

MKP's Call for "Unity"

**WHY ARE WE SEPARATE
OR
WHAT IS OUR DIFFERENCE?**



Party Publications

www.tkpml.com

MKP's Call for "Unity"
**WHY ARE WE SEPARATE, OR WHAT IS OUR
DIFFERENCE?**

Contents

Introduction

**I — Historical Memory and the General Approach to the
Question of Unity**

II — Rejection and Criticism of MKP's Call for "Unity"

a) The Ideological-Political-Organizational Vanguard
Detachment of the Working Class

b) Two-Line Struggle in the Communist Party and
Communist Platforms

III — Our Differences with MKP

a) Democratic People's Revolution

b) The Thesis of Socialist People's War

c) The Dictatorship of the Proletariat

d) The Thesis of the "State of the Whole People"

e) The Thesis of "Multi-Party Socialism"

IV — Conclusion

Introduction

The character and history of every communist party correspond to the struggle for power and the class struggle waged against the exploitation, oppression, attacks and domination of the ruling classes. The epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions is the reason for the existence of parties that constitute the vanguard and organized detachment of the class-conscious proletariat. Without the leadership of a communist party, revolution is not possible. To put it more clearly, without a party that leads the masses, mobilizes them for revolution, and takes aim at the reactionary system and the reactionary state apparatus, the decayed order cannot be overthrown. A revolution under the leadership of the proletariat cannot be realized.

When the history of class struggles is examined, every victorious revolution has been made possible by communist parties leading the working class and the labouring people. For example, the October Revolution, the working class's first experience of power after the Paris Commune at the beginning of the twentieth century, was carried out under the leadership of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP, later the CPSU). The Chinese Revolution, which reached victory in 1949, was carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party of China (CPC). Behind many successful revolutions that seized power in the twentieth century, the role of communist parties as the vanguard and organized detachment of the working class and the labouring people was decisive.

Revolution is, of course, the work of the working class, the other labouring masses and, in total, the masses. The existence of oppressed and exploited classes constitutes the objective conditions of revolution. But without organizing the subjective force that provides leadership to the labouring masses under

oppression and domination, it is not possible to carry the revolution to victory. More clearly, the leadership of the vanguard parties over the working class and the other strata of the people, with the perspective of revolution and power, is the precondition of revolution. Otherwise, revolution will not take place. Even if it does take place, it cannot be sustained. This reality, which we have expressed in very broad outline, is indispensable.

However, a communist party cannot lead a revolution by its organizational structure alone. That party must also arm itself with an ideological and political line, equivalent to a program that commands its practice — the proletarian line. Without an ideological-political line that reflects the will of the party and sets out the character and path of the revolution, revolution is not possible. More clearly, a party that takes part in the class struggle with the role of leading the revolution can command its social practice only through an ideological-political line that corresponds to objective reality. A Communist Party that lacks ideological, political and program-level unity cannot lead the revolution. The rich practice of class struggles and socialism proves this.

In summary, for a communist party to lead a revolution successfully, its organizational existence alone is not enough. An ideological-political-military program that shapes this organizational existence and gives direction within the class struggle is also necessary and indispensable.

For a communist party to play its leadership role in the class struggle successfully, it must equip itself with a theory, politics and a program that reflects the will of the party. Otherwise, it remains deprived of the quality required to lead the revolution. It is tossed to the right and to the left in the vast sea of class struggle. It cannot meet the anger of the masses against the system on the correct basis, nor can it organize that anger with a perspective of power.

Nor is this all. To the extent that the Communist Party does not meet with the class-struggle practice of the masses and does not relate to these struggles, it inevitably begins to experience problems within itself. Its organizational structure is also faced with right and “left” liquidationist attacks. When the Communist Party unites with the class struggle of the masses and is nourished by these struggles, it also strengthens organizationally and gains positions within the practice of class struggle. When the Communist Party does not relate to the struggle of the masses based on a correct line, it begins to experience organizational problems within itself. This reality has been experienced amply in the Communist Party’s history of more than half a century.

In short, for a Communist Party within the class struggle, the question of line is of decisive importance. It is not a simple or superficial matter. In Chairman Mao’s words: “The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything. When the Party’s line is correct, everything will come its way. If it has no followers, it will have followers; if it has no guns, it will have guns; if it has no political power, it will have political power. If its line is incorrect, even what it has will be lost...” (Mao Zedong, Selected Works, Talks with Responsible Comrades at Various Places During a Provincial Tour, from mid-August to 12 September 1971, Source: Mao Chu-hsi wen-hsun. From the English edition: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-t>)

The decisive nature of the question of line also brings with it the discussion of “which line”. In the geography of Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan there are dozens of lines that call themselves communist. Moreover, among these lines there are parties and organizations that define themselves as Marxist-Leninist-Maoist (MLM). Based on this reality, it is therefore possible to speak of many lines.

In this study we will address the call made by the line represented by the Maoist Communist Party, justified through the formulation of the “unity of communists”, towards the line represented by the Communist Party of Turkey- Marxist Leninist (TKP-ML), and TKP-ML’s response. Our purpose here is to clearly set forth our differences with the line represented by the MKP. This is necessary because of the "unity policy" that MKP has pursued for years, which, in our view, treats the line differences between us as insignificant and thereby undermines the struggle to establish the dominance of a correct line among the broad masses of people.

This necessity applies above all to the line represented by the MKP itself. We must underscore that our approach does not stem from any form of "arrogance" or "sectarianism" toward the concept of the "unity of communists," which the MKP has repeatedly raised but which, in our view, has by this stage been stripped of its substance.

In this matter, we uphold the necessity of establishing the dominance of a correct line among the masses of the people. This article has been written for that purpose. Its principal aim is to address the difference(s) between the line represented by the MKP and the line represented by the TKP-ML. This effort necessarily requires reference to developments that have taken place throughout the history of the TKP-ML. It should be clearly stated that our purpose here is not to reopen discussions concerning the various processes experienced during the more than half-century history of struggle of the TKP-ML, nor to place them back on the agenda. These debates have already been exhausted in the past. At the present stage, repeatedly bringing such discussions back onto the agenda serves no useful purpose for anyone, least of all for those directly concerned. At the same time, it should not be inferred from these remarks that we regard past events—particularly the offenses committed against the organizational functioning of the TKP-ML—as insignificant.

On the contrary, crimes committed against the organized unity and vanguard of the class-conscious proletariat are connected to the class origins of the individuals or groups responsible for them. In our view, however, the principal problem in such processes is not those who committed offenses against the will of the Communist Party and thereby objectively placed themselves outside the Party. The principal problem is that the TKP-ML failed to wage a sufficient struggle against such tendencies within the course of its own organizational activity. Because it was unable to wage this struggle on a correct basis, unable to transform such tendencies based on MLM, and unable on that basis to strengthen the correct proletarian line, the fundamental problem concerns the history of the communist movement itself and, consequently, the Party itself. For this reason, it is necessary to examine these processes and to draw lessons from them for the present day.

The periods during which these problems emerged constitute extremely important processes that must be examined and lessons drawn from them to understand the causes of the current condition of the revolutionary and communist movement (and, of course, within the context of our subject, to properly grasp the debates surrounding "unity"). These are processes of historical significance that have directly influenced and shaped the present state of the revolutionary movement, and above all the communist movement. However, there is little value in reopening for debate historical processes that a communist movement has already assessed, judged in terms of both their positive and negative aspects, and left behind. As we have already indicated above, for the TKP-ML the discussions concerning these processes have been exhausted and brought to a definite conclusion.

Therefore, in light of the current condition of the revolutionary and communist movement, and particularly in relation to the problems confronting the revolutionary and communist movement at the present stage, it is clear that reviving debates

that belong to the "dusty shelves of the past" serves no meaningful purpose for the revolutionary movement, the people's movement, and above all for the new generations of revolutionaries.

Of course, the documents published within the corpus of the TKP-ML on these matters may be studied. However, the purpose of such an examination should not be to carry the "dead weight of the past" into the present and repeatedly reopen debates and agendas that have already been exhausted and settled. Rather, it should be aimed at drawing lessons and experience from past practice—both its positive and negative aspects—to contribute to the development of contemporary revolutionary practice.

Our approach to this question was expressed by Chairman Mao: "We must pay attention to educating people on our ideological and political line. Our principle should still be 'learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones' and 'cure the sickness to save the patient'. Unite and win still greater victories." (Mao Zedong, *ibid.*)

Therefore, rather than once again reopening the debates on "unity" that the line represented by the MKP has persistently—and, at times, tediously—advanced from the past up to the present, and to which we ourselves have responded whenever necessary, let us state clearly that our principal purpose here is to set forth the differences between ourselves and the MKP. In this way, a healthier basis for discussion can be established.

We consider this important. We consider it important because, in our view, under the banner of advocating a policy of unity, the line represented by MKP is in fact propagating "how unity cannot be achieved". For example, the following assessment of the response given to MKP's unity proposal at TKP-ML's last congress (2nd Congress) is noteworthy. It sheds light on the MKP's understanding of what it calls "unity": "If not, what is the problem? If there is no solid reason, we must say that the last meeting has almost produced a new excuse and postponed

unity... Although uniting the broadest Kaypakkayaist section under the slogan ‘from tradition to the future platform’ is a correct approach, this correct approach has been placed as an obstacle before concrete unity and has effectively been turned into a lever for turning one's back on unity and evading it." (Bakış Can, “We Want to Understand the Ideas Opposed to Unity!”, 5 December 2024, Gazete Patika, <https://gazetepatika23.com/birlik-karsiti-fikirleri-anlamak-istiyoruz-160610.html>)

Whether this study will provide the "solid reason" sought by the view quoted above, we do not know. Our principal aim, however, is to set forth the differences between the line represented by the MKP and the line represented by the TKP-ML. Let us state clearly that this is our aim. Regardless of whether this answer convinces the holder of that view, let us particularly state that the above style, and especially concepts such as “producing an excuse”, “turning one’s back” and “running away from unity”, do not “belong to us”. To criticize the TKP-ML using concepts foreign to the TKP-ML can only be the product of an understanding external to the TKP-ML. This, too, should be regarded as further evidence of why unity has not been achieved.

Let us especially underline that the matter is a discussion of line and that this discussion of line is not the “two-line struggle” that should take place within the communist party and communist platforms in the form understood and defended by MKP. And let us state that the approach to this matter is precisely one of the differences between us and the line represented by MKP.

MKP persistently conflates the two-line struggle that is waged, and should be waged, within the Communist Party and communist platforms with the line struggles that are waged, and should be waged, against lines outside the Communist Party. This objective situation removes the distinction between inside and outside the communist party and communist platforms, serves to create complete cacophony under the banner of "two-

line struggle", and thereby obscures who is saying what and what they are aiming at. Therefore, while criticising the views of our friends in MKP, let us especially underline that these criticisms are not the "two-line struggle" waged in the communist party and communist party platforms.

Of course, this discussion and line struggle contains an ideological struggle. What course will this ideological struggle and polemic follow? Will we influence the line represented by MKP? We will see this in the future.

However, we believe that the fundamental difference between ourselves and the MKP is ideological. Connected to this basic question, we believe that our friends have failed—both in the past and in the present—to pose the questions that need to be posed correctly, precisely because of their ideological understanding. This is evident both in their assessment of the class roots of the crimes committed against the will of the Communist Party in the past and in drawing the necessary lessons, and in their present-day assessments that declare parties and organizations outside themselves, but "coming from the same tradition", to be "communist".

It will therefore be useful to turn to the historical experience behind the question of "why we are separate".

I. Historical Memory and the General Approach to the Question of Unity

One of our revolutionary poets, Ahmet Telli, writes in his poem *Perhaps I Will Come Again*: **"What wall cannot be brought down when the questions are the right ones?"** We believe that our friends in the MKP, through the "Historical Reckoning" they have so often invoked, have failed to ask the questions that truly needed to be asked, both regarding what came before and what followed. So long as this remains the case, we must state that the repeated calls for "unity" issued by our revolutionary friends in the MKP over many years will inevitably remain unanswered in relation to the question of "unity" itself. The

answer to the question posed by our friends in the MKP—“If not, then what is the problem?”—lies precisely here. The problem is not “unity” itself. The problem is “why we are separate”. Unless a convincing answer is given to this question, proposals for “unity” and the discussions that follow will remain without a firm foundation—and it does. In our view, rather than reacting defensively to this reality, it would be more correct to turn our attention toward our own mistakes and to settle accounts with our incomplete and incorrect understandings. Such an approach would also contribute to a scientific discussion of our differences. Emotional and populist arguments that are not grounded in a scientific approach will benefit neither our revolutionary friends, nor ourselves, nor the people. Because this has not been achieved, it is abundantly clear that repeatedly returning to the discussion of “unity” serves no useful purpose. Historical experience has demonstrated this more than sufficiently.

Of course, when deemed necessary, responses have been given to the MKP regarding both the question of “unity” and the differences between us. But because these responses failed to convince their intended audience, the matter has been removed from the realm of an ideological struggle over line and transformed into the subject of highly subjective assessments, and this remains the case today. In our view, the reason for this is that our friends in the MKP have failed to grasp that the approach to the question of “unity” is not “dogmatism,” “sectarianism,” or “arrogance,” as they perceive it. Rather, the issue is ideological in nature and therefore corresponds to difference(s) of line.

We would like to **recall** that our approach to this question is guided by Chairman Mao's words: “When questions of line and principle are involved, I hold firm and do not loosen my grip. I do not compromise on important questions of principle.” (Mao Zedong, op. cit.)

First of all, let us state clearly, as we have done in the past, our view of what the line represented by the MKP defines as the "Unity of Communists." We are in favour of the Unity of Communists. In our view, this is a clear fact that leaves no room for debate. Moreover, our position on this question is summed up in Chairman Mao's approach: "I hope you will practice Marxism and not revisionism; I hope you will unite and not split; I hope you will be sincere and open and not resort to intrigue and conspiracy." (Mao Zedong, *ibid.*)

Therefore, we must state clearly that, just as in the past, our aim today is to practice Marxism rather than revisionism; that, just as in the past, we strive for unity rather than division; and that, just as in the past, we remain sincere and open. Particularly in matters of this kind, we hold that there is absolutely no place for intrigue and conspiracy, nor should there be.

For this reason, it is necessary to clearly set forth the ideological differences between us and our friends in the MKP. It is more correct to conduct the discussion based on these line differences and thereby arrive at definite conclusions. First, "why we are separate" must be clarified; then the differences must be set out, and discussion must be conducted through these differences. Any approach other than this reduces calls that appeal to the emotions of the masses to hollow phrases. Far from reaching the intended aim, they produce the opposite effect. Moreover, they cause what is described as the "Unity of Communists" to remain an ambiguous and ill-defined concept. We believe that our friends in the MKP possess ample practical experience confirming precisely this point.

The reason the MKP's call for "unity" has once again come onto the agenda is that the line represented by the MKP first conveyed its proposal for unity to the TKP-ML orally and subsequently, at the request of the TKP-ML, in written form. The TKP-ML evaluated this proposal first in its subordinate bodies and subsequently at its 2nd Congress, set forth its reasons, and communicated them to its counterparts in writing.

The essence of the response was that the ideological, political, programmatic, and organizational unity that constitutes the precondition for party unity does not exist.

One may agree or disagree with this assessment. Nevertheless, it reflects a point of view and is an objective reality. Nor is it a question of intentions. There are serious differences between the maximum and minimum programs of the MKP and the TKP-ML. The programs of the two organizations contain substantially different content. For example, while the MKP directly advocates socialist revolution, the TKP-ML maintains that the democratic revolution has not yet been completed in our country. It holds that the Democratic People's Revolution will establish the people's democratic dictatorship and that, once the necessary conditions have matured, the transition to socialist construction will begin.

The MKP, on the other hand, advances, with regard to the path of revolution, a thesis such as "Socialist People's War," which, in our view, is eclectic and contrary to the fundamental principles of MLM. Likewise, in place of the dictatorship of the proletariat—which corresponds to scientific socialism and the maximum program—it advances revisionist theses such as the "state of the whole people" and the "multi-party system." According to the TKP-ML, contemporary ideological-political unity constitutes the precondition for the unity of the Communist Party; the MKP, by contrast, advances a vague, indeterminate, and unprincipled appeal to a shared past, exemplified by the claim that "we once stood in the same ranks."

It must first be accepted that what is being discussed is the unity of organizations that originate from the same tradition but have conducted separate organizational activity for 34 years and, in this sense, have clearly developed **distinct ideological, political, organizational, and military formations**. This is **the clear, scientific, and MLM approach**. The discussion must then proceed based on the differences that actually exist. A

sincere and honest self-critical approach must be adopted regarding why we are separate. Why do we consider this important? We consider it important because **"honesty is the beginning of all wisdom."**

As long as this is not done, it will not be possible to scientifically understand and explain why separate organizational formations have existed within a revolutionary struggle spanning more than half a century. And unless this can be understood, explained, and grasped, the question cannot be discussed on a correct basis.

Therefore, the matter must first be clearly defined. Wherever unity is spoken of, it is necessary to understand why "one divided into two" "why we are separate", and what differences exist between two lines that today find expression in two separate organizational formations. In this study, we will focus on these and similar questions and attempt to set forth the line differences between the TKP-ML and the MKP.

It must be reiterated that we, of course, defend the "Unity of Communists". We have already stated this position clearly. The organizational unity of communists united based on the maximum and minimum program and a common practical line should not be rejected. On the contrary, it is necessary that communists be united within the same vanguard and organized detachment, possessing unity of will and action. On this question, Chairman Mao's injunction—"unite and don't split"—must be upheld. To argue otherwise is absurd.

For those concerned with revolution, and from the standpoint that upholds the principle that **"the revolution is the work of the masses,"** it is beyond dispute that communists must defend unity of will and action and, furthermore, that all forces within the ranks of the people should be organized under the leadership of the Communist Party.

On the other hand, what is equally clear is that the basis of the organizational unity of communists is, and can only be, ideological-political-programmatic unity corresponding to the

minimum and maximum program. It must be known that one can take a place in the same organizational position through ideological and political unity. Where this does not exist, it is not possible to speak of unity. This is not a question of intention, but an objective reality. Unity in the communist party is possible only under these conditions. Party unity is the highest unity: strategic, ideological and aimed at revolution. It is the highest organ moving along the route of a single program that reflects the will of the party. It is the vanguard and organized detachment itself that leads the revolution.

In our view, the question of the “Unity of Communists” is not a unity based on nostalgic memories of the past and longing. We cannot, and should not, be content with reducing the justification for unity solely to historical roots, to the party past established by the party’s founding leader. It must be seen that, under today’s conditions, because people have taken places on different ideological-political-strategic courses, party unity has objectively disappeared and no longer exists. This is not a question of intention. It is concrete as an objective reality.

MKP’s understanding of unity is limited to a crude, superficial and hollow conception of unity that rests on having once been in the same ranks, but ignores the reasons why the struggle for revolution continued as separate parties, and overlooks today’s different minimum and maximum programs. Our friends in MKP place the unity question on the agenda from such an approach. Moreover, when the unity proposal is placed on the agenda, the putschist and liquidationist line to which the will of the party was subjected in the past process is pushed aside and ignored, and today’s different strategic-political separation is also overlooked while “unity” is defended.

At the present stage, “unity” is again defended on the basis of superficial assessments, while the reasons why different lines are now followed are ignored. In this way, putschism, liquidationism and self-centeredness that trampled on the will of TKP-ML are trivialized. These grave crimes directed against the

party's unity of will and action are treated as simple mistakes. This approach causes the line represented by MKP, through an anti-MLM approach, to be deprived of the ability to evaluate the crimes and mistakes committed on a correct basis. Yet communists are objective towards their own mistakes. They use the weapon of self-criticism. They put their own crimes, mistakes and weaknesses on the table. They judge themselves on the basis of correcting themselves. They continue on their road by purging themselves of weaknesses and errors they once failed to see. In this sense, self-criticism is meaningful if it finds expression in practice.

To make a brief reminder: as a result of the 1st Extraordinary Party Conference (1st EPC) held in April 1993, the "Steel Unity of the Party Forces" was declared. (See *Komünist*, No. 25, September 1993.) When the agenda and report of the EPC are examined, it can easily be established that no discussion was held on the question of "unity" and, more importantly, on why the party forces had separated. This points to an important deficiency and mistake for TKP-ML. It is clear that there was a problem of ideological understanding on this question.

It is clear that at the 1st EPC the practice of the Eastern Anatolia Regional Committee (DABK) in 1987 was not questioned, and that the crime of a coup committed against the party's will was not discussed and condemned. At this conference, out of concern for the "unity of the party forces", "the coup and liquidationism" were not placed on the agenda. The 1987 coup and the process that followed were not taken up, discussed and condemned at the 1st EPC. In short, a "unity" decision was taken in which the liquidationist and putschist line that split the party was not questioned — and, in this sense, as the subsequent process clearly proved. Undoubtedly, this approach was an opportunist and anti-MLM way of handling liquidationism.

Of course, the 1st EPC must be evaluated together with its positives and negatives. One divides into two! Indeed, alongside the opportunist attitude followed on the question of "unity" at

the same conference, decisions such as the 1st EPC's decision to use the concept Maoism, and so on, were positive. (See Decision 26, *Komünist*, No. 25, September 1993, p. 9.)

This practice of TKP-ML at the 1st EPC was evaluated at its 6th Conference, and the '87 separation that developed as a result of a self-centred, narrow regionalist and purely military viewpoint that denied party law, functioning and will, and the class character and emergence of DABK, were defined as follows: "The '87 separation took shape on the ground of the ideological-political-organizational damage created in the party by the right-opportunist line followed by the 2nd CC, which had taken over the party leadership in the post-1980 process (after 12 September).

DABK is a putschist, liquidationist current that denies party law, functioning and will, rejects two-line struggle, and in which a self-centred, narrow regionalist and purely military viewpoint is dominant. The understandings to which we have drawn attention above were imposed on the party on the basis of the rejection of two-line struggle; despite rising on the basis of a reaction to the right-opportunist line of the 2nd CC, it found life by openly raising the banner of struggle against the party. The understanding that marked it was essentially left opportunism. DABK's emergence is anti-MLM." (Decision 27, *Komünist* No. 27, pp. 12-13, September 1995)

At the same conference, TKP-ML placed on its agenda the process after the '87 separation and made a self-critical assessment concerning TKP-ML's approach to the question of "unity" and its handling of the process.

At TKP-ML's 6th Conference, it was assessed that the 3rd Conference had failed to grasp the character of DABK — which points to an ideological inadequacy — and that, for this reason, it had been within an opportunist and essentially pragmatist approach; the 4th Conference's decision for unity with DABK was also evaluated as opportunist and condemned: "Immediately after the '87 separation, it was essentially correct

that the 3rd Conference, convened by the necessity of party law and functioning, directed the sharp edge of the arrow at the right-opportunist 2nd CC line and the damage it had caused within the party, and concentrated on intervening in the organizational erosion of the party that had continued since 1980, gathering the party organization together and mobilizing it for class struggle. However, putting before itself a question such as unity with DABK, without grasping the character of DABK and without a principled view of unity, was an incorrect, opportunist and essentially pragmatist-marked approach. DABK, for its part, rejected unity with forced and distorted justifications, both because of its incorrect understandings on two-line struggle and party understanding, and because of its reactiveness. At the end of the zigzagging attitudes of both wings, the tendency towards unity predominated, and a unity devoid of ideological-political struggle was made. This unity, far from a principled basis for unity, in which differences were attempted to be based on secondary and artificial distinctions and the essential distinctions were not seen, was naturally unprincipled and pragmatist. The 4th Conference's unity decision is opportunist." (Decision 28, Komünist No. 27, p. 13, September 1995)

At the 6th Conference, the process experienced after the "unity" realized through the 1st EPC was also evaluated; the class character of the putschist-liquidationist line directed against the will of TKP-ML was defined as "the poor peasantry and its lumpenised sections in the city", and the character of this faction was evaluated as "left-sectarian, liquidationist, putschist and afflicted by dogmatism": "The formation of the putschist-liquidationist clique leading the faction that emerged in the party ranks extends back to the DABK formation. This clique approached unity deceitfully and hid its anti-unity face. In the SB and GBMK meetings after unity, they placed their anti-unity, liquidationist policies on the agenda step by step. During the EPC process they acted as a clique, and at the EPC they

continued this attitude by systematizing it further. With the favourable positions they had gained at the 1st EPC, at the 2nd meeting of the AK, organizational liquidation plans were made as a means of seizing the party through methods that did not conform to ideological-political struggle; and factional activities began after the meeting and continued in all areas of the party in line with this plan until the coup that culminated in the 18 April 'CC' statement. This faction is left-sectarian, liquidationist and putschist in character, and is afflicted by dogmatism. Its class character is the position in which the poor peasantry and its lumpenised sections in the city are clustered. There are serious ideological-political differences between it and the party on fundamental points. This section, with its ideological-political-military-organizational understandings and practice, is in a position far removed from and broken away from the party. With this character, the party has no unity question with them." (Komünist No. 27, p. 13, September 1995)

The line represented by MKP, however, changed its party name at its 1st Congress in 2002, evaluated its own historical process and announced that it had taken a decision for "unity" with TKP-ML. In taking this decision, the '87 and '94 processes were essentially ignored. In taking the unity decision, the question "why was the party split?" was, in essence, passed over. While both sides (DABK and TKP-ML) were supposedly "criticized", their own role in these processes, and in total the reality of the putschist-liquidationist attack that shattered the party's unity of will and action ("one dividing into two"), was overlooked. By placing the call for unity before giving an open and honest answer to the question "why was the party split?", the assessment of the lived practice on an MLM basis was covered over.

Yet the putschist-liquidationist attack directed against TKP-ML's unity of will and action is a reality. From the '87 DABK liquidationist emergence onwards, it is also a reality that there was a line which defended the party's unity of will and action

and, in accordance with the party's principles, functioning and statute — despite important mistakes and deficiencies — upheld the party.

Therefore, the basic issue here is where one stood in “one dividing into two”, and in the ranks of which line one took one's place. Those who, both then and today, defend the “Party's unity of will and action” must condemn, without ifs or buts, the '87 DABK liquidationism and, as the continuation of this line, the '94 coup liquidationism. If this is not done, can one speak of real self-criticism?

In summary, when the line represented by MKP made its reckoning with the past, it preferred to position its own line in a place “above the sides” — which, by the nature of things, is impossible. Is this understanding, under the name of “condemning” both the “Conference” and “DABK”, not in reality, at best, a trivialization of the putschist-liquidationist line from which they came?

The question is simple. Does MKP defend the '87 and '94 coups without ifs or buts? If, at the present stage, our revolutionary friends who propose “unity” do not defend and do condemn these putschist-liquidationist attacks, then what is the ground of their existence? Or, in the name of “asking the right question”, let us state it once again: if the processes experienced in '87 and '94 are condemned and if it is claimed that self-criticism has been made on this question, then why is the requirement of this self-criticism not being fulfilled?

What was experienced in the '87 and '94 processes was, in the final analysis, the product of a putschist and liquidationist understanding directed against TKP-ML's will, functioning, principles and statute. First this reality must be clearly established and grasped. Can past historical processes, principledness, crimes committed, putschism and liquidationism be ignored by changing the name? Would this not be opportunism, as our friends in MKP would also concede?

It may be said, and it will be said, that “all this was condemned” through the call for “unity”. Then it is right to ask our friends in MKP: the two parties come from the same root. At a certain point in history, for this or that reason, they separated because they could not “agree”. What, then, is the reason why they are separate now? In our view the reason is clear. Why could these two lines not sustain party unity? Why was unity of will and action shattered? In our view the reason is known.

One divided into two; on one side of the contradiction emerged the proletarian line representing the party will, and on the other a putschist and liquidationist line directed against the functioning, principles and statute of the party will. Independent of all those “wearisome” discussions, this is the objective reality. In the spirit of “one dividing into two”, which we think our revolutionary friends in MKP know very well, they must first clarify on which side of the contradiction they took their place.

For our part, we think that in these processes — as the decisions of TKP-ML that we quoted above also prove — despite its important mistakes and deficiencies, it stood on the correct side of the contradiction in “one dividing into two”. This is not unimportant, and it was then, and is now, our point of departure. It is the ground on which our unity of will and action rises. To defend this ground means, in Chairman Mao’s words, to stand firm on questions of principle and line, not to loosen our attitude and not to make concessions. This is the scientific, MLM attitude.

What is MLM is our approach to our own deficiencies and mistakes in these processes. It is not enough to have taken the correct attitude in the processes experienced. At the same time, we must also go after our mistakes and the deficiencies arising from them. The source of our mistakes is our inadequacy in grasping MLM. This is our “historical reckoning” with the process experienced!

As a result, two different lines that came out of such a historical process organized themselves in different political, programmatic and organizational channels. Despite this objective reality, the line represented by MKP announced, after discussions it had carried out within itself, that it had taken the decision to realize “unity” with the line of TKP-ML. After this process, the line represented by MKP persistently placed the question of unity with TKP-ML on the agenda and has maintained this policy as a “strategic approach” up to the present. TKP-ML, in the past and today, has defended that such a unity is objectively not possible under the present situation and conditions. From time to time, when it deemed it necessary, it discussed the communist party’s understanding of unity with the line represented by MKP.

Lastly, before TKP-ML’s 2nd Congress, the line represented by MKP once again made a call for “unity” to TKP-ML. This call was discussed at TKP-ML’s congress and a certain approach was developed. Within this approach, it is understood that the question of “unity” should be discussed with this revolutionary line with which, in the most general sense, we are in the same ranks in the practice of class struggle and with which we conduct common struggle in action unities and alliances; and that this discussion should be conducted especially through our differences and a certain clarification should be achieved.

It is especially necessary to take into account the positive/negative effect created, in the most general sense, among the ranks of the “Kaypakkaya Tradition”, by the “unity” policy that MKP has pursued for years and which, in our view, contains the danger of making even its own ground of existence vague. It must definitely be taken into account that the “unity” policy that our friends in MKP have persistently pursued for years, and which in our view does not rise on correct foundations, in reality does not serve what they aim at; on the contrary, it harms it.

Therefore, it is clear that this discussion should be conducted for a while together with our revolutionary friends in MKP, through publications and in different areas. It is necessary to discuss the views corresponding to the different minimum and maximum programs that have formed from the past to the present between the line represented by MKP and the line represented by TKP-ML, and to reach a certain clarity. In this sense, rather than a discussion of the “unity of communists”, the discussion should bring to the fore not the similar statements of the two lines but their diverging and differentiating aspects. According to MLM norms, it would be more correct to discuss the opposed views in the minimum and maximum program, which are the basic criteria in party unity.

While continuing the ideological-political struggle over these objectively existing line differences, we maintain our view that it is necessary to continue the alliances and action unities that are jointly organized and in which we take part. Ideological and political struggle is not a reason for revolutionary forces to separate and stand apart in their common struggle. Although we occupy different ideological positions in our struggle, it is clear that in the political arena, where we occupy the same positions and conduct common struggles, it is necessary to maintain our approach of organizing action unities and alliances. This must be grasped as a requirement of the MLM line.

II. Rejection and Criticism of MKP’s Call for “Unity”

In the letter addressed to TKP-ML, signed “Maoist Communist Party CC-PB” and dated September 2021, the line represented by MKP conveyed its proposal for “unity” in the following words: “...Although our separate organizational positions, conditioned by our unfortunate separations extending over many years and mutually considered essentially meaningless, have in practice made our unity of will-action existing, our political kinship, based on ideological-political closeness, has not

disappeared and has stubbornly preserved itself. (The fact that the voices for unity rising from the base have not been cut off, and that the demand for unity has unfortunately been kept current, even if one-sidedly, is an echo of this reality...) Precisely for this reason, our Party, as in its previous central sessions, reiterated at the Party's 4th Congress its decision for unity with the party forces. While the foundations of our view and proposal for unity are nourished by the above ground, the reason for our proposal for unity in your person is these decision(s)..." (Komünist, No. 76, May 2022, p. 281)

This proposal was placed on the agenda of TKP-ML's 2nd Congress. At the congress the unity proposal was evaluated and the following answer was given to the line represented by MKP: "Although the will of our 2nd Congress thinks that MKP's call for 'unity' was made with revolutionary concerns, it has given a negative answer because of our existing ideological-political differences and because MKP is not in a position that displays ideological wholeness." (Interview with a Political Bureau Member of the TKP-ML Central Committee: Let Us Organize the Party and the Revolution with the Decisions of the 2nd Congress! <https://www.tkpml.com/tkp-ml-mk-sb-2-kongre-kararlariyla-partiyi-ve-devrimi-orgutleyelim/>)

TKP-ML's will essentially ground its rejection of the "unity" proposal in "ideological-political differences" and in "MKP not being in a position that displays ideological wholeness".

The line represented by MKP, instead of evaluating this approach of TKP-ML on the basis of the written answer conveyed to them, first preferred to evaluate it on the basis of an article "published on social media" (!). (See: "A Short Assessment on the Reason for the Negative Response to Our Call for Unity", <https://halkingunlugu5.org/birlik-cagrimiz-olumsuz-yanitin-gerekcesine-dair-kisa-bir-degerlendirme/>)

Although this way of handling the matter (together with other examples) contains certain question marks regarding the importance of the issue, the line represented by MKP, in its

assessments of the “unity” proposal, takes the criticism of “not displaying ideological wholeness” as the basic criterion.

On the other hand, our friends in MKP do not take into account TKP-ML’s determination of “ideological-political differences”. In our view, this is the important point that must be discussed. Because TKP-ML and the line represented by MKP have two separate organizational formations. Since this objective reality is not taken into account, the starting assumption is that the two separate organizational formations are within “a single whole”.

The line represented by MKP handles TKP-ML’s approach of “not displaying ideological wholeness” precisely through its understanding of the Communist Party. This understanding, in one respect, also contains the answer to the question “why are we separate or what are our difference(s)”. By legitimizing the objective fact that “within the communist party every class and stratum will carry its own ideologies into the communist party” — which is unavoidable within the reality of class society — this approach obscures the struggle of the proletarian line against these line(s) and its inevitable dominance over them.

The possibility that a line may emerge and develop against the proletarian line — and it is good to be prepared against this — and our way of handling this, our point of departure, in accordance with TKP-ML’s functioning, principles and statute, are of decisive importance. How we grasp the contradiction and where we stand in the contradiction are decisive for the future of the contradiction.

The reality that the ideological lines of different classes and strata may emerge within the Communist Party does not negate the necessity of the proletarian line becoming dominant over these lines. It should not negate it. Lines within TKP-ML other than the proletarian line are grasped to be eliminated. Let us go even further. These lines are, and should be, handled so that the proletarian line is strengthened still further. This is precisely what we have not fully achieved. Because TKP-ML could not put this approach into practice on the correct basis and could not

handle different lines in order to strengthen its own proletarian line, this discussion now has to be conducted with the line represented by MKP.

We think that this approach of ours essentially means self-criticism regarding the proletarian line itself, and that our historical practice shows that we have had important inadequacies in making the proletarian line dominant. To remind once again: when there are questions of line, it is necessary to hold firmly and not loosen our attitude. This is not sectarianism or dogmatism. On the contrary, it is the effort to make the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line dominant.

It must be repeated that we are speaking of two separate organisational formations. However, MKP understands “the two structures as a single organization that is organizationally and politically within the same program”. They define the party as a structure in which different classes and strata take part in the Communist Party with the ideologies of the classes to which they belong. From this understanding, the line represented by MKP sees it as natural for the different ideologies of different classes and strata to exist within the Communist Party:

“Different classes and strata, groups that have an interest in the revolution, take part in the CP and they also carry their own ideologies into the CP. If this were not so, why would there be a need for two-line struggle? This is the unavoidable objective side of the matter. If ideological wholeness is to be sought, then the CP must close its doors to all different class strata outside the proletariat. Then you would make the revolution impossible; this way of thinking drives a person to that point.” (ibid., emphasis in original)

This approach of our friends in MKP trivializes the decisive difference between inside the communist party and outside the communist party, and equates the two-line struggle waged inside the communist party and communist platforms with ideological struggles waged outside the party towards different classes and strata. This ideological understanding of the

Communist Party, as we have also experienced in our own historical practice, leads to serious problems, especially organisational ones.

Different lines within the Communist Party are grasped in order to be eliminated and to strengthen the proletarian line; two-line struggle within the Party is handled, especially at certain times, on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism and on the basis of “unity-struggle-higher unity”. In the final analysis, two-line struggle also contains an organisational measure. Its ways and methods are determined in the functioning, principles and statute of the Communist Party.

Ideological struggle with lines outside the Communist Party, however, is grasped in order to change them, to bring them closer to the proletarian line and to neutralize them. Its ways and methods are clear. It can be defined as presenting the criticisms of the proletarian line on public platforms and continuing ideological-political struggle without interruption. It is also clear that, by its nature, this struggle does not and cannot contain an organisational measure.

First, the line represented by MKP evaluates two separate organisational formations as if they were within the same organisational formation. It is clear that this evaluation is not correct. Because of this mistaken understanding, the two-line struggle waged within a communist party or communist platforms is confused with line struggles between different organizations and therefore different lines. The ideological struggle of different organisational structures with one another is different from the ideological struggle within the same party. It is clear that we are speaking of two separate and different channels. This is not a question of intention but an objective reality.

Second, according to the understanding of our friends in MKP, the Communist Party contains more than one ideology within itself. The inevitability of one thing is one matter; the grasping and handling of that inevitability is another. According to MKP,

“different classes and strata, with their own ideologies”, take part in the Communist Party. This is inevitable! Therefore a party — according to MKP’s understanding — is composed of a combination of the ideologies of various classes! Yet the ideology, doctrine and politics of the Communist Party correspond to the class character of the proletariat, the only class that is the most progressive of the epoch and identical with socialism. The ideology of the proletariat rules the Communist Party’s revolutionary perspective, communist doctrine and the politics it follows. In short, the ideology of the Communist Party is the ideology of the proletariat. There is no place for different ideologies outside this ideology. There should not be.

As a result, according to the understanding of our friends in MKP, the view that “different classes and strata, groups that have an interest in the revolution, take part in the CP and they also carry their own ideologies into the CP” contains a vague understanding that regards it as legitimate for ideologies other than that of the proletariat to be carried into the party. And, following from this, with the view that “if ideological wholeness is to be sought, then the CP must close its doors to all different classes and strata outside the proletariat”, they reject the ideological wholeness of the party and defend the claim that every class and stratum entering the party can come and exist with the ideology of the class to which it belongs, instead of the ideology of the proletariat.

This view is fundamentally wrong and, moreover, weakens the struggle for proletarian ideology to become dominant within the party. Lenin was a bourgeois intellectual. But within the RSDLP he took his place not with bourgeois ideology, but with the ideology of the proletariat with which he had armed himself. We can say the same of Marx, Engels, Stalin and Mao. They too took their place in the ranks of the ideology of scientific socialism and communism not with the ideologies of the bourgeois or petty-bourgeois classes to which they belonged,

but with the ideology of communism of the class-conscious proletariat.

Indeed, although the majority of TKP-ML's founding leader and comrades were petty-bourgeois in class origin, they synthesized the experience they gained from practice together with the universal theory of MLM and became the representative of the proletarian line in our geography. This is the basis that distinguishes TKP-ML, above all İbrahim Kaypakkaya, from other petty-bourgeois revolutionary leaders.

In short, the founders and leaders of communist parties are, at first, mostly bourgeois intellectuals. But they have "betrayed" the ideology of their class. Of course, members belonging to the working class and other labouring classes take part in the communist party. Indeed, this is the essential aim. It is aimed that workers should constitute the majority within the organisational whole of the Communist Party. As the Communist Party develops, workers who internalize communist ideology and attain class consciousness constitute the majority of the Communist Party's members.

In summary, the Communist Party is not a structure marked by the eclectic combination of various ideologies. It should not be. What marks the Communist Party is the ideology of the proletariat. The Communist Party is a party that recognizes the party will, applies two-line struggle and fulfils the principle of democratic centralism.

Of course, the law of the "unity and struggle of opposites" also applies within Communist Parties armed with communist ideology. The law of contradiction also applies within the party, which is a material force. In the Communist Party, the existence of different ideas and views that constitute the opposite of communist ideology is inevitable. But here, what marks the communist party and constitutes the principal aspect of the contradiction is communist ideology. The views corresponding to the other ideology are secondary. Indeed, when anti-communist ideological doctrines become the principal aspect of

the contradiction, that party turns into a bourgeois party. In parties that were once communist, and in socialist systems, when bourgeois ideology passed from a secondary position to a principal position, the Communist Party turned into a bourgeois party and the socialist system into capitalism.

We will return to this question later in relation to two-line struggle in the party.

MKP's unity proposal is shaped around the unity of two organizations that come from the same tradition and rest on past togetherness and memories, but that today occupy different positions. The reality that, under today's conditions, they are in separate channels from the party to which the unity proposal is made, and that they possess an organisational formation extending over many years, is ignored.

As a product of this understanding, it is not taken into account that, under present conditions, TKP-ML and the line represented by MKP, although the same in words, are representatives of different ideologies in class terms; that they have different ideologies and different minimum and maximum program; that their understandings of the character of the revolution and the path of the revolution contain differences; and that they have formed separate organisational structures, among other serious questions.

With such a separation and such a differentiation, can one speak of the "unity of communists"? Can "two unite and become one"? Can unity be realized on the same course between the maximum and minimum program of the Communist Party and a petty-bourgeois party and program? If it is realized, can this be called the "unity of communists"? When two separate parties merge organizationally, is "party unity" achieved? On decisive questions, and above all on the basis of "our past experiences", can those who, as our people say, "play from different strings" in the functioning of the Communist Party act together?

In our view, our friends in MKP must answer all these questions clearly.

Of course, communist unity must be realized with a movement that is communist in content and on a communist route. Under conditions where the unity of communists exists, the unity of communists must be defended, and the necessary step must definitely be taken. Not doing so is unacceptable from the standpoint of the struggle of the proletariat and the people. But before doing this, it is necessary to set out clearly whether the conditions for the thing called “unity” exist, and what the similarities and differences are. To defend “unity” in an environment where this does not exist means emptying the policy described as “unity” of its content.

We are of the view that our friends in MKP are not aware of the channel in which their “unity” proposal is being made and what content it contains. The “unity” placed on the agenda by MKP is the unity of two structures moving in separate ranks. It means being on the highest ideological-programmatic-theoretical-political channel and within the same organisational formation. According to MLM science, whether the conditions for this proposal exist must definitely be evaluated.

In order to grasp the problem better, we will first touch on the role of the Communist Party as vanguard and organized detachment, and then on two-line struggle within the party and communist platforms. Later, linked to these questions, we will address our differences and discuss the question of unity under these conditions.

Our modest proposal to our friends in MKP is also this. Avoiding generalizations and especially avoiding the exploitation of the people’s wishes and demands, it is necessary to concentrate on the differences and to reach a certain clarification on these questions. We are of the view that this is the MLM attitude towards the matter. We defend that this approach is scientific and correct.

**a) The Ideological-Political-Organisational Vanguard
Detachment of the Working Class**

The function and aim of the TKP-ML in relation to the revolution in our geography is to organize itself along the ideological and political line of the working class, the most advanced class of our age; to carry out work among the working class, the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie; to establish ties with these classes and strata; to organize them and mobilize them for revolution; and, at a more advanced stage, when conditions exist, to include the left wing of the national bourgeoisie in the united front of the people.

The organization of this long-term struggle, and the channelling of the exploited and oppressed masses towards revolution, can be achieved only through the ideological-political-programmatic revolutionary perspective of the vanguard and organized detachment. Revolution is the work of the masses. This is an MLM principle. This principle can be put into practice only through the existence of a vanguard and organized Communist Party. Otherwise, revolution will not take place. And even if it happens by chance, it cannot be called a revolution carried out under the leadership of the proletariat.

Without an organization that possesses the ideological-political-organisational and military course of the proletariat, the old, decayed and rotten system cannot be overthrown together with its base and superstructure. Even if it is overthrown, the construction of the new under proletarian leadership cannot be realized. The necessity of the leadership of proletarian ideology after the revolution is known through the experience of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The ability of the party, which organizationally plays the vanguard and leading role, to accomplish the revolution it has undertaken is possible only through ideological-political-military leadership.

For communists, this truth is known through the lessons and experiences drawn from their historical experience. The following words of V. I. Lenin, leader of the October

Revolution and one of the teachers of the proletariat, confirm this truth: “Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This idea cannot be emphasized too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes hand in hand with an infatuation with the narrowest forms of practical activity.” (Lenin, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, p. 55; emphasis added)

Comrade Lenin’s words — that “this idea cannot be emphasized too strongly”, namely that “without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary practice” — state clearly and plainly that theory, ideology and politics command, and must command, organization and practice. Moreover, this emphasis is made “at a time when” there is an “infatuation with the narrowest forms of practical activity”.

Again, in his polemics with the Mensheviks, Comrade Lenin defended the view that the party would fulfil its leading role by arming the proletariat with its own theory. He pointed out that the vanguard party could fulfil this task only under the guidance of vanguard theory: “We wish to state only that the role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by an advanced theory.” (Lenin, *ibid.*, p. 56; emphasis added)

The vanguard theory that leads the party is the ideology that corresponds to the class character of the proletariat itself. Of course, the TKP-ML, which leads the revolution, needs good cadres, a solid organisational structure built from top to bottom, sound units, solid and well-established relations, the experience of the revolutionary past, a mass base and similar firm elements. These are indispensable main elements that are necessary for the vanguard and organized detachment.

However, for the organisational mechanism of the vanguard detachment to stand on firm ground, it must also, in Stalin’s words, be armed with sound ideology and sound theory: “But in order to be really the vanguard detachment, the Party must be armed with revolutionary theory, with a knowledge of the laws of the movement, with a knowledge of the laws of revolution.

Otherwise the Party cannot direct the struggle of the proletariat, it cannot lead the proletariat. ... The Party is the political leader of the working class.” (Stalin, Works, vol. 6, pp. 162-163)

As we stated above, people from petty-bourgeois, bourgeois and other classes and strata, whose class origin and social formation are outside the proletariat, do take part in the Communist Party. But the precondition for their taking part in the Communist Party is that they free themselves from the ideologies of the bourgeois classes in which they are located by class origin; that they qualitatively break from their ideological state of mind; that they arm themselves with the ideology of the class-conscious proletariat; and that, in the Communist Party in which they take part, they become equipped with the revolutionary theory of the proletariat.

A similar approach is also found in Comrade Mao Zedong: “Without revolutionary theory and a knowledge of history, without a profound grasp of the practical movement, a political party guiding a great revolutionary movement cannot possibly win victory.” (Mao, Quotations, p. 12)

In short, a revolution capable of victory cannot succeed without a vanguard and leading party armed with revolutionary theory. Moreover, it is not enough to seize power; MLM theory and the ideology of the proletariat are also needed in order to preserve power and advance towards communism.

Our friends from MKP will rightly say that they too defend these views. In that case, we too would rightly like to ask our friends: despite your claim that we think similarly, our historical experience shows that we have not followed the same practice. In our view, our friends from MKP have a problematic understanding of the ideological-political-organisational vanguard detachment of the working class, especially in their handling of two-line struggle within the party.

It is true that the party itself is a contradiction within the reality of class society. But how we understand this contradiction, and on which side of the contradiction we stand in the struggle over

whether the proletarian line or another line will dominate, is decisive for the dominance of the proletarian line. This is not unimportant. It is a matter of principle and line. It must be accepted that in our past historical experience we fell into errors and had shortcomings on this question, and that our failure to understand the class line of crimes committed against the party's unity of will and action also created obstacles to drawing the necessary lessons from these experiences.

It has been more than sufficiently established, as proved by the experience of struggle within the same organisational formation in the past, that we think differently from the line represented by MKP on the understanding of the Communist Party and especially on the implementation of the party's functioning, principles and constitution. At present, however, we do not have practical knowledge of this, because struggle is being carried out within different organisational structures. Nevertheless, on the basis of public statements and evaluations and so on, it is clear that MKP has a different understanding of the vanguard and organized detachment.

As we touched on briefly above, the fundamental question is that the working class's vanguard and leading detachment is a contradiction; but in handling this contradiction — in the two-line struggle within the party — the proletarian line must approach different lines on the basis of strengthening its own line. It is clear that TKP-ML and the line represented by MKP think fundamentally differently about the application of two-line struggle within the same organisational formation. This shows that we need to dwell a little more on the subject.

b) Two-Line Struggle in the Communist Party and Communist Platforms

Above, even if only briefly, we expressed our understanding of two-line struggle within the communist party and communist platforms. Here, proceeding from that understanding, we will dwell in more detail on the ways and methods of two-line

struggle within the party. We will dwell in detail on the understanding of two-line struggle so that our approach to the question, and therefore our difference, can be clearly understood.

We pointed this out briefly above. The party is a contradiction. Not only the party, but every communist is also a contradiction. No one is born a communist; and within the practice of class struggle, every communist must continuously educate themselves in accordance with the ideology of the proletariat. Here, the basic aim is for the revolutionary communist line to become dominant both in the individual and in the Communist Party. Therefore, two-line struggle is continuous both among those who make up the Communist Party and in that totality itself — the Communist Party. Continuity must be approached with the understanding that the proletarian line is the principal aspect.

This understanding is known from the standpoint of MLM. Chairman Gonzalo, leader of the Communist Party of Peru, points out that two-line struggle exists not only in the Communist Party and in communist platforms, but also in the minds of individuals, and reminds us that the struggle in our thoughts is also continuous: “Nevertheless, in our thinking there is a continuous contradiction between the revolutionary line, which is principal, and its opposite. Both exist, because no one is one hundred per cent communist. In our minds a struggle between two lines is taking place, and this struggle, in which the revolutionary line is always intended to prevail and to emerge as the principal aspect, is key in the formation of cadres. This is what we aim at.” (Chairman Gonzalo Speaks. <https://pdfcoffee.com/baskan-gonzalo-konusuyor-pdf-free.html>) Clarity of aim is of key importance in the handling of two-line struggle. Communist parties are not discussion clubs. They are unity of will and action. This unity of will and action is maintained around certain rules and principles. Within the class struggle, organisational formations that come together in

accordance with the ideology of the proletariat (MLM) and the program, as products of class society, have their own rules of functioning (their constitution) and principles drawn from practice. The political and practical line to be followed by a vanguard and leading party is determined in accordance with the decision(s) taken by the congress, the highest organ. The congress is the highest organ that reflects the will of the party. The decision(s) and orientation adopted by the highest organ remain valid until the next congress. The party acts according to the decisions of the congress. The struggle the party will wage against the ruling classes is conducted in accordance with these decisions. More clearly, the decisions taken by the highest organ — the will of the party — command the party's class and power struggle. The party's principles, constitution and communist norms are, in short, of this character. All members and committees of the party, on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism, are obliged to comply with this will. Where they do not comply, it is not possible to speak of unity of will and action.

Undoubtedly, the dialectical law of contradiction also applies to the Communist Party, which is an objective structure. Although there are decisions and unity of will adopted by the highest organ — the will — of the party, different views and ideas also arise, even if they are in a secondary position. Indeed, the rhythm, intensity and influence of different views and ideas rise and fall according to the course of the class struggle. Views that arise outside the will of the party may remain at the tactical level, while some may climb to strategic dimensions, and so on. In connection with the subject, the putschist-liquidationist attacks, factions and splits directed against the will of TKP-ML are directly connected and related to the class struggle in our geography. The historical experience of TKP-ML has shown and proved that right and “left” liquidationist lines have developed within the party during periods when the spontaneous movement of the masses has risen and the revolutionary

movement has grown stronger, or during periods of defeat and retreat. The party's unity of will and action has been abandoned. It is necessary to grasp the connection of these factions and liquidationist lines with the class struggle and their class roots in order to struggle against these lines and succeed. The reverse is also true — and, in our view, this is the main point. Because a successful two-line struggle against such lines could not be waged within the party, and because the dominance of the proletarian line could not be established, the party faced putschism, factions, separations and splits.

In short, the dialectical law of contradiction, which is life itself, also applies to the party. As long as the party exists, the law of contradiction will manifest itself within the party as the “unity and struggle of opposites”.

Indeed, Comrade Mao Zedong explains the law of contradiction within the party as follows: “Opposition and struggle between ideas of different kinds constantly occur within the Party; this is a reflection within the Party of contradictions between classes and between the new and the old in society. If there were no contradictions in the Party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the Party's life would come to an end. ... This makes clear the point we wanted to explain. Whether in simple or in complex forms of motion, whether in objective phenomena or in ideological phenomena, contradiction exists universally in all processes.” (Mao, *Theory and Practice*, p. 32; emphasis added)

As Comrade Mao Zedong states, the law of contradiction exists in all processes. Class contradictions in society — just as they are reflected in every institution of society — also appear within the party as the formation and clash of opposing ideas. Since the party too is an objective structure within class society, the law of contradiction manifests itself within the party as ideological struggle. The Communist Party is an organisational formation that is conscious of this law of dialectical materialism and its operation, and must act accordingly. This is unavoidable. But

stressing what is unavoidable does not mean failing to struggle against it. The struggle against this unavoidable objectivity is put into practice within the Communist Party as a “special type of struggle”, namely as “two-line struggle”. Different views that arise against the dominant proletarian line of the party’s will are, and must be, handled along the axis of two-line struggle.

This struggle has certain rules and a certain functioning. Criticisms and objections to the party’s current decisions and orientation, as well as different views and ideas, are handled according to the party’s functioning, principles and constitution. These views are expressed through the party’s organs and committees, in periodic meetings and reports. In this way, two-line struggle is conducted inside the party and in communist platforms between views and ideas that do not see one another as correct. Two-line struggle is also ideological struggle within the party itself.

Of course, there may be oppositional views within the party outside the decisions and orientation determined by the will of the party in its congresses. Among these, there may be different views on tactical questions, as well as views that contradict the program and the strategic line. Whether at the tactical level or the strategic level, every different view is inevitable in the party. The dialectic of life requires this. In the words of Comrade Mao Zedong, “if there were no contradictions in the party and no ideological struggle to resolve them, the life of the party would come to an end.”

Two-line struggle is ideological struggle and is continuous within the party. As long as the party exists, the law of contradiction will dialectically continue to operate within it. Therefore, two-line struggle, which is unavoidable as a result of the law of dialectics, plays the role of a motor force in the development of the party and in the repeated reproduction of proletarian ideology. Because two-line struggle gives momentum to the development of the party. It keeps the party’s inner dynamic constantly alive.

As a special type of struggle, two-line struggle is the basis of the party's unity of will and action: "But without two-line struggle there would be no basis for party unity. Without a deep and firm two-line struggle within the party, it is not possible to grasp ideology firmly, nor to formulate and develop the Program or the general political line, let alone defend, apply and develop them. For us, two-line struggle is fundamental and is related to the conception of the Party as a contradiction, in accordance with the universal character of the law of contradiction." (Chairman Gonzalo Speaks. <https://pdfcoffee.com/baskan-gonzalo-konusuyor-pdf-free.html>)

Two-line struggle also contains the unity of opposites within the party. The development of different views and lines that contradict and clash with the line representing the party's will is a manifestation of the unity of opposites. Party members and organized militants who hold different views and lines express their views, in accordance with the party constitution, in the organs and committees in which they are located. In accordance with the principle of democratic centralism, which plays a fundamental role in the functioning of the party, they convey their views to higher organs through the reports of the organs and committees in which they are organized. They conduct discussion in their organs and committees. When they consider it necessary, they also transmit their views in writing to higher party organs. On the eve of congresses and during congress processes, two-line struggle is conducted in higher and broader arenas and in sharper dimensions. But two-line struggle, which is a special type of struggle, is conducted within the party and in communist platforms. It means that comrades with different views carry on the views they defend in the organ in which they are located and in the party in accordance with the party constitution. This is two-line struggle. Any approach and handling outside this cannot be accepted.

Two-line struggle is conducted in accordance with these norms of the party and with the principles of the party. Those who hold

different views and have criticisms of the party's current will do not reflect these views outside the party. To do so is a violation of one of the most basic principles of the Communist Party's functioning, the principle of democratic centralism, and is a crime. Those who hold different views and ideas, those who oppose the party's current decisions and orientation, defend to the outside not their own thoughts and views but the party's existing decision(s) and orientation. They are obliged to do so. Unity of will and action can be achieved only in this way. While holders of different views express their views inside the party in accordance with the principle of democratic centralism, outside they act in accordance with the party's current minimum and maximum line. In short, they take part in organization in accordance with the party's existing line. They wage struggle in accordance with the decision(s) and orientation determined by the will of the party congress.

The idea that the party is a contradiction is the prior acceptance that the law of contradiction will also apply within the party. But this prior acceptance does not legitimize the dominance of different views and lines against the proletarian line within the party. More accurately, in the sense of "one divides into two", communists continue the struggle to make the proletarian line dominant in the contradiction. This is so by the nature of things. Indeed, communists handle two-line struggle within the party on the basis of strengthening the proletarian line. The emergence of different lines in the Communist Party does not mean accepting and approving those lines. Which line constitutes the principal aspect of the contradiction, and what is dominant, is of decisive importance. For communists, it is unacceptable — and must be unacceptable — for a line other than the proletarian line to become the main line in the Communist Party.

As long as the proletarian line constitutes the principal aspect of the contradiction in the party, two-line struggle is and must be carried on. Criticisms and different views must not be suppressed by organisational measures. However, if revisionism

becomes dominant in the party, communists must of course take an organisational stand against revisionism. Because this means that the bourgeois line has become dominant in the party. This is clearly unacceptable from the standpoint of the proletarian line.

Indeed, in such a situation Comrade Lenin took the path of organisational separation from the Mensheviks. By breaking from the Menshevik line that constituted an obstacle to the proletarian line, the party's proletarian line was preserved and the road to revolution was opened. Or, after the Chinese revolution, Comrade Mao Zedong waged the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) against revisionism that appeared and became influential in the party and in other institutions of China and conducted the struggle to liquidate the holders of this line. The GPCR, carried out in 1966-1968 after the 1949 Chinese Revolution, was another revolution against modern revisionism. In short, the party must make two-line struggle continuous, but it must also be vigilant against revisionism targeting the revolution carried out under proletarian leadership. A similar situation was also experienced during Comrade Ibrahim Kaypakkaya's struggle against the Şafak revisionists, with whom he was in the same party. Within the TIİKP, Comrade Ibrahim Kaypakkaya's criticisms were ignored, attempts were made to suppress them, and matters went even further: there was an attempt to have Comrade Ibrahim Kaypakkaya killed. Comrade Kaypakkaya summarizes this process in the following words: "Those who are factionalist and divisive are those who try to suppress criticism within the organization. They are those who hide the criticisms directed at them from the cadres. Those who are factionalist and divisive are those who try to wear down the cadres who criticize them with a vile campaign of slander and gossip, to discredit them in the eyes of other cadres, and to isolate them. Those who are factionalist and divisive are those who prepare insidious plans against cadres who operate the mechanism of criticism. They

are those who organize armed conspiracies against such cadres. Those who are factionalist and divisive are those who, by trampling on both democracy and the principle of centralism, want to apply the most extreme democracy to themselves and the most extreme centralism to Marxist-Leninists..." (Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, Complete Works, Nisan Yayıncılık, October 2016, p. 455)

In summary, as a product of the law of contradiction, the fact that the party too is a contradiction and that opposing ideas can arise and develop within the party naturally makes the vigilance and struggle of communists against this necessary. As MKP argues, the bourgeois line within communist parties, outside the proletarian line, is not legitimized by saying that it is a product of the law of contradiction; it is understood as something to be eliminated and is handled in order to strengthen the proletarian line. As long as communist ideology is dominant, the party continues to exist as communist. In the opposite case, revisionism and the bourgeois aspect become dominant in the party; the histories of the CPSU and the CPC are full of such lessons. The GPCR was carried out on the basis of this lesson, opened the way for communists against the bourgeoisie within the party, and enabled the socialist revolution to advance.

Therefore, for communists, the emergence of a line outside the proletarian line within the same party and in communist platforms, and the damage it causes to the party's and the communist platforms' unity of will and action, cannot and must not be accepted. This line must be struggled against; and when the conditions for struggle do not exist, the proletarian line must reorganize itself: "In parties dominated by incorrigible bourgeois elements, it is not factionalism for Marxist-Leninists to unite among themselves and struggle against them. It is a historical task. It is an indispensable obligation towards the proletariat and the labouring people. The factionalists are the incorrigible bourgeois elements." (I. Kaypakkaya, *ibid.*, p. 456)

In conclusion, for individuals or groups within communist parties to openly defend their own views instead of the party's existing proletarian line at that moment contradicts MLM party norms and organisational principles. The method is clear. Different thoughts, views and criticisms are expressed within the party's functioning, in the meetings of organs and committees. In addition, when necessary, they are transmitted in writing to higher organs. Party congress processes (and similar processes) are platforms in which inner-party democracy is operated at the highest level and in which different thoughts and views struggle on the basis of party functioning. After proletarian democracy has been put into practice in these platforms, the whole party, including those with different views and ideas, is obliged to obey the decisions and orientation of the congress — the will. The principle of democratic centralism requires this. Where this does not exist, one cannot speak of being within the same organisational formation. Where this does not exist, one has gone outside the party and negated the party. Another organisational formation outside the proletarian line comes into question. From this point onward, the struggle to be waged against the line that has gone outside the party may be called ideological struggle, but it cannot be defined as two-line struggle, which is a special type of struggle within the party.

This organisational consciousness — MLM organisational principles — distilled from the historical experience and practical lessons acquired through the successful or unsuccessful revolutionary practices of communist parties, is fixed in the party constitution and functioning. Every path and method outside the party constitution and functioning, every violation of the principle of democratic centralism, separate organization against the party's current will, and, in Comrade Mao Zedong's words, "intrigue and conspiracy", is unacceptable. All such attempts mean standing against the determined and approved principles and functioning of the Communist Party and violating the will of the proletarian line.

At the present stage, when our revolutionary friends from MKP speak of a unity proposal directed to TKP-ML, they overlook and ignore the processes experienced in the common past of those who currently possess two separate organisational formations, and especially why the known principles of two-line struggle were violated. It is clear that this is an ideological problem of the line from which MKP emerged and which it now represents, above all in its understanding of the party. Let us put it more clearly. “The Unity of Communists” is spoken of, but the reality of why the 1987 DABK and the 1994 Coup occurred is not sufficiently addressed. There is no self-critical attitude on an MLM basis regarding these processes. It is not explained why this line fell outside TKP-ML, nor why it negated TKP-ML’s most basic functioning and two-line struggle.

To put it in a way that our revolutionary friends from MKP will understand: a “unity” is spoken of, but the reasons for separation are not sufficiently addressed. The question of why one divided into two, and why the line they represent fell outside the party, is not addressed on an MLM basis. Why we are separate is not brought onto the agenda; instead, on the basis that we come from the “same tradition”, “unity” is proposed. It has to be accepted that one has divided into two (because this is objective reality), but the reason(s) for this are not examined.

To discuss the unity proposal means, in essence and first of all, clarifying “why we are separate”. Above we briefly indicated TKP-ML’s evaluation of and approach to the 1987 DABK and 1994 Coup processes. We think that the evaluations made and decided upon regarding both historical processes remain, in essence, in accordance with TKP-ML’s principles, functioning and constitution. We still maintain our view that, both in the 1987 DABK exit and in the 1994 Coup process, despite some secondary errors, the principal thing was to defend the proletarian line and the will of the party. Despite the years that have passed, it must be understood and accepted that our approach is not arrogance, dogmatism — or whatever else it

may be called — but is a matter of principle in terms of the functioning of a Communist Party. Many things can be discussed and put on the table. But putschist-liquidationist attack(s) directed against two-line struggle, against the will, functioning and principles of TKP-ML, and which disrupt the party's unity of will and action, cannot and must not be accepted. MLM understanding and communist consciousness require this attitude.

In short, can the unity proposal put forward by our revolutionary friends from MKP be evaluated without the coup, liquidationism, factionalism and so on being examined on an MLM basis, and without these line(s) outside the proletarian line being put on the table? Can the discussion of unity be raised in a situation where the separation is not judged, is not put on the table, and is passed over by being minimized as a simple mistake? If “unity” is brought onto the agenda without this questioning and without a consistent self-criticism, would this not be opportunism? Is it not necessary to draw lessons from the “Steel Unity of Party Forces”(!) carried out before the 1994 Coup? The questions can be multiplied...

We think that our revolutionary friends from MKP have had, both in the past and today, a problematic understanding of the party in general and of two-line struggle in particular. In the past, in the 1987 DABK exit and the 1994 Coup process — especially the handling of the communists' “1992 Unity” with an opportunist and essentially pragmatist approach — this prevented two-line struggle from being handled on an MLM basis. For this reason, from the standpoint of the proletarian line, the main question is not the 1994 putschist-liquidationist line that went outside the party, but the party's own opportunist and pragmatist approach. Because this handling points to an ideological problem and did not serve the proletarian line in emerging stronger from the process. This understanding caused the proletarian line to fail to put into practice the approach of eliminating different lines and strengthening its own line.

Therefore, in both the 1987 and 1994 processes, what we discussed was not those who went outside the party, but the party itself. Indeed, in the context of the subject, the party will of TKP-ML's 6th Conference was shaped on this basis.

The line represented by MKP has, both in the past and today, a problematic approach in its understanding of the party and of two-line struggle within the party. In the past, with the important errors of the proletarian line as well, this understanding did not handle two-line struggle on the basis of party principles, functioning and constitution; at the present stage, this same understanding can now speak of "two-line struggle" between organizations that possess two different organisational formations. It must be recalled again that this discussion is not a two-line struggle. Because this discussion is not being conducted within the party's unity of will and action, but with a line outside the Communist Party.

It must be emphasized that a line discussion between two political structures that are organizationally, ideologically and politically in different arenas is not an MLM two-line struggle conducted within the same organisational formation. It is an ideological-political struggle between two movements, two separate organisational formations. Two-line struggle of course also includes ideological struggle, but it is a struggle within the party. Therefore, ideological struggle inside the party and struggle outside the party are distinct. Ideological struggles waged against movements and lines outside the party are not, and must not be, defined as two-line struggles. Because two-line struggle within the party ultimately includes various organisational measures. This is what conditions it as a special type of struggle. Ideological struggles directed against lines outside the party, by their nature, lack this measure. This objective situation points to a fundamental qualitative difference that separates the two ideological struggles from one another.

III) Our Differences with MKP

a) Democratic People's Revolution

The existing economic, social and political structure of a country determines the character of the revolution, the road it will follow, and the aims of the revolution. A radical transformation in the existing structure of a country is possible only through a historical and thoroughgoing revolution.

In our age, the most advanced revolutions are those in which the oppressed classes are led by the class-conscious proletariat. The series of revolutions that began with the 1917 October Revolution, continued with the Chinese Revolution, and then followed one another, took place in a number of countries in Asia and Europe. Indeed, the Democratic People's Revolutions and Socialist Revolutions, and the experiences of socialism that took place in the last century, left their mark on the age in which we live. These revolutions were revolutions led by proletarian parties and included the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie, and the left wing of the national bourgeoisie. These classes formed the basic support of the revolution. And these revolutions targeted the reactionary bourgeoisie of the country, the feudal classes, and all economic, social and political institutions and problems corresponding to reaction. Alongside these targets, one of the other main targets of the Democratic People's Revolution was imperialism. Indeed, with the exception of the revolution in Russia, which was an imperialist state, the imperialists were among the principal targets of the democratic revolutions that took place in dependent countries. This is because imperialism made dependent upon itself the countries that had failed to carry out bourgeois revolutions in the last century. It created a comprador form of capitalism dependent on itself. In these countries, despite the objective process of dissolution into which the feudal structure had entered, also under the impact of the intensification of imperialist exploitation, imperialism not only failed to abolish these relations of production at their roots; it also constituted an

obstacle to resolving the pre-capitalist problems in the semi-colonies.

In short, democratic revolutions, which are bourgeois revolutions, continued to remain current in dependent countries. With one difference: because of the character of the age, the leading class of these bourgeois-democratic revolutions was the proletariat. The classes within the other strata of the people also took their place in these revolutions. These revolutions also targeted the bourgeoisie which had carried out the old bourgeois revolutions but had become reactionary in the age of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. And after such revolutions were realized, the uninterrupted construction of socialism was undertaken.

This approach, which we have set out in very general terms, also applies to our geography. In Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan, the Democratic People's Revolution has maintained its currency from the past to the present. The comprador capitalism dominant in Turkey is not a national capitalism that arose through its own internal dynamics. Comprador capitalism is dependent on international finance capital exported by the imperialists. It is the capitalism that acts as the extension of imperialism in the market which imperialism has made dependent upon itself. Indeed, the capitalism that began to develop in Turkey towards the second half of the nineteenth century was not the product and result of a democratic revolution. Therefore, the comprador bourgeoisie is not a revolutionary class. On the contrary, it is the class that stands as an obstacle before the "bourgeois revolution". As a result, it is a continuous target of the democratic revolution.

Just as imperialism made the Turkish market dependent on itself in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it also destroyed the natural economy of pure feudalism and created the central market system. It set the feudal structure into a process of dissolution and liquidation. But the principal role it played was to preserve, as far as possible, the pre-capitalist

economic, social and political structure of the Turkey it had made dependent. In this way, imperialism emerged as an obstacle to the development of relations of production in semi-colonial countries. It forced the feudal structure and the problems it created into a slow and painful process of liquidation. As a result, comprador capitalism and feudalism became intertwined, forming a semi-colonial, semi-feudal socio-economic structure. And this structure, from the past to the present, continued its dependence on imperialist states such as Britain, France, Germany and America. Indeed, dependence on imperialism continues today. Correspondingly, it also organized the institutions of the superstructure.

In the course of the process, the slow and painful dissolution of feudal relations, the economic policies put into effect by imperialism under the labels of neo-liberalism, globalization and the new world order, and so on, led comprador capitalism to become dominant in Turkey. These developments were summarized in the latest session of TKP-ML in the following words: “From the end of the second half of the twentieth century onwards, the reorganization of the international division of labour by imperialist capital led to certain changes in semi-colonial markets, including Turkey. ... The conditions of semi-colonialism dependent on imperialist capital were updated and reproduced. Parallel to this updating and reproduction, the semi-colonial, semi-feudal economic structure changed.

While semi-feudal relations of production were dominant in Turkish society, which from its foundation had a semi-feudal, semi-colonial economic and social structure, in the course of the process the deepening of semi-colonial conditions and the dissolution of feudal relations developed capitalism dependent on imperialism (comprador capitalism). Although feudal remnants still exist in present-day Turkey, comprador capitalism has become dominant.” (TKP-ML 2nd Congress Documents I, 2024, pp. 90-91)

The changes and transformations that have taken place in the economic and social structure of Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan in today's reality have directly affected the character of the revolution in our geography. This is because the existing structure of any country determines the character, course and aims of the revolution in that country. Revolution targets the economic, social and political structure of the country.

Thus, the revolution in our country targets comprador capitalism, which has become dominant in the economic base. The fact that comprador capitalism has become dominant in our country narrows the limits of the Democratic People's Revolution. The existence of feudal remnants reduces the content and aims of the DPR and places it on a relatively more limited course. But it does not abolish the necessity of the Democratic People's Revolution. This is because these developments in the economic and social structure are not developments that have resulted from revolution.

The change in the base also manifests itself in the superstructure. However, the failure to carry out the bourgeois-democratic revolution has led to the continued influence of feudal remnants, above all patriarchy, in the institutions of the superstructure. This objective situation gives rise to more than one contradiction within the social formation. In this social reality, while the fundamental contradiction is the contradiction between imperialism, comprador capitalism and feudal remnants on the one hand, and the broad masses of the people on the other, the following contradictions also emerge:

- The contradiction between imperialism and the broad masses of the people
- The contradiction between the masses of the people and feudal remnants
- The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie
- The contradiction between the oppressor nation and the oppressed nation and nationalities

- The contradiction between the patriarchal system and the oppressed gender
- The contradiction between the oppressor belief and the oppressed beliefs
- The contradiction between capitalism and the ecological system
- The contradiction among the ruling classes
- The contradiction between the ruling classes and refugees, and so on.

The existence of these contradictions makes democratic revolution current in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan. In this process, the principal contradiction emerges as the contradiction between comprador capitalism and feudal remnants on the one hand, and the broad masses of the people on the other. Radical change will be possible only through the DPR.

Among these contradictions, for example, the national question in general and the Kurdish national question in particular occupy an important place. Because the democratic revolution has not been carried out, oppression and attacks against the Kurdish nation have reached an extreme level. The annexation of the lands of the Kurdish nation, massacres carried out against it, the denial of its existence through oppression and attacks, its forced deportation from the lands in which it lives, the inability of Kurds to express their national identity, to speak their own language, to receive education, and to freely reflect their own national being, and so on, are known and experienced practices. The intensified oppression and domination over the Kurdish nation continue today in the same way.

Of course, the struggle for democratic rights in relation to these problems must be waged. A stand must be taken against oppression and sanctions. But these struggles must be subordinated to the Democratic People's Revolution, which will secure thoroughgoing liberation. A radical solution to the Kurdish question is possible only through the democratic people's revolution under the leadership of the proletariat.

Together with the Kurdish question, the genocide committed against Armenians, Greeks and Assyrians in the last century must also be brought to account, and it must not be forgotten that the TC state was founded on the doctrine of Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism. These genocides are on the same course as the present-day Kurdish question. With the overthrow through the democratic people's revolution of this power founded on the chauvinism of one nation and one religion, a step will be taken towards the radical solution of the problem.

Again, in our geography, Alevis and sections of society belonging to other beliefs are also subject to medieval-rooted oppression and attacks by the state. Alevis, who constitute a significant section of the country's population, have been subjected to denial and oppression for centuries, from the Ottoman period to the present day. The history of the Ottoman state and its continuation, the TC state, is based on hostility to oppressed beliefs outside the dominant Sunni faith, above all against Alevis. The radical liberation of Alevis and other oppressed beliefs is possible through the overthrow, by means of the democratic people's revolution, of the state apparatus that forms the ground for this oppression and domination.

In addition, patriarchal oppression directed against women and oppressed genders has greatly increased today. The solution of this problem is also among the aims of the democratic people's revolution.

In short, imperialism, which we referred to above, together with comprador capitalism and feudal remnants, is a basic target of the democratic people's revolution: "The fact that Turkey is economically a capitalist country does not invalidate the Democratic People's Revolution.

Because:

1. Turkey is a semi-colonial country. Therefore, anti-imperialist struggle is one of the main tasks of the revolution.

2. A bourgeois-democratic revolution has not taken place in Turkey. The dominance of capitalist relations of production has narrowed the tasks of the Democratic People's Revolution, but it has not abolished the necessity of this revolution.

The following tasks stand before us:

- a. Liberation from imperialism.
- b. The solution of the Kurdish national question and the securing of the rights of all minority nationalities.
- c. The elimination of the inequality between women and men that appears in every sphere of life because of the existence of patriarchy, and, in essence, putting an end to the sexist outlook.
- d. Giving the country a democratic character and creating the necessary preconditions for the construction of socialism.
- e. Securing freedom of religion and conscience.
- f. Securing all democratic rights.
- g. Democratizing society by securing freedom of thought and organization.” (TKP-ML 2nd Congress Documents, pp. 104-105)

The problems we have listed above can be solved radically only and only through the Democratic People's Revolution. To skip the democratic revolution and put forward the socialist revolution is, in reality, not to see the reality of our country. It means passing over the problems created by the existing state and order. It means covering over these problems and the oppressions carried out. From dependence on imperialism, the existence of comprador capitalism and feudal remnants, the Kurdish question, the Alevi question, fascism and the religious element in the state apparatus, to the medieval institutions such as tribe, religious order, religious community and religion that still continue to exist within the body of the system and the state, to patriarchy, and to the archaic-feudal oppression and domination deemed appropriate for the female sex, above all

working women, and for different sexual orientations — the radical resolution of all these problems is possible only through the Democratic People's Revolution, even though its limits and aims have narrowed. With the realization of the Democratic People's Revolution and the Democratic People's Dictatorship, the road to socialism is opened. The objective and subjective conditions of socialism are then formed. Thus, through the Democratic People's Revolution, the uninterrupted construction of socialism is begun. Otherwise, the construction of socialism cannot be begun.

Proceeding from these realities, a two-stage revolution is valid in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan. The revolutionary theses of approaches that ignore this reality and pass over the Democratic Revolution stand on the same ground as Trotsky's understanding of "single revolution".

Indeed, Lenin constantly criticized Trotsky's theory of "single revolution" and defended democratic revolution: "The removal of all the remnants of the old order that hinder the widespread, rapid and free development of capitalism is absolutely in the interest of the working class. The bourgeois revolution is precisely a revolution that removes the remnants of the old order, the remnants of serfdom (not only autocracy but also monarchy are among these remnants), in the most decisive way; ... Therefore, the bourgeois revolution is extremely beneficial to the proletariat. The bourgeois revolution is absolutely necessary from the standpoint of the interests of the proletariat." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Inter Publications, vol. 3, pp. 75-76, emphasis added)

Comrade Lenin's handling of revolution falls within this scope. He argued that all remnants of the pre-capitalist old order could be abolished only through democratic revolution. Just as the feudal structure and pre-capitalist archaic problems form the targets of the democratic revolution, the national question too is a target of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. National oppression, national domination and national massacres can also

be overcome at their roots only through democratic revolution. The problem lies among the aims of the democratic revolution. Indeed, in his polemic with Rosa Luxemburg on the national question and the Right of Nations to Freely Secede, Lenin stated that countries that had not resolved the national question had not carried out their bourgeois revolutions. According to Lenin, in the past, between 1789 and 1871, the revolutions led by the bourgeoisie resolved the national question. But with the bourgeoisie taking on a reactionary character, the solution of national questions fell to democratic revolutions under the leadership of the proletariat. As a result, in our age, in countries where the democratic revolution has not taken place, the national question has not been resolved.

Comrade Lenin, in his polemic with Rosa Luxemburg, clearly stated that she could not see this difference: “The same is true of the national question. In many western countries this question has long been settled. It is ridiculous to seek answers to a question that does not exist in the programs of the Western European countries. Here Rosa Luxemburg has overlooked the most important thing: the difference between countries that have long since completed the bourgeois-democratic revolution and countries that have not yet completed this revolution. This difference is the essence of the question.” (Lenin, *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, p. 62, emphasis added)

As can be seen, Lenin states that the national question has been settled in countries that completed the bourgeois-democratic revolution, but that the problem continues in countries that have not completed it. And Comrade Lenin explains in the following words why, in countries that have not carried out their bourgeois-democratic revolutions and have not resolved the national question, it is necessary to include the right of nations to self-determination in the program of TKP-ML: “In Eastern Europe and Asia, the period of bourgeois-democratic revolutions began only in 1905. The revolutions in Russia, Persia, Turkey and China, the Balkan wars — such is the chain

of world events of our period in our 'East'. And only the blind can fail to see, in this chain of events, the awakening of a series of bourgeois-democratic national movements striving to create independent states composed of the same nation. It is precisely because Russia and the neighbouring countries are passing through this period that we must include in our program a clause on the right of nations to self-determination." (Lenin, *ibid.*, p. 63, emphasis added)

As a result, Comrade Lenin's handling of the Democratic People's Revolution under the leadership of the proletariat is clear. The leader of the October Revolution argues that the Democratic People's Revolution is the removal of all remnants of the old order that hinder the widespread, rapid and free development of capitalism, that it is absolutely in the interest of the working class, and that it is absolutely necessary from the standpoint of the interests of the proletariat.

Again, Comrade Lenin states that the solution of existing national questions is possible only and only through democratic revolution. Together with this, he argues that the defence of the Right of Nations to Self-Determination (UKKTH), or, more correctly, the Right to Freely Secede (OAH), must take place in the program of the proletariat. It is clear that this program is not yet the maximum program of socialist revolution, but the minimum program of democratic revolution. The national question and the Right to Freely Secede are within the program of communist parties that includes the democratic people's revolution.

When the historical revolutionary practices concerning democratic revolutions are examined, similar experiences are encountered. For example, the Democratic People's Revolution carried out in China is one of the examples of this revolution. The revolutions that took place in Asia, the Balkans and Eastern Europe also fell within the scope of the Democratic People's Revolution. These revolutions had universal and international validity, but they also took different forms according to the

specific conditions of the countries. Thus, in Russia, the cities came to the fore in the democratic revolution, and it moved uninterruptedly to socialist revolution. In China and other countries, the objective conditions brought the countryside to the fore. As a result, in countries such as China, Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, they achieved victory as democratic revolutions carried out against domestic reaction and imperialist occupation.

Before and during the Second Imperialist War of Re-Division, democratic revolutions also came onto the agenda in the countries of Eastern Europe, and war was waged against reactionary rule and imperialist occupation. Indeed, in the 1928 Program of the Communist International it is stated that “a broad agrarian and peasant movement under the leadership of the proletariat was envisaged, and the agrarian revolution played a decisive role.” (1928 Program of the Communist International, Inter Publications, October 2021, p. 88)

In conclusion, when the historical experiences and successful revolutionary practices of the International Communist Movement are examined, it is clear that, in terms of the economic and social structure of Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan, we are faced with the necessity of the Democratic People’s Revolution. However, the line represented by MKP is not aware of this concrete fact. The necessity of Democratic Revolution for Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan is passed over, and the thesis of direct socialist revolution is defended. Yet in countries such as ours, which have not carried out the bourgeois-democratic revolution, socialist revolution is possible only through the prior resolution of the problems of the democratic revolution.

To put socialist revolution on the agenda without completing the Democratic People’s Revolution under the leadership of the proletariat means setting aside — let alone feudal remnants and the archaic oppressions of the state — the women’s question, the Kurdish question and the Alevi question as well. It even means blocking the road to socialist revolution. Because the

precondition for socialist revolution is possible through the realization of the democratic revolution. Only through the realization of the democratic revolution is the road to socialist revolution opened.

Despite this reality, the line represented by MKP takes a very narrow view of democratic revolution. The tasks of the Democratic Revolution are defined as “the remaining democratic questions” and are minimized: “Feudalism, which has been dissolved, has lost its character as a class and continues to exist as feudal remnants. The feudal relations of production and mode of production represented in these feudal remnants have been subjected to liquidation on the basis of becoming weak through deepening dissolution. The peasant population and the land question are not at a level that would keep democratic revolution on the agenda. The remaining democratic questions and the tasks around the land question are far from sufficient to require a democratic revolution; they are questions or tasks that have been assigned to the Socialist Revolution or that will be solved by the Socialist Revolution.” (emphasis added) (MKP 4th Congress Decisions, p. 104)

As can be seen, what the line represented by MKP understands by democratic revolution is “the remaining democratic questions” and only “the peasant population and the land question”(!) Of course, in democratic revolution, the scale of the feudal structure and the size of the peasant population are important. This must not be denied. Of course, these changes must be taken into account. Indeed, it is clear that, as a result of the dissolution of the feudal structure in our country and the considerable decrease in the peasant population, comprador capitalism dependent on imperialism has become dominant. As a result, it is also clear that the aims and limits of the democratic revolution in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan have narrowed. But the fact that the “limits have narrowed” does not mean that these problems are removed from the agenda of the revolution. Because the democratic revolution has not been carried out in

our geography, and the problems have not disappeared altogether.

The basic approach of the line represented by MKP, however, is solely and exclusively the question of the dissolution of feudalism. This approach is the product of a shallow and narrow viewpoint. This, in turn, causes it to fail to grasp the other necessary tasks of the minimum revolution in our geography, and leads to the route of the revolution being turned directly towards socialist revolution. With this viewpoint — leaving aside other problems — the importance and necessity of resolving the national question, the question of belief, the women's question and so on in our country are not grasped.

The line represented by MKP removes from its agenda the Democratic People's Revolution that it defended in the past. But it also sets up an obstacle to the realization of the socialist revolution it defends today. This is because it does not see the reality that, in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan, the road to socialist revolution passes through democratic revolution.

MKP evaluates “Socialist Revolution” and “Democratic Revolution” within the same category. Yet without the realization of democratic revolution under the leadership of the communist party, socialist revolution on the basis of the old order is not possible. Comrade Mao states this reality clearly: “Without an all-embracing bourgeois-democratic revolution of a new type under the leadership of the Communist Party, it would be a pipe dream to attempt to build a socialist society on the ruins of a colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal order.” (Mao, *Selected Works* 3, p. 291)

The understanding of revolution in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan is fundamentally different in the lines represented by MKP and TKP-ML. While TKP-ML defends the Democratic People's Revolution, MKP defends “Socialist Revolution”. In our view, this is an important difference.

b) The Thesis of Socialist People's War

In this study, let us also touch on the road of the revolution in Turkey. The fact that the semi-colonial, semi-feudal structure dependent on imperialism has today been replaced by the dominance of comprador capitalism has also brought certain changes within the Democratic People's Revolution itself onto the agenda. The change in the country's own internal structure has also been reflected in the road of the revolution and in the strategic course of the revolution. As a result, although the character, aim and essence of the revolution have not changed, it has entered into a certain narrowing, and the stages it will follow have taken different forms. There is no doubt that this situation cannot be ignored.

Indeed, as a result of the developments in our country that we referred to above, the Democratic People's Revolution today has made organization and struggle in the cities essential. The quantitative and qualitative weight of the working class has increased in the cities; the contradiction between labour and capital has come to the fore and has climbed to the sharpest dimensions in history. The rural area has fallen into a secondary position compared with the past. This reality must be seen, and steps must be taken in accordance with this objective situation. The class struggle, the struggle against fascism and against international finance capital, commands this necessity. Otherwise, one enters an imaginary and dogmatic realm and becomes trapped in a vicious circle. For this reason, the objective situation must be seen clearly, analyses appropriate to the existing situation must be made, and objective policies must be produced.

Indeed, as a result of comprador capitalism becoming dominant in the semi-colonial structure dependent on imperialism, the People's War Strategy based on the rural areas has now given way to the Armed People's Uprising cantered on the cities. This situation has been taken into account by TKP-ML, and analyses

appropriate to the objective situation have been made: “In capitalist countries, the road of the revolution is the Armed People’s Uprising centred on the cities. ... The struggle based on the cities must take the countryside into account. In today’s world, struggles and contradictions have become so complex and so intertwined that, within the revolutionary process, the applicability of both uprising and guerrilla strategy based on the countryside may be in question. In the cities, we will have our city military committees /city guerrillas.” (TKP-ML 2nd Congress Documents, p. 111)

This question, to which we have referred briefly, concerns the road of the revolution. The fact that comprador capitalism has become dominant, and that the knot of contradictions in the economic, social and political spheres between the comprador bourgeoisie and the working class has gained momentum, brings to the fore taking the cities as the basis and the armed people’s uprising. Of course, this situation does not reject organization and struggle in the rural areas. Organization and struggle in the rural areas too must be carried out in a manner connected to the cities. This is also valid for military organization and military struggle. The necessary steps must be taken for military/guerrilla organization both in the cities and in the countryside. Until the revolution is carried out, guerrilla struggle will be used as an instrument of armed struggle when the occasion arises. In a period of defeat, the struggle may withdraw to the rural areas. Guerrilla warfare may be waged in the rural areas and, again under suitable conditions, the cities may be brought to the fore, and so on. Of course, this will become clear according to concrete conditions. However, strategically, armed struggle is the principal struggle.

This, in essence, is the approach of the vanguard detachment to the road of the revolution in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan. While this approach rejects the armed-struggle experiences of the previous period, it also contains the necessity of taking account of the changing conditions in Turkey and Turkish

Kurdistan and, proceeding from this, of forming a military line. It is clear that the revolution in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan will not be a copy, point for point, of either the Russian or the Chinese Revolution. It is clear that the revolution in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan will contain its own particular features. This understanding makes it necessary to take account of many factors, such as the administrative legacy and central structure that the TC state inherited from Byzantium and the Ottoman Empire, its relations with imperialism and the importance of the market it holds under its control, and the military-political experience it has acquired in the face of struggles for social and national liberation, and so on.

The fact that the revolution in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan has its own particular features must be evaluated together with the changes in the economic and social structure in our geography. For example, on the question of the road of the revolution, the people's uprisings that have taken place recently in the world and in Turkey must certainly be taken into account. Developments such as the "Gezi Uprising", which was an important turning point in the history of the TC over the last hundred years in terms of the movement of the masses, are concrete realities that must be taken into account in determining the military line and identifying the road that the revolution will follow.

In the light of such basic principles as the necessity of armed struggle for the proletariat to seize power, the decisive role of the masses in revolution, and, of course, the principle that "politics commands the guns", it is a fact that the road of the revolution in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan does not have, and will not have, a "ready-made recipe" based on the Russian and Chinese examples. In the most general sense, it is clear that the road of the revolution in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan passes through the "Armed People's Uprising" centred on the cities, and that this strategy cannot reject guerrilla war in the countryside.

Against this approach, MKP has for a long time defended a thesis that it formulates as “Socialist People’s War”: “The character of our revolution is socialist revolution, which assumes the tasks of the democratic revolution shaped according to socio-economic structural relations. The road of the revolution, however, is socialist people’s war.” (p. 91, Partizan Special Issue, June 2014, p. 53, Criticism of the MKP Third Congress, emphasis added)

Further on, the following is also stated: “Socialist revolution is carried out through the strategy of socialist people’s war, which the proletariat begins as the leading and basic force against the comprador monopoly bourgeoisie dependent on imperialism in power, and in which the urban and rural petty-bourgeois sections are allies.” (p. 94, *ibid.*, p. 53, emphasis added)

MKP’s formulation of “Socialist People’s War” contains contradictions within itself. On the one hand, the formulation it defends brings socialist revolution to the fore, while on the other hand it treats democratic revolution and socialist revolution as intertwined. On the one hand, the character of the revolution is determined as socialist revolution, but on the other hand reference is made to “socialist revolution that assumes the tasks of the democratic revolution”. In other words, the tasks of the democratic revolution are loaded onto the socialist revolution. Yet socialist revolution, as its name indicates, assumes the tasks of the socialist revolution, not those of the democratic revolution. To load onto the socialist revolution, which sets before itself the maximum programme, the already resolved tasks of the democratic revolution, which is the minimum revolution, is an absurd exercise. For with socialist revolution a new period is entered. But MKP argues that socialist revolution can assume the tasks of the democratic revolution.

For this reason it is necessary to ask MKP: does the socialist revolution assuming the tasks of the democratic revolution not contain a contradiction within itself? Is this understanding not to

load the tasks of the democratic revolution onto the socialist revolution?

But the following must be seen: the tasks of one revolution are not loaded onto another revolution. They are fulfilled by that revolution itself. In this way, another revolutionary process is entered. This is the ABC of historical materialism. But those who close their eyes to the two-stage revolution of our country do not see this reality.

This understanding, on the one hand, loads the current tasks and aims of the Democratic People's Revolution onto the socialist revolution and casts the democratic revolution aside; but, on the other hand, when speaking of the road of the revolution and its strategic aim, it blends socialism with people's war - the military strategy of the democratic revolution - in an intertwined way. It places two different revolutions into a single category, a single route. And, proceeding from this understanding, the thesis of Socialist People's War is advanced.

As can be seen, while socialist revolution is brought onto the agenda in terms of the character of the revolution, with the designation "Socialist People's War" the content of people's war, which is the military strategy of semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries, is emptied, and in this way a virtual thesis that does not correspond to reality is advanced. A kind of theory based on illusion and a bundle of contradictions is created. Moreover, it is claimed that this thesis is valid on a world scale. To reduce the revolutions of two different social processes to a single process goes no further than an eclectic system of thought. As a result, MKP, which rejects democratic revolution, at the same time presents "Socialist People's War" as valid internationally in all countries.

This approach treats "Socialist People's War" as valid in all countries, without distinguishing between imperialist countries and semi-colonial countries dependent on imperialism, and stands in the magnetic field of Trotskyism's understanding of "single revolution". According to MKP's defence, the "Socialist

People's War" contained in the decisions of the 3rd Congress is valid throughout the world: "Turkey-North Kurdistan is capitalist in terms of its socio-economic structure. Accordingly, in our revolutionary strategy, Socialist People's War is defended in our party's ideology document; the understanding that People's War is valid only for semi-feudal, semi-colonial countries is incomplete. People's War is also valid in capitalist countries. This may take different forms in each capitalist country. We do not consider a static mould, as a single road, to be correct. (...) In the Strategy of People's War, guerrilla warfare too will be treated as an important and basic force. However, it will be handled and carried out in coordination with mass uprising. It may be considered or grasped as the dialectic of countryside and city." (MKP 3rd Congress Documents, p. 97, 2013, emphasis added)

These determinations contain contradictions within themselves. The limits of people's war are extended beyond semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries and presented as a strategy valid on a world scale. This treatment is based on the erroneous thesis that the Protracted People's War formulated by Mao and applied by China should be applied in all countries, without taking into account the stages of social development of the various countries of the world. Yet Mao Zedong himself condemned this thesis: *"To seize political power by armed force, to settle the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution is universally valid, for China and for all other countries.*

But while the principle remains the same, its application by Communist Parties finds expression in different forms according to changing conditions. When capitalist countries are not fascist or not at war, they practise bourgeois democracy (not feudalism) in domestic politics; in foreign relations they are not subjected to the oppression of other nations; on the contrary, they themselves oppress other nations. Because of these features, the task of Communist Parties in capitalist

countries is to educate the workers, to grow strong through a long period of legal struggle, and thus to prepare for the final overthrow of capitalism. In these countries the question is one of long legal struggle, using parliament as a platform, economic and political strikes, organising trade unions and educating the workers. There the form of organization is legal, and the form of struggle is bloodless (not military).... But this uprising and war must not be launched until the bourgeoisie has become truly helpless, until the majority of the proletariat is determined to take up arms and fight, and until the rural masses begin to help the proletariat wholeheartedly. And when the time comes to launch such an uprising and war, the first step will be to seize the cities and then advance to the rural areas; not the reverse. All this has been done by the Communist Parties in capitalist countries and has been confirmed by the October Revolution in Russia.

But China is different. China's characteristics are that it is not independent and democratic, but semi-colonial and semi-feudal; that internally it has no democracy and is under feudal oppression; and that in its external relations it has no national independence and is oppressed by imperialism. Therefore, we have no parliament of which we can make use and no legal right to organize the workers to strike. Basically, the task of the Communist Party here is not to pass through a long period of legal struggle before launching uprising and war and to seize the big cities first and then occupy the countryside, but the reverse." (Mao Zedong, Problems of War and Strategy, 6 November 1938, English edition, https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-2/mswv2_12.htm#bm1)

While MKP declares the strategy of people's war valid for all countries of the world with the prefix "socialist", socialist revolution and people's uprising in imperialist countries, and democratic people's revolution and armed people's uprising/people's war in countries dependent on imperialism,

are pushed aside and covered over. In this way, both the real content of people's war is concealed, it is reduced to a single category of revolutionary strategy on a world scale, and the revolutions corresponding to the MLM criterion are camouflaged. People's War, which is the revolutionary strategy in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries, is seen as possible in all countries, thereby making the conception of revolution identical with subjectivism. In this way, MLM's maximum and minimum revolutionary perspectives are passed over.

Socialist revolution corresponds to the maximum programme. People's War, however, corresponds to the minimum programme of the democratic people's revolution. But MKP's understanding combines the maximum revolution and the minimum revolution along the same course. This is to make "two into one", and it is contradictory within itself.

The rejection of democratic revolution and the presentation of People's War as valid worldwide in capitalist-imperialist countries are the product of a subjective viewpoint. Making People's War intertwined with Socialist Revolution is also the product of the same line. Yet just as the strategy of Socialist Revolution and Mass Uprising has proven itself through victorious revolutions and has taken its place within the theory of scientific socialism, the strategy of People's War has also taken its place within the theory of scientific socialism as the military strategy of the Democratic People's Revolutions carried out in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries.

As can be seen, there are serious differences of understanding between MKP and TKP-ML that correspond to programme and strategic line. One of these concerns the road of the revolution. While TKP-ML conceptualises the road of the revolution in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan, in a social formation where comprador capitalism dependent on imperialism is dominant, as the Armed People's Uprising, MKP defends the road of the revolution as "Socialist People's War". The thesis of "Socialist People's War" derives its source from the mistaken view that

Mao Zedong's People's War Strategy, valid in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries and whose correctness has been proven in practice, is also valid in capitalist countries. This thesis rejects Mao Zedong's views on what road revolution should follow in capitalist countries. The thesis of "Socialist People's War" is one of the important differences between us and MKP.

c) The Dictatorship of the Proletariat

Another question on which we differ from MKP concerns the dictatorship of the proletariat. Indeed, at the 3rd Congress of the line represented by MKP, a line was defended that rejects the dictatorship of the proletariat under socialism: "It is clear that the dictatorship of the proletariat can never be treated as party dictatorship. Unfortunately, there have been, both yesterday and today, defenders of party dictatorship. This must definitely be rejected. We think that, instead of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the definition of the new state of the proletariat and the labouring people would be a more solid and correct concept, in the sense that it contains a sharper break with every kind of bourgeois conception of dictatorship. This can also be called the democracy of the proletariat and the labouring people." (MKP 3rd Congress Documents, pp. 119-120, 2013, emphasis added)

In our view, this thesis is one of the most fundamental points of separation. For from the standpoint of MLM, "whether or not one defends the thesis of the dictatorship of the proletariat" is defined as one of the criteria of whether or not one is a Marxist. The fact that MKP opens to discussion this thesis on the dictatorship of the proletariat - one of the concepts most attacked by bourgeois ideologists - requires explanation. A discussion of this concept, whatever the justification, naturally contains question marks within itself.

While Lenin unconditionally defended the dictatorship of the proletariat practised in the Soviet Union, he referred to Marx's presentation of the question and emphasized that Marx had

already grasped its essence in 1852. In Lenin's quotation, Marx explains that he had not discovered the existence of classes or class struggle; bourgeois historians and economists had already described these. What was new in his contribution was to show that classes are bound to definite historical phases of production, that class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that this dictatorship is only the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society. (Lenin, *Selected Works*, vol. 7, pp. 43-44, emphasis added)

Marx later remained a resolute defender of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Against all trends and doctrines that distorted socialism and rejected communism, he continually upheld scientific socialism and communism. In *The Civil War in France*, written in 1871 and presented to the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, Marx described the Paris Commune as a concrete and practical example of the "dictatorship of the proletariat". Marx and Engels also criticized the Gotha Programme Draft of 1875, which rejected revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In *Critique of the Gotha Programme* Marx unconditionally defended the rejected dictatorship of the proletariat and spoke of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat: "Between capitalist and communist society 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, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, p. 37)

Engels, confirming Marx, made the concept concrete in this way: "Well then, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the dictatorship of the proletariat." (*The Civil War in France*, Introduction by Engels, 1891, Yordam Publications, first edition, October 2016, p. 27)

According to Lenin, with this analysis Marx and Engels once again separated themselves in essence from the bourgeoisie. With this doctrine, Marx was fundamentally and essentially different from bourgeois historians. He did not treat the question of the state apart from class struggle; he extended the limits of its existence to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Moreover, according to Lenin, the definition of a Marxist is bound up with the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat: “Only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is what constitutes the most profound distinction between the Marxist and the ordinary petty bourgeois, and also the big bourgeois. This must be the touchstone on which the real understanding and recognition of Marxism is to be tested.” (Lenin, *ibid.*, p. 44, emphasis added)

This doctrine, repeatedly and insistently emphasized by Lenin, is a criterion of being MLM. In Lenin’s view, “he who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a Marxist.” In other words, the criterion of being a Marxist - today, of being MLM - passes through recognising the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the “touchstone of being a Marxist”.

The reason we insistently emphasise these views of Lenin here is that he identifies the dictatorship of the proletariat with being communist. It is put forward as a precondition of being communist. Views of “socialism”, “class struggle” and “revolution” detached from the dictatorship of the proletariat fall into bourgeois categories outside the communist ranks. Especially today, when the destruction and distortion of socialism have become so widespread, defending the dictatorship of the proletariat gains even greater importance and forms the touchstone of being MLM.

Although the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people’s democratic dictatorship take different forms according to the

specific features of the countries in which revolution has taken place, in essence they have been treated along the same line. The question is the necessity of dictatorship under proletarian leadership after the revolution. There is no room for any ambiguity on this question.

It is clear that on this extremely important and decisive question, MKP's views and TKP-ML's views are essentially different. This difference is a turning point at which the two structures separate ideologically. The touchstone of being MLM passes through defending the dictatorship of the proletariat and struggling along that line. Yet the line represented by MKP rejects this doctrine, which constitutes and must constitute the basis of a communist party's maximum programme, and therefore stands on a very different route from TKP-ML.

With the following views, MKP openly rejects the dictatorship of the proletariat: "The state of the proletariat and the labouring people is an instrument for continuing the revolution toward statelessness. In order to be suitable for such an aim, the state must be administered by the masses united with communist leadership, and they must themselves be the continuers of the revolution. The state is necessary to the proletariat and labouring people for this." (MKP 3rd Congress Documents, 2013, p. 107, emphasis added)

Again, on this question, the views of the 3rd Congress of the line represented by MKP are as follows: "It is clear that the dictatorship of the proletariat can never be treated as party dictatorship. Unfortunately, there have been, both yesterday and today, defenders of party dictatorship. This must definitely be rejected. We think that, instead of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the definition of the new state of the proletariat and the labouring people would be a more solid and correct concept, in the sense that it contains a sharper break with every kind of bourgeois conception of dictatorship. This can also be called the democracy of the proletariat and the labouring people." (MKP 3rd Congress Documents, 2013, pp. 119-120, emphasis added)

With this understanding, MKP defends a supra-class conception of the state that rejects the existence of classes under socialism. MKP avoids uttering and defending the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat that we have explained above on the basis of the communist masters from Marx to Lenin. Moreover, it does this under the mask of criticising “party dictatorship” and in the name of a sharp break with the bourgeois conception of dictatorship.

Under the name of criticising “party dictatorship”, MKP replaces the dictatorship of the proletariat with the concept of “the new state of the proletariat and the labouring people”. In doing so it rejects the fact that the historical origin of the state is rooted in the emergence of classes and class struggle. This approach lacks the understanding that the state is the product of classes and class struggle, that it is an apparatus of pressure of the ruling class over the exploited, oppressed and dominated class, and that it is the dictatorship exercised by the ruling class over the oppressed and exploited class. Just as this dictatorship has existed in all class societies until today, so too in the future people’s democratic dictatorship and under socialism there will be dictatorship under proletarian leadership. This is not a matter of will; it is the law of historical materialism. It is objective reality itself. It is the product of class contradictions.

Is the criticism and rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat not the rejection and denial of Marx’s teaching that “class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat”? Does this approach not contradict Lenin’s criterion, quoted above, that “only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat”? Or did the Chinese Revolution, and especially the practice of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, not show that the dictatorship of the proletariat is an indispensable condition?

The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which MKP tries to cast into doubt, began to be used by the first

theoreticians of MLM science and was then developed and applied in theory and practice by the other masters. By opening the concept of the “dictatorship of the proletariat” to discussion, the line represented by MKP proves that it has a very serious problem of understanding. In fact, when the masters raised and defended the dictatorship of the proletariat, they already gave the necessary answer to the rejection of that dictatorship. In our view, these defences remain current, especially as a criterion of being communist. The precondition for establishing and advancing socialism is to insistently and resolutely defend and apply the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Despite these clear facts, because the line represented by MKP discusses the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat for one reason or another, it is necessary to dwell on the necessity of this concept and why it is obligatory.

As is known, the dictatorship of the proletariat is a dictatorship specific to socialism. It is a dictatorship based on the class interests of the proletariat, the working class in power, and applied against the bourgeoisie and reactionary strata, against their worn-out, decayed ideological doctrines and their social and political centres. Its aim is to carry society toward the advanced route of socialism and communism through the dictatorship of the proletariat exercised against all the reaction of the past. In other words, it is the pursuit of a consistent and stable line in order to carry through the transition from class society to classless society. This is possible only by relying on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Indeed, in our epoch too, the struggle that marks the age is the struggle between the oppressed and exploited classes under the leadership of the proletariat, on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie and the oppressor classes and groups under its leadership, on the other. This struggle has, when the occasion arose, risen to sharper dimensions and brought powers into being through revolutions under proletarian leadership. In our epoch these revolutions have occurred as democratic people’s

revolutions and socialist revolutions. Of course, there is a qualitative difference between democratic people's revolutions and socialist revolutions. The content of the democratic revolution has a bourgeois character. But in our epoch this revolution is a revolution under the leadership of the proletariat, involving all sections of the people. It is not a revolution led by the bourgeoisie of the period of free competition. For in our epoch the bourgeoisie has assumed a reactionary structure and constitutes an obstacle to the democratic revolution. For this reason, the proletariat has assumed the leadership of the democratic revolution. In Mao Zedong's words, by carrying out the democratic revolution the preconditions of socialism are created: "Thus the new-democratic revolution clears the way for capitalism on the one hand and creates the prerequisites for socialism on the other." (Mao Zedong, *On New Democracy*, p. 55)

Before the Chinese Revolution, the democratic revolution came onto the agenda in Russia. The democratic revolution that was defeated in 1905 overthrew Tsarism with the February Revolution of 1917, weakened the feudal structure in the state machine, and accelerated the dissolution of feudal production. But together with this revolution, an uninterrupted struggle was waged against the bourgeois groups that constituted an obstacle to socialism. Under the leadership of the RSDLP, Soviets composed of workers, soldiers and peasants came into being. The counter-revolution was defeated and the socialist revolution of 17 October was realized.

With the socialist revolution, the transition was made to the dictatorship of the proletariat. The class in power was now the proletariat. In Russian conditions the dictatorship of the proletariat was a dictatorship that also included the poor sections of the peasantry. With socialism, the proletarianization of the peasantry accelerated. Indeed, in Russia the peasantry gradually turned into a proletarian class and the dictatorship of the proletariat was placed on a firmer basis.

However, the transition from capitalism to socialism does not mean that everything has ended. Nor does it mean that everything is rosy. The revolution is made, the bourgeoisie is overthrown, and its place is taken by the people's democratic dictatorship or the dictatorship of the proletariat. Of course, historically this is a new system and a new state, an alternative to the old system. The aim is to carry socialism further and build it on a firmer basis. The road to this passes through laying the solid foundations of socialism and establishing a consistent dictatorship of the proletariat.

Socialism contains a historical period that covers the transition from capitalism to communism. This is the period in which the old system and state are overthrown by revolution and a new system and power take their place. Historically, an important step is taken. But under socialism, which emerges from the womb of capitalism, class struggle and class contradictions do not disappear. The remnants of the old classes do not immediately vanish. They continue to exist and leave their traces within socialism for a long time. The exploiting class has been overthrown and its oppression and domination have been ended. The proletariat has come to power. The ownership of the capitalists over the means of production has been transformed into socialist property.

This, of course, is the distinguishing feature that marks the characteristic structure of socialism. But bourgeois right, with the inequalities that arise in distribution and allocation, does not disappear altogether under socialism. The inequality within socialist equality is the reflection, to one degree or another, of bourgeois right from the womb of the old society into the new society. It is the remnant of the old that reappears within the new. As a result, the contradictions between ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, between town and countryside, between mental and manual labour, between workers and peasants; the existence of markets, the existence of money, the division of labour in production, and the ideological

structure of the old system over society, do not disappear immediately. The remnants of capitalism continue for a time within socialism in one form or another. The ideological remains, customs, traditions and all traces of the old system upon society are not immediately erased.

In short, the conditions of classes and class struggle continue to exist, under changed conditions, within socialism, the first stage of communism that arises as an alternative to capitalism. For this reason the dictatorship of the proletariat is inevitable under socialism, until socialism withers away and gives way to communism. Indeed, all the masters of MLM defended the dictatorship of the proletariat for this reason.

There are also international reasons for the socialist state and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The socialist system is also the target of the imperialists. Internally and externally, the socialist system continuously faces the situation of being a target of international finance capital. For this reason it must be vigilant and prepared against imperialists and all counter-revolutionary extensions. The possibility that they may infiltrate from within, not only attack from outside, and strike the socialist state from within, commands vigilance and caution. This is another reason for the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Indeed, Lenin defended the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat under socialist conditions and argued that classes and class struggle would not disappear but would continue unconditionally. He repeatedly warned on this question: "The transition from capitalism to communism takes an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has ended, the exploiters inevitably cherish hopes of restoration, and these hopes turn into attempts at restoration.... The abolition of classes requires a long, difficult and stubborn class struggle; after the overthrow of the power of capital, after the destruction of the bourgeois state, after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, class struggle does not disappear, as the vulgar

representatives of old socialism and old social-democracy imagined, but only changes its forms and in many respects becomes even fiercer.” (Quoted from Lenin, *Polemic* 1963, p. 482, emphasis added)

On the other hand, as a product of the law of contradiction, the existence of classes under socialism is inevitable. This is so according to the law of dialectical materialism. Where proletarian democracy is applied and where the dictatorship of the proletariat is spoken of, not speaking of its opposite, the bourgeoisie, means not seeing the law of contradiction, the “unity and struggle of opposites”. Therefore, just as we speak of proletarian democracy as the opposite of bourgeois democracy, we must speak of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the opposite of bourgeois dictatorship. To deny the dictatorship of the proletariat means indirectly opening space for the bourgeoisie.

The aim of the class-conscious proletariat does not end with making the revolution and seizing political power. As Lenin emphasized above, after the revolution too, the proletariat is commanded to continue the struggle, to be vigilant against the bourgeoisie, and to preserve the power and system it has won. For this reason the dictatorship of the proletariat is a precondition for carrying socialism forward. Another condition here is the education of the proletariat, its being armed with scientific socialism, the gradual increase of its numbers in the party, and the increase of its numbers and influence in the levels of the state. In this way, it must increasingly leave its mark on the socialist system.

Comrade Lenin also took seriously the situation of the small producers. For Lenin, the situation of the small producers was a very serious reason for the existence of classes under socialism. They were small commodity producers. On the one hand they were labouring people; on the other, the land and instruments of production with which they produced were their own property. There was such a contradiction between proletarians separated

from the means of production and small commodity producers. Under capitalism, the relationship between workers and small commodity producers is different from what it is under socialism. There is a serious contradiction between the two classes. The problem is to educate the small commodity producers and transform them into the working class. For this reason, in the Soviet Union, the attitude taken toward capitalists and big landowners was not the same as the attitude taken toward small peasant producers.

Three years after the Soviet Revolution, Lenin explained this situation as follows: "To abolish classes means not only to drive out the landowners and capitalists - that we accomplished with comparative ease - it also means abolishing the small commodity producers, and they cannot be driven out, or crushed; we must live in harmony with them. They can and must be transformed and re-educated only by very prolonged, slow, cautious organisational work." (Lenin, vol. 10, p. 99)

As can be seen, the construction of socialism also includes the abolition of small commodity producers and their transformation into the proletarian class. The dictatorship of the proletariat does not include physical pressure upon small commodity producers or their crushing. It includes their transformation into the proletarian class and their education through socialism. Just as under capitalism the peasant class was transformed into the working class, under socialism too the peasant class is transformed into the working class. In the Soviet Union, agricultural institutions called sovkhozes and kolkhozes were created for the purpose of transforming the peasants.

In China, from 1957 onward, the Democratic People's Revolution and the People's Democratic Dictatorship were gradually replaced by the construction of socialism. Socialist revolution was implemented more easily in the economic base. The transformation of capitalist property and the individual property of small producers was relatively completed. However, in the construction of socialism the main problem appeared in

the ideological transformation of the superstructure and of human beings. The problem of transforming the new state and society and adapting them to the socialist system came to the fore. Mao set essentially these two aims before socialist transformation: “The remoulding of man, however, will take quite a long time, although some progress has been made. Socialist transformation has a twofold task: first, the transformation of the system, and second, the transformation of man. The system includes not only ownership but also the superstructure, mainly the state apparatus and ideology.” (Mao, *Selected Works*, vol. 5, p. 501)

Indeed, in China an increasingly sharp struggle was waged in the superstructure, in the state apparatus and, most importantly, within the Communist Party, which played the leading role in the construction of socialism. While transformation in the economic base of socialism was relatively faster and easier, bourgeois ideology increasingly came to the fore in state institutions, universities, and social and cultural institutions. Bourgeois ideology also became increasingly effective within the CCP. Revisionists such as Liu Shao-chi, Chou Yang and Deng Xiaoping became influential inside the party. In the highest ranks of the party they tried to make bourgeois ideology and revisionism effective. They tried to camouflage themselves under the chatter and guise of “Marxism-Leninism” and conceal their bourgeois face. According to Mao, these were “sugar-coated bullets”. (Mao Zedong, Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, 5 March 1949, Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, English edition)

However, the two-line struggle within the party between Mao and his comrades on one side and the revisionists on the other rose to increasingly extreme dimensions. Thus the struggle inside the party quickly reflected itself outside the party as well. The capitalist-roaders wearing a “socialist” mask openly tried to spread bourgeois ideology in state institutions and socialist

institutions, and to seize the party and power. They attacked socialism in art, literature and culture. They tried to bring bourgeois ideology to the fore in education and the arts, such as schools, theatre and opera. They tried to influence society with archaic views such as China's overthrown monarchy, Confucian philosophy, old history, old traditions and the old cultural structure. They carried out propaganda defending and encouraging capitalism and private property. In short, instead of arming the Chinese people with socialist ideology, politics, consciousness, culture and education, they tried to make effective the reactionary ideological structure, institutions, culture, value judgements and idealism of the past.

As a result, the revisionists inside the party carried the two-line struggle outside the party. In this way an ideological and power struggle was waged in China between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Of course, the proletariat under the leadership of Mao and his comrades could not remain indifferent to the counter-revolutionary attempt of the bourgeoisie. As a result, the mass-based Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) was waged against the revisionist bourgeoisie. The GPCR under Mao's leadership was a new revolution launched in 1966 after the 1949 Revolution. Those leading the counter-revolution emerged directly from within the CCP. Indeed, when Mao told the masses to "Bombard the Headquarters", he was referring to the capitalist-roaders. (Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, vol. 9, 5 August 1966, English edition)

The GPCR in China was the further consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie that had been pushed back. This does not mean that the same process will occur in every country where revolution is made, in the same dimensions. But the question of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is beyond dispute. Indeed, it is necessary to take account of and learn from the theoretical and practical experiences of the GPCR, which was the practical experience of the theory of "revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat" and

a “new kind of revolution” under socialist conditions, under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As this historical experience also proves, class struggle under socialism will continue to exist with its ebbs and flows, right up to communism. The fulfilment of this task is possible, in Mao’s words, through a solid dictatorship of the proletariat: “Let us unite around one aim: to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat. You must apply this in every factory, village, office and school.” (Mao, *Selected Works*, vol. 6, p. 403)

In conclusion, the question of the “dictatorship of the proletariat” has been treated by MLMs with an extremely convincing understanding. To open this concept to discussion - for whatever reason - is a problematic approach. This is especially important in a period when attacks on the “dictatorship of the proletariat” continue. Anti-MLM currents, especially Trotskyists, which separate and counterpose the concepts of proletariat and party under socialism and make anti-propaganda against them, expanded their influence internationally after Mao. With modern revisionism’s betrayal of the revolution, bourgeois ideologists and anti-MLM currents tried to hollow out scientific socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the eyes of the masses; in this sense Stalin and Mao, masters of scientific socialism, were made targets. This anti-propaganda, supported by imperialist-capitalist centres, brought many circles to the point of making concessions from the principle of the “dictatorship of the proletariat” - and the issue is not merely conceptual.

It appears that MKP has also been influenced by this wind. Separating the concepts of party and proletariat from each other means denying that the party is the most advanced position of the proletariat. Another side of this is the denial that the class struggle carried on under socialism and the advancement of Cultural Revolutions are conducted under the leadership of the Communist Party. In the socialist system, the bourgeoisie emerges precisely from within the party and secures the reversal

of the revolution and the restoration of the bourgeoisie. In other words, the loss suffered by the socialist road in the party means the loss of the proletarian revolution.

Failure to see this tight dialectical bond between party and proletariat has taken MKP as far as counterposing these two concepts/facts to one another. This means the denial of Leninist party principles, Maoist cultural revolutions and two-line struggle. On this extremely important and decisive question, MKP has also shown how much it has been influenced by anti-MLM currents. At the same time, it has become an instrument of counter-revolutionary aggression against MLM. It has defended “sugar-coated bullets” within the revolutionary ranks. This logic, which does not look at the socialist system as the dictatorship and, of course, democracy of the proletariat, and which does not grasp in whose class interest the state mechanism created under socialism exists, has dragged MKP toward the thesis of the “state of the whole people” developed by modern revisionists. This view too must be defined as one of the important distinctions between MKP and TKP-ML.

d) The Thesis of the “State of the Whole People”

The MLM understanding of the state, in its simplest expression, is that the state is the apparatus of pressure of the ruling class over the oppressed and exploited class. It is the dictatorship of the class in power over the oppressed and exploited class. The reason for the existence and historical origin of the state rests on the emergence of classes and class struggle. From the time it appeared until today, the state has continued to exist in all class societies. It will continue to exist in the future too, until the classes that constitute the reason for its existence disappear. When classes disappear, the state will wither away and disappear.

From the standpoint of MLM, the definition of the “state” is clear. Engels explains that the state is a product of society at a

definite stage of development; it arises because society has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction with itself, has split into irreconcilable antagonisms, and is powerless to remove them. In order that these antagonistic classes, with conflicting economic interests, do not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, a power seemingly standing above society becomes necessary; this power, arising from society but placing itself above it and increasingly alienating itself from it, is the state. (Engels, Werke, vol. 21, Dietz Verlag, 1975, p. 165) Again, in Lenin's words: "The state is a product and manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms... The state is an organ of class rule, an organ for the oppression of one class by another; it is the creation of 'order' which legalises and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the conflict between classes." (V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Yordam, 2016, pp. 15-20)

Such, in summary, is the MLM understanding of the state. However, MKP's "understanding of the state under socialism" constitutes another question on which we diverge and stand on different lines.

The point we have tried briefly to emphasise above, proceeding from the masters, is clear. MLMs put forward the existence of classes, class contradictions, and the element of pressure and dictatorship over classes at the root of the state in every society. Therefore, the state that exists under socialism is also the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie.

Yet MKP introduces, instead of the dictatorship of the proletariat under socialism, the definition of "the new state of the proletariat and the labouring people": "We think that, instead of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the definition of the new state of the proletariat and the labouring people would be a more solid and correct concept, in the sense that it contains a sharper break with every kind of bourgeois conception of dictatorship. This can also be called the democracy of the

proletariat and the labouring people.” (MKP 3rd Congress Documents, pp. 119-120, 2013, emphasis added)

In the previous section, drawing on the views of Lenin and Mao in the Russian and Chinese revolutions, we touched on the dictatorship of the proletariat. After the revolution, the state is the necessary dictatorship of the proletariat in power against the bourgeoisie and against attempts at capitalist restoration. However, revisionism has tried at every opportunity to distort and reject the dictatorship of the proletariat by means of definitions and concepts such as “party dictatorship” and “dictatorship of the people”, and has denied it through theses that reflect the bourgeoisie. With an extremely conscious class attitude, it has been treated apart from its “class content”. The essence of scientific socialism has been rejected. The phenomenon of the state has been put forward from a supra-class point of view. Of course, these theses have been condemned.

In practice, this line’s counterpart is Khrushchev’s doctrine of the “state of the whole people”. Marxism has shown that the state will wither away only with the abolition of classes. To claim, under socialism, that the state can become a classless “state of the whole people” while class struggle still exists is to reject the dictatorship of the proletariat and to open the door to the struggle of the new bourgeoisie against it.

This attack on socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the past was exposed, defined and condemned by MLMs. In the polemic against modern revisionism it was stated that the Khrushchev revisionist clique, at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, not only systematised the counter-revolutionary theories of “peaceful coexistence”, “peaceful competition” and “peaceful transition”, but also declared that there was no longer any need for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and put forward the absurd theories of the “state of the whole people” and the “party of the whole people”. Thus revisionism became fully systematised.

The programme put forward by the Khrushchev revisionist clique at the 22nd Congress was a fake communist programme; it was a revisionist programme against the proletarian revolution and for the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the communist party. Under the screen of the “state of the whole people”, the Khrushchev clique abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat; under the screen of the “party of the whole people”, it changed the proletarian character of the CPSU; and under the screen of the “all-round construction of communism”, it opened the way for the restoration of capitalism. (Polemic 1963, p. 477, emphasis added)

The quotation above clearly shows what kind of doctrine modern revisionism is. In place of the dictatorship of the working class, the dictatorship of the revisionist bourgeoisie was established. More plainly, at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU the “new bourgeoisie” seized the state and power changed hands. Of course, the “new bourgeois” who seized power did so by putting forward a revisionist programme. As a result, the Khrushchev revisionist clique rejected the dictatorship of the proletariat under the cover of the “state of the whole people” and proclaimed the dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie. They did this through false formulations claiming that “classes had disappeared” in the Soviet Union, that “classless society had been entered”, that “the dictatorship of the proletariat had ended”, and that the existing state had given way to the supra-class “state of the whole people”. The new bureaucrat bourgeoisie was brought to power through a fabricated, fake “communist” programme. The “state of the whole people” was built on the ideological-political propaganda of the bureaucrat bourgeoisie that came to power under the cover of socialism.

Using the authority of the CPSU, they also pulled the socialist states in Eastern Europe onto their own track. Internationally, they took their place on the social-imperialist track. In short, they led the counter-revolution both at home and abroad.

The CCP took a stand against the counter-revolutionary route on which they advanced under the cloak and mask of the “state of the whole people” and the “party of the whole people”. It argued that after Khrushchev usurped the leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet state, the situation of class struggle in the Soviet Union changed fundamentally. Khrushchev introduced a series of political revisionist practices serving the interests of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union and rapidly developing capitalist forces.

Under the screen of “combating the cult of the individual”, Khrushchev slandered the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system and in reality paved the way for capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union. By totally denying Stalin, he essentially denied the Marxism-Leninism to which Stalin had remained faithful and opened the floodgates to revisionism.

Khrushchev replaced the socialist principle “from each according to his ability, to each according to his work” with “material incentive”. He did not reduce, but on the contrary widened, the gap between a small minority and the income of workers, peasants and ordinary intellectuals. By protecting corrupt elements in high positions, encouraging them to abuse their authority more recklessly and to appropriate the fruits of the labour of the Soviet people, he further accelerated class differentiation in Soviet society. Khrushchev sabotaged the socialist planned economy, applied the capitalist principle of profit, developed capitalist free competition and undermined the socialist ownership of the whole people. (Polemic, p. 495)

With the long quotation above, we have tried to indicate how, after seizing power, the rapid return to capitalism was put into effect. We have tried to touch on how the modern revisionists slandered the socialist past and tried to make capitalist production dominant. Indeed, in place of socialist relations of production came relations of exploitation based on surplus value. “Material incentive” was brought to the fore. The differentiation and class contradictions between workers,

peasants and intellectual labourers on the one hand and the sections fattened in the upper levels of the state apparatus on the other grew increasingly. The bureaucrat bourgeoisie rapidly seized power. The subsequent process and the dissolution of the USSR are known.

Those who stand in the ranks of TKP-ML are in fact not strangers to these developments. TKP-ML was founded immediately after the period in which these developments took place in the USSR. TKP-ML under the leadership of Comrade Ibrahim was founded in conditions in which the ideological struggle between the CCP under Mao's leadership and modern revisionism, and the international reverberations of the GPCR, marked the international political atmosphere.

The foundations of the vanguard detachment of Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan were laid in an atmosphere of taking a stand against modern revisionism, which had appeared on the market with shabby theories and slogans such as the "state of the whole people", the "party of the whole people" and "peaceful transition". Today too it continues to maintain its place in the ranks that took a stand against modern revisionism in the past.

By contrast, the face of modern revisionism has been thoroughly exposed. At a turning point when exploitation, oppression and all kinds of attacks are escalating, and contradictions between oppressors and oppressed are sharpening, communist movements must hold more firmly to the principles of MLM. Therefore, they must defend socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat more resolutely.

As we close this question, let us add the following. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat contains democracy for the working class within itself. Everything exists together with its opposite. Just as there can be no supra-class democracy, there can be no supra-class dictatorship. Let us look first at Lenin and then at the CCP under Mao's leadership. To Kautsky's criticism of the dictatorship of the proletariat and his defence of supra-class "pure democracy", Lenin replied that Soviet power, as one

of the forms of proletarian democracy, brought about an unprecedented development and expansion of democracy precisely for the overwhelming majority of the population, for the exploited and labouring people. Proletarian democracy is millions of times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy; Soviet power is millions of times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic. (Lenin, vol. 7, pp. 147, 149)

Let us also look at the CCP on this question: “Dictatorship over the exploiting classes and democracy among the working people - these are the two aspects of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only under the dictatorship of the proletariat can democracy for the working masses be developed and expanded to an unprecedented degree. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat there can be no real democracy for the working people. Where there is bourgeois democracy there is no proletarian democracy, and where there is proletarian democracy there is no bourgeois democracy. One excludes the other, and it cannot be otherwise.” (Polemic, p. 505)

To defend the thesis of “the new state of the proletariat and the labouring people instead of the dictatorship of the proletariat” in reality contains the rejection of democracy for the labouring people. For the precondition of democracy for the people is the application of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat there can be no democracy for the proletariat and the labouring people. The dictatorship of the proletariat exercised over the bourgeoisie is democracy for the proletariat and the labouring people. Democracy applied for the proletariat is dictatorship for the bourgeoisie. Therefore, the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, which contains democracy for the proletariat, must be openly defended without hesitation or reservation.

e) The Thesis of “Multi-Party Socialism”

A significant part of the differences between the line represented by MKP and TKP-ML arises over questions that form the foundation of scientific socialism, such as socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. We have explained how the line represented by MKP diverges from TKP-ML, how it stands on a different route, and how deep the lines between them are. Together with the minimum programme, these differences, which encompass a much longer historical process and the maximum programme, show how the line represented by MKP and TKP-ML stand on separate ideological tracks. As we have stated above under various headings, this must be seen. For this reason, we have opened to discussion the fundamental questions that exist between the line represented by MKP and the line of TKP-ML and that, in our view, correspond ideologically to different lines.

Indeed, another serious wrong understanding of the line represented by MKP concerning socialism is its defence of “multi-party socialism”. The line represented by MKP argues that parties other than the communist party should also exist and organize freely under socialism. Its views on the question are as follows: “The question of multi-partyism under socialism: The understanding of multi-partyism is an objective reality under democratic people’s power and socialism. In these transitional societies, how can you imagine and conceive of people as thinking in one single way? Moreover, a uniform, monolithic and indivisible integration is never possible. This is what our communist ideology explains. Those who monopolise society despite the facts cannot go beyond being a mechanism over the people. They turn into an instrument for producing another type of the state they claim to be candidates to destroy, and they did so.” (MKP 3rd Congress Documents, p. 115, emphasis added)

It then claims that the understanding of single-party socialism has harmed socialism: “Likewise, single-party socialist state conceptions have caused great harm to humanity, the proletariat and the labouring people. (...) Just as multi-partyism is treated

as a method for the participation of the popular masses in the revolution on the basis of the united front of the people, so too in power the alliance of the proletariat and the labouring people is necessary. And it includes the joint exercise of power.” (ibid., p. 116, emphasis added)

This question is one of MKP’s problematic theses concerning socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The passage from democratic people’s power to socialism is defined as a “transitional society” and multi-partyism is seen as an “objective reality”. The fact that classes, class struggle and different views continue under socialism is not disputed. But the answer to this is not multi-party socialism. The continuation of class struggle under socialism requires the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leadership of the Communist Party.

MKP’s thesis treats different class interests and political tendencies under socialism as if they must necessarily be organized in separate parties and share power. This is to blur the class character of the state. The issue is not whether people think differently. Of course they do. The issue is which class holds power and through which political organization that class exercises its leadership. Under socialism, the proletariat must exercise power through its vanguard party and through the organs of proletarian democracy.

The experience of socialism does not show that multi-partyism is a necessary form of proletarian power. On the contrary, the historical experience of the Soviet Union and China shows that the question of political power under socialism is inseparable from the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leading role of the Communist Party. When this leadership is weakened or denied, the bourgeoisie finds the opportunity to organize politically and ideologically, often from within the party and the state apparatus themselves.

MKP tries to present the question as if those who reject multi-party socialism wish to impose a monolithic society in which everyone thinks the same. This is not the question. The

dictatorship of the proletariat does not mean the abolition of all contradictions, debates and differences among the people. It means the organized rule of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie and the defence of socialism against restoration. Contradictions among the people are handled through proletarian democracy, criticism and self-criticism, mass participation, and the political leadership of the Communist Party.

The argument that “single-party socialist state conceptions harmed humanity, the proletariat and the labouring people” is in substance an argument taken from the ideological arsenal of anti-communism and modern revisionism. It puts the blame for the problems of socialist construction not on revisionism, capitalist-roaders and the pressure of imperialism, but on the principle of the leadership of the Communist Party itself. In this respect it weakens the defence of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the democratic revolution, the united front may include different classes and strata under the leadership of the proletariat. In certain conditions, this may also be expressed through different political organizations participating in a united front. But the existence of allies in the democratic revolution cannot be mechanically transferred to socialism as a permanent system of multi-party power-sharing. The democratic revolution and socialist revolution are different stages, with different class contents and different tasks.

The line represented by MKP confuses the united front under proletarian leadership with the question of state power under socialism. It moves from the necessity of alliance with other classes in the democratic revolution to the conclusion that socialism must be multi-party. This is an eclectic approach. The united front does not abolish the leading role of the proletariat; on the contrary, it presupposes it. Under socialism, the issue is no longer the joint power of all classes that had participated in the democratic stage, but the consolidation of the dictatorship of

the proletariat and the transformation of society toward communism.

The October Revolution and the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union were not based on the principle of multi-party socialism. The Bolsheviks led the working class and poor peasants, defeated the bourgeoisie and counter-revolution, and established Soviet power. Various temporary and tactical relations with other forces occurred under specific conditions, but these cannot be converted into a general thesis of multi-party socialism.

Nor can the experience of the Chinese Revolution be used in this way. The Chinese Revolution passed through a democratic stage under the leadership of the proletariat, in which a united front was necessary. But this does not prove that socialism requires multi-party rule. The transition to socialism and the subsequent struggles in China, especially the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, show that class struggle continued under socialism and that capitalist-roaders could arise inside the Communist Party itself. The lesson is not multi-party socialism but the necessity of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In defending the thesis of multi-party socialism, MKP refers to the existence of other forces after October and to alliances in the Chinese Revolution. But these examples are taken out of their concrete historical context. The Bolsheviks did not share power with counter-revolution as a principle of socialist construction. Temporary tactical arrangements made under the pressure of civil war and imperialist intervention cannot be turned into a model of multi-party socialism.

The working class was the leading class in the October Revolution and in the construction of socialism. The ideological-political doctrine that commanded both the October Revolution and socialist construction was that of the working class. Of course, in their history of struggle and during the period of power, the Bolsheviks formed relations and certain

blocs with intermediate classes when necessary. During the October Revolution, the Bolsheviks also formed a bloc with the Socialist-Revolutionaries in 1918. This was a temporary bloc formed under conditions in which the imperialists were attacking. The Socialist-Revolutionaries, after the February Revolution of 1917, had stood in the camp of counter-revolution against the Bolsheviks together with the Cadets and Mensheviks. The bloc formed under the pressure of existing conditions was later broken by the Socialist-Revolutionaries. After the Entente imperialists led by Britain entered Russia in July 1918, the Socialist-Revolutionaries attacked the Bolsheviks.

Lenin explained this situation by saying that precisely during the October Revolution, by accepting the entire agrarian programme of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Bolsheviks formed an unofficial but very important and successful political bloc with the petty-bourgeois peasantry. They did this to prove to the peasants that they did not intend to outvote them but wished to come to an agreement with them. They also proposed a formal political bloc to the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, including participation in government. After the signing of the Brest peace, the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries broke this bloc and later, in July 1918, launched an armed uprising and then armed struggle against the Bolsheviks. (Lenin, vol. 10, pp. 129-130)

As can be seen, under conditions in which the internal and external forces of counter-revolution attacked after the October Revolution, this relative and tactical bloc formed by the Bolsheviks with the Socialist-Revolutionaries did not last long. Immediately afterwards, the Socialist-Revolutionaries launched an armed attack against the Bolsheviks. Comrade Lenin was wounded in an assassination attempt during this period, and so on.

All these historical facts are ignored by MKP. This relative and temporary agreement, made immediately after the October

Revolution in the period when the imperialist alliance headed by Germany was attacking, is used as a basis for the thesis of multi-party socialism: “Moreover, they seek support from the example of the Socialist-Revolutionaries after October. They say: ‘After the October Revolution, the Socialist-Revolutionaries were a component of the Soviets and held many ministries. In China too, the proletariat had a power partnership with other allies.’” (TKP-ML Special Issue, 2014, p. 116)

In order to have its thesis of “multi-partyism under socialism” accepted, MKP does not choose to make use of the practical experiences of socialism. Rather, in order to defend its erroneous thesis, it resorts to distorting historical facts. In defending its erroneous thesis, MKP gives examples and states that after socialism the proletariat shared power with the Socialist-Revolutionaries. In this way it tries to prove the conception of “multi-party socialism”. It is clear that this is not a correct method. Comrade Lenin explains the existing practical experience and the real facts. The Bolsheviks did not share power with counter-revolution. It was a bloc formed in the period when, after the October Revolution, all the imperialists attacked the Soviet Union.

MKP’s views on the Chinese Revolution, which it raises in order to defend its erroneous thesis, relate to the front formed between the CCP and the Guomindang under Sun Yat-sen in the period 1921-1924. This corresponds to a process different from the period of socialism. In fact, we have dealt with these theses and questions before and discussed them in more detail. The answers were given more extensively. However, under conditions in which MKP persistently conceptualises “Kaypakkayaist forces” and ignores and blurs the differences between us, it is necessary to point to these differences again and again. This too is one of the differences between us and MKP.

IV) Conclusion

At the beginning of our study we tried to respond to MKP's proposal for "unity". We clearly emphasized that the precondition in the question of unity is ideological and political unity. Indeed, we clearly demonstrated that the differences of view between us correspond to the maximum and minimum programmes and form the basis for separate organization in the ideological-political sphere.

We touched on the fact that the way to evaluate the unity proposal on a correct basis lies in the answer given to the question "why separation?" We emphasized that an organization that violated TKP-ML, its functioning, principles and statutes, and thereby placed itself outside the party, must see where it essentially made its mistake and must adopt a self-critical approach. In evaluating TKP-ML's historical process, we quoted decisions showing that TKP-ML turned not primarily to the "outside" but to itself, and that it identified its own fall into opportunism and pragmatism. We pointed out that in the processes of the 1987 DABK and the 1994 Coup, although TKP-ML made important mistakes, it essentially stood on an MLM line and upheld the party's functioning, principles and statutes.

In this study we stressed that the line represented by MKP wrongly grasps the fact that the two-line struggle conducted in the communist party and communist platforms is qualitatively different from the ideological struggle conducted against lines outside the party, and must be so. We touched on the fact that two-line struggle is a "special type of struggle" conducted in the communist party and communist platforms. We stated that MKP confuses ideological struggles inside and outside the party. We pointed out that the reason for this error lies in MKP's understanding of the communist party.

We emphasized the differences which, in our view, are extremely important between the line represented by MKP and the line of TKP-ML. We set out that the two separate organisational formations make different analyses of the economic and social structure and, correspondingly, defend different strategies of revolution and different roads of revolution. We also dealt, in detail above, with serious differences concerning the maximum programme. We emphasized that essentially different lines are defended regarding the People's Democratic Dictatorship and the conditions of socialism. We criticized the thesis of "Socialist People's War", which in our view is mistaken. We discussed whether the "unity" discussion of organisational formations with such different lines can be defined, as MKP proposes, as "the unity of structures coming from the same tradition" or "the unity of Maoists".

The precondition for organisational unity is ideological, political and programmatic unity. The unity of communists can be formed only in this way. Communists who claim to lead the revolution can form unity of will and action only with this understanding. Where this basic condition does not exist, is unity possible? Can such a unity be the "Steel Unity of Party Forces"?

We explained our view on why two separate organisational formations emerged. We especially emphasized that the unity of two different organisational formations defending different strategies of revolution and different roads of revolution corresponds to the understanding of "two combining into one". Against the proposal that "two combine into one", we emphasized "why one divided into two" and that, at the stage reached, this is a reality for parties that have two separate organisational formations. We dwelt on the fact that the real point that must be discussed is why "one divided into two" and that "those who played a historical role must play their historical role", and we stated that a real unity can be achieved

only by courageously condemning erroneous lines and practices.

While pointing out that the main obstacle before unity today is the differences between two separate organisational formations, and while discussing this, the reason why we are at present on different lines is that the 1987 DABK split was not condemned on an MLM basis and that the 1992 Unity ended in a coup. Why did the structures that today discuss unity separate? Why did different organizations emerge? Can there be a solid unity without putting on the table the destruction and damage caused by the coup and liquidation, and without carrying out serious criticism and self-criticism? It is clear that the answers to these questions can be given only by condemning, on an MLM basis, the coup, liquidationism, self-centredness and other problems committed in the past.

As can be seen, there are two obstacles before unity. The first is that different programmatic, ideological and political lines are occupied. The second is the 1994 Coup and the damage and destruction it caused. These questions must be taken seriously; there must be honesty, and the mechanism of criticism and self-criticism must be operated. If this is not done, it is clear that one cannot speak of a “unity”.

This is how we treat and evaluate the “unity” policy of the line represented by MKP. We wish to state clearly that, in rejecting MKP’s proposal for “unity”, the will of TKP-ML evaluated primarily its own reality and, secondarily, the reality of the line represented by MKP. We want to emphasise insistently that rejecting the unity proposal does not mean rejecting closer unity of action with the line represented by MKP. Indeed, it can and must be said that we think the road for the unity proposal to become evaluable passes through doing common work. Far from populist rhetoric, we state clearly that what is realistic in present conditions is to work together on a revolutionary basis in every area where we are present; this is essentially the task

required by the process. Can one speak of a “unity” where this is not done?

We are conscious that sincere and principled unity can be achieved only by drawing lessons from our mistakes and through self-criticism that is realistic and serves our practice, and that the road to this, passes essentially through grasping MLM. It is clear that because we have not sufficiently achieved this, we have had to experience these processes. Our discussion concerns ourselves: our inadequacies and our shortcomings in grasping MLM. It should be known that to the extent that we achieve this, we will not refrain from organising in our ranks the forces we see in the ranks of the people, beginning with those closest to us.

Link: <https://www.tkpml.com/mkps-call-for-unity-why-are-we-separate-or-what-is-our-difference/?swcfpc=1>