we have detailed our views on the TKP in a separate booklet we will not dwell on them here. Let us point out briefly

that the TKP pursued a rightist and revisionist line after the death of comrade Mustafa Suphi. Shefik Husnu, who seized the leadership of the party, drifted so far away from Marxism-Leninism as to expect the Kemalists to carry out socialist revolution. The TKP under the leadership of Shefik Husnu never grasped the revolutionary role of the peasantry or the worker-peasant alliance. It always tried to forge an alliance with the bourgeoisie and paid the penalty, but had the working class and poor peasants suffer for it. The TKP under the leadership of Shefik Husnu maintained an endless fidelity to the Kemal administration. It rejected the armed struggle. Initially it waited for the Kemal government to achieve socialism (!) with coercive nationalisation, then suffered disappointment, and set about waiting for the Kemalists to mature the conditions for socialist revolution. It applauded the Kemal government's oppression and persecution of the minority nationalities. This inheritance well befits our greedy inheritance merchants. We are sure that they will find many things in the TKP inheritance to support their revisionist theses. But a movement genuinely bound to the cause of communism will reject such an inheritance. We are the heirs of comrade Mustafa Suphi and the TKP under his leadership. We are the heirs of the unshakeable belief in the fire of "revolution" and "communism" carried subjectively in the hearts and minds of the worker, peasant and intellectual cadres who were committed to the cause of communism but whose beliefs and energy were channelled into erroneous paths by the revisionist leadership.

### **27. The Shafak Revisionists Deny the Class Character of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought.**

According to the Shafak revisionists "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought is the joint property of all mankind". The revisionist traitors are comparing Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought which is the joint property of the global working class, with a printing machine, with the means of production that are neutral and serve the class that controls them. The Shafak revisionists do not hesitate to trample on the

most fundamental realities of the alphabet of Marxism-Leninism that all communists should know. Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought has two characteristics: one is its class character, that is, in the service of a class, the proletariat. And, secondly, its practical characteristic in that it emerges from the class struggle, production struggle and scientific test practice and the fact it can again be implemented in practice. The revisionists have torn Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought away from its most important characteristic, its class character; in this way they have reduced it to the state of "a divine ethical philosophy" that will serve the bourgeoisie and landlord class to the same degree it serves the proletariat. Besides, even every ethical philosophy has a class character. To vulgarise Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought to this extent takes great ability (!) and a subtle mind, talents our revisionists have in abundance.

The means of production are neutral as regards the classes. Whichever class has seized control of them they will serve that class. When the working class seizes power it will not destroy the means of production, but will take them away from the hands of a handful of exploiters and make them the joint property of the proletariat. In this way the means of production, with production relations, that is, collective production, will find the opportunity to develop and expand. However Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought has been in conflict with the ideas of the bourgeoisie and all classes since the day it emerged. It is an important weapon in the hands of the proletariat. Just as it is of no use to the reactionary classes it will also bring about their death as a class. The reactionary classes and even a section of allies of the proletariat may sometimes make imitations of this weapon and put them on the market but this cannot overshadow the class character of Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought. This is because the thing put on the market by the other classes as Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought is the thoughts of their own classes varnished with Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought in order to mislead the proletariat.

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, too, Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought will be in conflict with the ideas of other classes and will again serve the proletariat. Only when all classes disappear, when the state which is a means of class domination withers away and society writes the slogan "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need" on their banners, that is, when the sublime world of communism is attained, only then will Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought become the joint property of all humankind, as all classes will have disappeared and there will no longer be a class struggle.

Then Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought will be in the service of humanity in the production struggle, the struggle of scientific test that is humanity's struggle with nature. In today's world humanity is divided into classes and there is a merciless struggle between these classes. The proletariat is waging a life and death struggle against reaction having gathered a section of the people behind it with the weapon of Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought. In such an environment the revisionists are saying: "Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought is the joint property of all humanity", in a way that will make the proletariat and its allies doubt this weapon. If this is not due to their ill intentions it is due to their utter stupidity.

### **28. The Shafak Revisionists are Distorting the Doctrines of Democratic People's Dictatorship, Socialism and Communism in an unbelievable way.**

We are quoting the following articles regarding this subject from the Draft Programme and the criticism of them since they are important.

"36. These are the main contradictions in our semi-colonial, semi-feudal society: 1) the contradiction between imperialism and our country; 2) the contradiction between the broad popular masses and feudalism; 3) the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; 4) the contradiction amongst the ruling classes."

"37. The disappearance of all these contradictions and our people's liberation from exploitation and oppression will be realised with socialism."

**"The disappearance of all these contradictions....** will be realised with socialism". As is known, there are different ways of resolving different contradictions. The contradiction between imperialism and our people (but not our country) will be resolved by a revolutionary national war (with a national revolution). The contradiction between the broad popular masses and feudalism will be resolved by a revolutionary civil war (with democratic revolution). In semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries the struggle against imperialism and the struggle against feudalism, that is, the national revolution and the democratic revolution are not separated one from the other, as they are linked to each other with unbreakable ties. But according to circumstances sometimes one of these contradictions and sometimes the other may become prominent. Although in semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries under the indirect rule of imperialism the contradiction between feudalism and the popular masses is the main contradiction, in such countries that suffer the military occupation of imperialism the national contradiction comes to the fore and becomes the main contradiction. But in both cases the resolution of these two contradictions is not separated one from the other. This means that the "resolution" of these first two contradictions will come about before through the democratic popular revolution, not "with socialism". Since the country in question is Turkey and the "ruling classes" in question are the ruling classes of Turkey, then once their "ruling" position in Turkey is ended there will no longer a question of "contradiction among the ruling classes". Who are the ruling classes today? The big comprador bourgeoisie and landlords. When they are brought down from their "ruling" positions by the democratic popular revolution, who will be the ruling classes? Primarily the working class, peasantry, urban petit-bourgeoisie and the revolutionary wing of the national bourgeoisie. The dominant class in this alliance will be the proletariat. It is clear that the

contradiction amongst the ruling classes of the democratic people's government will be entirely different to the contradiction amongst the old ruling classes. And it is a contradiction "within the people" that can be resolved by peaceful, non-antagonistic methods.

The contradiction that "will be resolved by socialism" is, of the four contradictions, only the "contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie". (in other words, the contradiction between labour and capital).

Let us make another point: in the draft mention is made of the "disappearance" of the contradiction, not its resolution. Neither the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords, nor the national bourgeoisie can be entirely abolished by either the democratic popular revolution or the socialist revolution. They will maintain their existence in the ideological and cultural sphere after the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and even after the completion of the transformation of the means of production to collective ownership. This is the reason for the continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. They have shown the source of all this in comrade Lenin's "Left Communism, an infantile Disorder". As long as imperialism and reaction is not uprooted worldwide, in a country where the proletariat has achieved victory, the overthrown reactionary classes will maintain their existence, lie in wait and look for an opportunity to transform the revolution into a counter-revolution. What is meant by the resolution of the contradiction is the secondary facet of the first three of today's contradictions becoming primary and the primary contradictions becoming secondary. As for the "disappearance" of contradictions this implies that they will no longer exist and completely vanish and will have neither a dominant nor a secondary facet. The democratic popular revolution will make imperialism and the comprador bourgeoisie and landlords who constitute the primary facet of the current contradiction into the secondary facet and the proletariat and the other popular classes that constitute the secondary facet of the current contradiction into the primary

facet. But it will not entirely remove this contradiction. Socialism will make the proletariat the primary facet and the entire bourgeoisie, including the national bourgeoisie, the secondary facet but will not entirely remove this contradiction. In the period of proletarian power and the foundation of socialism and even after the completion of the transformation of the means of production to socialist ownership, a contradiction will still exist between the proletariat of that country and imperialism and the **entire** bourgeoisie and landlords (particularly in the ideological sphere). But in that country the proletariat will constitute the primary facet of this contradiction while the others will constitute the secondary facet. The contradiction amongst the reactionaries that constitute the secondary facet will also continue to exist. "The **disappearance** of all these contradictions" will "be realised" with communism, not "with socialism!". From whichever angle we look the sentence in the draft is erroneous and contrary to Marxism-Leninism.

"37....the liberation of our people from exploitation and oppression will be realised with socialism". It is true that with socialism "our people's" exploitation will end. In the period of democratic people's power, since the national bourgeoisie and its property will continue to exist, exploitation, although not extreme, will continue to exist. Even the existence of small-scale production means that exploitation will exist to a certain extent. Therefore, under proletarian power too, as long as the transformation of the means of production to collective ownership has not been completed exploitation will **partially** continue. Once collective ownership has been achieved in all fields there will no longer be any question of exploitation. The universal watchword of socialism "from everyone according to their talents, to everyone according to their needs" will become reality. The situation of the means of production, the source of exploitation, being in the hands of a group of people will have ended with these becoming the joint property of society. The source of exploitation will have been dried up.

But the second part of the sentence "the liberation of our people

from oppression will be realised with socialism!!!” is completely wrong. This is to accept indirectly that oppression will exist in the system of democratic people’s dictatorship. What is oppression? Oppression is the persecution and coercion inflicted by the current ruling classes on the popular classes. It is reactionary violence to which the reactionary classes resort in order to maintain its exploitation and preserve its position of power. In this respect the violence they inflict on the popular classes is also unjust. What is this unjust and reactionary violence implemented with? The regular army whose profession is to guard the ruling classes, the police, prisons etc... The ruling classes have from way back always used two weapons against the people: “Hangman and priest”. The means of oppression is this “hangman”. Since a victorious people’s revolution under the leadership of the proletariat will throw out the “hangman” and the “priest” from that country where will the oppression remain? Yes, after the democratic popular revolution (and even after the socialist revolution) **violence** will not disappear. But the character of this violence will change completely. It will be revolutionary violence used by the proletariat and popular classes against the reactionary classes wishing to bring back the old order, and will be historically legitimate and just. But is it oppression”? If you ask the reactionaries, it is, but if you ask us it is the most natural, inevitable thing, a just and progressive thing and never oppression! On the contrary, it is a punishment given by the people to those who wish to bring back the old oppression. Isn’t the Draft Programme, by indirectly accepting that oppression will exist in the system of democratic people’s dictatorship, slipping into a parallel position with the reactionaries?

“59. The ultimate goal of our movement is to realise a classless society, that is, communism, by getting rid of all manner of exploitation and oppression”.

With the above phrase the Programme has fallen behind article 37. At a stroke the abolishing of exploitation and oppression becomes the ultimate goal of our movement. That is, the abolishing of exploitation

and oppression is being postponed until communism. That is, both in the system of democratic people’s dictatorship and in the system of proletarian dictatorship “oppression” exist! Furthermore, socialism is preserving “exploitation”! Either this “socialism” is something like “Swedish socialism”, or the imperialists or reactionaries are right when they say “Socialism is the most oppressive and exploitative order”. Or the colleague who penned the Draft is unaware of the real meaning of the concepts he uses.

Let us reiterate: in a socialist society although **classes** and the state which is the vehicle of proletarian dictatorship exist, there is neither exploitation nor oppression. Exploitation disappears with the construction of socialism. To talk of exploitation in a society where the watchword is “from everyone according to their means, to everyone according to their labour”, shows that this principle has not been grasped. As for oppression, this will disappear with the realisation of the democratic people’s power (this is a people’s republic). That is, there is no question of oppression in either the system of democratic people’s dictatorship or the system of proletarian dictatorship. Oppression is the crushing of the revolutionary people by a handful of exploiters and the reactionary class. If the dictatorship of the people and proletariat over the reactionaries is seen as oppression this is absolutely wrong, and the language of reactionaries.

It is correct that the world of communism is “a world where there are no longer classes.” But this is not all. In the world of communism, along with classes the **state** that is the product of irreconcilable class contradictions, that is the means of repression of the ruling classes over other classes, and the means of proletarian dictatorship in socialism, will also disappear. This is because with the complete disappearance of classes the proletariat will no longer need the state. On the other hand, at the stage of communism, that is

*“From each according to his ability, to each according to his need” (Marx)*

It means that the characteristic of the world of communism is not just the disappearance of classes, but also the disappearance of class domination and the replacement of the slogan from everyone according to their means, to everyone according to their labour”, by the watchword: “from everyone according to their talents, to everyone according to their needs”. The Draft, apart from confirming exactly the qualities attributed to socialism and the system of democratic popular dictatorship by reactionaries, has also broken communism away from its most significant characteristics.

### 29. On Certain Slanders

The Shafak revisionists, in panic, published a rag that criticised us, or rather, slung mud at us. It is necessary to briefly touch on some of these slanders.

As we maintained that legal publishing activity should **not be primary** they say we “advocate closing the newspaper and magazine and stuffing the entire cadre into a mouse hole”. We have stated before that we have never rejected publishing activity, only that we opposed a communist movement being reduced to the status of a publishing house. We will demonstrate how we understand publishing activity with our future practice. The revisionist traitors are exposing their own vileness as they slander us. To want illegal activity to be primary is, in the eyes of the revisionist traitors who have a dog’s loyalty to bourgeois laws, “to stuff the cadre into a mouse hole.” These vain intellectual gentlemen are saying: “Wasn’t it these publications that transported working class ideology into their bourgeois heads and got them involved in the struggle?” Presumably those who read these criticisms will decide who owns a bourgeois head? Anyone who is familiar with Marxism-Leninism will easily understand that our publications contain undiluted bourgeois ideology with a little Marxist-Leninist polish in the name of working class ideology. As for the claim that we learned Marxism-Leninism from your publications, there is some truth in this. gentle-

men! For people can learn good lessons from bad teachers. From such teachers people learn what not to do and what not to champion and this is a good lesson. PDA and Shafak revisionism have been our bad teachers, from whom we have learned good lessons. And we have digested these good lessons in struggle against the bad advice of our teachers. In this context the PDA and Shafak revisionism have helped us to grasp Marxism-Leninism. If we had tamely followed our teachers we would have ended up now like you revisionist traitors.

Since we criticised PDA revisionism for extending a hand to Soviet social-imperialism in the past they became irate, saying: “Their accusation is just like saying to a five-year-old child ‘why don’t you think like a fifteen -year-old?’” How pathetic! Comrade Stalin said:

“A person’s social life determines their consciousness”. What true words. The answer to why the Shafak revisionists cannot stop thinking like bourgeois is these words of comrade Stalin. A child of five will in a normal process of development be a youth at the age of fifteen. But a five-year-old donkey will never become a fifteen-year-old youth.

In the same way revisionism will never **grow up** to become Marxism-Leninism. Bourgeois gentlemen see Marxism-Leninism as the natural outcome of revisionism. They see the correct idea as the natural result of an erroneous idea. A young communist movement is not a revisionist movement. It may be inexperienced and still weak and with limited ability to wage struggle, but it will still follow a correct line in spite of this. It will not defend errors on questions concerning which it has no experience. It will merely grasp the truth with time and step by step. A communist movement will make mistakes in every period, but these errors will not be serious and will be corrected as soon as possible. Marxism-Leninism will develop in struggle and in rejection of revisionism. Do you understand? As long as you do not reject “being a donkey”, as long as you do not struggle with “being a donkey” however much you grow up you will not be a “man”. You will just be an older “donkey”, that’s all!

The revisionists say that we used to be together with the “liquidationists” and that we made a self-criticism in their ranks and stayed there. To claim that we are with them is to tell a blatant lie. In particular the claim that we made a self-criticism and stayed in their ranks is the limit. If you are hoping to stay upright with such lies and chicanery it will not be long before you begin to decay.

The revisionist traitors also claim that we say that “the workers, peasants, all our people have understood that liberation will come with armed struggle”. What we say is this: this sentence exists in exactly the same form in the DABK Resolution. “Today a current that does not take the revolutionary struggle in our country to a very significant point, the path of the armed struggle, will be isolated from the masses, even if by name it is a communist movement.”

This is something different from what you are trying to attribute to us. Today in Turkey there are many people who have not yet grasped the necessity of armed struggle who trust and believe in a movement that leads the armed struggle. And look at these pearls of wisdom:

“The designation that ‘all our people have understood that liberation will happen with armed struggle’ involves the party of the proletariat having established its influence over the people in our country and the workers and peasants in particular having grasped politically the question of power, prepared to take up arms, being organised etc. Does such a situation exist?”

According to this logic it is necessary for there to be absolutely nowhere in Turkey where there are workers and peasants “who have grasped that liberation will come with armed struggle,” because without the influence of a party the masses cannot work out the necessity of armed struggle through their own experience! So, gentlemen, what about the rebellions in history?, or let us put to one side the distant past, the struggle of workers and peasants who had not heard even the name of the proletarian party in recent periods? Workers and peasants cannot attain scientific socialism through just their own experience,

but they will attain the idea that liberation will occur with armed struggle long before timid, garrulous types like you who adorn themselves with the title proletarian “revolutionary.” Long before you have read this truth in books a section of workers and peasants will know that liberation will come with armed struggle. Let us reiterate: if your logic was correct then in today’s Turkey where the proletarian party is still in its labour pains then it would be necessary for there to be no workers and peasants anywhere in Turkey “who have grasped that liberation will be by armed struggle.” This would be a shameful slander of the masses.

And these traitors are laying down the condition of the masses having “politically” (whatever that means) grasped the question of power”, “**being prepared to take up arms**” and “**being organised**” (yes, you have not misread “**organised**”)!

The revisionists are describing a militant member of a communist party, not a worker or peasant “who has grasped that liberation will occur with armed struggle.” And since the number of people who would match this description in our country could be counted on the fingers of very few hands, our gentlemen are snoozing comfortably! At least do not try to attribute our backwardness, lack of intelligence, stupidity and lethargy to the masses that are a thousand times more advanced than you timid bourgeois. In our country, contrary to your claim, a significant section of the workers and peasants knows that liberation will be with armed struggle. They know this from the experience they have gained in their own class struggle. But the masses are in need of a decisive, energetic, intelligent communist leadership that will give them confidence and leadership! And such a communist leadership can emerge and develop today in our country amidst the flames of the armed struggle. This is the crux of the matter. To know that liberation will be with armed struggle does not mean to know Marxism—Leninism. An ordinary person who sees their enemy coming towards them with a cudgel or a gun will presumably think of grab-

bing whatever they have and bringing it down on the head of their enemy. As for our people they have lived under the threat of the enemy's rifle butt, bayonet and prison for years. Why can you not think of talking to them in their own language?

From all this garrulousness it is once again understood that for you the armed struggle is a phobia. You are making any number of excuses and inventing numerous theories in order to keep it away. Your above theses are further proof of your rightist and pacifist line that delays the armed struggle for years.

And already we can see that new theories are beginning to appear, such as "let's not annoy fascism or we'll suffer for it", completely capitulationist, pacifist theories wrapped up ready to be put on the market. Instead of reaching the conclusion from the blow of martial law to embrace illegality more seriously, we are amazed to see that reactionary conclusions such as "we drew many cadre into illegality, that's why it happened", have been reached. And we wait impatiently for what new theories you will come up with!

You say we support an armed struggle disconnected from the masses. You cannot show even one sentence or a single act of ours that will support this claim. On the contrary, we have constantly maintained the necessity in the conditions in Turkey of organising the peasant masses for the armed struggle. But since you consider that the armed struggle is contrary to the mass line (!) we were not surprised at your accusation.

Your claims that we reject the party and the worker-peasant alliance are too ridiculous to be worthy of a response

### LET US SUMMARISE

Shafak revisionism, as can be seen, on all the fundamental questions of the revolution has extended one hand to revisionism and the other to Mao Tse-tung Thought. A merchant-like cunning has replaced

a revolutionary policy tied to principles. Both revisionism and Mao Tse-tung Thought are to be found in these cunning traders' shops. According to circumstances they sometimes have one, and sometimes the other on display. But most of the times both of them are on the market. Whichever one is there they always implement revisionism in **practice**. Another characteristic of Shafak revisionism is that it presents the most rightist practice in an excellent way and is expert at deceiving cadre. In this way we have indicated the three fundamental characteristics of Shafak revisionism:

1) Its efforts in ideology and in policy to reconcile the shoddiest revisionist theses to Mao Tse-tung Thought. 2) Always pursuing a rightist, capitulationist pacifist line in practice. 3) Being excellent at concealing this rightist, capitulationist, pacifist line.

### The Sources of Shafak Revisionism

From all these criticisms the sources of Shafak revisionism should have been clearly understood. These sources are, briefly: 1- The fact that the cadres who fill the ranks of the movement are to a great extent from bourgeois or even big bourgeois circles. They bring their class ideologies, habits and long-established class instincts with them and manifest them at every opportunity in different forms. 2- The emergence and development of the movement in peaceful forms of struggle. Being alien to the armed struggle from the beginning. The Shafak movement, which prepared itself and its cadres according to entirely peaceful methods of struggle, is totally unable to throw off the ailments of passivity and bureaucracy that have penetrated to their very marrow, in the conditions of armed struggle, and is trying to conceal this attitude with new theoretical coverings. Until the storm of the increasingly violent class struggle hurls it aside Shafak revisionism will continue to hinder the revolutionary movement. But its life will not be long.

## **A New Variety of Shafak Revisionism: Refugee Revisionism**

In the struggle between the two lines, certain elements that have been in the ranks of the Shafak revisionists from the beginning and are now abroad made a self-criticism during martial law announcing they had joined the ranks of the Marxist-Leninists. But when these incorrigible opportunists were summoned to participate actively in the class struggle they once again showed their true faces, and shunned the class struggle. They also accused our Marxist-Leninist movement of “left deviation” in a Shafak revisionist way. Their claims are:

1-The question today is one of organising the proletarian parties. Such a party should be organised that comes to lead all the people, in which there will be no more debate and will go on to the end without any deviation. Armed struggle is the highest form of class struggle and the party is the highest form of proletarian organisation. Therefore, without such a party being formed armed struggle cannot be launched.

2- What needs to be done today is to sit down and read and learn from the Vietnam experiment and experiences of other countries.

3-The revolutionary movement in Turkey has suffered a great defeat. The responsibility is on “our” shoulders. We should be aware of our responsibility and not get ourselves arrested. For this reason it is not correct to go to Turkey.

4-There should not be sectarianism. We should have friendly relations with all groups. The Shafak movement’s error is not opposition to armed struggle and passivity, but sectarianism. The TKP movement’s error from the start was also sectarianism.

5-Colleagues in Turkey (they mean us) made an error in not consulting with “us” before stating to organise. We are also, like them, establishing a group. There should have been a meeting and agreement made between representatives of the two groups prior to commencing organisation.

The gentlemen who made these claims are now abroad, far from the “fear of arrest”, grasping (!) the revolutionary experiences of Vietnam and other countries. They are “learning” how to organise a proletarian party from abroad (!). Subsequently they will found a “proletarian party” that we have all looked forward to and they will save us from curiosity and the people of Turkey from lack of leadership (!). These “colleagues who are well aware of their responsibilities (!)” are apparently debating whether it will be more useful to apply for asylum in Algeria or in Sweden. In our opinion it would be best if they went to the “moon”, as there are no police there!

It is clear that the above theories are a cover for pacifism and fleeing the struggle, while the slogan “No to sectarianism” is in reality a justification for the desire to establish unity without principles with all revisionist and opportunist groups and for mental laziness.

As for the idea that “we are a group, so are they” this is an expression of narrow cliquism and careerism. Marxist-Leninists, wherever they are, see themselves as part of the communist movement, not as a separate group. The most worthy place for the refugee revisionists is their former homes, that is, the ranks of Shafak revisionism.

### **All the Communist Revolutionaries of Turkey!**

#### **Unite in the Ranks of the Marxist-Leninist Movement!**

The Marxist-Leninists, whatever appearance they take, will continue to wage a determined struggle against revisionism.

The Marxist-Leninists will be merciless towards their own errors and implement the principle of criticism and self-criticism sincerely and courageously. Today in our country the primary task of communist revolutionaries is to construct the **three weapons of the people** within the armed struggle.

A disciplined **Communist Party** cleansed of subjectivism, revisionism and dogmatism, fused with the masses, combining practice and theory, implementing self-critical method; **people’s armed forces**

under the leadership of such a party; and a **people's united front**, again under the leadership of such a party. These are the three weapons of the people we shall use in defeating the enemy.

The Marxist-Leninists have decided and are determined to ignite the fire of armed struggle amongst the masses in various areas of our country for this purpose.

All Comrades! All the Communist revolutionaries of our country! Let us break off all our links with the revisionist cliques!

Let us establish a stable unity in the Marxist-Leninist ranks!

There are hard but glorious days of struggle in front of us. Let us leap into the sea of class struggle with all our being!

Let us possess an endless trust in our heroic working class, long suffering peasants and bold youth in this struggle!

Long live the bright road of comrades Marks, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung!

Long live the toiling people of every nationality in Turkey!

Long live our Marxist-Leninist movement!

*The Origin And Development Of  
The Differences Between Ourselves And  
Shafak Revisionism*

*A General Critique of TIIKP (Turkey  
Revolutionary Worker Peasant Party)*

*June 1972*

## INTERROGATION

“Accused Ibrahim Kaypakkaya was brought in and after his identity was ascertained the accused was reminded of the incident and organisational relationship and asked: the accused replied, saying: I studied for 6 years at the Hasanoglan Primary Teachers’ Boarding school as a child from a poor family. Due to my success there I was sent to the High Teachers’ School. After a year studying in prep class I entered the Istanbul Capa High Teachers’ School and at the same time the Faculty of Science at Istanbul University. After that I participated in democratic and revolutionary actions of the revolutionary youth and developed my revolutionary ideas. In 1967 along with 9 colleagues I was a founder of the Capa Ideas Club. At that time as a member of the FKF (Ideas Club Federation) and the TIP I attended all the meetings, debates, rallies and demonstrations organised by them. In 1968 I was initially provisionally and subsequently permanently expelled by the School’s reactionary administration. Despite getting a stay of execution of this decision from the Council of State the fascist administration of the school did not comply with it. My ideas, actions in which I had participated and my work in youth organisations were given as the main reasons for my expulsion. As far as I can recall my participation in the No to NATO and protest of the American 6th Fleet, work in organising a Troubadour’s Night, distributing certain leaflets and participation in workers’ marches were regarded as actions harmful to my status as a student. However, all these activities are things that everyone who loves their country and people should carry out in accordance with their beliefs, consciousness and personal responsibility.

Over time certain differences of opinion developed within the FKF youth organisation. This was in one respect a natural outcome of advancing awareness and experiences gained. The two main views that emerged were, firstly, the opinion of the FKF administration from way back i.e. the TIP parliamentarist and reformist view and, secondly, the phased revolutions view that advocated a national democratic revolution. Initially this view was championed by Turk Solu and Aydinlik Socialist Magazine and subsequently by the PDA and Isci-Koylu. In spite of certain negative aspects, Turk Solu and Aydinlik Socialist Magazine assisted the advance of the revolutionary cadres' awareness and their understanding of revolutionary ideas. This is because the TIP and its leading cadre were preventing the dissemination of revolutionary ideas and Marxism-Leninism amongst revolutionary cadre, workers and peasants. I see the TIP's administrators as reformist middle bourgeois intellectuals who call themselves socialists. The TIP's line was also a consistent reformist line of the radical section of the middle bourgeoisie.

In this split I was in the group advocating MDD (National Democratic Revolution). Although the grouping around Turk Solu and Aydinlik Socialist Magazine was not of a revolutionary character - in the real meaning of the word - it endeavoured to show a little more interest in the democratic and revolutionary actions of the workers, peasants, students and other popular masses than the TIP.

Later, in 1969, at the conference in which the FKF transformed into DEV-GENC, a split took place within DEV-GENC and the Aydinlik Socialist magazine. In this split I was in the group of colleagues around Proletarian Devrimci Aydinlik magazine and isci-koylu newspaper. I endeavoured to assist in the production and distribution of these publications and to disseminate the views we championed amongst workers, peasants and the youth. Meanwhile, I also did what I could to help the actions of landless peasants in occupying the land of large farmers in Thrace who had seized their land by coercion of the

gendarme and the just strikes and resistance of workers in the Istanbul factories of Demir Dokum, Sungurlar, Horoz Civi, Pertrijs, Ege Sanayi, EASAKU, Gislaved, Gamak, Singer and Derby. I participated in the great workers' demonstration of 15-16 June and when I had the opportunity I endeavoured to make a contribution to the struggle of revolutionary youth defending themselves against fascist attacks on the universities, and other democratic actions. I have no objection to making the preceding comments. All these activities were legal during that period and did not constitute offences. And I, as a revolutionary, took part in these activities within the framework I have explained above. I continued these activities as being necessary work for the liberation of the people as a communist revolutionary believing in Marxism-Leninism and as a member of the revolutionary youth organisation DEV-GENC as a necessary responsibility of a revolutionary youth towards the people and youth. However, apart from subjects concerning me and the charges against me I cannot make a statement that will affect others in the youth organisation and revolutionary groups in which I worked. The things I have explained concern my own work and ideas within the youth and revolutionary groups I was in. I deem making declarations regarding others as an action exceeding my area of personal responsibility. These were my activities up until the proclamation of martial law.

Immediately following the declaration of martial law and particularly after the killing of the Israeli consul Efraim ELROM, many youth and intellectuals were remanded in custody after the intensifying fascist mass oppression and arrests that followed these events. After people within DEV-GENC who had not been active were also arrested I went into hiding for a long period, guessing that I would be sought and arrested. I consider it unnecessary to say anything regarding where I hid or relationships during this time. During this period when I was a fugitive Shafak publications reached me around the end of April 1972. I do not consider it important who brought these publications to me.

Although the Shafak magazine and publications contained certain views regarding the democratic popular revolution with which I did not agree, I was pleased to learn of the continuing existence of revolutionary work. I subsequently carried out propaganda and consciousness raising work in line with my own ideas and through my own means at the place where I was, without making any contact with the organisation that publishes the papers.

I did not know that the Shafak publication belonged to an organisation called the Revolutionary Worker Peasant Party of Turkey (TIHKP) and did not know of the existence of such an organisation. I learned these things subsequently from news of arrests concerning this organisation on the radio and in newspapers. I have not been in communication with Dogu PERINCEK, who you say is an administrator of this illegal organisation. And I was not given an organisational or other task by Dogu PERINCEK. In fact I do not know Dogu PERINCEK, I had merely heard of him prior to martial law. I knew of him as revolutionary writing articles in PDA. I did not join the, in your words, illegal SHAFAK organisation. I will not say anything regarding my activities in that period. I am of the opinion that to say I worked is sufficient from the point of view of my personal responsibility. I was not active in the Malatya and Tunceli regions, as you have asked. My districts of work were not there and I find it unnecessary to say where they were. I find it sufficient to say where they were not. My activities of a personal nature without any connection whatsoever to the organisation you mention by the name of the TIHKP continued until I joined the ranks of the Turkish Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) and the Worker, Peasant, Liberation Army of Turkey. I do not remember when I joined these organisations and I find it unnecessary to say who recruited me. I do not know by whom the TKP (M-L) and TIKKO organisations were established and directed. But I do not hide the fact that I joined the ranks of these organisations and that I am an illegal member and supporter and feel

great pride in being a member of these organisations. My method of work within this organisation and the ideas that are the basis of the organisation's founding are to be found to a great extent in the articles you mention. I agree with the ideas and theses that reflect the ideas of the organisation contained in these organisations' articles entitled: "A CRITIQUE OF THE THESES OF SHAFAK REVISIONISM", "THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN TURKEY, THE KEMALIST MOVEMENT IN TURKEY, THE PERIOD OF KEMALIST POWER, SECOND WORLD WAR YEARS AND 27 MAY MOVEMENT", "LET US GRASP CORRECTLY THE RED POLITICAL POWER DOCTRINE OF CHAIRMAN MAO".

I am prepared to put my signature to these articles as being my views but by which person or persons these articles were actually written I do not know. In order to wage revolutionary struggle in line with these views late in January 1973 I went to Tunceli with my heroic friend Ali Haydar YILDIZ, who was later martyred by fascist forces. We went to the villages to organise the peasants for revolution and people's uprising. Our work there continued until the commune at Vartınik hamlet was raided on 24 January 1973. I do not consider it necessary to say anything more apart from this.

Essentially, we communist revolutionaries do not in principle hide our political opinions and views anywhere. But we do not relate our organisational activities, the colleagues with whom we work in the organisation or the persons and groups outside the organisation who assist us. From the point of view of my personal responsibility I have already said what was necessary to say. What I have related I did for the sake of the Marxist-Leninist idea in which I sincerely believe. And I have absolutely no regrets as regards the outcome. I waged a struggle to this end taking into account all possible consequences and was arrested. I have no regrets. If one day I escape from your hands I will work again in the same way," he said.

He said he had nothing more to add and this statement was then

read back and signed. (21 April 1973, TKP (M-L), TIKKO, TMLGB case, File no.3, dossier no.1 line 4)

“The alleged incident constituting a crime was explained to Ibrahim Kaypakkaya and he was shown the person brought in. The accused said: “I do not know this person here or Haci DOGAN. I did not, as you allege, obtain an identity card from this person. I found the identity card which was on my person and which you say belongs to this person here in Malatya. Since I was being sought by the martial law authorities I stuck my own photograph on this identity card I found in order to conceal my identity. I am a communist who has adopted the ideology of the proletariat and champions the liberation of the people. I consider such things to be normal in this struggle I am waging against you which is a class struggle. I do not know the person who is here and you say is the owner of the identity card found on my person. His saying he knows me is due either to your coercing him with torture and persecution, or because he is lying on account of fear for the same reason. I don't know the reason for this,” he said.

The accused Ibrahim Kaypakkaya was shown the three other persons and the incident in question was explained. The accused said: “I do not know the three peasants you have brought here and have never met them. Your allegation that they helped me after the raid is a fabrication and a lie. As I was wounded in the clash I could not eat anything, even bread. These three peasants have been brought here for no reason, unjustly and they have been intimidated with persecution and torture, although they have absolutely no connections to me. This is an example of fascist oppression and the fascists will be called to account for their oppression of the people sooner or later.”

(TKP/ML, TIKKO, TMLGB case, File no.3, dossier no.4 line 13/2)

**Kaypakkaya identified with Turkey political and social revolution's character. He achieved this by theoretical, political and organizational line he established. He became fairly the spirit of Turkey revolution.**

**He grew early and shouldered this historic responsibility by maturing on the point that ongoing process, availability of social conditions and strong principals of the class struggle which knocked term's door as revealing necessity of a pioneering and leading power**