

MKP'S 3RD CONGRESS

NEW STAGE IN LIQUIDATIONISM

By I. Suphi, et al.

March 20, 2015

Note

This article originally in written in Turkish language by Ibrahim Suphi, was published in the special edition of the Partizan magazine, in June 2014. It is in response to the propositions, analysis and the general line presented in the documents of the 3rd Congress of the MKP (Maoist Communist Party of Turkey and North Kurdistan). The MKP Congress was held sometime in 2013 and its documents were made public in Turkish language sometime in 2014.

We draw the reader's attention to some major theoretical issues and controversies relating to the Marxist assessment of the current crisis, the mode of production in countries like Turkey, the strategy of protracted peoples war and the current situation in the world,... that is addressed by the author.

Published by
www.red-path.net

Contents

ON MKP'S 3RD CONGRESS - NEW STAGE IN LIQUIDATIONISM	3
ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE CAPITALIST-IMPERIALIST SYSTEM	5
1) The MKP, with its argument for planned production, is actually swung towards Hilferding's thesis of "organized capitalism"	5
2) Has the free competition capitalism indeed come back?	11
3) Was Lenin wrong on stock exchange?	13
4) Monopolies are compelled to turn to global markets because national markets do not satisfy their needs!.....	14
5) The problem of the crises of capitalism	14
6) Qualitative changes in Imperialism!.....	16
ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC STRUCTURE	20
THE CHARACTER AND THE STRATEGY OF REVOLUTION.....	33
1) The character of the revolution	33
2) The strategy of the Revolution.....	38
3) The problem of universal validity of people's war	44
DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S POWER, SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM.....	46
1) Party and Leadership in Socialism	46
2) Proletarian Dictatorship in Socialism	48
3) The Multi-party System in Socialism	51
4) The theory of the productive forces and stages	53

ON MKP'S 3RD CONGRESS NEW STAGE IN LIQUIDATIONISM

MKP has concluded its 3rd Congress and the Congress Documents have been made public. With a claim to capture that which is new and qualitative, the Congress, taking refuge under the pretext of radical and profound changes, has already secured a place in the history of revolutionary movement in Turkey as the entrenchment of liquidation by also formally and blatantly breaking away from its traditional roots and from the most important lines and principles of fundamental and general doctrines of scientific socialism.

With its contradictory theses, tiresome repetitions, superficiality, confusing disarray of unclear concepts, judgment dullness in understanding and interpreting the revolutionary theory, characterizations that are hastily dressed up in political embellishments, and with its clumsiness due to incapability and inadequacy in comprehending even the fundamentals of Marxist theory, put aside its current evolution, MKP, evidenced by its Congress Documents that are prepared in a "copy-paste" fashion with parts and bits taken from here and there, has gotten itself stuck in the anarchism-democratism layered liquidationist-revisionist swamp by turning away from its past program and from the gains of victorious revolutions while intending to analyze what is new in the class struggle.

By not being able to avoid the hacking impacts of the damage, degeneration, and destruction caused by the neo-liberalism fed global liquidationism; by taking a position against the party and its leadership in the name of the class, and against the dictatorship of proletariat, against this most important "principle" issue of the modern worker's movement, in the name of mass democracy, Congress is swung in the direction of disarming the proletariat, benefiting the bourgeoisie. It appears that MKP, playing around with terms such as party, state, leadership, discipline, and so on, has opened wide its doors to all those without direction, orientation, and aim. It is also on the way to becoming a safe boat for the freshwater revolutionaries and to those who see the top to down party discipline as a mangle.

Let us remind MKP, which cannot even stand the name of the proletarian dictatorship as the state of transition from capitalism to communism that, as it was witnessed in the example of Spain, it was not a joke by the history but a flaming reality that those who ride on this Bakunian horse, a descendant of anarchism, were toppled down from their gained positions by a handful of [pro-Franco] soldiers.

Even though embellished with leap towards "left", the Congress, under the signboard of "left", winding along the shores of extremism, is preaching rightism, fresh water revolutionarism, and diluted socialism. Leaning on the pretext of breaking free from "static formalism as a one way out," with open and indignant attacks on the classics and the theory and practice of scientific socialism, the path followed is the one that step by step distances itself even from what is left of Marxism and its "formal" concepts. MKP, with this Congress, has dug a ditch between itself and Marxism by choosing to openly challenge the modern scientific socialism; launching attacks on the columns that sustain it.

Moreover, their criticism of Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, on the "basic principals" that find their expressions in his fundamental-theoretical documents, in other words on his analyses of the socio-economic structure [of Turkey], the character of the revolution, its strategy, its driving forces and the national bourgeoisie; their new "contributions" that turn their back on the democratic people's revolution, their misery on the subject of the strategy of protracted peoples' war, and linked to this, their new "brilliant" analyses that crosses out the countryside as the primary areas of struggle, their caricaturisation of people's war, its replacement with the fallacy of "socialist people's war," their diagnoses as to the principle contradiction, and on the vanguard and fundamental forces, compose a bouquet that is obvious evidence that they have burned and destroyed all main channels and bridges that connect them to Kaypakkaya.

In this bouquet, there is no place either for Kaypakkaya or for his theory and practice. With all this upside down strategy and diametrically opposed contradictions, their false praises for Kaypakkaya sound like a cacophony that scratches ears. The MKP, caught up in an epidemic liquidationism, has not only put the guiding compass of Marxism in the closet but also that of Kaypakkaya's.

The MKP's "unique" Maoism too seems to have been done away with. There is no sign of "Maoism is a must!" This article, step by step through following the Congress Documents and the "theoretical rottenness" that dominates them, its anarchism-democratism layered right-revisionism, covered with "left revisionism," expressed in the context of "general evaluation", reviews, among other things, the Congress's superficial diagnoses on world-wide people's war and on the new developments in imperialism, its vapid take on the proletarian dictatorship and multi-party system, socialism, and the classics, and finally its approach that accuses the Proletarian Party [the Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist-Leninist] as well as themselves with "not having seen the changes due to their unscientific conservative stubbornness."

ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE CAPITALIST-IMPERIALIST SYSTEM

Under this heading, the Congress analyzes the development process of capitalism and the current state that it has reached, coming to the following conclusions: Along with the capitalist mode of production and relations, significant changes occurred in the surplus-value. Homes and streets have turned into ateliers that are tied to the capital. There are quantitative and qualitative changes in the mechanisms of capitalism. Because national markets stopped answering the needs of monopolies and due to the tendency of proliferation, consolidation, and centralization, the system inevitably turns towards the global markets. More importantly, we are facing a capitalism that controls the demands of society and therefore, to a significant degree, the production has become proportional to the demand. Meanwhile, however, in many areas, there is still anarchy of production. Lenin was wrong in his conclusions in regards to stock exchange and monopoly capitalism-free competition capitalism and therefore while some of the classics' theses on imperialism are still valid, some others have lost their validity. While the crises of capitalism are more frequent than before; imperialism shows not only quantitative changes but also qualitative; centralization and concentration exhibit new qualitative changes as a result of both production and distribution.

Therefore, by analyzing these new developments emerging in imperialism "We have to break away from incorrect approaches" (p.19) says the Congress Document.

Are these theses put forward in the name of discovering new things really that new?

Or, is it that the MKP arrives at the wrong conclusions in its understanding and interpretations of the developments in imperialism, a.k.a. monopoly capitalism, which came about "as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristics of capitalism," as Lenin observed? Are Lenin's and the classics' descriptions of the evolution of imperialism wrong? Or is it that the MKP's failure to understand this issue that is the cause of their troubles?

1) The MKP, with its argument for planned production, is actually swung towards Hilferding's thesis of "organized capitalism"

The Congress Documents note the followings on this subject:

Through their wholesale retail sales and trade establishments (retail shops), they keep a check on the demands of society and to a significant degree produce proportionally to the demand. Instead of producing tons of a certain product, pushing it to the market, and searching for buyers, they are now offering hundreds of variations of their products to the masses through huge advertisement campaigns and produce the ones that are most preferred according to the parameters of demand and sell them to buyers through their retail stores."

In continuation, however, they still maintain a certain margin of precaution: "From this situation it shouldn't be concluded that the production anarchy has entirely disappeared." (p. 23) So, this means that the anarchy of production is in the secondary plan; planned production is primary. The primary side of the matter is proportional production; however anarchy of production too still exists.

Laying out the issue in this way also implies that the economic crisis of over-production in capitalist mode of production is ignored. When there is overall excess of production, we cannot talk of planned production. The reason that they come up with as to the proportional production: Retail stores that are controlled by producers. This is exhibiting a kindergarten level of understanding in terms of capitalist production, circulation and exchange processes; the roles of productive capital, commodity capital, and finance capital; the differentiating of surplus-value at its earliest stages into interest, rent, and profit; and that these three

different groups of capital belong to different capital groups; in terms of comprehending these simplest and earliest processes of Marxist political economy.

As if the retail stores are a new phenomenon in the history of capitalism.

This society, as was proved by the founders of Marxism, is a system "that functions with anarchy within anarchy" and is "a war of everyone against everyone." Even though monopoly capitalism has employed many tools in order to prevent the anarchy in production, so far the fact of the anarchy of production has not changed.

These tools were also employed in Engels' time, Lenin's time, and an increasingly more so today. However, so far the system has not been able to do away with the economic crises of over-production.

Why?

"While uniting production, the cartels and trusts at the same time, and in a way that was obvious to all, aggravated the anarchy of production." (ABC) (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 11, p. 483)
[<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/apr/03.htm>]

Taking it from the very beginning; Capital, while producing, does not take the deep rift formed between production and the market into account; while producing, it does not pay any attention to the masses' necessities, met only by their limited purchase power; nor does it take into account the markets that are getting too tight for the growing production capabilities. The main requirement of the "general law" of capital production is to produce until the very end of the limits determined by the forces of production is reached.

This means that the capital, especially through the credit economy, will try to expand itself without stop, drawing a motion that resembles a spiral, ever pushing the limits of its borders. That is true even if this development carries within itself elements of the system's downfall.

In other words, with that perfect formulation by Marx: "Over-production arises precisely from the fact that the mass of the people can never consume more than the average quantity of necessities that their consumption, therefore does not grow correspondingly with the productivity of labour." (Theories of Surplus Value, Book II, p. 451)

It is inevitable under capitalism that there is a constant gap between the limited consumption and the unlimited production. Because capital ignores the market's actual conditions and the miserable living conditions of the masses who are stuck within the mandatory necessities of sustenance; its main pursuit is the maximum profit; anything other than accumulation and the goal of increasing the ever expanding re-production scales fails to capture its attention.

It is not for nothing that Marx, in his analyses in Capital, keeps on underlying the gap between the limited scale of consumption and the production that ceaselessly tries to overcome the limited barrier of consumption.

The MKP ignores the following conclusions by Marx: "Since the aim of capital is not to minister to certain wants, but to produce profits, and since it accomplishes this purpose by methods which adapt the mass of production to the scale of production, not vice versa, conflict must continually ensue between the limited conditions of consumption on a capitalist basis and a production which forever tends to exceed its immanent barriers." (Capital, Volume Three, p.227) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1894-c3/ch15.htm>]

In other words, the Congress Documents of the MKP is in complete opposition to Marx's conclusions described in his monumental work. The Congress Documents keep on talking about capital accumulation and the dimension this accumulation has reached. It is well known that, according to Marxism or Marx,

capital consists of commodities and "and therefore the overproduction of capital implies an overproduction of commodities." [Capital, Volume III, Chapter 15, Paragraph 44]

And this means the anarchy of production.

In such a case can we talk of planned production?

More importantly: "Over-production is specifically conditioned by the general law of the production of capital: to produce to the limit set by the productive forces, that is to say, to exploit the maximum amount of labour with the given amount of capital, without any consideration for the actual limits of the market or the needs backed by the ability to pay; and this is carried out through continuous expansion of reproduction and accumulation, and therefore constant reconversion of revenue into capital, while on the other hand, the mass of the producers remain tied to the average level of needs, and must remain tied to it according to the nature of capitalist production." (Marx, Theories of Surplus-Value, Book II, p. 512)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1863/theories-surplus-value/ch17.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1863/theories-surplus-value/ch17.htm)

This means that the Congress ignores the general law of the Marxist political economy on the production of capital. Over-production and the lack of planning, haphazardness, and anarchy caused by it are inherent to this system and hence to the capital. The great development of productive forces, which is proportional to the progress of society, continuously expands the production, commodity supply disproportionately exceeds the commodity demand, markets get overloaded with products, and eventually over-production becomes an obstacle before the capital's production, circulation, and exchange processes, and subsequently the laws of production and circulation are all turned upside down.

Obviously, what causes the over-production is the contradiction between the expansion of unlimited production brought about by the unbridled development of productive forces and the limited consumption of real producers who are caught up within the limits of the necessary means of subsistence. This is not the kind of production, as described in the Congress Documents, that takes place "within the framework of demand" or through "the control of the demands of society" and is "proportional to the demand." What provides the foundation for the over-production is the incredible growth of the production capacity of capitalism through the tremendous increase of the productivity of labour that coincides with the progress of the society, on the one hand, and the limited purchase power of millions of labourers whose quality of life is kept to a minimum level by the capital, on the other hand.

This situation excludes the demand-proportional production from the outset.

Moreover, due to the nature of the functioning of the capitalist production process; the fact that the direct production conditions are not identical to the conditions of the realization of this production or the fact that the conditions of production of surplus-value are not identical to the conditions under which it is realized makes a "demand proportional" production impossible.

Perspectives such as the demand proportional production that are presented by the Congress Documents, in other words putting such an approach to the centre of matter, cannot be linked to Marxism and to the analyses of Marx in Capital; they could only be linked to the theses of Hilferding.

It may be asked: Didn't the existence of monopolies provide, to a certain degree, basis for the organized and planned production? Of course it did. But this is not a new phenomenon nor has it been at a scale that made the demand proportional production the primary type of production, as claimed by the Congress Documents.

In the first volume of Capital, under Chapter 25, titled General Law of Capitalist Accumulation, where Marx examines the consolidation and centralization of capital, there is a material extremely valuable in explaining the current monopolization.

Marx explains the relationship between centralization and monopolization as follows:

"In any given branch of industry centralisation would reach its extreme limit if all the individual capitals invested in it were fused into a single capital. In a given society the limit would be reached only when the entire social capital was united in the hands of either a single capitalist or a single capitalist company." (K. Marx, Capital, Volume 1, chapter 25, p. 644) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch25.htm>]

In the fourth German edition of this observation by Marx, Engels adds the following note: "The latest English and American 'trusts' are already striving to attain this goal by attempting to unite at least all the large-scale concerns in one branch of industry into one great joint-stock company with a practical monopoly."

Indeed, in the third volume of Capital, Marx, where he examines the price increases and the relationship between the fixed constant-capital and the circulating constant-capital, gives the following example in order to explain the factors that lead to cartelization in the context of raw material: "During the period in which raw materials become dear, industrial capitalists join hands and form associations to regulate production. They did so after the rise of cotton prices in 1848 in Manchester, for example, and similarly in the case of flax production in Ireland." (Marx, Capital, Volume III, Chapter 6, p. 109)

[<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd.pdf>]

So, in the later years of Marx's and especially Engels's period, there was monopolization through mergers of capitals in a single branch of an industry. They were only the early attempts and it was not a common practice. This development, however, was already analyzed far-sightedly by the founders of Marxism. Engels, in his work Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, notes the following brilliant observation on trusts:

"The producers on a large scale in a particular branch of an industry in a particular country unite in a 'Trust', a union for the purpose of regulating production. They determine the total amount to be produced, parcel it out among themselves and thus enforce the selling price fixed beforehand. But trusts of this kind, as soon as business becomes bad, are generally liable to break up, and on this very account compel a yet greater concentration of association. The whole of a particular industry is turned into one gigantic joint-stock company; internal competition gives place to the internal monopoly of this one company. This has happened in 1890 with the English alkali production, which is now, after the fusion of 48 large works, in the hands of one company, conducted upon a single plan, and with a capital of 6,000,000 pounds." (Engels, Socialism: Utopian and Scientific Socialism, Marx, Engels, Selected Works-3, p. 172)

[https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Engels_Socialism_Utopian_and_Scientific.pdf]

Thus, the centralization of capital reaches its summit through cartels and trusts and they, by undertaking the regulation of the production in a given industry's particular branch, control the entire social production.

In another of his footnotes in the Capital, Volume III, Engels explains that a certain regulation is brought to the production "by the trusts of manufacturers of whole spheres of production which regulate production, and thus prices and profits" and yet this regulation still contains within itself elements of irregularities; and this is very important for the present period. A similar note is shared by Marx in Capital. "[A]s soon as the immediate impulse is over and the general principle of competition to 'buy in the cheapest market' (instead of stimulating production in the countries of origin, as the associations attempt to do, without regard to the immediate price at which these may happen at that time to be able to supply their product) – as soon as the principle of competition again reigns supreme, the regulation of the supply is left once again to 'prices'." (Marx, Capital, Volume III, Chapter 6, p. 109)

[<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd.pdf>]

We know that during Marx's period, cartels were not as widespread and predominant as they have become in the imperialism state of capitalism. After all, the concentration of capital would inevitably lead to monopoly: cartels, trusts and trade alliances. We know from Engels's research that even by those years, international cartels were being established in the British and German iron industries.

Although on one hand through cartelization, centralization reaches its summit, organizes the production, and to a certain degree regulates the production anarchy, on the other hand, this order without much delay again stands before the capital as the "order of disorderliness." As put by Engels, the functioning of trusts that are established by the capitalists in order to regulate the production among themselves is particular to normal times. This fraternal sharing, this "international" brotherhood of the capitalist form, transforms to the opposite, to the hostile brotherhood:

"It goes without saying that these experiments are practicable only so long as the economic climate is relative favourable. The first storm must upset them and prove that, although production assuredly needs regulation, it is certainly not the capitalist class which is fitted for that task. Meanwhile, the trusts have no other mission but to see to it that the little fish are swallowed by the big fish still more rapidly than before." (Footnote Engels, Marx, Capital, Volume III, Chapter 6, p.110)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd.pdf\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd.pdf)

Today, monopoly, with a huge weight, has become the "deepest economic foundation of imperialism." (Lenin, Selected Works, Volume IV, p. 101)

The phenomenon of mergers bringing a certain level of order to the production and yet maintaining internal conflicts due to competition, which was acutely observed by Marx and Engels at its earliest stages, has today been over and over confirmed; and especially during this period of general depression it has been ascertained.

It is a fact that today giant monopolies are able to control raw material resources on their original locations and thus supervise the production, sales conditions, production amount, term periods, price, profit, and so on.

In Lenin's words: "Forms of cartels: a) Cartels fixing sales conditions (terms, time limits, payment, etc....) b) Cartels fixing the sales areas c) Cartels fixing output quotas d) Cartels fixing prices e) Cartels fixing distribution of profit" (Selected Works, Volume 5, p.29)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/ni-alpha/princise.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/ni-alpha/princise.htm)

Whatever form that monopolies assume today, whatever the level of centralization is, and no matter how developed is the form of production regulation they come up with, production plan cannot go on without crises and within the struggles of monopolies against struggles, imperialism against imperialism, finance capital against finance capital. Thus monopolies cannot avoid being the womb of disorder within order.

It is a fact that in the imperialism phase of capitalism, certain forms of organization do emerge within the anarchy of production of monopoly capitalism and subsequently a certain degree of competition is removed. However, at the same time, anarchy blows out at another front, which is very characteristic of such mode of production.

While merging the production, trusts also increase the anarchy of production and the pressure of capital, which leads to more intense contradictions and antagonisms within capitalism.

At this point a parenthesis should be opened: The likes of Rudolf Hilferding, who wrote Finance Capital (a book that is important and valuable and yet contains certain mistakes), did not neglect to come up with a fatuous theory such as "organized capitalism" from a certain level of regulation that monopolies give to the economy. As we know, the "organized capitalism" thesis negates the theory of the collapse of capitalism. According to this thesis, in the phase of developing capitalism, in its imperialist stage, the order that the monopolies bring to the production also prevents capitalism's collapse by eliminating the conflicts and antagonisms in the economic arena.

In particular at the stage of imperialism, capitalism's law of uneven and erratic development deepens the anarchy and competition. Today's development confirms this fact. On the one hand, monopolies carry the

socialization of production to the peak by advancing the development, while on the other hand they accelerate the decay within the system; the organized production that is brought about by finance capital through monopolies also reproduces disorder in every stage of development and expansion. Lenin's words remain as the accurate assessment of the matter: "Independently of the development of unities of capitalists, independently of monopoly capitalism's efforts to eliminate the free competition in each country... monopoly... in its integrity amplifies and intensifies the chaotic character of capitalist production."

Although every effort of monopolies to bring an order to the organization of production gives a certain orderliness to the anarchy in the social production, through its development, the monopoly capitalism not only brings the conflicts and contradictions, disorder and chaos in world economy, but also intensifies them. The certain order that is brought to the production in the period of dominance of monopolies has neither been capable of eliminating the lack of planning and anarchy in economic process nor has it been able to take the competition out of this process.

Let us continue with an extremely important analysis by Marx.

A relative over-production is an essential condition for the expanding reproduction. In the second volume of Capital, at the section where he re-examines the elimination of the capitalist mode of re-production, Marx writes the following: "The quantity of raw materials, semi-finished products, and auxiliary materials required for the annual production of the articles of consumption — provided other things remain equal — does not decrease in consequence. Hence the aggregate production of means of production would have to increase in the one case and decrease in the other. This can be remedied only by a continuous relative overproduction. There must be on the one hand a certain quantity of fixed capital produced in excess of that which is directly required; on the other hand, and particularly, there must be a supply of raw materials, etc., in excess of the direct annual requirements (this applies especially to means of subsistence). This sort of over-production is tantamount to control by society over the material means of its own reproduction. But within capitalist society it is an element of anarchy." (Marx, Capital, Volume 2, Chapter 20, p. 496) [<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-II.pdf>]

Wholesale purchase, on the one hand, and, in the same manner selling as much as possible, on the other hand, enter the exchange process independently. In this way, commodity is exchanged with money and vice versa. The constant renewal of this process composes one of the essential factors of circulation. The balance between purchases and sales exists only abstractly. Due to the unique character of production, this balance can only be random. And this random factor, within the production that is based on capital that functions in anarchy, always carries within itself the probabilities of interruption, pause, volatility, and crisis as potential.

A production that is immune to crisis, free from difficulties, and is based on a smooth and flat rate is irrational and absurd in practice. In a society where the production is based on lack of planning and where everyone produces for himself, in other words, in a society where the productive forces of the society and the means of production are not used and distributed according to the measures and degrees of necessity and in a planned way that is oriented towards answering the needs of the society, there is no other way than the loss and re-establishment of that hypothetical ratio.

Congress Documents show that the MKP has neither understood the process of capitalist production and the cartels that emerged through this process and their roles on the production within the context of their historical meaning nor has it properly understood the chaotic nature of production of mode of cartels. This lack of understanding brings them to the thesis of "organized capitalism" or planned production and from there to the point of treating the capitalist mode of production without the production anarchy, bringing them further away from Marxism.

The Congress Documents state that what is meant by "demand proportional production" is that monopolies, which control 80% of the world production "are able to control the market's capacity and demand in a more proliferated way and are able to produce in a more planned and regulated way compared to the past." (p. 23)

The MKP, which renders capitalism prevalent in its Congress Documents, concludes on page 93 that "...semi-feudal production relations have not entirely disappeared but they are no longer the chief contradiction," in which not having disappeared entirely comes to the meaning of no longer being the primary, similarly with the production anarchy, where it has not entirely disappeared, meaning that it is no longer the primary, in other words the non-essential secondary.

As we finish this voluminous sub-header (voluminous because this problem draws on one of the most fundamental lines of Marxist political economy), we should point out to the following contradiction of the MKP, which is directly related to this issue:

On the page 25 of the Congress Documents, where it formulates their criticism of Lenin on the matter of free competition, they say that Comrade Lenin had stated that with the monopoly stage, free competition would gradually lose its effect; however developments so far have shown the contrary.

If this is the case, in that if free competition has not lost its importance with the emergence of monopoly capitalism, if free competition goes on at its full speed, then the competition that goes on in the economic arena among monopolies, as Marx put it, would take place only "through the lowering of commodity prices." (Capital, Volume 1, p. 643)

For that is the way to seize the market. And this is in line with the nature of the expanding re-production. So this means that realizing greater rates of large-scale production would translate into overproduction; and this would arrive at the anarchic character of the production, which excludes proportional or planned production.

In the name of changes in the imperialist system, in Lenin's words, "by superficially generalizing facts that are disconnected from the integral capitalist order," the MKP gives us a good example of clear and conspicuous distortion of Marxism. By attempting to find lines of changes in the production of anarchy, in the production that is based on lack of plan and randomness, it has entirely detached itself from the Marxist point of view. In Mao's words "by negating the fundamental principles and universal truths of Marxism," and thus by blunting the contradictions of capitalism, it has rolled down into the swamp of revisionism.

The MKP should know that it is a proven scientific analysis of Marx that the anarchy of production, which is based on the fact that the economic relations develop without relying on a single order, will not vacate its place to a "demand proportional" "organization of production." It seems that for the MKP, Marx's monumental work has remained as another unopened book.

2) Has the free competition capitalism indeed come back?

The Congress Documents argue that with the domination of the world by monopolies, "free competition has transformed into the competition among multi-national monopolies in the international arena." (p. 25)

Therefore, Lenin's thesis that the free competition will gradually lose its effect at the monopoly stage is proven wrong with the developments indicating the contrary.

In order to more accurately determine where the MKP stands and from which angle and how it looks at the issue, let's go directly to Lenin:

"Free competition is the basic feature of capitalism, and of commodity production generally; monopoly is the exact opposite of free competition, but we have seen the latter being transformed into monopoly

before our eyes, creating large-scale industry and forcing out small industry, replacing large-scale by still larger-scale industry, and carrying concentration of production and capital to the point where out of it has grown and is growing monopoly: cartels, syndicates and trusts, and merging with them, the capital of a dozen or so banks, which manipulate thousands of millions. At the same time the monopolies, which have grown out of free competition, do not eliminate the latter, but exist above it and alongside it, and thereby give rise to a number of very acute, intense antagonisms, frictions and conflicts. Monopoly is the transition from capitalism to a higher system." (Selected Works, Volume 5, p. 90)

[<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc/ch07.htm>]

Lenin's analysis of monopoly capitalism or imperialism is very clear and convincing, leaving no room for doubts or distortions. Monopoly emerged from the process of free competition and is a new phase in the development of capitalism, passing beyond free competition. If this were not so, there would not have been a need for a term as imperialism. Monopoly is a product of the development of capitalism. The more concentrated are the production and capital, the faster this development transforms into monopoly.

Just as it is impossible to regress from capitalism to feudalism, regress toward feudalism's economic lines; it is also impossible to regress from the monopoly stage of capitalism to an earlier stage of its economic evolution. Since the MKP is suffering from superficiality and has not been able to absorb Marxism, it fails to see this fact. From an economic perspective, imperialism is the highest stage in the development of capitalism, says Lenin. This is a new stage in the history of capitalism, where the expanding re-production reaches immense scales and free competition leaves its place to monopoly. This expresses itself in the omnipotence of the giant banks, trusts and unions; in the foreclosures of sources of raw materials; in the accumulation of bank capital.

The political superstructure of free competition capitalism corresponds to democracy, whereas the political superstructure of monopoly capitalism corresponds to reactionarism. These are the ABCs of Leninism, facts established in Lenin's article A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism.

The Congress Documents indicate that interpreting the on-going economic competition struggle among monopolies, the MKP arrives at the assumption that the free competition capitalism has returned. Had the MKP better studied Lenin, better comprehended his polemics with Kautsky, it would not have ignored the following statement by Lenin: "Let us assume that free competition, without any sort of monopoly, would have developed capitalism and trade more rapidly. But the more rapidly trade and capitalism develop, the greater is the concentration of production and capital which gives rise to monopoly. And monopolies have already arisen—precisely out of free competition! Even if monopolies have now begun to retard progress, it is not an argument in favour of free competition, which has become impossible after it, has given rise to monopoly." (Lenin, Selected Works, Volume 5, p. 115)

[<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc/ch09.htm>]

Yes, after creating the monopolies, it is impossible for the former stage to re-emerge. But this situation, by no means, would exclude the competitions of monopolies against monopolies, imperialism against imperialism, and capital against capital, as explained by Lenin over and over. And this does not mean a transition to the capitalism of free competition; it is the struggle among monopolies for the markets. So, as Lenin emphasized, to claim that in the era of imperialism, or in other words in the era of monopoly capitalism, the competition among the imperialist countries or monopolies would end would essentially remove contradictions and antagonism from capitalism, which would mean to be on the same line as Kautsky.

One final point: the MKP claims, on the one hand, that Lenin was wrong on the point of free competition, that free competition did not retreat but on the contrary it further developed; and yet, on the other hand, it argues that, due to the scale that monopolisation has reached, the planned production has become primary. Now, these are contradictory statements. If the free competition has become the primary aspect of the matters, it would also become the biggest obstacle before the planned production.

After all, the process that gives the production an order to a certain degree is a result of the monopolist stage and not that of the free competition stage.

3) Was Lenin wrong on stock exchange?

The Congress Documents state the following: "In the same way, the stock markets, too, instead of losing influence, contrary to conclusions of Comrade Lenin, have become even more influential in the form of legal giant casinos, becoming means to exploit the labours of billions of people." (p. 25)

This is another case of lack of comprehension of Lenin, of arbitrarily interpreting his text, or being amazingly ignorant of the content of his writings. Based on what is being said on stock markets in Lenin's book on Imperialism, in the section where the bourgeois economists' interpretations are reviewed, to come up with such a claim is plain distortion, as the MKP does. If this were not to a deliberate distortion, the MKP would have ignored what Lenin had written in 1919, a few years after he wrote his book Imperialism:

"What, it can be asked, is altered in this respect when capitalism gives way to imperialism, i.e., when pro-monopoly capitalism is replaced by monopoly capitalism? Only that the power of the stock exchange increases. For finance capital is industrial capital at its highest, monopoly level which has merged with banking capital. The big banks merge with and absorb the stock exchange. (The literature on imperialism speaks of the declining role of the stock exchange, but only in the sense that every giant bank is itself virtually a stock exchange.)" (Lenin, A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, p. 54-55)
[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/carimarx/3.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/carimarx/3.htm)

How could one misinterpret such a clear explanation on the increase of stock markets' power? There is more. As if to directly refute the MKP, on July 11, 1919, Lenin says the following: "The power of capital is everything. The stock exchange is everything." (Lenin, Marx, Engels, Marxism, p. 303)
[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/jul/11.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/jul/11.htm)

It is a fact that there is a difference between the role of the stock market at the beginning of the free competition capitalism and at its later stage and finally its role at the monopoly stage.

While preparing Marx's Capital for publication, Engels, in his addendum to the Volume III of Capital, underlines that the stock market has gained a lot more importance since Marx wrote the book:

"The position of the stock exchange in capitalist production in general is clear from Vol. 3rd, Part 5, especially Chapter [27]. But since 1865, when the book was written, a change has taken place which today assigns a considerably increased and constantly growing role to the stock exchange, and which, as it develops, tends to concentrate all production, industrial as well as agricultural, and all commerce, the means of communication as well as the functions of exchange, in the hands of stock exchange operators, so that the stock exchange becomes the most prominent representative of capitalist production itself." (Capital, Volume Three, p. 794) [\[http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd .pdf\]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd.pdf)

Yes, today these developments in the stock exchange have reached gigantic proportions, making it the heart of deterioration as well as steering centre of the economy. It is now pretty much impossible to come up with an opinion on any economic and financial problem without having followed the stock exchange.

Stock market is an unprecedented type of casino, where stocks, bonds, and derivative financial assets, representing goods and services, as the bourgeois media often mentions, are exchanged at great speed and quantities; it is a casino from where stems out the "imaginary money wealth." (Karl Marx, Capital 3rd , Section 30, Money-Capital and Real Capital I, p. 424) At stock exchange the repossession and movement of property rights take place via bunch of valuable papers and hence it becomes an arena for endless game of gambling and fraud.

Moreover, wealth that occurs here is a virtual one, assuming a body as an imaginary capital.

It is because Lenin had seen this fact and the extent to which the subsequent developments had reached that he had said, "stock exchange is everything."

4) Monopolies are compelled to turn to global markets because national markets do not satisfy their needs!

The Congress Documents state; "Due to the fact that national markets are unable to answer their needs, monopolies are compelled to turn to world markets." (p.17)

In the context of this sub-header, the relevant question is this: Why would capital require foreign markets? Firstly, in order to obtain higher profits; secondly, in order to ever expand the production; and thirdly, because of one of capital's natural feature, competition.

First, let's listen to Marx's analysis in Capital: "If capital is sent abroad, this is not done because it absolutely could not be applied at home, but because it can be employed at a higher rate of profit in a foreign country." (Capital, Volume Three, p. 226)

[\[http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd_.pdf\]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd_.pdf)

Now Lenin: "Capitalism's need of a foreign market is by no means to be explained by the impossibility of realising the product on the home market..." (Lenin, Development of Capitalism in Russia, p. 512)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1899/dcr8v3rd_/v3rd_8v.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1899/dcr8v3rd_/v3rd_8v.htm)

Here, the "need" is the essence of business and is directly linked to the "realization issue."

If what is meant is that the realization issue cannot be resolved within the domestic market; in other words, to put the matter in the way the MKP does, if the "needs of monopolies" cannot be answered within the domestic market, which is to say that the realization of the total social product is impossible without opening up to foreign markets, then this is another distortion of Marxism.

So the problem here is the problem of the realization. It is one of the keystones of Marx's economic theory and, moreover, is the main theme in the second volume of Capital. This is an issue of reproduction of social capital and at the same time it holds light to the matter of crisis in the system. The problem here has to do with the realization of the total social product, both in terms of its value (constant capital, variable capital and surplus-value) and its natural format (means of production and consumer goods, especially necessities and luxury goods. In the post-Marx era, one of the mistakes of Rose and some others, as formulated in Rosa's book Capital Accumulation, lies precisely on this point. And this is one of the points that are emphasized in Lenin's The Development of Capitalism in Russia.

5) The problem of the crises of capitalism

The Congress Documents state: "As a consequence of capitalist production and distribution, the crises of the capitalist system, too, compared to the past, have considerably increased." (p. 26)

Although the documents frequently repeat words such as "further enhanced", "new developments", "qualitative development" in an attempt to load more meaning to their theses but in actuality these do not help advance it even an inch. That aside, what is said about the crisis in the documents is a distorted presentation of reality. Even in Engels's time, crises had already changed relative to Marx's period, a situation on which Engels had written extensively. The documents offer their conclusion as if it is offering a new diagnosis on the new era, whereas this diagnosis has a history of at least one hundred and fifty years.

So what is the Marxist perspective on the crises of capitalism?

As an inevitable part of the capitalist system, crises emerged along with capital. What initially began as ten, eight, five, and increasingly shorter intervals of "recurring" economic crises of capitalism gradually became a continual element of the system, changing appearances, forms, and alternating cycles, and becoming ever

more complex, protracted and irregular. So much so that they have become a shadow of the capitalist system. Although, the causes of crises remained the same, their forms, appearances, and cycles show differences from those of Marx's period. This is the general framework that should be underlined. This is also the common view of the classics after Marx.

Engels has extensive evaluations about the topic of crisis. However, it will suffice to reiterate only several most striking ones. Let's start with the following: "While the productive power increases in a geometric, the extension of markets proceeds at best in an arithmetic ratio. The decennial cycle of stagnation, prosperity, over-production and crisis, ever recurrent from 1825 to 1867, seems indeed to have run its course; but only to land us in the slough of despond of a permanent and chronic depression. The sighed for period of prosperity will not come; as often as we seem to perceive its heralding symptoms, so often do they again vanish into air." (Engels, Preface to the English Edition of Capital, Volume I, p. 39) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/p6.htm>]

In other words, what was a periodically returning crisis terms in Marx's time left its place to a chronic depression in a new era. The cycles of capitalist circulation had changed and the periods of prosperity remained at the margins of life without ever to come back.

Here is a second quote from Engels to re-emphasize the change in the duration and frequency of crisis: "[As I have already stated elsewhere [English edition: Vol. I. — Ed.], a change has taken place here since the last major general crisis. The acute form of the periodic process with its former ten-year cycle, appears to have given way to a more chronic, long drawn out, alternation between a relatively short and slight business improvement and a relatively long, indecisive depression-taking place in the various industrial countries at different times." (Engels's note # 8 to Marx's Capital, Volume III , Section 30, p. 433-434) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1894-c3/ch30.htm>]

Our third quote from Engels is from one of his letter to Bebel in 1866:

"We have entered upon a period incomparably more dangerous to the existence of the old society than the period of ten-yearly crises." (Engels, Engels to August Bebel in Berlin, London, 20 (-23) in January 1886, Marx, Engels, Selected Correspondence 2, p.205) [https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Engels_Correspondence.pdf]

Thus, as Engels underlines, the new era, leaving behind the cycle routine of capitalism, points out to a more complex and forbidding period for capitalism.

Here is Lenin's succinct assessment: "The forms, the sequence, the picture of particular crises changed, but crises remained an inevitable component of the capitalist system." (Lenin, Marxism and Revisionism, Selected Works, Volume 11, p. 483) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/apr/03.htm>]

And here's Mao's conclusions on the same topic: "Crises that are seen in the capitalist society since the Second World War are different that those of Marx's days. In those days, crises in general appeared every seven or ten years. In the past fourteen years from the end of the Second World War until 1959, three crises emerged." (Mao Tse-tung, Selected Works VI, page 248)

In short, the conclusion is that crises have change since Marx with increasingly shorter cycles and irregularities.

This is the collective conclusion we can draw: The cycles of the capitalist economy goes on in disorder in its entirety. Not only that the crises have remained as an element, component, or part of the capitalist economy but also they have gained a continuous character. This does not mean that the capitalist economy has no chance to breathe at all. It means that the periods of prosperity are becoming less and less frequent and inadequate, whereas the depression periods are getting increasingly more painful and intense. In other words, capitalism must go on with a protracted general crisis. As Engels had mentioned, chronic and

protracted crises that intensify in between short-term improvement and long-term and indecisive depression have become a continuous and constant character of the capitalist system.

The period of prosperity that Engels had mentioned is still nowhere to be seen; capitalism is yet to recover completely from depression; it is still stuck in the industrial cycle, stagnation, and depression.

In other words, considering the three decades of "golden years" following the Second Imperialist War of Repartition as a parenthesis symbolizing capitalism's long-term development, the general trend is in accordance with Engels' words: relatively short and slight improvement in business followed by a long and unstable depression.

In a situation where the concentration and centralization of capital has reached new peaks and the monopoly capitalism has prevailed everywhere and has taken the entire production under its control, and as the monopoly rendered capitalism's contradictions even bigger through higher inequalities and the production through scientific applications have expounded the imbalance and disharmony among the various branches of the economy, in the new era depression has become even more pronounced.

Thus, the crisis of the capitalist system had taken a new form with shorter intervals and had become "a continuous and constant depression" even by Engels' days. In that case, what is new and "increased compared to the past," as the MKP puts it? It would have been understandable if they had said the following: in the recent decades, financial crises have overtaken the economic crises of overproduction; what is being observed are the financial crises, even if they reveal, in many cases, the over-production crises - just as in the 2008 crisis. Even though the MKP often brags about holding true to Kaypakkaya's line, they haven't managed to learn from his writings. By the beginning of 1970's, Kaypakkaya was saying: "By the Second World War, the conditions have changed... Periodical depressions of the imperialist system have become more frequent and violent." (Kaypakkaya, Selected Writings, p. 429).

6) Qualitative changes in Imperialism!

The Congress Documents state: "Although certain essentials of the system, such as the capitalist mode of production, production relations, and surplus-value have not in essence changed, in accordance with new developments, they indicate significant differences." (p.19)

And it follows: "We must break away from incorrect approaches by analyzing these developments, which are not changes in the essence [of the system] but emerge according to the historical conditions that arise upon the same essence." Further on, the emergence of "some new qualitative changes" is explained as follows:

"The fundamental contradiction of capitalism and imperialism is between the social nature of production and the private property. Today too this is the unchanged content-essence. However, imperialism shows not only quantitative but also certain qualitative changes. National monopolies are replaced by multinational monopolies; concentration and concentration have brought out some quantitative changes." (p.249)

What are the significant differences occurring in the surplus-value on the basis of the capitalist production system? The following is extremely important and had been explained by Marx more than 150 years ago: The large industry does not see the existing production process as the final and unchanging form; in this regard, its technical basis is revolutionary; and this is its fundamental difference with the conservatism of the previous modes of production. Large industries not only lead to changes in the technical basis of production but also, conditional to these changes, they would bring about changes in the tasks of workers and in the social compilation of the labour process.

Marx never claimed that these changes have caused significant changes in surplus value as well. Concentration and centralization of production does not lead to a change in surplus-value. International

monopolies or today's transnational production and multinational monopolies cannot be the elements of changes or significant transformation in surplus-value. As Marks had pointed out, even "fundamental changes" in the technical conditions of labour process have "not in the least degree affected the essential difference between" the constant and variable capitals. They would change "only the quantitative relation between the constant and the variable capital, or the proportions in which the total capital is split up into its constant and variable constituents." (Capital, Volume I, p. 226)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch08.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch08.htm)

This means the following: Closely parallel to the progress of the society, gigantic steps in the relative surplus-value and thus the increase in the productivity of labour or the shortening of necessary labour-time cannot cause significant alterations in surplus-value. Surplus-value remains as the confiscation of the worker's unpaid labour by capital. All the developments in labour productivity at the end come to one conclusion: reduce the necessary labour, increase the surplus-labour, and turn it into unpaid labour. This situation does not cause a qualitative change either in the mode of production or in the fundamental relation between labour and capital, meaning in surplus-value.

It is incomprehensible that despite such clear scientific analyses by Marx, the MKP still insists on arguing about significant changes in surplus-value. So the question that the MKP must answer still remains: What is the significant change or difference in surplus-value? How will they answer this question satisfactorily without avoiding Marx?

They claim that besides some quantitative changes, imperialism has also undergone some qualitative changes. National monopolies are replaced by multinational monopolies. Certain qualitative changes have emerged in the centralization and concentration. What is the centralization and concentration?

As Marx described in the third volume of Capital, centralization is the merging of many capitals into several large capitals, through changes in the distribution of existing capitals or through the changes in their quantitative grouping. In other words, centralization is the transformation of many capitalists into a few capitalists. And, again paraphrasing Marx, concentration is another name given to the production in large scales.

Concentration and centralization have to do with the extraordinary expansion of concentration, not with the qualitative transformation. This means the realization of production in very large scales. This is a natural tendency of capitalism.

The question here is this: Is the replacement of national monopolies by multinational monopolies a qualitative change? Or does it have to do with the scale that concentration has reached? More importantly, is the emergence of multinational monopolies a new development? Or had they already appeared soon after the completion of the process of monopoly stage?

Replacement of national monopolies by international monopolies is not a new phenomenon. It should be noted that the national monopoly of multinational monopolies to leave the place of what was the last year of the decade what the problem is and what the last thirty years. Its historical background goes way beyond the last decade or the last three decades. It is a development that goes as far back as the "golden years" of capitalism. This is a development of the period so-called the "golden years" in the history of capitalism. If we were to follow this historical development along its major lines: Even in Marx and Engels' days, due to the nature of capital or due to the concentration and centralization of capital and production, a trend of monopoly mergers was on the rise. As could be clearly seen from the examples that Engels gave based on the American and British capitals, there were already trust type monopolies popping up here and there. This was so "by the trusts of manufacturers of whole spheres of production which regulate production, and thus prices and profits." (Engels, in Supplement to Capital, Volume III , p. 110, footnote 16)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd_.pdf\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd_.pdf)

At the time, this trend was at its embryo stage. By the very beginning of twentieth century, free competitive capitalism, due to the concentration of production, reached the monopoly stage. As Lenin had noted, this development went on with giant steps until 1912. So much so that, by the first decades of the twentieth century, this line of development led to emergence of super monopolies, as Lenin pointed out:

"Monopolist capitalist associations, cartels, syndicates and trusts first divided the home market among themselves and obtained more or less complete possession of the industry of their own country. But under capitalism the home market is inevitably bound up with the foreign market. Capitalism long ago created a world market. As the export of capital increased, and as the foreign and colonial connections and 'spheres of influence' of the big monopolist associations expanded in all ways, things 'naturally' gravitated towards an international agreement among these associations, and towards the formation of international cartels. This is a new stage of world concentration of capital and production, incomparably higher than the preceding stages. Let us see how this supermonopoly develops." (Lenin, Selected Works, Volume V, p. 70-71) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc/ch05.htm>]

So, it is obvious that "the formation of international cartels," what is by Lenin called "supermonopoly", is not a new phenomenon. Lenin gives the cartelization in the electric industry as a typical example. Further on, in the same work, he writes about how the private and state monopolies are intertwined. Afterwards, during the "golden years of capitalism, an era that covers the post-WWII years until 1973, the year when the oil crisis blew off, international monopolies organized themselves as multinational monopolies. However, the trend did not stop there. In especially the last twenty years, merged megamonopolies that rule the markets across the world became a reality of our days. It must be underlined that this development is closely linked with the abandonment of Keynesian model after the 1970s and the adoption of Friedman market model (no-liberalism) and with the elements of the collapse of modern revisionism in Eastern Europe and Russia.

This means the followings: Firstly, in the Congress Documents, these developments in imperialism, namely the emergence of multinational monopolies, are being touted as something new. However, multinational monopolies have a history of at least 50-60 years. Secondly, even these developments do not correspond to a new qualitative change in imperialism. The fact that international monopolies became multinational monopolies 50-60 years ago does not lead to a change at the core of business and cause an imperialism as a in the new predicament we face. In the development of capitalism, centralization and concentration would remain at the level of cartels in the transition to a new order.

By the way, at some point the Congress Documents uses terms "unification and centralization" within the context of capital next to each other. Do we need to remind that from the viewpoint of economy, centralization is already the term used to describe the quantitative merger of capital groups?

As for "the trend of progress towards a single world monopoly," as mentioned by the Congress Documents, it of course will not find any possibility of realization. It has been resolved in Marx; "This process would soon bring about the collapse of capitalist production if it were not for counteracting tendencies, which have a continuous decentralizing effect alongside the centripetal one." (Capital, Volume III , p. 218-219) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-3rd.pdf>]

As Lenin had noted in his Introduction to Bukharin's Imperialism and World Economy in 1915:

"There is no doubt that the development is going in the direction of a single world trust that will swallow up all enterprises and all states without exception. But the development in this direction is proceeding under such stress, with such a tempo, with such contradictions, conflicts, and convulsions-not only economical, but also political, national, etc., etc.-that before a single world trust will be reached, before the respective national finance capitals will have formed a world union of "ultra-imperialism," imperialism will inevitably explode, capitalism will turn into its opposite."

It is apparent that with round sentences such as "the mechanisms of capitalism do not go on as a routine quantitative increase and decrease. They are shaped by historical circumstances, showing quantitative and qualitative changes," the MKP's Third Congress gets the feet entangled in the theory. It is a fact that as the new stage of capitalism, monopoly capitalism does not stand still on one point; it develops, expands. This development, however, has not come to an extension to express a qualitative leap. In this regards, the basis of the theory of MKP is deprived of real ground.

ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

This is one of the conclusions that are described in the Third Congress Documents: The semi-feudal mode of production and relations are no longer predominant [in Turkey]; instead, the capitalist mode of production and its relations of production have become predominant. This is how the argument is offered in the Documents: "...the disintegration of the prevailing semi-feudal relations of production and mode of production in the country have deepened, semi-feudal relations of production and mode of production have ceased to be the predominant mode. (...) The capitalist relations of production and therefore the capitalist mode of production have become the predominant relations of production and mode of production, determining the character of the system. "(p. 91)

No doubt this subject would gain adequate clarity by being reviewed through the Marxist political economy. Moreover, it would require a contextual interpretation of statistical data of the past historical experiences.

There are some fundamental points that must be considered when drawing conclusions on such a vital issue for our revolution as the socio-economic structure [of Turkey]. Otherwise, arriving at wrong conclusions would be inevitable and it would mean dry, unilateral, and inaccurate interpretations of statistical data, integrity of which is compromised.

What are these points?

First of all, the modern political economy and incidentally Marxist political economy base their economic theories on production processes and not on circulation and consumption processes.

Secondly, a given subject of study can be accurately evaluated only by a thorough consideration of its historical context. Thus, the evaluator would never shut himself off to the two state of the liquidation of feudalism in history, opening the way to at least learn from the results of the situation or consume it "productively," meaning "theoretically." And if the "internal transformation" is the "solution from above," how is it that it leads to the domination of the "comprador" capitalism and not to that of the national capitalism. After all, all the examples of "internal transformation" in history led to "national" capitalism.

Thirdly, as a historical experience, it is important to remember which characteristics were defining the economy in Russia in the period between 1900 and 1907. For that period, Lenin admitted that although they had correctly diagnosed the "direction" of the capitalist development in Russia, they failed to see the right "timing, and consequently had made mistakes in the first years of 1900's. And he adds: "We rectified the mistake by substituting for the partial aim of combating the survivals of the old agrarian system, the aim of combating the old agrarian system as a whole."

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch02s8.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch02s8.htm)

Moreover, Lenin admits that they had exaggerated the development level of capitalism in Russia. In this context, it is absolutely worthwhile to ask as to why there was an exaggeration.

Fourthly, in capitalist Russia in October 1917, and not during the 1905/1906 revolution nor during February 1917, but at the time of the socialist proletarian revolution that Lenin, putting aside his own agricultural program, accepted the program of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, without even modifying it at all. And they actually obtained success with it. This too is a historical experience that we can draw valuable lessons from. How come this program was chosen to be implemented?

Fifthly, what was the condition that facilitated the transition from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution in Russia? The answer to this question is also important and meaningful.

All these considered, it can be said that the MKP's 3rd Congress did not weigh this topic with the sensitivity of an apothecary's scale but rather approached this extremely important matter superficially and

drowned it in bourgeois statistics instead of bringing any clarity to the questions. That is why the Congress falls into a line that neither entirely breaks away from the old nor does it hold on to the new. It fails to come to a scientific socialist resolution on the issue. Instead, it looks for exits via resorting to crude theses such as "socialist people's war strategy" in the name of "contributing" to MLM, ending up at an embarrassing position.

Here the problem of feudalism's two-state mode is the key in the analysis of economic structure. It is a matter that Marx pays attention in *Capital* and Lenin in a series of articles.

What is the two-state mode of feudalism and how has this issue been viewed in the history of Marxism? It is surprising that this extremely important issue has not attracted the keen interest of the MKP, for it is fundamental in the analysis of socio-economic structure of the country. It seems that the MKP was trying to quietly slip away from the discussion when it could not find adequate evidence to support its thesis on this issue.

Let's take it from the top:

There are two ways to eliminate feudal property relations: the Prussian mode and the peasantry mode. Germany and Russia are the best examples of the first mode, whereas the US, England, and France are the best examples of the second mode. These two modes were called by Lenin as the "Prussian way" and the "American way." The Prussian way is characterized as the "solution from above" or the "reform way." The second mode, the American way, is characterized as the "solution from below" or the "revolutionary way." Throughout a series of articles at different dates, Lenin had used one or the other of these terms but the most frequently used terms are the Prussian way and the American or the revolutionary way.

Prussian-style mode: In this mode the medieval property relations or pre-capitalist forms of exploitation or feudalism are not liquidated overnight in one swipe. Instead, the feudal mode of production and production relations are brought into concordance with capitalism in small, slow, painful steps of bourgeois development. In this mode, the "internal transformation" of the economy of landlordism is the foundation of the transition from labour-service to capitalism. In short, in this development form, what is essential is the internal transformation.

Peasant-style mode: In this mode, the medieval property relations or pre-capitalism exploitation forms or feudalism are liquidated, demolished, and destroyed at once through a revolution. In this mode the foundation of the transition from the previous state to the next, from the labour-service to capitalism is the expropriation of estates of landlords in the name of peasants. In short, in this development mode, the confiscation of estates of big landlords is the primary model.

Prussia is obviously lends it name to the Prussian-way. At the time, Germany was composed of small states, divided into dukedoms, principalities, and kingdoms. The question of overcoming this situation was the chief issue for Germany at the time. It was the principle contradiction of Germany of 1860s and 1870s, so to speak. For this fragmentation was the biggest obstacle before the capitalist development in Germany. It was also the fundamental issue for the national unity or nationhood of Germany.

According to the historical circumstances, there were three possible ways for the unification of Germany: Either the fragmented German states were to get unified within a German Empire by the Prussian Junkers' government, which possessed the biggest military might among them and led by Bismarck - via a "revolution from above," as Engels described it; or the unification was to be realized under the leadership of Austria; or via a "revolution from bottom," which meant a unified, democratic German Republic, via a bourgeois-democratic revolution. The period of 1866-71 was not optimal for a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Subsequently this meant that the path to the third way, a revolution from bottom, too was not open. Thus there remained two options for the unification: either under the leadership of Prussia or Austria. The outcome of the war in 1866 between Prussia and Austria was to determine by who the

unification was to be realized. Austria was weak compared to the big and powerful Prussia, who won the war. So Prussia undertook the unification of Germany and yet Austria did not join the unification and remained as an independent country. The Unified North Germany meant even a stronger Prussian Monarchy. In 1871, Germany declared war on France and came out as the victorious party. Following this victory, the German Empire was established by the Prussian Junkers. With the unification and centralization of Germany, the path for the development of capitalism in Germany was opened.

The Bismarck led "revolution from above" was carried out by the Prussian landlords. Thus, the main obstacle before the capitalist development of agriculture in Prussia was overcome and the landlords, through a process that spanned many decades, have become capitalists.

This was the "internal transformation" way. The process was completed as the old feudal economy (properties of Prussian big landlords) became the economy of the capitalist Junker regime. This way of establishing capitalism based on the agriculture of old economy was called the Prussian mode of bourgeois development.

Both founders of Marxism and Lenin had pointed out to the necessity of carrying further and completing the Prussia way of "revolution from above" with a "revolution from below." It must be remembered that even though this solution with a revolution from below was a step forward for the development of capitalism in Prussia, the Prussian property relations of old economy (feudalism) was not taken apart and liquidated. It was largely preserved and, moreover, it even became the foundation of the essentially capitalist Junker economy. Despite the "revolution from above," capitalism retained many of the feudal features and continued for a long time as a semi-feudal exploitation form. Here too, very much as it was in Russia, "serfdom," for example, was abolished with a series of decrees from above, the dependency of peasants on big landlords kept on going on.

The abolition of serfdom in Prussia dates to 1807. However, through a number of liabilities loaded on the backs of peasants, dependency on landlords continued. Even though fifteen years later these obligations were officially removed, due to the difficult conditions peasants found themselves, soon after a large number of them became landless as their lands were acquired by big landlords, a process very similar to that of Russia. This led to the further expansion of now capitalist big farms of Junkers, which still preserved many pre-capitalist exploitation forms.

In Lenin's words:

"In Germany the reshaping of the medieval forms of landed property proceeded in a reformative way, so to speak. It adapted itself to routine, to tradition, to the feudal estates that were slowly converted into Junker estates, to the routine of indolent peasants who were undergoing the difficult transition from *corvée* to the condition of the Knecht and Grossbauer." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol 3, p. 203)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch02s5.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch02s5.htm)

It is not hard to imagine that in this respect the American Way relates to what is now called the United States of America. Until the mid-19th century, the US was divided into two groups of states, North and South. They carried different characteristics of agricultural development. In the North, free peasant economy was predominant and big landlordism was large absent. The North was already in the capitalist development stage. Therefore, in the North, where feudalism was absent and the free economy of free farmers provided opportunity for the capitalist development, there was no economic basis for the pre-capitalist forms of exploitation in agriculture. In the rural areas of the Northern States, the capitalist agriculture was developing as the industry was developing in the urban areas, giving rise to the industrial bourgeoisie and the capitalist farmers. This free economy in the North States was the foundation of capitalist development in agriculture. However, the situation was completely different in the Southern States. Here both the large land ownership and slavery was still dominant.

Thus, whereas in the Northern States there were no restraining barriers before the capitalist development, the slavery system and the presence of large landowners in the Southern States constituted an insurmountable obstacle to the capitalist development. Moreover, the slave owning economy of the big landlords was a huge obstacle before the development of free farmers on free lands. This obstacle could be removed only by means of violence after the second half of the 19th century, during the 1861-1865 American Civil War.

Essentially this war was waged to determine the absolute dominant power between the bourgeoisie of the Northern States (and the East) and the landed aristocracy who held control of the South's plantation economy. The American Civil War ended with the victory of the Northern States, thanks to the superiority of its industry. Slavery, the obstacle before the development of capitalism in the Southern States was removed and the large estates of big landowners were confiscated and were eventually, along with unclaimed swaths of lands, divided down to smaller pieces and sold to people with nominal prices, facilitating the emergence of small farmers in the South and of further development of capitalism in general.

So, the American Way of transformation was realized through the violence that was used by the Northern States against the established slavery system of the Southern States. In this transformation, the essential characteristic is the fact that big landownership was liquidated at once in one blow, the transition to the predominance of small farmers was swift and decisive.

For this transition, Lenin says the following:

"In America this reshaping went on in a violent way as regards the slave farms in the Southern States. There violence was applied against the slave-owning landlords. Their estates were broken up, and the large feudal estates were transformed into small bourgeois farms." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 3, p. 203)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch02s5.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch02s5.htm)

Of course, another example to such transition in the agricultural sector, the "American way," as Lenin called it, is England. Lenin stated that in England this transition period in agriculture took place through the revolutionary way, in other words through means of violence, and that it was implemented by displacing peasants from their lands and villages.

This transition process, extensively referred to by Marx's Capital, is an extremely painful one. As Marx had underlined, this transition mode or the direct expropriation of producers, was done through a "ruthless brutality."

Another of the typical examples of this transition is France. In France, the feudal forms of ownership or pre-capitalist forms of exploitation were removed by way of violence, with the Great French Revolution. In 1789, with a great popular uprising under the leadership of the bourgeoisie, the estates of feudal landlords in the countryside were expropriated through violence. Thus, the obstacles before the capitalist development of agriculture were removed in one swoop and by revolutionary means using the shortest, most decisive, and most direct way. That is so even if the governing power changed hands several times between the bourgeoisie and the feudal landlords and despite the revolutions of 1789 and 1793, when a certain equilibrium was observed between the bourgeoisie and the landlords, and despite the Bonapartist Bourgeois regime that was implemented with the revolutions of 1848 and 1859 by Napoleon I and Napoleon 3rd. No doubt that the period of bourgeois rule began with the Great French Revolution of 1789 and the bourgeoisie could establish its absolute dominance only after three subsequent major uprisings, in 1830, 1848, and 1871.

Debates about the two modes of capitalist development in agriculture, the Prussian way vs. the American way, took place most extensively in Russia. Having reviewed the historical backgrounds of these two ways, let us now review the Russian example.

In Russia, the 1861 Reform laid the foundation for the "Prussian way." Following the signing of the manifesto dated 19 February 1861 by Alexander II, serfdom that went on for centuries in Russia was abolished and the peasants were "liberated." According to this law, big landlords were forced to sell land to the peasants. However, this sale was severely fettered with a series of terms and conditions. Land allocated to peasants could be bought only after having paid large fees and until these fees were paid, peasants had to fulfil a series of heavy obligations in return for the use of land. Although on that day serfdom was officially abolished, pre-capitalism forms of exploitation continued after the passing of the law as well. Therefore, this was not an "actual" liberation. In Lenin's words, "Once the latifundia are retained, this inevitably means also the retention of the bonded peasant, of métayer, of the renting of small plots by the year, the cultivation of the "squire's" land with the implements of the peasants, i.e., the retention of the most backward farming methods and of all that Asiatic barbarism which is called patriarchal rural life." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol 1, p. 209)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/agrquest/vii.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/agrquest/vii.htm)

This way of transformation, as a heavy, painful and slow process, preserved the economic basis of the serfdom era's exploitation forms, while the peasantry was doomed to decades longer of painful dispossession and enslavement. However, it must be noted that the 1861 Reform opened the way for the development of capitalism, even though it was a very slow and painful process of development and it progressed through violence, destruction, and starvation. It also paved the way for the optimal conditions for the removal of pre-capitalism forms of exploitation in one way or the other, via the "revolutionary" way or the "reformist" way.

Moreover, in particular with the 1861 Reform, Russia was entering a new era of substantial completion of primitive accumulation of capital. This was an extremely important threshold for Russia. In fact, the so-called primitive accumulation is nothing more than a historical process in which the means of productions are separated from the producers, as Marx had noted. This is the process in which the preconditions for the development of capitalism are put in place. This is the phase where, on the one hand, the means of production and subsistence are taken away from the dispossessed producers and are turned into capital; while on the other hand, the dispossessed producers are turned into wage labourers. With the 1861 Reform, Russia had entered the path of capitalist development in agriculture. The concerned debates at the time were at a conjunction with the question of how to proceed from that point on.

There were two possible ways for the agrarian development in Russia. One was the Prussian way, whose path was opened by the 1861 Reform and the second was the American way. In other words, either the way of reform or the way of revolution. This situation was formalized by Lenin as follows: "With the present economic basis of the Russian Revolution, two main lines of its development and outcome are objectively possible: Either the old landlord economy, bound as it is by thousands of threads to serfdom, is retained and turns slowly into purely capitalist, "Junker" economy. The basis of the final transition from labour-service to capitalism is the internal metamorphosis of feudalist landlord economy. The entire agrarian system of the state becomes capitalist and for a long time retains feudalist features. Or the old landlord economy is broken up by revolution, which destroys all the relics of serfdom, and large landownership in the first place." (Lenin, The Development of Capitalism in Russia, p. 22-23)

[\[http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1899/devel/preface2.htm\]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1899/devel/preface2.htm)

Until the 1905-1907 First Russian Revolution, the Russian liberal bourgeoisie was the main advocate of the Prussian way. After the 1905 Revolution, this line was followed by Stolypin, as Russia had entered a period of capitalist development at a great pace.

At the time, in Russia, the capitalist system was predominant in 19 states, while in 17 states corvée (repayment through work) system and in 7 states the semi-feudal system was predominant. In Russia's particular conditions, the corvée system was still the predominant form of production relations in many

states, spreading over very large areas. The development of capitalism in agriculture was most acutely visible in the periphery areas.

Realizing that Russia had entered a phase of rapid capitalist development and dissolution of feudal exploitation forms, the Stolypin led government came up with the "Stolypin Agrarian Reform" package. The reform package, in a Prussian way, had further opened the path for the capitalist development in agriculture and encouraged the development of capitalism in general.

After this stage, the feudal-autocracy changed skin, transforming its autocratic form towards a bourgeois-monarchic form, ornamented with the constitutional bureaucracy. In this form, one of the system's feet was planted in bourgeoisie while the other was still resting on big landlords, trying to keep a balance between the two class powers. Lenin likened this situation to Bonapartism in France and named it the "bourgeois-Bonapartist" policy or the "agrarian Bonapartism."

Lenin explained the situation as follows: "The alliance of Tsarism with the Black-Hundred landlords and the top commercial and industrial bourgeoisie has been openly solidified and recognised by the coup d'état of June 3 and the establishment of the Third Duma. Having of necessity finally taken the path of the capitalist development of Russia, and striving to keep to a path which would preserve the power and the revenues of the feudalist landlords, the autocracy is manoeuvring between that class and the representatives of capital." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 4, p. 22)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/5thconfr/1.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/5thconfr/1.htm)

Furthermore, Lenin adds the following regarding this form of transformation: "[T]he retention, in the main, of landed proprietorship and of the chief supports of the old "superstructure"; hence, the predominant role of the liberal-monarchist bourgeois and landlord, the rapid transition of the well-to-do peasantry to their side, the degradation of the peasant masses, not only expropriated on a vast scale but enslaved, in addition, by one or other kind of Cadet – proposed land-redemption payments, and downtrodden and dulled by the dominance of reaction(...)" (Lenin, of Capitalism in Russia development, p.23)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1899/devel/preface2.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1899/devel/preface2.htm)

Clearly, this was a development path that was actually slowing down the development of productive forces as well as of capitalism. Moreover, this path facilitated the plundering of village associations by big landlords and feudal farm owners and thus made sure that rich landlords would expand even further their land ownership. Of course, it also meant that latifundia would remain intact. In Lenin's words, "The fact that tens of millions of peasants are starving, as was the case last year and the year before, reveals better than any lengthy argumentation the mendacity and hypocrisy of the tales about the beneficial influence of the farmsteads. This fact shows most clearly that even after the change in the government's agrarian policy, and after the notorious Stolypin reforms, the Russian countryside is just as much overwhelmed by oppression, exploitation, destitution, lack of human rights as it was under serfdom. The 'new' agrarian policy of the Council of the United Nobility left untouched the old serf-owners and the oppression on their estates of thousands and tens of thousands of dessiatines. The "new" agrarian policy enriched the old landowners and a handful of the peasant bourgeoisie, and ruined the masses of the peasants to a still greater extent." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 4, p. 245)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/jun/07.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/jun/07.htm)

Even though this way of capitalist development was led by big landlords and it did not secure the path to the liberation of productive forces as much as the American way, it still encouraged the capitalist development to a certain degree.

Alongside the Prussian way of bourgeois development, there was also a second way of development, namely the American way or the peasantry mode. Briefly put, this was the revolutionary way. It meant the liquidation of the feudal economy in one blow.

Lenin describes this path as follows: "The revolutionary path of really overthrowing the old order inevitably requires, as its economic basis, the destruction of all the old forms of landownership, together with all the old political institutions of Russia. The experience of the first period of the Russian revolution has conclusively proved that it can be victorious only as a peasant agrarian revolution, and that the latter cannot completely fulfil its historical mission unless the land is nationalised." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol 3, p. 264) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/concl.htm>]

Furthermore, in his preface to the second edition of his work titled the Development of Capitalism in Russia, Lenin would add the following in regards to the second way, right after having explained the Prussian way: "(...) the destruction of landlordism and of all the chief supports of the corresponding old "superstructure"; the predominant role of the proletariat and the peasant masses, with the neutralising of the unstable or counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie; the speediest and freest development of the productive forces on a capitalist basis, under the best circumstances for the worker and peasant masses at all conceivable under commodity production;—hence, the establishment of the most favourable conditions for the further accomplishment by the working class of its real and fundamental task of socialist reorganisation." (Lenin, The Development of Capitalism in Russia, p. 23) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1899/devel/preface2.htm>]

In essence, in the first way latifundia are evolved into capitalist farms gradually over a protracted period, whereas in the second way latifundia are eliminated by peasants through revolution and violence. Lenin explains the situation as follows: "In the second case there is no landlord economy, or else it is broken up by revolution, which confiscates and splits up the feudal estates. In that case the peasant predominates, becomes the sole agent of agriculture, and evolves into a capitalist farmer." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol 3, p. 169) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch01s5.htm>]

It was clear that the removal of latifundia was the key to the capitalist development in agriculture in Russia. The question was which class was going to lead in achieving this and by what means it was going to be achieved. Either through the means of reform or of revolution. As Lenin put it: "[B]oth forms of "solution" of the agrarian question that have been advanced in practice—both the Stolypin solution from above, by preserving landlordism and finally doing away with the commune, by having the kulaks plunder it, and also the peasant (Trudovik) solution from below, by abolishing landlordism and by nationalising all the land—both these solutions, each in its own way, facilitate the transition to a higher technique and promote agricultural progress. The only difference is that one solution bases this progress on accelerating the process of forcing the poor peasants out of agriculture, while the other bases it on accelerating the process of eliminating labour service by abolishing the feudal latifundia. (...) Consequently, in the agrarian question and the agrarian crisis the heart of the matter is not simply the removal of obstacles to the advance of agricultural technique, but what way these obstacles are to be removed, what class is to effect this removal and by what methods. And it is absolutely necessary to remove the obstacles to the development of the country's productive forces—necessary not only in the subjective sense of the word, but also in the objective sense, i.e., this removal is inevitable, and no power on earth can prevent it." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 1, p. 178) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/agrquest/vii.htm>]

In another place, in December 1907, Lenin says the following about the same matter: "In the economic history of Russia both these types of evolution are clearly in evidence. Take the epoch of the fall of serfdom. A struggle went on between the landlords and the peasants over the method of carrying out the reform. Both stood for conditions of bourgeois economic development (without being aware of it), but the former wanted a development that would preserve to the utmost the land lord economies, the landlord revenues, and the landlord (bondage) methods of exploitation. The latter wanted a development that would secure for the peasants the greatest degree of prosperity possible with the existing level of agriculture, the abolition of the landlord latifundia, the abolition of all serf and bondage methods of exploitation, and the expansion of free peasant landownership. Needless to say, in the second case the

development of capitalism and the growth of the productive forces would have been wider and more rapid than by peasant reform, carried out in the landlords' way." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 3, p.170)
[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch01s5.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch01s5.htm)

Now let us review Lenin's letter to Skvorzov-Stepanova, where the crux of the problem is discussed. The letter is written in December 1909, and the essence of letter consists of Russia's bourgeois agricultural development in two ways, the Prussian way and the American way. In the letter, Lenin asks: "The point of difference is whether the bourgeois agrarian system has taken root in Russia to such an extent as to make a sharp transition from the 'Prussian' development of agrarian capitalism to the 'American' development of agrarian capitalism objectively impossible." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 4, p. 229)
[\[http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1909/dec/16.htm\]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1909/dec/16.htm)

The question had a political-history background, which was directly related to the agrarian-peasantry revolution, as Lenin saw it. Against this background, Lenin's words, "agriculture-peasant revolution with" was linked by direct.

According to Cadets and Liquidationists, the Prussian way had prevailed and thus it has rendered the American way as an impossible path. They argued that after the Stolypin Agrarian Reform, the capitalist development in agriculture extremely accelerated; that the semi-feudal economy and natural economy no longer continued to exist; that the old form of the peasantry also shares the same fate; that according to these circumstances, the liquidation of the old farm aristocracy through the American way, meaning through a revolution from below, can no longer be included in a political agenda as the class contradiction between the peasantry and the feudal landlords disappeared.

According to them, a proletariat led "agrarian-peasant revolution" against the Tsar, autocracy, and the semi-feudal landlords was entirely unnecessary. This line of logic arrived at the conclusion that the question of overthrowing the autocracy of the Tsar and big landlords no longer existed.

In other words, there is no need to put the proletariat led democratic revolution in the agenda - this was already completed through the Prussian way by the 1861 Reform and subsequently by the Stolypin Agrarian Reform after the 1905 Revolution. This logic claimed that Russia was already fully capitalist.

Lenin's response to this was clear: "The development of capitalism in Russian agriculture was also under way in 1861–1904. All the symptoms of this development that Rozhkov and Polferov now point out were in existence at that time. The development of capitalism did not avert the bourgeois-democratic crisis in 1905, but paved the way for it and intensified it. Why? Because the old, semi-feudal, natural, economy had been eroded, while the conditions for the new, bourgeois economy had not yet been created. Hence, the unusual intensity of the 1905 crisis." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 4, p. 253)
[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/nov/15.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/nov/15.htm)

In the same article Lenin underlines the existence of pre-capitalist exploitation forms in agriculture in Russia as follows: "N. Rozhkov did not even attempt to deal with the data showing the degree to which métayage, labour service, corvée, bondage are prevalent in the rural districts today. With amazing unconcern, lie ignored the fact that these forms are still widespread." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 4, p.254)
[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/nov/15.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/nov/15.htm)

By 1913, Lenin argued that either the Prussian way or the American way of agrarian development has not yet won a decisive victory. The following analysis by Lenin is important to note here: "We assumed that the elements of capitalist agriculture had already taken full shape in Russia, both in landlord farming (minus the cut-off lands and their conditions of bondage—hence the demand that the cut-off lands be returned to the peasants) and in peasant farming, which seemed to have given rise to a strong peasant bourgeoisie and therefore to be incapable of bringing about a 'peasant agrarian revolution'. The erroneous programme was not the result of "fear" of the peasant agrarian revolution, but of an over-estimation of the degree of

capitalist development in Russian agriculture. The survivals of serfdom appeared to us then to be a minor detail, whereas capitalist agriculture on the peasant allotments and on the landlords' estates seemed to be quite mature and well-established. The revolution has exposed that mistake. (...) We rectified the mistake by substituting for the partial aim of combating the survivals of the old agrarian system, the aim of combating the old agrarian system as a whole. Instead of purging landlord economy, we set the aim of abolishing it." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 3, p. 218-219)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch02s8.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch02s8.htm)

As the paragraph above makes it clear, Lenin viewed the revolution necessary not only to abolish serfdom and overthrow the autocracy but also to eliminate all feudal remnants of the old economy. In the Agrarian Programme of Russian Social-Democracy, he wrote: "The agrarian question is the basis of the bourgeois revolution in Russia and determines the specific national character of this revolution. The essence of this question is the struggle of the peasantry to abolish landlordism and the survivals of serfdom in the agricultural system of Russia, and, consequently, also in all her social, and political institutions." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 3, p. 260) [\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/concl.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/concl.htm)

Continuing a few pages later, drawing from the results of the First Russian Revolution, he comes to the following clear conclusion: "The reformative path of creating a Junker-bourgeois Russia presupposes the preservation of the foundations of the old system of landownership and their slow adaptation to capitalism, which would be painful for the mass of the population. The revolutionary path of really overthrowing the old order inevitably requires, as its economic basis, the destruction of all the old forms of landownership, together with all the old political institutions of Russia. The experience of the first period of the Russian revolution has conclusively proved that it can be victorious only as a peasant agrarian revolution, and that the latter cannot completely fulfil its historical mission unless the land is nationalised." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol 3, p. 263-4)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/concl.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/concl.htm)

During the periods of both the First Russian Revolution and the Second Russian Revolution, meaning until February-March of 1917, the principle goal of the revolution was to overthrow the Tsarist regime and remove all remnants of feudalism. Until the revolution of February-March 1917, Russian government was still mainly controlled by the old nobility, led by Nicholas Romanov, and big landlords.

This meant that it was not possible to clean off all the feudal residues of old economy from the society via the Prussian way. This task had to be carried out by the October 1917 Revolution. In the period from March 1917 to October Revolution, that is in the second phase of the revolution (with the first phase being the period between the First and the Second Russian Revolution), the control of the state apparatus passed into the hands of the bourgeoisie. Subsequently the objective of the Russian revolution changed to defeating the imperialism in Russia and to get out of the imperialist war [the First World War].

As Lenin had explained at the very beginning of his letter to Skvorzov-Stepanova, in Russia both the Prussian way and the American way is possible for the bourgeois development in agriculture and added: " I do not deny the possibility of the 'Prussian' path; I recognise that a Marxist must not 'vouch' for *either* of these ways, nor must he *bind* himself *down* to one of them *only*; I recognise that Stolypin's policy is *another* step along the 'Prussian' path and that at a certain stage along that path a dialectical change *may* set in which would *abolish* all hopes and prospects for an 'American' path. But I assert that at *the present time* this change has *certainly* not yet come and that, therefore, it is absolutely inadmissible for a Marxist, absolutely wrong theoretically, to renounce the 'classical' presentation of the question. That is where we differ." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 4, p. 229-230)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1909/dec/16.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1909/dec/16.htm)

In the historical circumstances of Germany, the Prussian way had a decisive victory. In Russia, the Prussian way had the prevalence until February-March 1917, until the second phase of the revolution. However, the struggle for an agrarian revolution was strong and continued on all throughout the years that the

representatives of the aristocracy and big landlords maintained their power and controlled the old economy, eventually being overthrown entirely by the October 1917 revolution.

In the era of imperialism and revolutions, neither the American mode of development path nor the Prussian mode of development way has any validity. The bourgeoisie of today is no longer the revolutionary bourgeoisie of the free competition capitalism and there are no conditions to call the removal of obstacles before the capitalist development through the Prussian way. Besides, in the age of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the power relations of and the contradictions among the existing classes is in no state to allow such a transformation method. Subsequently, the situation is similar for the American way, which left its place for an agrarian revolution led by the proletariat.

What is the situation in our country? What are significance of these two ways for us? Another question is whether it is possible for Turkey to evolve into a capitalist country through either the Prussian or the American way?

The reality of the country is that there is a backward and imbalanced capitalist economy. Its industry is underdeveloped and comprador, chained to the international capital. And the socioeconomic structure is still predominantly surrounded by the semi-feudal economy. However, it cannot be denied that there is a developing capitalism in the country, albeit heavily indexed to imperialism and its growth needs. We have to take it seriously that, proportional to the developing capitalism, there is a numerical increase of the exploitation of labour and therefore of the working class in the charts of social relations. Consequently, its importance gains weight and its organizational level are going up. Even though it carries a comprador character and is a basic pillar of the government's economic restructuring program and the integration with the European Union, the National Program, for example, does add a momentum to the country's capitalist development. The vanguard must reckon with this reality and determine its tactics accordingly.

However, precisely here we must open a wide parenthesis.

In Turkey and in countries that fall in the same socioeconomic category, the capitalist development was limited and hampered from the very beginning by two major breakwaters. These two restraining barriers before the capitalist development are imperialism and the suffocating oppression of pre-capitalist relations. For imperialism, countries such as ours are areas of consumption of their products, a source of cheap labour, and cheap raw materials. When questioned from this perspective, we will see that these vital interests of imperialism also constitute insurmountable obstacles before the development of capitalism countries such as ours.

The initial and subsequent commodity and capital export of foreign capitalism would never allow a genuine capitalist development in countries like ours. From the outset, the imperialist economy takes over the control positions of the dependent country, blocking the development path of the industry there. In such countries, capitalism that develops or is allowed to develop is the kind of capitalism that prepares the optimal imperialist exploitation conditions or developed according to those conditions, conforming to the maximum profit principle of imperialism. After all, a genuine capitalist development in a dependent country would also develop contradictions with the imperialist dependency relations.

In our country, the path of capitalist development was cut off as early as capitalism's free competition phase, the period before the monopoly capitalism. The international agreements that were signed by the Ottoman Empire, chiefly with France in the 16th century and with England in the 17th century, played a significant function in making the country dependent on these colonialist centres. More specifically, the trade agreements that were made with France in 1535 and the one made with England in 1838 opened up the customs gates to the foreign capitalism. Consequently, with the flow of low or no-tariff foreign commodities flowing into the country, the domestic capitalism that was supposed to flourish out of the manufacturing sector was crippled from its very early years on. As the free competition capitalism evolved into monopoly capitalism, the commodity export got more and more supplemented with the capital export.

This evolution led to huge foreign debts and subsequently to heavy dependency. Another consequence of this situation was that the hampered and crippled domestic capitalism never had the chance to achieve capital accumulation, which is a prerequisite for the capitalist development in the era of imperialism. Therefore, without ever getting the proper chance to go through the processes of capitalist development and primitive accumulation, the country became a tool of colonial politics. Had the natural development process was not interrupted, the primitive accumulation would have been achieved by the domestic economy - meaning that the production means would have been increasingly concentrated under the big producers, turning the direct small producers into wage labourers, leading to a stronger domestic industry. However, the semi-colonial dependency relationships were an insurmountable barrier to the progress of this process. Moreover, this dependency created a comprador bourgeoisie within the country, playing the role of the middleman between the domestic market and the financial capital. From then on, foreign capitalists carried out their capital export through this comprador bourgeoisie, in other words, foreign capital's domestic social-economic-political support basis.

Such were the circumstances, when the country entered the era of imperialism: without a strong genuine domestic capitalism or industry. Since the primitive accumulation was never completed and from an early period on the country's development of capitalism was heavily dependent on the foreign capitalism, the train for the Prussian way of transformation was already missed. In the age of imperialism, in a country that has not already completed the process of primitive accumulation or without maturing the conditions for this process, the Prussian way is not a possibility. So that historical perspective was already closed off for this option. Russia entered the age of imperialism with the 1861 reform movement, crossing over the threshold of primitive accumulation and was ready for the full capitalist development by the beginning of 20th century. Therefore, Russia entered the age of imperialism in such circumstances that made her open to liquidate feudalism both through the Prussian way, from above, and through the peasant-style method, from below. As for us, the Prussian way was eliminated as an option from the very beginning by the foreign capitalism. The ones who try to fit the country to the scenario that would suit the Prussian way are somehow skipping the principles of historical development processes. This is an incomprehensible attempt indeed.

In countries like ours, the certain level of capitalist development cannot be considered as a result of general policy of imperialism. It is rather a side element, product, and fact of imperialist plunder and enslavement, which constitute the essence of the imperialist policy. An otherwise perspective would result in investing hopes in the imperialist robbery system called the economic restructuring and in applauding the unlimited and unobstructed plunder attempt that aims to open the country's even the smallest hamlet to the exploitation of international capital monopoly.

After all, this economy rests on consumer economy model. It is closed off to the productive economic model, which is the essence of a genuine capitalist development. The process here is carefully manoeuvred by the foreign capital. Besides, there is always the risk of exaggerating the development level of capitalism. Just as the capitalist development in Russia was exaggerated in the early 1900's and the existence and the strength of pre-capitalist economic relations were underestimated and were treated as insignificant details.

The eventual changes that might take place in urban and rural areas with the economic restructuring program must be analyzed without losing the sight of these parameters of capitalist development. It is true that we are moving ahead in a process from the predominance of land to the predominance of money. It is true that the "direction" of development conditions a process in which market predominates over producers, towards the predominance of commodity. However, it is as much a fact that the "moment" of the development is characterized by the semi-feudal economics.

Therefore, in a socioeconomic structure where the two organisms' lines cross each other, the principle task of the revolution is the complete removal of feudal residues. The degree of development of capitalism does not exclude this task and therefore the character of our revolution. The first step of our revolution in

essence refers to the needs of the peasantry. Peasantry's issue remains to be paramount importance as the basic link of our revolution. This means that the contradiction between feudalism and the masses as well as the contradiction between imperialism and the masses, which arise from the existing socioeconomic relations, are the fundamental contradictions, determining the current process. Of these, the contradiction between feudalism and the masses is the principle contradiction and has the role of directing the particular phase of the process. Therefore, this contradiction also plays a decisive role in the character of our revolution. The democratic people's revolution is the method of solving these contradictions in a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country. Thus, due to the semi-feudalism, the anti-feudal revolution and due to the semi-colonial status, the anti-imperialist revolution appears as a mandatory threshold. The devastation caused in agriculture by the government's restructuring program does not negate this basic framework - it cannot.

In the Congress Documents of the MKP, wrong conclusions are reached from wrong precedents by attempting to put a distance between themselves and the "classic" presentation of the issue. However, this analysis can be properly done only by, in Lenin's words, "employing the established practices of the materialist method and of theoretical political economy." Diagnosing Turkey as a capitalist country, the MKP also comes to the wrong conclusions as to the character and the strategy of the revolution.

Let us read the following accurate explanation by Kaypakkaya on this matter: "The collaborationist capitalism that is developed by imperialism can never dissolve feudalism through the 'peasant style'. And as long as feudalism is not fundamentally liquidated, the peasant masses remain as a revolutionary force and the content of the revolution continues to be the democratic revolution." (Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, Selected Writings, p. 111, Umut Publishing, April 2004)

There are a few more points on this subject to be made.

In the Congress Documents, it is stated that "avarice of profit, as the imperialist capital's dynamic law, and the destruction it causes have forced the social relations in a context of a long historical process to evolve into a new state." (p. 93)

So, the country has become capitalist with "the whip of imperialism." But then how is that the "dynamic" law, "avarice of profit", plays a "destructive" role? On the contrary, should it not be a progressive role since it pushes the economic-social relations forward and forces the phase to evolve to the next one?

Furthermore: What does it even mean the avarice of profit as the dynamic law of imperialist capital? We would understand the law of capitalist profit rate decline or the law of surplus-value. We would even understand if the statement has to do with the law of maximum profit as the capitalist mode of production's fundamental law, which stems from the basis of surplus-value. We cannot grasp, however, "the avarice of profit as the dynamic law of imperialist capital." Is this how Marx explains in Capital? Marx says: "Production of surplus-value is the absolute law of this mode of production." (Capital, Volume I, p. 635) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch25.htm>]

It may be argued that the term used is "imperialist capital" and that such a law implying to imperialism does not exist in Marx's works since imperialism had not yet emerged. In that case, let's refer to Stalin. The following passage explains specifically this matter, which incidentally seems to be overlooked by the MKP:

"Most appropriate to the concept of a basic economic law of capitalism is the law of surplus value, the law of the origin and growth of capitalist profit. (...) The main features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism might be formulated roughly, in this way: the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized

for the obtaining of the highest profits." (Stalin, Works, Vol 16, p. 23)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1951/economic-problems/ch08.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1951/economic-problems/ch08.htm)

Additionally, what is said in the Congress Documents on the semi-feudal relations and the semi-feudal economy is also noteworthy. According to the MKP's Congress Documents, an economy is either feudal or capitalist. Their argument rests on the thought that a relation cannot be semi-feudal and semi-capitalist. (p. 36)

Is this how Lenin lays out this issue? No.

What is the semi-feudal economy in the Marxist sense: It is an economic style in which the characteristics of both the feudal and the capitalist economy are present in such a way that where one begins and the other ends is very imprecise; characteristics of both economy are intimately blended into each other in countless combination possibilities. It is not that physically half the country's economy is feudal and the other half capitalist. Lenin explains the matter in this way:

"Present-day landlord economy in Russia combines features of both capitalism and serf-ownership. (...) [T]o attempt to enumerate all individual cases, to weigh each individual case, and to determine with the precision of an apothecary's scales exactly where serf-ownership ends and pure capitalism begins, is to ascribe one's own pedantry to the Marxists. We cannot calculate what portion of the price of provisions bought from a petty shopkeeper represents labour-value and what part of it represents swindling, etc." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 3, p. 261-262)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1905/oct/25.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1905/oct/25.htm)

Can it be any clearer and more comprehensible than this?

THE CHARACTER AND THE STRATEGY OF REVOLUTION

As a result of their definition of Turkey's economic structure as capitalist, the MKP with the Third Congress abandons their traditional views also on positioning of classes. The Congress Documents ascribes the proletariat the role of leadership and fundamental force and places the national bourgeoisie behind the capital groups as an auxiliary force of the counter-revolutionary front. According to the Congress, the national bourgeoisie has lost its national character. In the Congress Documents, the scope of the popular classes is composed of the proletariat, the semi-proletariat, and the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie and the scope of enemies of people is composed of the multinational monopoly owners, the comprador big bourgeoisie, and the rural-urban bourgeoisie, supplemented by a small number of middle bourgeoisie and even a smaller number of the landlords class.

The Documents state the following in terms of the character of the revolution: "Our revolution is a socialist revolution, which takes form according to the socio-economic structure relations and overtakes the tasks of democratic revolution. As for the path of the revolution, it is socialist people's war." (p.91) At a further point, the following is added: "The socialist revolution is realized through the means of socialist people's war against the ruling comprador monopoly bourgeoisie, which is depended on imperialism, waged by the proletariat as the vanguard and fundamental force, with the petty-bourgeois sectors of urban and rural areas as allies." (p. 94)

1) The character of the revolution

Let's get to the matter by referring to Kaypakkaya. As we have noted above, in the previous section, Kaypakkaya had written that the collaborationist capitalism, which is developed by imperialism, can never dissolve feudalism through the "peasant style". And as long as feudalism is not entirely rooted out, the peasant masses would remain as an important revolutionary force and the content of the revolution would continue to be democratic revolution.

Kaypakkaya knew that as long as the feudal production relations are not "fundamentally" rooted out through the means of revolution or a strong uprising by peasants, democratic revolution would continue to be the basic method of dissolving the contradiction between feudalism and the masses. This is an extremely important conclusion and is in accordance with that of Lenin's. (...) Lenin had never considered the remnants of serfdom as "a problem that does not belong to the essence" or "an economy that is of secondary importance" or as "an unimportant detail." Those have had the chance to study Lenin's works of that period would recall very well that in his letter to Skvorzov-Stepanova, dated 29 December 1909, he explained to Skvortzov and Stepanov, who were underestimating the importance of the agrarian issue and subsequently arguing to skip the democratic revolution, Lenin had explained that this was an issue of top importance, fundamental, and national importance. The relevant passages are noted in previous sections.

For Lenin, neither the fact that Russia had entered the Prussian way or that Russia was highly matured for this way or that Russia's conditions had matured for the bourgeois economy or the level that the capitalism in Russia had reached, none of these had marginalized the "peasant agrarian revolution" as long as the remnants of corvée system were not entirely cleaned off. This issue was not crossed off by Lenin because the feudal remnants were the oppression upon and the "restraining barriers" before the progress and improvement of peasantry's life quality, in particular, and of the entire social order and development, in general. The sole method of liberation from these obstacles was a democratic revolution. In fact even by 1913, in his response to N. Rojkov, who argued that "the agrarian question in its old form in Russia has disappeared from the agenda," Lenin states that this approach is liquidationist and is entirely wrong and adds that the agrarian question constitutes the essence and foundation of the democratic revolution in Russia. He emphasizes that the essence of the agrarian question "is the struggle of the peasantry to abolish landlordism and the survivals of serfdom in the agricultural system of Russia, and, consequently, also in all

her social, and political institutions."

[<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/concl.htm>]

The following is the question: How and by which method can the removal of private ownership of land and estates and thus the liberation of the rural toiling masses from the enslaving oppression of feudal and semi-feudal relations be achieved? Moreover, how and by which method can the principle contradiction between the masses and feudalism be resolved? Answer to this question shall also provide answer for the perspective and path of our revolution. It shall also reveal the historical and revolutionary role of peasantry in our revolution. As for the question of which method to employ, the answer of course shall be the democratic revolution. The factor that puts forth this method as the right option is the semi-feudal, semi-colonial character of the country. The main axis of contradictions that are formed as a result of this character also determines the democratic people's revolution as the basic path and method of our revolution. Only a revolution of peasantry can entirely remove the feudal remnants. This is the mandatory path in order to realize a genuine development in productive forces and to leave behind all pre-capitalist relations and traditions of slavery. In society where the chance of a genuine capitalist development is taken away by imperialism, only a democratic people's revolution can entirely root out the economy of drudgery along with all its remnants, bondage of debt, working repayment system, bondage to the land, personal bondage, and the economic external compulsion.

In a country where the predominant entity in the rural areas is not the bourgeoisie, the capitalist economy, but the usury and large land ownership; where backward and scattered production means and outdated mode of productions are not insignificant details but on the contrary predominate the overall the social and economic life, a revolution can assume only the character of a democratic people's revolution in order to end the predominance of all medieval obstacles over the land. In a country where feudalism is dissolved only insofar as it suits imperialism's interests but it is never entirely liquidated; where an economic form within which the lines of capitalism and those of feudalism are intertwined is predominant, as Kaypakkaya had put it, "the peasant masses remain as a revolutionary force and the content of the revolution continues to be the democratic revolution."

Due to the imbalance in the economic development, in some areas in the country feudalism has dissolved to a greater extent than in some other areas. We could see that more concretely in the contrast between Kurdistan/Turkey and the west of Turkey. Naturally, the democratic people's revolution cannot carry the same level of relevance in all regions. It is less relevant for more developed regions, such as the Trachea and the Aegean regions, while it is a lot more relevant for Kurdistan/Turkey. However, even in the regions where the feudal relations have gone through increased levels of dissolution and the necessity for an agrarian revolution is not as intense, the role and importance of the rural toiling masses is preserved. After all, the movement of democratic revolution would preserve its importance in terms of providing the poor and consciousness-deprived masses of the rural areas a democratic development environment, in terms of cleaning off the remnants of serfdom in the entire countryside, and in terms of liberating the country from economic, political, and all other forms of imperialist dependency. As Kaypakkaya had accurately put it, "In a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country, the weakness of feudalism would only reduce the tasks of the agrarian revolution or shrinks its boundaries, that's all."

This is a country that has not yet resolved its national question that is rested on peasantry as a social base; that has not yet reached the economic level that would liberate this peasantry from the isolation of land bound life; that has not yet shaken off the overwhelming pressure of feudal judicial extruder that feeds the overlord economy; that has not yet entirely broken off the clamp of the feudal exploitation forms that are restraining barriers before the development of all social life; and that, before being able to catch the train of bourgeois revolutions, has been tied down with the chain of capitalist exploitation and been bound to imperialism as a backyard. In such a country, the character of the revolution is democratic people's revolution and the basis and content of this revolution rests upon agrarian revolution.

In spite of this reality, the Third Congress of the MKP insists on exaggerating the development level of capitalism and considers the feudal remnants as "insignificant" and as a question that is "not of the essence." This matter, which the Congress was incapable of absorbing adequately, leads the MKP to the liquidationist line. This is a liquidationist-revisionist line that looks at the question of development from left, bypassing the historical perspective of revolution and replacing the democratic revolution with a socialist revolution. The approach turns its back on the peasantry and pushes the national bourgeoisie, a strategic component of revolutionary united front, to the ranks of the counter-revolution. Thus the MKP turns its back on the current tasks of the revolution, rolling on to the liquidationist path via the thesis of Trotskyism.

The first step of our revolution, as per its essence, expresses the requirements of the peasantry; the question of peasantry appears as the basic ring of the chain in our revolution. The economic foundation of this ring requires this route. This means that, in the first step of the revolution, in order to realize the economic essence of the struggle for land, lands and estates of landlords as well as those that belong to the state treasury shall be confiscated and be distributed to the peasants. So in the first step of our revolution, land shall be primarily distributed to the landless and less-landed peasants - a redistribution of land favouring those who had been at the bottom of the pyramid thus far - opening the way for fundamental changes in the production relations. This is the task of the moment cannot be postponed. Moment that this task is achieved through a successful revolution, the obstacles to the revolutionizing of agriculture, to the development of the productive forces in agriculture would be removed. Subsequently, the causes for the miserable living conditions of the peasantry would be eliminated completely. Albeit the first step, in terms of economic substance, is carried out in a bourgeois framework, since it opens up the path for the second step, and in terms of giving the political power to the revolutionary classes under the leadership of the proletariat, and, finally, in terms of the creation of socialism's prerequisites, it is a step that is locked to the axis of future objectives of the proletariat.

For a society beset with such condition, the path of transformation into a democratic, liberated, and independent society must go through the resolving anti-imperialist, anti-feudal contradictions that stem from being a semi-colonial, semi-feudal society, by a democratic people's revolution, leading to the establishment of the new democratic people's power, subsequently of socialism, and finally reaching the golden age. Imperialism, feudalism, and comprador capitalism are the targets of the democratic people's revolution. As Mao said: "New Democratic Revolution is the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution of the masses of the people, led by the proletariat." (Selected Works II, p. 327)

The MKP's theory bypasses the peasantry in the revolutionary process and jumps to Trotskyism slurred "left". Instead of formulating the "moment", it theorizes the "future" and thus loses the perspective of the revolution. It turns its back on the concrete and current tasks of the revolution and attempts "to play a number on history", aiming to jump off to the next "phase".

By negating the democratic revolution, not only did the MKP "throw this necessary stage of the historical process into the fire" but also, and more importantly, rather than cling to the strategic slogan corresponding to the period of socialist revolution, it carves the slogan of an earlier stage of revolution into the form of "redeemer" for its own slurry of a theory, putting it into the "service".

What was said in the Congress Documents?

"The socialist revolution is realized through the means of socialist people's war against the ruling comprador monopoly bourgeois, which is depended on imperialism, waged by the proletariat as the vanguard and fundamental force, with the petty-bourgeois sectors of urban and rural areas as allies." (p. 94)

Past experiences of the revolution and the Russian revolution in particular, the most appropriate in this particular case, has proven that the main slogan for the conditions where the democratic revolution is applicable, is the achievement of democratic revolution against the current ruling power by the proletariat

with "all the peasantry", the poor and middle peasantry. In the first phase of the revolution in the Russian revolutionary experience, in other words in the period from 1905 to the democratic revolution in February 1917, the following was the basic slogan: "The proletariat must carry to completion the democratic revolution, by allying to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to crush by force the resistance of the autocracy and to paralyse the instability of the bourgeoisie." (Lenin, Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, p.119) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1905/tactics/ch12.htm>]

As for the second stage, i.e. the socialist revolution stage, a period from March 1917 to October 1917, the following is the basic or the strategic slogan: "The proletariat must accomplish the socialist revolution, by allying to itself the mass of the semi-proletarian elements of the population in order to crush by force the resistance of the bourgeoisie and to paralyse the instability of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie." (ibid, p. 119.120) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1905/tactics/ch12.htm>]

It is clear that Lenin's approach and the conclusions of the MKP differ fundamentally from each other. What is extremely important here is the MKP's stance regarding the rural petty bourgeoisie, in other words, stance on the middle peasantry. On the one hand bring the socialist revolution on the agenda, but on the other hand, don't abandon the slogan of the democratic revolution on the peasantry or on the middle peasantry, to be more precise! If the revolution is at the stage of democratic revolution, then the slogan is clear: With all the peasantry. If this stage has been already replaced by the socialist revolution phase, then the slogan on the peasantry is: "Only" with the poor peasantry. The so-called poor peasantry is categorized as semi-proletarians, as Lenin and Stalin had explained. Even though the MKP seems to be fixed on the socialist revolution, it somehow does not seem to be able to depart from the revolution's earlier stage's basic slogan on the peasantry. And as long as it does that, it gets stuck under the sign of class positioning that corresponds to the socialist revolution without ever being able to pass beyond the horizon of the democratic revolution.

Without possessing a clear idea as to this basic slogan on the peasantry, it would not be possible to have a clear direction as to the revolution. This is precisely the case with the MKP. For an organization whose basic slogan does not rest on "a Marxist analysis of classes"; who does not rest its "arrangement of revolutionary forces at the front of class struggle" on the correct scheme, driving up the stud in the mud would be a natural consequence.

As the passage above from Lenin clearly explains, at the phase of the socialist revolution, "[t]he proletariat must accomplish the socialist revolution, by allying to itself the mass of the semi-proletarian elements of the population in order to crush by force the resistance of the bourgeoisie and to paralyse the instability of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie." If the middle peasantry is a component of the socialist revolution, or as the MKP states, if "[t]he proletarian party, under the leadership of the proletariat, as the fundamental and vanguard force, relying on the poor and middle peasants" (p. 273) will seize the political power, then this revolution cannot be called a socialist revolution. As long as the revolution is carried out along with middle peasantry, in terms of economic and social perspectives, this revolution would be a bourgeois revolution and not a socialist revolution. In Lenin's words, "... as long as we march with all of the peasantry, our revolution is a bourgeois revolution." In a socialist revolution, all of the peasantry is not a force that the revolution would rely on. On the contrary, in this revolution, their instability would be neutralized.

In this regard, the MKP handicaps itself with the decision to consider urban and rural petty-bourgeois sections, middle peasantry as allies in their "socialist revolution" perspective. This is basically a distortion of basic slogans of both the democratic revolution and the socialist revolution.

Understanding of the Congress of the chief contradiction is a problem in itself; both in terms of its eclectic nature and contradictory statements. According to the Congress Documents, the monopolist comprador bourgeoisie is the class that put its stamp on all aspects of life in "Turkey Northern Kurdistan particularity".

Thus, "the principal contradiction has concretely transformed into the contradiction between imperialism and the comprador monopoly capitalism and the broad masses." (p. 96)

At another point, we come across another statement in the Congress Documents, which contradicts the principal contradiction conclusion above. Here it is: "In this complex process where multiple major contradictions exist, the contradiction that determines the development of all other contradictions and exerts influence on them, the principal contradiction, is one between the international imperialism dependent comprador monopoly capitalism and the large masses of people of various nationalities and ethnic minorities. The contradiction between the comprador monopoly bourgeoisie and the broad masses of people constitutes the essence of this contradiction."

In the next paragraph, however, the one that negates the previous one is negated, and returns back to the first description of principal contradiction. It goes: "Principal contradiction is between imperialism, comprador monopoly bourgeoisie and the broad masses of people." (p. 257)

Which one precisely is the principal contradiction? Between imperialism, the comprador monopoly bourgeoisie and the people or between the comprador monopoly bourgeoisie and the people? In other words, is imperialism included to the contradiction or not?

The MKP muddies the question of principle contradiction with its conflicting descriptions. This shows the current confusion among the MKP. And understanding of the principle contradiction that includes imperialism would be fatal for the MKP with their current perspective of revolution. Here, by the way, the MKP courts expressions authentic to Mao. It was Mao who had stated that in a complex situation, if there is more than one contradiction, one of them would be the principle and determining contradiction and the rest would play a secondary role. In this regard, the comprador monopoly bourgeoisie and imperialism would correspond to two distinct contradictions. So, the MKP does not act even according to the statement that it courts; by including in the principle contradiction both imperialism and the comprador monopoly bourgeoisie, it actually negates Mao's statement.

In a country where the semi-feudal relations are partly (or even deeply) dissolved but not entirely liquidated, "the content of the revolution would remain to be democratic revolution," as Kaypakkaya had concluded. The principle contradiction that is resolved by a democratic revolution is the one between feudalism and the broad masses of people. Mao had said it clearly: Different contradictions would be resolved with different methods.

Just as the bourgeoisie-proletariat contradiction is resolved by the method of socialist revolution, the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of people is resolved by the method of democratic revolution. This general and basic formula by Mao remains valid today as it was yesterday. It is a common knowledge that, as in the development process of everything, in the social development process of our society as well, there are various contradictions. Of these contradictions, the one or the ones that determine the existing revolutionary process are the basic [fundamental] contradictions. The one that puts its stamp on a given particular phase that the revolutionary process has reached is the principal contradiction. The principal contradiction is the one that influences all other ones, deeply impacts their existence and development in the process of social evolution of the society. In our country, where the dissolving of feudalism is deepening but is not yet liquidated entirely; where the [Kurdish] national question still remains unresolved, where imperialism still sustains pre-capitalism exploitation forms; where feudalism is still a partner in the ruling political power; where, especially in villages, the overwhelming pressure of pre-capitalism forms on the social life continues to exist; and where the lines of feudalism and capitalism are intertwined, the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of people is of course the principal contradiction.

Socialist revolution is the key to resolving principle contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The MKP, however, includes within the framework of the principal contradiction both imperialism

and capitalism. Furthermore, from the point of view of a socialist revolution, instead of positioning the proletariat as the opposite of the bourgeoisie, it places the broad masses of people. From the perspective of a socialist revolution, the opposite of the bourgeoisie (essentially and fundamentally) is the proletariat, not the masses of people. In this specific principal contradiction "inner unity" can only be achieved that way. Capitalism breaks down the society into the bourgeoisie-proletariat anti-thesis, not into bourgeoisie-people. In a capitalist society, bourgeoisie is saddled with its own anti-thesis, with the class that symbolizes its destruction, i.e. with the proletariat. In a country where the comprador monopoly bourgeoisie is in power, if you remove the proletariat as the polar opposite of the bourgeoisie from the equation and replace it with the masses of people, then even if you call this formulation a socialist revolution, your conclusion of principal contradiction would still have to come to face to face with a democratic revolution. The Congress defines the working class as the main force, demoting the peasantry from being the main force. Then how come the broad masses of people are put at the polar opposite of capitalism? If the proletariat is the main force in this country, should this not correspond to as to which one is the principle contradiction?

A similarly conflicting conclusion is on the matter of national bourgeoisie. Here is the analysis of the national bourgeoisie by the Congress Documents: "[A]s a consequence of the prevalence of capitalist production relations, resulting from the imperialist colonialism, the national bourgeoisie has dissolved and gone through an evolution of character change, part of it becoming the comprador monopoly capitalism and the other part becoming the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie." (p.96)

Elsewhere it states: "Thus, the national bourgeoisie has lost its independence within this economic process. Part of it went bankrupt and disappeared, part of it became comprador, and yet another part, with a middle bourgeois character, became the auxiliaries of big capital groups as subcontractors or in other forms." (p. 90)

While at one place claiming that the national bourgeoisie has changed character, becoming partly comprador monopoly capitalism and partly urban-rural petty-bourgeoisie, at another place it is claimed that the national bourgeoisie has become an auxiliary component of capital groups - meaning that that part has entirely joined the counter-revolutionary ranks. Through this eclectic approach, they are defining the class positioning as follows: Included in the ranks of people's class and strata are the proletariat, the semi-proletariat, and the urban and rural petty-bourgeoisie. As for the enemies of the people, "owners of multi-national monopolies, comprador monopoly rural urban big bourgeoisie, and, auxiliary to these classes, a small number of middle bourgeoisie and a small number of landlords, who have become of secondary importance." (s. 90)

2) The strategy of the Revolution

Congress Documents explains the following regarding the socialist people's war as the strategy of the revolution: "In terms of socio-economic structure, Turkey-North Kurdistan is capitalist. Accordingly, our revolution strategy is the socialist People's War strategy." (p. 97) And this is how the content of this strategy is filled: "... [I]n the strategy of the socialist People's War, guerrilla warfare will also be considered as an important and major power, however it will be carried out in coordination with the mass uprising. This can be considered or understood as rural-urban dialectic." At a further point, the following is written: "Our revolution strategy is the Socialist People's War Strategy. The Socialist People's War Strategy (SPWS) is distinct from the People's War Strategy that is valid in semi-colonial / semi-feudal social systems." (p. 100)

Thus, the Congress Documents claim that the new democratic revolution phase is replaced by the socialist revolution phase; that therefore in the new phase the people's war strategy that is valid at the new democratic revolution phase is also replaced by the socialist revolution model and accordingly the people's way strategy is replaced by "the Socialist People's War Strategy, which is a particular revolution strategy and a new type of unity of guerrilla warfare and mass uprising forms." (p. 100)

At a further point, it is stated that the socialist people's war strategy "is also distinct from the mass uprising strategy, which is the strategy of classic socialist revolution." And according their strategy, they focus on large cities, where the masses of people are concentrated. These cities "are chosen as the main struggle areas, where within the process of revolutionary war, from small to large in military context, general people's uprising shall be developed. The revolutionary war shall be carried out through the means of Partisan People's Forces (PPF), which shall insure the development of the people's uprising and the establishment and the institutionalization of the revolutionary power organs." (p. 100)

Confusion about the nature of the revolution makes itself felt also on this matter. It seems that although they are trying to stand on the ground of "mass uprising," they are still not able to entirely break away from the requirements of the previous stage of the revolution, from people's war. Even though they are trying to make steps on the path of "mass uprising," their hands still hold on to people's war - even if in the meanwhile they are diluting, distorting, and caricaturizing the people's war in order to fit it to their theory. Thus, what they are advocating is neither mass uprising nor people's war.

The revolution experiences of the 20th century distinguish two revolution strategies. One of these is exemplified by Russia and the other is exemplified by China. In the first type, revolution was carried out from the cities to the countryside and in the second one from the countryside to the cities. However, an overwhelming majority of revolution practices in the 20th century relied on the countryside rather than the cities and in the countryside; they again relied on villages rather than cities. With the exception of Russia, throughout the last century, revolution strictly followed a route that surrounded cities from the countryside. And this strategy has proven itself passing through the test of time, becoming a worldwide practice and setting trend in the 20th century.

Mao concluded new theses and formulations, summing it all up as MLM, in the light of lessons that it drew from the revolution practices of China and other revolutions. These two revolution strategies were analyzed by Mao with a deep clarity, contributing to their universality. His article titled "Problems of War and Strategy" dated November 6, 1938, forms a foundation in presenting the theory that is fully competent in terms of revolution strategies.

In this important article, Mao states that the seizure of power by force of arms is the foremost task and the highest form of revolution, especially emphasizing the universal validity of this Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution. At one point in this article, Mao underlines that, "while the principle remains the same, its application by the party of the proletariat finds expression in varying ways according to the varying conditions." (Mao, Selected Works II, p. 23) [https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-2/mswv2_12.htm]

He goes on further in this article to analyze the paths of revolution by the distinction of capitalist and semi-colonial, semi-feudal: "Internally, capitalist countries practice bourgeois democracy (not feudalism) when they are not fascist or not at war; in their external relations, they are not oppressed by, but themselves oppress, other nations. Because of these characteristics, it is the task of the party of the proletariat in the capitalist countries to educate the workers and build up strength through a long period of legal struggle, and thus prepare for the final overthrow of capitalism. In these countries, the question is one of a long legal struggle, of utilizing parliament as a platform, of economic and political strikes, of organizing trade unions and educating the workers. There the form of organization is legal and the form of struggle bloodless (non-military). On the issue of war, the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries oppose the imperialist wars waged by their own countries; if such wars occur, the policy of these Parties is to bring about the defeat of the reactionary governments of their own countries. The one war they want to fight is the civil war for which they are preparing. But this insurrection and war should not be launched until the bourgeoisie becomes really helpless, until the majority of the proletariat is determined to rise in arms and fight, and until the rural masses are giving willing help to the proletariat. And when the time comes to launch such an insurrection and war, the first step will be to seize the cities, and then advance into the countryside' and

not the other way about. All this has been done by Communist Parties in capitalist countries, and it has been proved correct by the October Revolution in Russia.

China is different however. The characteristic of China are that she is not independent and democratic but semi-colonial and semi-feudal, that internally she has no democracy but is under feudal oppression and that in her external relations she has no national independence but is oppressed by imperialism. It follows that we have no parliament to make use of and no legal right to organize the workers to strike. Basically, the task of the Communist Party here is not to go through a long period of legal struggle before launching insurrection and war, and not to seize the big cities first and then occupy the countryside, but the reverse.

(...)

All this shows the difference between China and the capitalist countries. In China war is the main form of struggle and the army is the main form of organization. Other forms such as mass organization and mass struggle are also extremely important and indeed indispensable and in no circumstances to be overlooked, but their purpose is to serve the war. Before the outbreak of a war all organization and struggle are in preparation for the war, as in the period from the May 4th Movement of 1919 to the May 30th Movement of 1925. After war breaks out, all organization and struggle are coordinated with the war either directly or indirectly." (Ibid, p. 222-23) [https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-2/mswv2_12.htm]

The long passage above was necessary to indicate how Mao carefully distinguishes two different struggle and organization models according to two different socio-economic structures, one being the capitalist countries and the other one semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries such as China.

If the concerned country is a capitalist country and if the country does not happen to go through some special circumstances such as war or fascism, the principle of seizing the political power through the means of force would not be applied until the very last stage of the revolutionary process. Strategy of communist parties of such countries is, in preparation of the final uprising, to wage a long period of legal struggle, to gather strength, to educate the workers, to employ the parliament as an arena of class struggle, to turn unions into ranks of resistance against the reactionary forces of capitalism, and thus to prepare the class for the insurgency, to organize, to do widespread mass work. In such countries, the last blow, mass uprising, would be carried out only after having utilized all grounds that were available under the bourgeois democracy. And even then, it would be utilized only when the subjective forces and objective forces are in concordance with each other, favouring the revolutionary moment.

This means that, in these countries until the ultimate limit, until the moment of uprising, the main form of struggle is not military, it is bloodless and the form of organization is legal. And military line of the revolution here is "to surround the countryside from the cities.

At its First Congress, the MKP was saying the following about the theory that is being negated now by its Third Congress: "In summary, the revolution strategy of People's War cannot be simplified down to only a military line or to 'besiege the cities from the countryside.' It is the general strategy and political line of the New Democratic Revolution." (Ideology: Marxism Leninism Maoism, p. 37.)

The same congress said also the following: "...People's War is neither only a struggle by itself, an organization and form of getting organized nor a form of war that can be simply described as a military war. It is the synthesis of all of these. (Ibid., p. 94)

And much worse, again at the same Congress Documents [of the First Congress], it was also them claiming to have reached a higher level of consciousness with the latest developments about People's War. (Ibid., p. 93)

Above all, the MKP's socialist people's war strategy dilutes the people's war. One cannot get away simply by stating that the kind of socialist people's war that they advocate is different than the strategy that is promoted for semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries. People's war strategy is unique; it is specific to semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries. It is a concrete enough reality that the content of which cannot be changed by simply putting the word "socialist" before it.

In semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries, people's war is the formidable way of overthrowing bourgeois-feudal fascism and seizing the political power from the counter-revolutionary classes, which are the social basis for imperialism. However, it should be underlined that in these countries not every direct "from below" initiative of the masses or their "revolutionary force" amounts to a people's war.

In order for a revolutionary armed struggle to be considered a "people's war", it must carry the following characteristics:

Firstly, it is required that this revolutionary armed struggle rests on "the strategy of protracted war." In semi-colonial, semi-feudal country where the enemy is strong and the forces of the revolution are weaker but this strength-weakness equilibrium can be reversed with correct policies. Moreover, despite the fact that the enemy is initially stronger, it does inevitably have some vulnerability just as the forces of the revolution are initially weaker but they do possess certain superior aspects. In other words, neither the weakness nor the strength of any side is absolute. They are all relative, temporary, and conditional. Throughout the protracted revolutionary war strategy and with a correct political line, strong aspects of the enemy shall gradually erode away while its weaknesses shall increase and the weaknesses and disadvantages of the forces of revolution shall be remedied while their few superior aspects shall be made more, eventually determining the course of the struggle.

Naturally, the protracted character of the war is determined by the situations of both sides in regards to each other and by the reciprocal relations of factors that affecting both sides. Offensives and mobilizations that give quick results are a necessary condition of the protracted war strategy.

Secondly, one of the essential components of the protracted war strategy is the establishment of red political base areas. Red base areas constitute the embryo state of the future Democratic People's Power. At the initial phases of the struggle, the enemy is at first stronger and relentless. Against the stronger and well-equipped enemy, revolutionary forces are weaker and badly equipped. However, the enemy is reactionary and wages an unjust war, whereas the forces of the revolution wage a just and progressive war. This equation of the opposites, the unity of the opposites, throughout a protracted war strategy can be reversed. With a correct line and policy, weak revolutionary forces can step by step, from the small to the big, be developed and the red base areas, established in the depths of countryside, would emerge as a constant character and indispensable basis of this process.

Base areas are a "must" for the sustenance of the protracted war as the enemy's terms of war are brutal and ruthless. It would not be possible to defeat the enemy forces in urban areas, where they are the most established, most powerful, and shielded with a tightly knit safety net. Therefore, the conditions of semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries prescribe that the forces of the revolution first establish revolutionary base areas in the depths of the countryside, which is the underbelly of the enemy and where the balance of power is in favour of the revolutionary forces.

These are the rear fronts where the guerrillas and other revolutionary forces get a chance to breath, recuperate their strength, and continue with the training. For the revolutionary forces, base areas are the military, economic, political, and cultural establishments and growth spheres. In Mao's words, base areas "are the strategic bases on which the guerrilla forces rely in performing their strategic tasks and achieving the object of preserving and expanding themselves and destroying and driving out the enemy." (Selected Works II, p. 88) [http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-2/mswv2_08.htm]

Thirdly, people's war leans on the foundation of surrounding the cities from the countryside. This is a component of the first two aspects. Therefore, this, too, is a direct consequence of the country's semi-colonial, semi-feudal status. Balance of power between the revolutionary forces and the counter-revolution forces is in such a configuration that in the countryside it is in favour of revolutionary forces whereas in the cities it is in favour of the enemy forces. Protracted war strategy rests on the social base of peasants and the guerrilla constitutes the backbone of the armed revolutionary struggle. Consequently, our revolution is a peasant war in essence and sees the countryside as the areas in which to train, develop, recuperate, mobilize, gather and distribute its forces. As Mao had underlined, "Basically, the task of the Communist Party here is not to go through a long period of legal struggle before launching insurrection and war, and not to seize the big cities first and then occupy the countryside, but the reverse." (Ibid, p. 222) [https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-2/mswv2_12.htm] The Strategy of surrounding the cities from the countryside is directly linked to the Democratic People's Power. Since the revolution's basic content is the agrarian revolution, it is essentially a revolution of the peasantry, and its skeleton is composed of the army, which is again based in the countryside, it is then natural and necessary that such a revolution follows a development line that grows from the countryside towards the cities.

Fourthly, the protracted war strategy sees the Communist Party and the leadership of the proletariat as an essential condition of the revolutionary war. The proletariat and the Communist Party is the sole basis of achieving a successful revolution. If the proletariat, through its party, does not lead the processes of the preparation for the revolution, carrying out the revolution, and after the revolution, then for this revolutionary struggle achieving success is just an illusion. That is why Mao had stressed that "Revolution is the sole to victory in the revolution."

[<http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/works/download/mao01.pdf>]

It was again him stating the following, "In this era, any revolutionary war will definitely end in defeat if it lacks, or runs counter to, the leadership of the proletariat and the Communist Party." (Ibid, p. 246)

[https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_12.htm]

Elsewhere, he also wrote: "Given a big country, guerrilla warfare is possible; hence there was guerrilla warfare in the past too. But guerrilla warfare can be persevered in only when led by the Communist Party. That is why guerrilla warfare generally failed in the past and why it can be victorious only in modern times and only in big countries in which Communist Parties have emerged, as in the Soviet Union during its civil war and in China at present." (Ibid, p.233) [https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-2/mswv2_12.htm] This feature is also the fundamental condition for continuing to fight along a revolutionary line. Moreover, this is the key that distinguishes the revolutionary armed struggle from any other armed struggle, the people's guerrilla war from any other guerrilla war. A guerrilla warfare can be successfully sustained and can open the path to the victory only under the leadership of the Communist Party. Otherwise, it will get buried in the depths of history without even capturing a relative success. There are various guerrilla warfare based revolutionary struggles that have reached to current days but alas without any sustainable victory and revolution. The lack of a Communist Party is the main reason for this failure. Similarly, this is the main reason also for some revolutions that took place via this strategy and yet ended up shrinking and degenerating or becoming a satellite of imperialism. The leadership of the proletariat through the Communist Party is an indispensable condition and a continuous character in order to grow roots in guerrilla warfare, to march towards the victory, and to sustain it.

No armed struggle can be called a people's war unless it fulfils every one of these requirements. A people's war in its real sense is the war of the entire people, in which the main forces with the local forces, armed forces with the unarmed masses, the regular army with the people's defence detachments and the people's militia forces are fused into each other.

People's war is a military strategy and integral collective of tactics, which employs fluid battle lines as opposed to fixed fronts and methods of guerrilla attacks on and destructions of outer lines of enemy forces

via broad and mobile fronts as opposed to the positional warfare that is based on deep trenches, high fortifications, and consecutively lined up defensive positions.

Moreover, people's war bases its protracted war strategy on the mastering of the art of directing war and maximal employment of the active role of people through the mobile guerrilla warfare. Within this protracted warfare, superiorities of the enemy and the weaknesses of the revolutionary forces are seen as relative. As the people's war grows from the small to the large, from the simple to the complex, and from being weak to becoming strong, it reaches the top of the ladder step by step.

People's war is the counterpart of the regular warfare. Positional warfare is based on fixed fronts, deep trenches, and high fortifications. However, people's war (more accurately put, prolonged, scattered people's guerrilla warfare) is based on fluent base areas and mobile battle lines. People's war is the irregular warfare of the orderly army and guerrilla forces.

As it is well known, the revolutionary war that was waged in China was essentially guerrilla warfare. Upon carefully reviewing Mao's Military Writings, one shall notice that instead of the term "people's war", terms such as "protracted warfare", "protracted warfare strategy", "protracted and scattered people's guerrilla warfare", "flexible and extensive guerrilla warfare", "mobile warfare", "guerrilla warfare" and so on are more often used. Instead of people's war as a military term, Mao emphasizes the term of protracted war strategy and places the prolonged, scattered people's guerrilla warfare within this strategy.

The MKP, however, in its Third Congress, has introduced both the mass uprising and the guerrilla warfare within its strategy of socialist people's war and named this configuration as the rural-urban dialectic. It does not help, however, that they attempt to load a great meaning to it through the formulation called the Partisan People's Forces. The strategy of people's war is not based on mass insurgency. In this regard, efforts to merge the guerrilla warfare and the mass uprising inevitably would end up being a "coordinated warfare". Ultimately, this is the double revolution strategy. If this is chosen as the strategy of revolution, philosophically it cannot be called "monism" but "dualism". It is an attempt to punch both sides with one fist; to carry two heads in one body; to carry two watermelons under one arm. Moreover, employment of statements such as "general armament of the people from the small to the big" throughout the revolutionary war process with the densely populated cities taken as the main struggle areas stands contrary to the thesis laid out in Marxist classics, especially contrary to the relevant thesis of Marx and Lenin.

What does it mean a military line of from the small to the big in Istanbul, for example? The Documents state, "An armed struggle from the very beginning and knitting this stitch by stitch in the cities and the countryside with the perspective of a revolutionary army have been revealed as a historical necessity." (p. 101)

This perspective can be understandable in terms of the countryside. However, in terms of the cities, it forces the limits of imagination. In that sense it is an extreme left sectarian approach that entirely ignores the conditions of the city and disregards the mass uprising strategy and the previous experiences.

This is "the theoretical synthesis" they have reached, as the MKP puts it. The Documents state "Of course, this synthesis, namely the unity of the mass uprising and the guerrilla warfare is different from both the classic form of mass uprisings and the classic form of guerrilla warfare and it is a new style corresponding to its own conditions and peculiarities." (P.102) Such a discourse of the extreme left does not coincide with the reality of the city where the counter-revolution is the most powerful and neither can such a strategy be called people's war.

In this regard, the MKP's imaginary concept of people's war, the content that it introduces to this concept and especially the new meaning that it sticks on people's war by putting the word socialist at the beginning,

only caricaturises people's war. There is neither a drop of Maoism nor an inkling of logic in the theory that the MKP introduces under the name of socialist people's war strategy.

A few decades ago, Kaypakkaya had clearly explained the question: "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 agrarian revolution against feudalism, are merged into each other. 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". (Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, All Writings, Umut Publishing p. 443, 445)

In the following pages, Kaypakkaya continues as follows: "In summary: the thing that determines the strategy of 'encircling the cities from the countryside' is that the relationship of forces between the revolution and the counter-revolution is, more in favour of the revolution in the villages, relative to the cities. The weakest link in the chain of counter revolution is in the rural areas. Consequently, the revolution front is stronger in these areas." (Ibid, p. 445)

And he concludes: "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."

3) The problem of universal validity of people's war

In this matter, the following is said in the Congress Documents: "Understanding that the People's War is valid only in semi feudal-semi colonial countries would be an incomplete understanding of it as it is endorsed by our Party's Ideological document. The People's War is also valid for capitalist countries. This may take different forms in every particular capitalist country. We do not find the static formalism as the only way a correct approach."(p. 97)

It is indeed a Marxist proposition that violence is the essential condition of every revolution. Along the same line, Mao indeed defined it as a principle that every revolution's main task is to seize the political power by the force of arms. In the hands of the MKP, however, this principle is "adjusted" in order to fit it to its bogus theory. What Mao had considered as a universally valid principle, applicable both for China and all the other countries, was the achieving the revolution, sooner or later, through the means of force - nothing further than that. In other words, Mao had made it clear that as to how and in what forms this principle would be applied in each particular country would depend on that country's conditions. We had gone more into details about this point in the previous sections. As for specifically people's war, however, Mao had underlined that it would be applicable only in countries such as China; and that in capitalist countries, revolution would follow the line of mass uprising.

The MKP is blatantly distorting the revolution strategy of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism by distorting Mao. According to Mao, protracted people's war strategy is applicable to semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries, not to capitalist countries. With their theory of socialist people's war, however, the MKP, on the one hand,

claims that this strategy is applicable in capitalist countries as well, while on the other hand skipping the mass uprising strategy by attempting to adopt people's war strategy in capitalist countries. By doing so, the MKP comes up with a fit-all formula for the entire world; disregarding the common-sense that path of carrying out the revolution in each country shall be decided according to each country's particular conditions. This makes people's war strategy only a universal dogma. What is more is that the MKP has turned its back on people's war so brazenly that it has labelled those who consider people's war strategy applicable to semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries and not as a world-wide applicable strategy as "static formalists".

The MKP is imposing a single universal key on a problem that should be locally [in each country according to its particular conditions] decided upon. The fact that each country or each economic groups of the country possess a particular economic, political, historic, geographic, cultural, national, etc. properties, development levels, and formation, already leaves out the possibility of a uniform strategy. What the MKP does is just filling up the content of people's war with a bunch of groundless nonsensical words and rendering the strategy useless. As Lenin had so succinctly described it, "For any truth, if 'overdone' (as Dietzgen Senior put it), if exaggerated, or if carried beyond the limits of its actual applicability, can be reduced to an absurdity, and is even bound to become an absurdity under these conditions." (Selected Works, Volume 10, p. 119) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/lwc/ch07.htm>]

For those who take the easy way out by over-generalization; who cannot bother with solving particular and complex problems and suffering from mental drought and intellectual laziness, Marx has a very appropriate passage: "[B]ut one will never arrive there by the universal passport of a general historico-philosophical theory, the supreme virtue of which consists in being super-historical. (K. Marx, F. Engels Pre-capitalist Economic Formations, p. 275) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1877/11/russia.htm>]

Obviously, wandering along the shores of extremism, the MKP has got its feet tangled up in its own theory, which it sees as the summit of wisdom, apparently. In fact, it is nothing other than a revision of Maoism dressed up in people's war.

DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S POWER, SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

This is where the MKP is weakest with its anarchism-revisionism mixture of views. Bizarrely, however, on its problematic views on this matter, the MKP is trying to cover up its deficiency by referring to Marx, thus ending up preaching liberalism using the testimony of Marx. The views expressed under this title indicate that this is where the Congress falls most badly under the influence of the degenerations caused in the ranks by neo-liberalism. These views, expressed under the name of "Return to Marx" are by no means anything new. Almost every one of these views were once advocated by the German Left-wingers and their followers, during Lenin's time, and afterwards by the Spanish turncoats, such as Fernando Claudin. In short, this is where we find the Congress Documents flirting with such circles and making high pitch noises around their theoretical leftovers. Let's take a look at the Documents again.

Right at the beginning of this topic, there is a question to be raised. For some strange reason, in such expressions as "the scientific socialism doctrine of Marx and Engels, developed further by Lenin and Mao," (p. 105), Stalin's name is not mentioned. Is the fact that Stalin is not listed as one of the masters who contributed to the development of scientific socialism an accident of pen or is it a result of the MKP's deep contradiction?

1) Party and Leadership in Socialism

The MKP's opinion on this topic can be summarized as follows: There cannot be a monopoly of power by the leadership and the party on behalf of the proletariat and toilers; this idea was rejected by Marx, too, from the very beginning. (p. 106) It is argued that in the socialism realities that were experienced, the role of the party, in the name of the masses, was exaggerated; that the practices such as the party monopoly and the party as sole ruling power, due to historical exigencies, were 'turned into theories'. More importantly, this approach "leads back to the bourgeois state and indeed it has." (p. 106)

Basically this is the summary of their scattered thesis.

Anyone who has studied the history of Marxism knows that throughout the history, the question of the leadership vs. the masses, the party vs. the class was often raised. As Lenin had put it, the question was brought to the agenda in the forms of whether to choose the dictatorship of leaders or the dictatorship of the masses; whether the dictatorship of the party or the dictatorship of the class. Such dichotomous formulations, however, met severe criticisms by Lenin.

When the question was being discussed by the German Left-wingers, in "Radikal", under the sub-heading "'Left-Wing' Communism in Germany; the Leaders, the Party, the Class, the Masses", Lenin had described the efforts to raise the question in this way as a ridiculous nonsense and stupidity.

Lenin wrote: "The mere presentation of the question—'dictatorship of the party or dictatorship of the class; dictatorship (party) of the leaders, or dictatorship (party) of the masses?'—testifies to most incredibly and hopelessly muddled thinking. These people want to invent something quite out of the ordinary, and, in their effort to be clever, make themselves ridiculous." (Selected Works, Volume 10, p. 96)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/lwc/ch05.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/lwc/ch05.htm)

Further on he adds: "It is common knowledge that the masses are divided into classes, that the masses can be contrasted with classes only by contrasting the vast majority in general, regardless of division according to status in the social system of production, with categories holding a definite status in the social system of production; that as a rule and in most cases—at least in present-day civilised countries—classes are led by political parties; that political parties, as a general rule, are run by more or less stable groups composed of

the most authoritative, influential and experienced members, who are elected to the most responsible positions, and are called leaders. All this is elementary. All this is clear and simple. Why replace this with some kind of rigmarole, some new Volapük?" (Ibid). He goes on to remind that "[t]he divergence between 'leaders' and 'masses' was brought out with particular clarity and sharpness in all countries at the end of the imperialist war and following it. The principal reason for this was explained many times by Marx and Engels between the years 1852 and 1892, from the example of Britain. That country's exclusive position led to the emergence, from the 'masses', of a semi-petty-bourgeois, opportunist 'labour aristocracy'." He explains that this gave rise to groups of traitor, opportunist, social-chauvinist leaders, eventually ending up with opportunist parties, which in time got marginalized from the toiling masses; and that a similar situation among the German Left-wingers again brings up the question of whether the dictatorship of the party or of the masses and so on. He adds, however, that "[t]o go so far, in this connection, as to contrast, in general, the dictatorship of the masses with a dictatorship of the leaders is ridiculously absurd, and stupid." (Ibid, p. 98) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/lwc/ch05.htm>]

So, the matter's historical roots go as far back as the era of Marx and Engels and stems from the "labour aristocracy". It may be asked: What are the factors that in the current period compel some to raise the question in the same way? It is clear that what gives way to it now is, firstly and foremost, the thinking that the parties of the socialist and people's democracy countries that were established post-October 1917 were transformed into their opposites through their "leadership" and that this led to searching reasons for the temporary defeats among the leaders and the parties.

Secondly, the fact that the degeneration caused among the ranks by attacks, pressures, and influences of liquidationism and neo-liberalism put the leaders and the party on the target board. And thirdly, it is the degeneration caused by the liberal labour policies. This feeds the freshwater revolutionarism, which downplays the significance of the party, the organization, the leadership, and the discipline, and leads to democratism, anarchism, disorganization, and liberalism.

As Lenin reminds in the above mentioned article, there has always been attacks on the "dictatorship of the leaders." Lenin had to take up this matter often. In fact, in his "Speech On the Role of the Communist Party at the Second Congress of the Communist International", dated July 23, 1923, he once again had answered the criticisms on the matter after the speeches of comrades Tanner and Maclaine: "Comrades, I would like to make a few remarks concerning the speeches of Comrades Tanner and McLaine. Tanner says that he stands for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but he does not see the dictatorship of the proletariat quite in the way we do. He says that by the dictatorship of the proletariat we actually mean the dictatorship of the organised and class-conscious minority of the proletariat.

True enough, in the era of capitalism, when the masses of the workers are subjected to constant exploitation and cannot develop their human capacities, the most characteristic feature of working-class political parties is that they can involve only a minority of their class. A political party can comprise only a minority of a class, in the same way as the really class-conscious workers in any capitalist society constitute only a minority of all workers. We are therefore obliged to recognise that it is only this class-conscious minority that can direct and lead the broad masses of the workers. (...) What is this organised minority? If this minority is really class-conscious, if it is able to lead the masses, if it is able to reply to every question that appears on the order of the day, then it is a party in reality." (Ibid, p. 236)

[<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/jul/x03.htm#fw2>]

Finally further on in his speech, he does not neglect to put a reservation on the record: "If the minority is unable to lead the masses and establish close links with them, then it is not a party, and is worthless in general, even if it calls itself a party or the National Shop Stewards' Committee..." (Ibid p. 238)

Lenin concludes that a class-conscious minority "can direct and lead the broad masses of the workers." Whereas the MKP states that "...the state must be governed by the masses united with the communist leadership." (p. 107) Can we talk of an internal congruence between these two statements? What is visible

is that there is a deep gap between the two, for Lenin says that the party must direct the class and the MKP argues that the masses must direct the class. And yet, the MKP still goes on to claim that "this was the theoretical proposition and orientation of Marks, Lenin, and Mao." (p. 107) It is just a tragicomic case that the MKP calls Lenin as a witness to defend its theory, which stinks "mass adulation".

Lenin explains the matter very clearly: Under the conditions of capitalism, the class-conscious workers constitute a minority and this minority is capable of directing the masses. The real issue is being able to, gradually and with a tireless effort, bring the masses to the level where they can manage themselves. Social limitations are at the same time make the basis for the limitations on this issue. As long as there are social limitations, to the extent of these limitations, there will be a party, a leadership, and a state. Along the process, with the transition to the statelessness, which shall take a very long time, people will be able to govern themselves. Demanding this by now would just mean disarming the proletariat to the benefit of the bourgeoisie.

The MKP should not forget that the proletarian dictatorship is the basic content of the proletarian revolution and the party is the essential content of the proletarian dictatorship.

Under the capitalist imperialist encirclement, while the classes, contradictions, and antagonisms exist, in the struggle between two lines, two paths, and two classes, a leadership and a Communist Party that is united with the masses is the essence of the matter. This fact cannot be negated by pointing at the experiences where leaderships in time had degenerated and got converted into the opposite of what the Party stood for. This would hide the actual sources of the conversions. Moreover, it would make the masses hostile toward these means.

2) Proletarian Dictatorship in Socialism

The MKP has a problematic approach on the question of the proletarian dictatorship as well. Let us introduce the matter from the example of the Paris Commune, which the MKP heavily relies on while explaining its views. There is an extremely important conclusion by Garibaldi about the Commune. He said that the Paris Commune was defeated because there was no authoritative power in Paris, that there was nothing other than anarchy. This assessment entirely overlaps with the analysis of Engels, who concluded that what cost the life of the Paris Commune is the lack of centralization and authority. Marx, who put the concept of proletarian dictatorship in its right place from the practical consequences of stormy revolutions that took place in the process of 1848-1849 wars, in his letter to Weydemeyer, dated March 08, 1852, writes that the class struggle necessarily leads to dictatorship of the proletariat, and thus contributing a clear depth and broadness to the theory of dictatorship. Finally, in 1871, with the lessons drawn from the defeat of the Paris Commune, which survived for only two and a half months, Marx was to further develop his theory of the proletarian dictatorship. He arrived at the following theory: The proletariat should not be content with the seizing of the existing state mechanism and using it for its own purposes; it must also destroy this machine and in its place establish a new type of state, a Paris Commune type state. This means that the proletariat, as the ruling class, needs a state in the process of transition from capitalism to communism.

The proletarian dictatorship forms that we have seen up to now have all used "standing armies" instead of using the path of "arming the people". Then the question is, by doing so, did they not break away from the example of the Paris Commune and therefore from Marx? If they did indeed break away, how come? The MKP fails to give the correct answer to this question and holds a position that is against the dictatorship of the proletariat, being capable of defending it only by softening, carving, and diluting it. And it does so by decorating the proletarian dictatorship with the pudding of democratism and by disowning its name [dictatorship] and returning to the Paris Commune (p. 106, 119), a format that has been long surpassed.

Instead of relying on the experiences of people's democracy and socialism, which was a reality for one third of the world, the MKP relies on the limited experience of the Paris Commune.

Now we can go on to answering the question we asked at the beginning of this section. Garibaldi is right: The Paris Commune was defeated because of the lack of an authority. The Commune prepared its own end by depriving itself of a party and centralization that would be capable of direction. Marx drew concrete lessons from the Commune's defeat. His conclusions expressed in the letter to Weydemeyer found the right place to sit when combined with the lessons he drew from the 1871 defeat. As the ruling class, the proletariat must destroy the old state and create a new one in its place. It should be noted that neither the post-October Revolution nor the post-Chinese Revolution and nor the post-other revolutions, the proletarian dictatorships or the democratic people's dictatorships were not organizational models that could establish the model of arming the people as opposed to establishing standing armies. In this regard, those experiences did not coincide with Marx's doctrine that originated by the lessons from the Commune. Written only several months before the October Revolution, in his book the State and Revolution, one of the fundamental works of Marxism, Lenin was proposing the model of arming the people, in accordance with the example of the Paris Commune. In this work, Lenin was relying on the example of the Paris Commune and the lessons drawn by Marx from this limited experience. However, the new and vibrant practice of the October Revolution, the happenings in Hungary, short-lived experiences of German revolutions, and more importantly what was taking place in Russia inevitably compelled the proletariat to establish a centralization of the rule of the proletarian class and a united military force. Thus, the experiences accumulated with the October Revolution and afterwards moved the thesis of armed people as opposed to a standing army on to the shelves as a "surpassed point of view". As Stalin had accurately stated; "Clearly, in its development [Marxism-Leninism] it is bound to become enriched by new experience and new knowledge, and some of its propositions and conclusions are bound to change in the course of time, are bound to be replaced by new conclusions and propositions corresponding to the new historical conditions." (Stalin, Works, A.16, p. 23)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1939/x01/ch13.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1939/x01/ch13.htm)

Indeed, after the October Revolution, Lenin was to abandon his proposition about the armed forces as formulated in the State and Revolution and to recognize the necessity of a state with a standing army. He repeatedly emphasized the necessity of coming up with the united and centralized forces of the proletariat against the united and centralized forces of the bourgeoisie. In Lenin's doctrine, this was a new and practical approach as given birth by the revolutionary movement. A new and living experience, shooting up from the October Revolution, was to surpass the limited experience of the Paris Commune. Furthermore, revolutions that took place after the October Revolution and especially the revolution in China followed the example of the October Revolution, which prescribed the necessity of maintaining a standing and consistent revolutionary army. Under the capitalist imperialist siege, in a society still containing classes, class contradictions, and class struggle, that goes through the transition from capitalism to communism, it is impossible to reach the next stage from contradictions filled stage of socialism and wipe out the bourgeoisie step by step without a centralized authority and means of oppression, in other words without an organized "revolutionary force".

State is the tool for organizing the force. A socialist state is still a state of a society that contains classes. It contains antagonistic contradictions in all realms of life, whether economic, political, cultural or otherwise. It is a transition society where the question of who wins the ultimate victory is not yet finalized. In such conditions, approaching the organization of the force in a socialist state from the angle of arming the people, leaving the state without a standing army would be leaving the proletariat disarmed in benefit of the bourgeoisie. Moreover, it must be noted that a socialist state inherits its population from capitalism. This is a population that capitalism put great efforts to corrupt, to suppress its consciousness, and to ideologically influence. Arming such a population would be opening the gates to a complete chaos and creating an "anarchism of authority", just like the organizational anarchism.

Of course the communists are the proponents of entirely eliminating the state, albeit a proletarian state, and its army. However, this cannot be done overnight. This is one of the main points that distinguish the communists from the anarchists. It is in fact one of the principle questions. Limitations on the social conditions of the socialist stage obligate the existence of the state. These conditions are fed on imperialism, bourgeoisie, classes, and class struggle and as long as these sources of limitations continue to exist, it is necessary to have, coupled with the directing role of the party, a revolutionary authority and an "iron hand" based on a "standing army". The experience of the Paris Commune during Marx's period was too limited and narrow to extend itself to this necessity. Understandably, it could not come up with the theory of dictatorship, which matured only after the experience of the October Revolution.

After all these experiences and all these theories that are matured through these experiences, going back to a point of view that is long exceeded by new, richer, and time proven theories would be a step backward. After all, practice provides richer and more valuable materials to work with than any theory would. Furthermore, proposing a transition from capitalism to communism without the dictatorship of the proletariat or diluting and castrating that necessary dictatorship (by replacing the standing army with armed people, for example) would mean nothing other than breaking away from Marxism, preaching an anarchism mixed revisionism, and being swayed away by liberalism. The energetic criticisms that the MKP directs towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, through opinions expressed on the "standing army" (p. 113-114) and the "secret intelligence service(s)" (p. 120) do not constitute a key to resolve this question. On the contrary, they represent, logically, the very deadlock on the matter.

The MKP has been swayed away so far on the point of proletarian dictatorship that it is not even able to tolerate its name. The Congress Documents state: "We are in the opinion that the definition such as the new state of the proletariat and the toilers, instead of the dictatorship of the proletariat, would be a more robust and accurate term as it contains a sharper distinction from any type of bourgeois understanding of dictatorship. This could also be called the democracy of the proletariat and the toilers." (p. 119)

The Third Congress of the MKP is just trying to cover up the truth with empty words. The main thing that they oppose is the dictatorship of the proletariat. As Lenin had said: "Those who recognize only the class struggle are not yet Marxists; they may be found to be still within the bounds of bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. To confine Marxism to the theory of the class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is what constitutes the most profound distinction between the Marxist and the ordinary petty (as well as big) bourgeois." (Lenin, Selected Works, Volume 7, p. 44)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/staterev/ch02.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/staterev/ch02.htm)

The MKP should know that the question of dictatorship of the proletariat is the main problem of the modern labour movement. It is also the area that first attacked by anyone who descended to the liberal-labour politics. As soon as you start negotiating over this principle matter, you would be breaking the backbone of the party. Moreover, you would be putting the proletarian socialism on the interrogation chair. This would openly mean turning away from Marxism and carrying water to the bourgeoisie's mill.

Bluntly put, the dictatorship of the proletariat is a form of power that directly relies on force. Against whom? Against the bourgeoisie. It is the oppression apparatus of the once exploited majority over the once exploiting minority. In short, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the force used against the bourgeoisie in order to keep it under the oppression, to break down its resistance, and to rouse fear in it. Oppression of the exploiters, the bourgeoisie, with force is the indispensable condition, the necessary and absolute element of the dictatorship and it is the chief element that determines its nature. This is the essence of the matter. We cannot really change this essence by calling it the state of the proletariat and the toilers or the democracy of the proletariat and the toilers. As Lenin had said: "Principles are not an aim, a programme, a tactic or a theory. Tactics and theory are not principles. How do we differ from the anarchists on principles?"

The principles of communism consist in the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and in the use of state coercion in the transition period." (Lenin, Selected Works, Volume 10, p. 307-308)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1921/jun/12.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1921/jun/12.htm)

In this regard, attempting to put new meanings on the proletarian dictatorship by calling it the state or the democracy of the proletariat and the toilers and juggling with words in an effort to make it "charming" (!) is neither scientific and nor does it contribute anything to the topic.

Lenin wrote: "Attempts are sometimes made to lend these words what is considered to be greater force by speaking of the "dictatorship of democracy". That is sheer nonsense. (Lenin, Selected Works, Volume 8, p. 183) [\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/rcp8th/06.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/rcp8th/06.htm)

Marx, too, in the footnotes to the Programme of the German Workers' Party, had taken a clear position against such juggling of words:

"This question can only be answered scientifically, and one does not get a flea-hop nearer to the problem by a thousand-fold combination of the word 'people' with the word 'state'.

Between capitalist and communist society there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." (Marx Engels, Selected Works 3, p. 32-33)

[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1875/gotha/ch04.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1875/gotha/ch04.htm)

3) The Multi-party System in Socialism

The Third Congress of the MKP continues to attack the main columns of Marxism and of the modern scientific socialism - this time via the proposition of multi-party socialism: "The multi-party system is an objective reality of both democratic people's power and of socialism." (p. 115) The Congress Documents continue on to argue that the one party socialist state model has done great damage to the humanity, the proletariat, and the toilers. (p. 116) Further on, it is claimed that in socialism, along with the communist party, other parties in the ranks of people should be able to get organized as well. The Documents state: "Masses of the people can, besides the communist party, prefer, change, put in power or dismiss any other party or organization that is within the people category." (p. 117)

If you live in the world of dreams and not of the reality; if you are not encircled by enemy forces; if the scale is tilted in favour of socialism worldwide; if you were dealing with a society that is conditioned for centuries with the worry of sustaining their livelihood and survival, that is curbed with the bourgeois ideology and way of life and with the cultural slavery of imperialism, if there were no restraining barriers set before your development, if you did not inherit a human material that is corrupt and adulterated with the vices of old societal models, if you were actually attempting to build socialism in optimal conditions and matured elements; and of course if there were no classes and class contradictions left and no need to wage class struggle, in such a picture, the MKP could had been right to a certain point.

Alas, the reality of the current world do not match this picture at all. Let's take China, as an example - for albeit timidly, the MKP is still trying to lean against this example. Long before the victory of the revolution in China, there was the tradition of alliance with the bourgeoisie. This goes back to the periods of the red political bases. As it is known, due to the specific conditions of the Chinese revolution, the revolution progressed on its path while it had formed a block, was in an agreement and alliance with the bourgeoisie. And this was the correct path for that particular revolution. Right after the revolution, a political, organizational, and economic block was formed with them. Consequently, this traditional alliance line, allowed the existence of multiple democratic parties. However, were these parties, a consequence of China's particular conditions, and equivalent to the Communist Party of China (CPC)? Did Mao approached

matter in such a manner? And what about the post-Cultural Revolution period? Besides, other bourgeois democratic parties had to recognise both the monopoly of the CPC and its leadership.

Let's listen to Mao: "In our country, there are several criteria by which to judge whether the bourgeoisie and bourgeois intellectuals are politically honest or dishonest, good or bad. The main thing is to see whether they really accept socialism and really accept the leadership of the Communist Party. They agreed to both long ago, but now some want to go back on their word, and this will not do. Once they back out, there is no place for them in the People's Republic of China. Your ideals are those of the Western world (also known as the free world), you might as well go there." (Mao Tse-tung, Selected Works V, p. 510-511) [https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-5/mswv5_61.htm]

So, accepting the Communist Party's leadership and socialism is taken as baseline. In other words, "monopoly" of the Communist Party is the basic criteria for Mao. It seems that even in the traditional alliance line in China, democratic parties are never the equivalent of the CP; on the contrary, they are subjected to leadership of the CPC.

Socialism is incompatible with the multi-party system. Even in pre-socialism revolutionary stage, other parties that are formed must recognise the CP's leadership and "monopoly". Multi-party system is not an objective reality of socialism, as claimed by the MKP. On the contrary, the objective reality of socialism requires the one-party regime, that of the Communist Party.

The MKP claims that the one-party system has done great damage to the proletariat, to the toilers, and to the humanity (whatever that means!). In order to be able to say that the one-party system of the periods of Lenin, Stalin, and Mao has caused damage to the humanity, one's head must be spinning under the influence of bourgeois propaganda. In fact, this is the state that the MKP has fallen into with its theoretical despair. Since the MKP was not able to find any supportive materials in the history of Marxism for its theory on this matter, it invests its hopes on one of Lenin's sentences, which is pulled out of context with tweezers.

We find the following in the Congress Documents: "By 1918's Lenin had said that 'if the workers are not satisfied with their own party, they can prefer another party, they can change the government'." (p.116)

There is more. They cling on to the example of the post-October Socialist Revolutionaries. They write: "After the October Revolution, the Socialist Revolutionaries were a component of the Soviet Union, they possessed the many ministries. China also had a power partnership with other allies of the proletariat." (p. 116)

As for the post-October Soviet Union: the MKP will not be able to find a basis for its theory on this matter. That is because the concerned quote's context is as follows. Let's hear it from Lenin himself: "At the very moment of the October Revolution, we entered into an informal but very important (and very successful) political bloc with the petty-bourgeois peasantry by adopting the Socialist-Revolutionary agrarian programme in its entirety, without a single alteration—i.e., we effected an undeniable compromise in order to prove to the peasants that we wanted, not to "steam-roller" them but to reach agreement with them. At the same time we proposed (and soon after effected) a formal political bloc, including participation in the government, with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, who dissolved this bloc after the conclusion of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and then, in July 1918, went to the length of armed rebellion, and subsequently of an armed struggle, against us." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. 10, p. 129.130) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/lwc/ch08.htm>]

It seems that this block, which was formed during the early days of the revolution, was annulled by the Socialist Revolutionary themselves and by initiating an armed insurgency and armed struggle against the socialist government, they eliminated themselves from the process. Secondly, this block was not formed after the revolution. It was formed during the period when there were still Kulaks; and when the middle

peasantry had just begun to take side, changing their position from neutrality. And this alliance was shattered with the progression of the class war to the point that the interests of the proletariat no longer overlapped the interests of the Socialist Revolutionaries. And it should be noted that such an alliance never again entered the agenda afterwards.

Before finishing this section, another point needs to be underlined. According to the MKP, "practices of public ownership, as called in socialism, are far from representing the actual and real sense of expropriation. On behalf of the Party and the masses, the economy, production, repartition, and distribution were controlled by the party and the leadership of the party. Deep polarization and alienation that this practice caused is beyond any dispute." (p. 106)

4) The theory of the productive forces and stages

The Congress Documents state that: "...there are wrong concepts, in handling the materialist dialectic, history of societies, that defend and bring to a pre-socialism capitalist society by proposing that 'by going through four absolute stages that societies' can arrive at socialism." (p. 125) And below that they draw the following conclusion: "In that sense, by stating that in poor countries such as China it would be 'easier to get to' the revolution and socialism, comrade Mao had raised an important flag against the Eurocentric theoreticians of mechanical productive forces. The traditional view, however, claims that it is not possible to advance towards socialism in backward countries and that it is necessary first to advance towards capitalism."(p. 125)

Dressed in the costume of "Maoism", ascribing "Eurocentric" point of view to Marxism and subsequently "lead to" revisionism via the thesis of "production forces" is another embarrassing denial of Marxism by the MKP. Let us discuss this topic a little further.

Firstly, let us ask whether indeed in traditional Marxism or in the classics there is a thesis that prescribes that "societies must absolutely go through four stages"? Or is there a formulation that says it is first necessary to advance towards capitalism? Here is Lenin's answer: "The question was posed as follows: are we to consider as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of economic development is inevitable for backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom a certain advance towards progress is to be seen since the war? We replied in the negative. (...) [I]t will be mistaken to assume that the backward peoples must inevitably go through the capitalist stage of development. [T]he Communist International should advance the proposition, with the appropriate theoretical grounding, that with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, backward countries can go over to the Soviet system and, through certain stages of development, to communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage." (Selected Works, Volume10, p. 266-267)

[<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/jul/x03.htm>] Lenin's answer is sharp and decisive. And it clearly exposes the fact the MKP's thesis is another distortion of Marxism.

The MKP, with an entirely inappropriate method, seeps into the cracks caused by certain mistakes that the International Communist Movement (ICM) at times has fallen into throughout its history and launches attacks from these cracks. When the MKP's 3rd Congress Documents are carefully examined, it can be seen that a major portion of its criticisms in regards to the proletarian dictatorship, the party, the organization, the discipline, the leadership, etc. are based on the liberal interpretation of Marxism, which was put forth by the MKP's First Congress Documents, titled "Ideology: Marxism-Leninism-Maoism". Now let us return to the topic at hand. What is the theory of productive forces?

This theory is a theory often used like a worn-out weapon by the likes of Bernstein, Kautsky, Lui Shao-Shi, Lin Biao, and the Soviet modern revisionists opposing the cause of revolution and socialism. It is an international revisionist theory that worships spontaneism. Briefly put, this theory reduces the role of the

productive forces to technology and the production means and in that framework it exaggerates the role of the production forces (here we should recall the polemics of Stalin with Yaroshenko and Notker) and sees the social development greatly dependent on the role of productive forces - to such extent that the existence and importance of the human element within the context of production forces are entirely abnegated. According to this theory, a next stage can be spontaneously reached only when the productive forces are sufficiently developed. Otherwise, if they are not sufficiently developed, it is a futile effort for the proletariat to embrace the cause of revolution and socialism.

This theory, on the theoretical ground, favours peace between classes, as opposed to class struggle, and on the philosophical ground it favours crude evolutionism as opposed to dialectic. Therefore, it is fundamentally opposed to the proletarian revolution and theory. Bernstein, the notorious revisionist of the Second International, for example, had preached that once the productive forces reach a high enough level of development, capitalism will peacefully turn into socialism. Therefore, he argued, a revolution based on violence is pointless. This was his way of turning back on the revolution. Subsequently Kautsky claimed that the universal welfare shall be possible with the extensive development of productive forces and that socialism will come about this way. And this was Kautsky's way of getting off Marxism's path. In fact, Kautsky and his followers had opposed the Soviet revolution, arguing that "the productive forces in Russia have not yet reached a level that would make socialism possible."

So, in summary, it is a revisionist theory that negates the revolution, exaggerates the role of the productive forces, and claims that with the widespread and high development of productive forces, socialism will be reached spontaneously and peacefully, and so on. What is the MKP's method? The MKP installs the "theory of the productive forces" on the "Eurocentric" point of view and places it in Marxism's hands and then starts criticizing Marxism for the thing it placed in its hands.

Let's go to the last point under this heading: In which countries it is easier carry out and maintain the revolution?

In this regard, Lenin said that: "... it is more difficult for Western Europe to start a socialist revolution than it was for us." (Selected Works, p. 121) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/lwc/ch07.htm>]

A few years after the October Revolution, along the same line, he was to state the following: "we have seen for ourselves that the revolution's development in more advanced countries has proved to be considerably slower, considerably more difficult, considerably more complicated. This should not surprise us for it was naturally easier for a country such as Russia to start a socialist revolution than it is for the advanced countries." (Selected Works, Volume 8, p. 88)

[<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/dec/05.htm>]

At another occasion, he expressed the same theory with the following words: "Anyone who has given careful thought to the economic prerequisites of the socialist revolution in Europe must be clear on the point that in Europe it will be immeasurably more difficult to start, whereas it was immeasurably more easy for us to start; but it will be more difficult for us to continue the revolution than it will be over there." (Selected Works, Volume 7, p. 303)

Lenin explains the reasons for the difficulty of starting a revolution in Western Europe as follows: "It is more difficult to start a revolution in West-European countries because there the revolutionary proletariat is opposed by the higher thinking that comes with culture, and the working class is in a state of cultural slavery." (Selected Works, Volume 7, p. 415)

[<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1918/jun/28.htm>]

As for the challenges of sustaining the revolution, he writes: "I have had occasion more than once to say that it was easier for the Russians than for the advanced countries to begin the great proletarian revolution, but that it will be more difficult for them to continue it and carry it to final victory, in the sense of the

complete organisation of a socialist society." (Selected Works, Volume 10, p. 51; see also p. 121)
[\[https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/apr/15.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/apr/15.htm)

It should be noted that, in a long passage that takes place right after the quote above, Lenin lists 6 reasons why it was easier for the revolution to start in Russia. Mao says largely the same things on this matter. The only difference between Lenin and Mao is that Lenin says that it is easier to start a revolution in backward countries, compared to the West, but that it would be more difficult to sustain it. Mao, however, says that both to start and sustain a revolution in backward countries would be easier than the developed countries. So, Lenin and Mao share the same denominator in terms of relative easiness of starting a revolution in backward countries and more difficult in advanced countries, mainly due to the imperialist cultural slavery and ideology, bourgeois lifestyle, and the severe effects of bourgeois control mechanisms. So far, history has confirmed this conclusion. What is left are the different approaches in terms of sustaining the revolution. Therefore the question is: Where would it be easier to sustain the revolution - in backward countries or in countries that are equipped with modern technology?

Mao had first argued that it would be also easier to sustain the revolution in backward countries. However, experiences of the modern history proved this view wrong. In fact, in his Critique of the Soviet Economics, Mao was to write: "In a country such as ours bringing the building of socialism to its conclusion is a tremendously difficult task." (Selected Works, Volume VI, p. 182)
[\[https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-8/mswv8_64.htm\]](https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-8/mswv8_64.htm)

The MKP, strangely, interprets this as a supportive material for the theory of the productive forces. According to the MKP's logic, claiming that the revolutionary transition is easier in countries where there is high degree of mechanization and a concentration of capitalist productivity and proletariat means an exaggeration of the role of productive forces. Therefore it corresponds to the "Eurocentric" point of view. So, let us ask: Is there any similarity between the reasons that the MKP ascribes to Lenin as to the difficulty of sustaining the revolution in backward countries and the reasons that Lenin explains in his own works?

So what's the problem? The problem is that the MKP seems to have engaged in an open showdown with Marx's concept of materialist history concept via this theory. As we have pointed above, by the time he wrote the Critique of Soviet Economics, Mao too came to share Lenin's opinion on this matter. This means that Mao too could not break away from the theory of the productive forces. The main problem here is that MKP seems to have an issue with Marx's materialist history concept, namely with the passage below, which gives a complete definition of historical materialism:

"In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure.

In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic – in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about

himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.

Mankind thus inevitably sets itself only such tasks as it is able to solve, since closer examination will always show that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already present or at least in the course of formation. In broad outline, the Asiatic, ancient,[A] feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production may be designated as epochs marking progress in the economic development of society. The bourgeois mode of production is the last antagonistic form of the social process of production – antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism but of an antagonism that emanates from the individuals' social conditions of existence – but the productive forces developing within bourgeois society create also the material conditions for a solution of this antagonism." (Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Preface, p. 25) [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm>]

We can essentially summarize the passage above with this sentence: "The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life."

Thus, the MKP appears to have tripped on by Marx's thesis and gotten caught!