

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

MARCH - 1995

3



RED DAWN

INTERNATIONAL BULLETIN OF MARXIST-LENINIST COMMUNIST PARTY



CONTENTS

PREFACE	3
1. (WORKERS') CONFERENCE OF MLCP HELD	5
PEACE AND REVOLUTION	6
ENGELS IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM IN THE WORKERS' MOVEMENT	12
FIRST CONGRESS OF İDLB HELD	23
COMMEMORATING THE 1. CONFERENCE OF MLCP	23
BUCA MASSACRE	24
A GIGANTIC STRIKE WAVE	25
AN UNNATURAL DISASTER	26
ANTI FASCIST RESPONSE TO FASCIST HOWLS	26
KGÖ IN ACTION	27
HEROIC STRUGGLE OF ÜMRANIYE PRISONERS	28
"PICTURES OF SAVAGERY"	29
SAVAMA MURDERS IN TURKEY	28

Preface

Almost six months have passed since the publication of the second issue of Red Dawn. In the meantime, the struggle between revolution and counter-revolution has continued unabated both in the world in general and in Turkey in particular. The last six months have witnessed to the disruption of imperialist-sponsored "peace" or caesefire agreements in Ireland, Palestine and elsewhere, to the growth of discontent and struggles of working classes of several imperialist countries (France, Germany, Britain) who are beginning to react against the manoeuvres of ruling classes aimed at robbing them of their hard won gains, to the leftward movement of the masses in Russia and several Eastern European countries and to the multiplication of efforts at the unification of communist and anti-imperialist forces internationally.

In Turkey and Northern Kurdistan the last six months have witnessed to the growth of struggles of workers, youth, public employees and city poor. Bloodthirsty Turkish ruling classes have responded with counter-revolutionary terror to the unilateral ceasefire put into effect by Kurdish national liberation movement led by PKK ("Workers' Party of Kurdistan"). Early general elections held on 24 December 1995 have testified to further weakening of mainstream bourgeois parties and to the strengthening of religious fundamentalist bourgeois party ("Refah").

All these developments show that both in our country and on the world scene as a whole, contradictions between labor and capital, those between oppressed peoples and imperialists and those between various imperialist powers and monopoly groups, are not lessening as the apologists of capital would have us to believe, but are aggravating.

All communists, class-conscious workers and true revolutionaries are obliged to prepare themselves and the masses for revolution. They should do everything in their power to transform the rising anger of exploited and oppressed millions into a mighty storm that will smash the citadel of capital.

5 March 1996



There has not been a single important movement for emancipation in the history of mankind in which women have not closely participated, for every step taken by an oppressed class along the road towards emancipation brings with it an improvement in the position of women.

J. V. Stalin

1. (WORKERS') CONFERENCE OF MLCP HELD

MLCP convened a workers' conference in our country between 25 and 30 December 1995, under conditions of illegality. During the 60-hour conference a series of questions concerning working class struggle and trade union work were discussed and some resolutions adopted.

Central Committee of MLCP issued an announcement as regards the conference. In sum it said the following:

"During this conference, a range of questions, such as the historical and political mission of working class, history of the struggle and the present situation of working class in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan, the level of integration of working class movement and communist movement, our party's achievements and deficiencies in its work among workers and in labor unions were discussed.

The conference was characterized by proletarian discipline, the enchanting atmosphere of comradeship, belief in the future and the party and a determination to win. It ended with an overall assessment and passing of numerous resolutions. Being the first of its kind held by communist and revolutionary organizations, this conference was a testimony to the revolutionary will of class-conscious representatives of working class. Our 1. (Workers') Conference will constitute a turning point in our work among workers and will render a great service in destroying the ideological and political hegemony of bourgeoisie over proletariats

1. (Workers') Conference of MLCP also issued a call to advanced workers. In sum it said:

"Our party has convened a workers' conference in a period of disbelief in the vanguard role of working class and under conditions of all-out terror carried out by fascist dictatorship of capital.

1. (Workers') Conference of ML(' P, a directive of our Unity Congress (held in September 1994), is a testimony to the determination and will of our party with regard to combination of socialism with working class movement. The mere fact that 85% of the delegates to the conference were communist workers, was an irrefutable proof of the correct orientation of MLCP.

If all-producing proletariat does not rise and unite resolutely around its party, sufferings of exploited and oppressed masses will not come to an end.

Unfortunately, the working class of our country is still held in bondage to bourgeois ideology. The reign of trade union bureaucrats, who don't bother to defend any of the urgent demands of workers, remains unbroken. Almost three fourths of workers are outside of the unions. Capitalist state and civilian fascist bands have been more and more brazenly attacking strikes and resistance actions of workers.

1. (Workers') Conference of ML(' P calls on advanced workers in different factories to come together and produce a workers' will and initiative through joint platforms. It calls on them to organize meetings of workers' representatives on factory region and city levels, to constitute workers' assemblies in factory regions and cities and conduct discussions, where masses of workers will be present.

1. (Workers') Conference of MLCP calls on all advanced workers to join the ranks of the party.

1. (Workers') Conference of MLCP calls on advanced workers to heighten the struggle against trade union bureaucrats and at the same time defend unions against the onslaught of capital.

1. (Workers') Conference of MLCP calls on advanced workers to support the struggles of urban poor, of public employees, of student Youth, of toiling women and of Kurdish nation.

DOWN WITH IMPERIALISM!

DOWN WITH EXPLOITATIVE ORDER OF COLLABORATIONIST CAPITALISM!

DOWN WITH THE FASCIST DICTATORSHIP OF CAPITAL!

LONG LIVE FREEDOM! LONG LIVE SOCIALISM!

LONG LIVE MLCP!"

PEACE AND REVOLUTION*

In the age of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the question of war and peace has always been on the agenda of humanity. Apart from giving rise to innumerable so-called local wars, inciting and supporting all sorts of fascist and reactionary violence against workers, toilers and oppressed strata, waging wars of aggression against socialist and democratic countries and oppressed peoples, imperialist powers and monopoly groups have plunged humanity into two world wars which have resulted in the death of about 75 million people. Though coming to the brink of a nuclear war in 1962, humanity has not passed through the ordeals of a Third World War. But thanks to the savagery of imperialist powers and their local henchmen and to the developments in the destructive capacity of weapons, more than another 25 million people have died in various local and civil wars during the half a century following the end of Second World War. These wars have caused untold suffering for the great masses of workers and toilers and at times meant the destruction of whole countries and peoples, as has been the case in Afghanistan and Rwanda. All bourgeois states and especially imperialist powers have not been content with equipping themselves with a whole series of nuclear, biological, chemical and conventional weapons capable of destroying almost all human life on earth time and again. They have kept on increasing the size and destructive capacity of their arsenals and enhancing their armies, police and intelligence organizations and other repressive organs.

On the other hand, bourgeoisie in general and imperialists in particular have tried and continue to try to camouflage their aggressive and warmongering stance and activities mongering stance and activities about "peace", "disarmament", "limitation of strategic arms", "human rights", "democracy" etc. And despite their almost unbroken monopoly over all means, instruments and organs of force and violence and systematic utilization of these means, instruments and organs against workers, toilers and oppressed nations, they at the same time have hypocritically accused and do accuse communist, revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces of being "terrorists", "bandits" etc and of perpetrating a war against human rights, democracy, freedom etc. But practice has time and again shown and proved that, while carrying on their democratic and pacifist demagogy, these vicious enemies of workers and toilers keep on perfecting their oppressive state apparatus and their constituent parts, they keep on torturing, killing and massacring not only communists, revolutionaries and anti-imperialists, but also great masses of workers, toilers and oppressed nations.

Bourgeois and imperialist ideologists heralded the beginning of a "new era of peace", in the wake of the downfall of the social-imperialist Soviet empire. According to them, the end of "Cold War" and "East-West confrontation" would help the creation of a capitalist paradise on earth, where welfare and freedom would abound and democracy and "free market economy" would flourish. The passage of time has amply shown that this is nothing but a reactionary illusion fostered by the apologists of capital and the "New World Order" proclaimed by US imperialists is the same old imperialist world "order". This climate of pacifist euphoria was followed by the Gulf War, where the US-led imperialist coalition dealt a heavy blow at reactionary Saddam Hussein clique, UN-sanctioned imperialist aggression against Somalia, the breaking out of ethnic conflicts and wars in Moldova, Caucasia and Tadjikistan and in former Yugoslavia, US intervention in Haiti, genocide in Rwanda, aggravation of civil war in Afghanistan, the relatively brief war between Peru and Ecuador etc. Some conflicts have been resolved or rather seem to have been resolved, such as those in El Salvador, Colombia, South Africa, Namibia, Palestine, Angola, Mozambique, Cambodia etc, essentially in favor of imperialism and reaction. But even if

we leave aside these dubious successes of “international community”, we can’t fail to see that in many and a growing number of countries and regions, especially in Algeria, Sudan, Burundi, Kurdistan, Kashmir, Peru, Philippines, Afghanistan, East Timor, Chechenya, Tadjikistan, Liberia, Srilanka, Western Sahara etc. ethnic and civil conflicts and wars and resistance and wars against imperialist and colonialist oppressors go on unabated.

Communists and all consistent revolutionaries are duty bound to fight for peace and to wage war on war, especially in our time when hundreds and even thousands of workers and toilers are perishing daily due to counter-revolutionary violence and aggression perpetrated by imperialists, colonialists and the bourgeoisie and due to ethnic, tribal and religious conflicts and when growing application of science and technology progressively increases the destructive capacity of all sorts of weapons and when all achievements and future of mankind are being threatened by a nuclear or biological war to be unleashed by imperialists.

But to be able to fight for and establish a durable peace and to be able to throw all weapons, armies and the war itself into the dustbin of history, one has to have a correct and scientific understanding as to the reasons of violence and war, strive for the unity of all exploited and oppressed classes and strata under the leadership of the working class and fight for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and imperialism, the main sources of violence and war in our age. The use of force and violence in general and the existence of war in particular are an outcome and a product of class contradictions and class struggle. As long as classes, class contradictions and class struggle exist, the use of force and violence in general and the existence of war in particular, are inevitable. Lenin said:

“Only **after** the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap; the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before.” (“The ‘Disarmament’ Slogan”, **Collected Works**, New York, Vol. XIX, p. 354) And in his “Socialism and War” he wrote:

“The socialists have always condemned wars between peoples as barbarous and bestial. Our attitude towards war, however, differs in principle from that of the bourgeois pacifists and Anarchists. We differ from the first in that we understand the inseparable connection between wars on the one hand and class struggle inside of a country on the other, we understand the impossibility of eliminating wars without eliminating classes and creating Socialism, and in that we fully recognize the justice, the progressivism and the necessity of civil wars, i.e., wars of an oppressed class against the oppressor, of slaves against the slaveholders, of serfs against the landowners, of wageworkers against the bourgeoisie.” (**Collected Works**, New York, Vol. XVIII, p. 219) At least two inferences can be drawn from these passages of Lenin’s. In contrast with revisionists and pacifists, Marxist-Leninists maintain that,

a- the elimination of use of force and of war are conditional upon the elimination of classes and class struggle and necessitate the overthrow of ruling classes and the destruction of the bourgeois state and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and,

b- a distinction must be made between revolutionary and counter-revolutionary violence, between just and unjust wars and while opposing and condemning the latter, **the** former should be endorsed and supported firmly and unequivocally.

Since the use of force and the phenomenon of war are a continuation and an extension of politics and class struggle, to ascertain the nature of an armed conflict or a war, one has to study the nature of politics and class struggle that has preceded the armed conflict or war in question. It is totally wrong to oppose and condemn all use of violence and all wars, without assessing the nature of politics and class struggle leading to armed conflicts and war. Bourgeois pacifists, who act in this way serve only to mislead and confuse workers and toilers and help the ruling classes to conceal the aggressive and oppressive nature of capitalism and imperialism. Just as the First World War, in its initial phase, the Second World War too was a continuation of inter-imperialist rivalries among major

capitalist states that preceded these wars. And both Russian Civil War of 1918-21 and Spanish Civil War of 1936-39 were continuations of the struggles between revolutionary and counter-revolutionary classes and strata that preceded these wars. This approach holds true for all wars.

The distinction that should be made between just and unjust wars finds its parallel in the distinction between revolutionary and counter-revolutionary terror. For decades; imperialists and the bourgeoisie have been making a lot of noise about “terrorism”, “banditry”, “vandalism” etc., allegedly being perpetrated by communists and revolutionaries. Marxist-Leninists and consistent revolutionaries should not in any way retreat in the face of this hypocritical assault and should identify the real terrorists: imperialists and all reactionaries. They should systematically expose the brutal and inhuman nature of exploiting classes, who are employing counter-revolutionary terror against workers and toilers daily and continuously, massacring, torturing, wounding and imprisoning communists and all progressives and even conducting genocides and wiping out whole peoples. On the other hand, communists and consistent revolutionaries should unequivocally defend the legitimacy of revolutionary terror, defying the slanders and vilifications of bourgeoisie and its hirelings. It is obvious that in certain periods of acute economic and political crises, class struggle is transformed into a civil war between revolution and counter-revolution, where it is both legitimate and obligatory for the party of proletariat to use revolutionary violence and resort to armed struggle against armed reaction. Revolutionary terror employed by Paris Communards against the Versailles armies, by the Bolsheviks against the White Guards, imperialist interventionists, agents of imperialism and fascism and Nazi invaders, by Hungarian Soviet Republic against its reactionary hangmen, by the anti-fascist partisans of Europe, Russia and Asia against Nazis and collaborators during the Second World War, by the Indian people and revolutionaries against the British colonialists, by Palestinian guerillas against Zionist invaders, by Vietnamese, Laotian and Cambodian peoples against US imperialists and their lackeys, by the black people of South Africa against racist Apartheid regime of white bourgeoisie, by FRETILIN fighters of East Timor against Indonesian colonialists, by the FSLN of Nicaragua against the Somoza clique, by Kurdish guerillas against Turkish reaction etc. is completely legitimate and justified. Whoever denies, denigrates or even in the least degree throws a shadow of doubt on the legitimacy of revolutionary terror employed by oppressed classes, strata and nations, who right from the beginning are in a defensive position, in the name of opposing war and violence is a sham fighter for peace and is a conscious or unconscious accomplice of most bloodthirsty butchers and hangmen of toiling humanity. Moreover he is an outright demagogue and is fact, a hypocritical ally of imperialism, bourgeoisie and reaction. In his **“Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder”** Lenin said:

“Of course, we rejected individual terror only out of considerations of expediency; upon those who ‘on principle’ were capable of condemning the terror of the Great French Revolution, or the terror in general employed by a victorious revolutionary party which is besieged by the bourgeoisie of the whole world-upon such people even Plekhanov in ,1900-03, when he was a Marxist and a revolutionary, heaped ridicule and scorn.” (Selected Works, London, Vol. X, p. 72)

Revisionists of all hues have always tended to separate struggle against war, from the struggle against capitalism and imperialism and have tried to embellish capitalists and imperialists, alleging that they are capable of following a “democratic” and “peaceful” policy toward workers, toilers and oppressed nations. And it is no surprise that this opportunist approach is always accompanied with the idea of peaceful transition to socialism and the advocacy of parliamentary road to revolution. For instance, Kautsky, who did not regard imperialism a special stage of capitalism and said that imperialism was one “policy” among various “policies” adopted by industrial nations to bring agrarian regions under its control, advocated that,

“...the most rational solution would be to deal with the most important agrarian regions in peaceful and democratic ways instead of with imperialist violence.” (“National State,

Imperialist State and League of States”, A. Dallin, **Diversity in International Communism**, p. 282) in order to achieve the aim of capital expansion. In one of his articles, he said:

“If it comes to pass that the various nations reach agreement, reduce armaments, and realize a lasting peace, then these worst causes for the growing prewar moral decay of capitalism may disappear.” (“The Two Books of Relearning”, **Neue Zeit**, April 30, 1915) At the moment of the writing of these reactionary lines, workers and toilers of England, France, Germany Austria-Hungary, Russia, Italy etc. were slaughtering each other on the battlefields of Europe at the behest of their ruling classes. Such was the depth of betrayal to which this renegade and philistine had sunk! Lenin exposed Kautsky’s pro-imperialist fallacies and condemned him in these words:

“Kautsky separates imperialist policies from imperialist economics and separates political monopoly from economic monopoly, thereby paving the way for such vulgar bourgeois reformism as so-called ‘disarmament’ and ‘ultra imperialism’ and similar piffle.” (“Imperialism and the Split in the Socialist Movement”, **Complete Works of Lenin**, XXIII, People’s Publishing House, 1958) The Khrushchevites, who followed in the footsteps of Kautsky, actively contributed to the spreading of pacifist illusions about capitalism and imperialism and argued that a total disarmament could be attained and a world without wars could be created prior to the downfall of capitalism and the victory of socialism. In his report the XXII. Congress of CPSU in October 1961 Khrushchev said:

“Present conditions have opened up the prospect of achieving peaceful coexistence over the entire period within which the social and political problems now dividing the world must be resolved. Matters are reaching a point where even before the total victory of socialism on earth, while capitalism holds on in part of the world, there will be a real chance of eliminating war from the life of the society.” (A. Dallin, **Diversity in International Communism**, p. 20, emphasis in the original text) This opportunist clown who was exaggerating the forces of revolution and socialism and underrating the forces of capitalism, imperialism and reaction, to further his malicious aims, was in fact attacking the Marxist-Leninist position of Stalin who had said:

“It is said that Lenin’s thesis that imperialism inevitably generates war must now be regarded as obsolete, since powerful popular forces have come forward today in defence of peace and against another world war. That is not true.” (Robert V. Daniels, **A Documentary History of Communism**, Vol 2, p. 172) Political developments since these words were written in 1952, have completely corroborated Stalin and refuted the arch-revisionist Khrushchev. Great Marxist-Leninist Enver Hoxha,- defended the line of Lenin and Stalin on the question of war and peace and fought resolutely and consistently against Khrushchevites and sharply criticized them, right from the beginning. In his speech at the meeting of 81 communist and workers’ parties in Moscow in 1960 he said:

“Let us look facts straight in the eye. World imperialism, headed by its most aggressive detachment, US imperialism, is directing the course of its economy towards preparations for war. It is arming itself to the teeth. US imperialism is rearming Bonn’s Germany, Japan and all its allies and satellites with all kinds of weapons. It has set up and perfected aggressive military organizations, it has established and continues to establish military bases around the socialist camp. It is accumulating stocks of nuclear weapons and refuses to disarm, to stop testing nuclear weapons, and is feverishly engaged in inventing new means of mass extermination. Why is it doing all this? To go to a wedding party? No, to go to war against us, to do away with socialism and communism, to enslave the peoples.

“The Party of Labor of Albania is of the opinion that if we were to say and think otherwise we would be deceiving ourselves and others. We would not call ourselves communists if we were afraid of the vicissitudes of life. We communists detest war. We communists will fight to the end to smash the diabolical plans for war which the US imperialists are preparing, but if they declare war on us, we should deal them a mortal blow that will wipe imperialism from the face of the earth, once and for all.

“Faced with the threats of the US led world imperialists of atomic war, we should be

fully prepared economically, politically, morally, as well as militarily, to cope with any eventuality.

“We should prevent a world war, it is not absolutely inevitable. but no one will ever excuse us if we live in a dream and let the enemy catch us unawares, for it has never happened that the enemy is to be trusted, otherwise he would not be called an enemy. The enemy is and remains an enemy, and a perfidious one at that. He who puts his trust in the enemy will sooner or later lose his case...” (**Selected Works**, Volume II, p. 799-800). Political developments since 1960 have proved the correctness of Enver Hoxha’s analysis. To be able to prevent war and win a durable peace, proletariat and peoples of the world should conduct a relentless struggle against imperialism, overthrow capitalism and never and never allow themselves to be duped by pacifist, parliamentary and reformist illusions.

* * * * *

Today, communist, revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces of the world are once more face to face with the task of fighting against world imperialism, at the head of which stands US imperialism, the arch enemy of peoples of the world. In this life and death struggle, we should close our ranks and strive to establish a united front of the proletariat and the peoples of the world against the united front of imperialism and reaction. But the struggle against imperialism can not be separated from the struggle against the lackeys of imperialism and local reaction. Communist and consistent revolutionary forces do and should unite struggle against imperialist enemy with the struggle against internal enemy, that is collaborationist-monopolist bourgeoisie and landlords and other propertied classes.

Revolutionary and anti-imperialist front of the proletariat and the peoples of the world will become consolidated in proportion to the development of democratic and socialist struggles of proletariat and toilers in individual countries. Marxist-Leninist Communist Party, the most powerful constituent of communist movement and the most mature detachment of revolutionary proletariat in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan is striving to do just that. By its struggle against Turkish reaction, fascism and colonialism and US and Western European imperialists, shoulder to shoulder with Kurdish national liberation movement and all revolutionary and anti-fascist forces in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan, MLCP is doing its utmost for the formation of an anti-imperialist front both on a regional and a global scale. Militant vanguard fighter of proletariat of all nationalities of Turkey and Northern Kurdistan and one of the foremost detachments of international communist movement, MLCP extends its hands of revolutionary comradeship to all truly revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces the world over. MLCP vows to fight to the end against imperialism, capitalism and reaction in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan, which is situated in a strategically vital junction between Caucasia, Balkans and the Near East. It firmly believes that to deal a mortal blow at imperialism and capitalism in this turbulent and strategically important region will mean an immense contribution both to the cause of world revolution and to the cause of peace. And in its fight against wars, which is inseparably connected with its fight against imperialism and capitalism, MLCP shall never forget the advice of Lenin who said:

“The end of wars, peace among peoples, cessation of pillaging and violations are our ideal, to be sure, but only bourgeois sophists can seduce the masses with this ideal, while separating it from a direct and immediate preaching of revolutionary action.” (“The Peace Question”, **Collected Works**, New York, Vol. XVIII, p. 266)

NOVEMBER 1995



An oppressed class which does not strive to learn to use arms, to acquire arms, deserves to be treated like slaves. We cannot forget, unless we have become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists, that we are living in a class society, that there is no way out, and there can be none, except by means of the class struggle and the overthrow of the power of the ruling class.

V. I. Lenin



ENGELS IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM IN THE WORKERS' MOVE- MENT*

The Case of German Social- Democracy, 1875-95

Engels played an immense role in the formation of revolutionary German social-democratic movement during the 1860s and 1870s and in its progress and consolidation in the following two decades. The German working class movement had stood at the forefront of the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat during the nearly 4.5 decade-long period after the defeat of Paris Commune in 1871. German Social-Democracy, who both led and symbolized international working class movement

between 1871 and 1914, was considered the model for all revolutionary working class parties.

The rich experience of German Social-Democracy was closely associated with the names and work of Marx and Engels, who apart from part in and actively assisted the organization of revolutionary working class movement both on the international and the national level and with their counsils, criticisms and analyses, provided a far-sighted leadership to it. The exemplary successes of German Social-Democracy and its tragic and disgraceful demise contain important lessons for the international communist movement of our day, despite the changes on the economic, political and social scene during the last hundred years or so. At present, when international communist movement and its constituent parts are very weak, when the question of unity of communist forces and that of scientific socialism with the working class movement are waiting to be solved both on the theoretical and the practical planes and when the task of formation of Marxist-Leninist parties free from all brands of revisionism are on the agenda etc., a comprehensive study of the struggle of two founders of scientific socialism against right and 'left' opportunism and all deviations from the correct path of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship in the second

*A Paper Prepared by Marxist-Leninist Communist Party for the International Seminar on "THE RELEVANCE OF ENGELS TO THE PRESENT DAY" Held on December 13-17 1995, Naples, ITALY.

half of the 19th century, will be very useful and instructive. This paper aims only to summarize a small segment of this struggle and point out to the lessons thereof.

* * * *

At the beginning of 1870s, Social-Democratic Labor Party (“Eisenachers”) was the strongest and most influential section of European revolutionary working class movement. But Lassalleism was still quite widespread among certain Segments of German workers. Marx and Engels were for the unity of revolutionary working class movement. But they were against unity at any price: So, when the question of unification of two workers’ organizations began to be discussed—of which, they were not even informed beforehand—Marx and Engels made known their opposition to an unprincipled union. The unity between Social-Democratic Labor Party and Lassalle’s General Association of German Workers could and had to be based on firm Marxist principles and a correct

program. Therefore they fought against the incorporation of Lassalean follies into the program of united party (“Socialist Labor Party of Germany) that came into being at the Gotha Congress, on May 22-27, 1875. Better known by Marx’s **Marginal Notes to the Programme of the German Workers’ Party (or Critique of the Gotha Programme)**

this struggle was also continued through the critical letters Marx and Engels addressed to the leaders of “Eisenachers”, Liebknecht, Bebel and Bracke.

Engels in his letter of 18-28 March 1875, written before **Critique of the Gotha Programme**, complained on his and Marx’s behalf, for not having been informed about the preparations for unification and not having been presented with a copy of the draft of the programme that was to be adopted at the Unity Congress. Noting the difficult situation of Lassalleans and the fact that “Eisenachers” had “absolutely nothing to learn from the Lassalleans in the theoretical sphere in what is decisive for the programme”, Engels sharply criticized his comrades for accepting Lassalean follies concerning “state aid”, “iron law of wages”, all other classes constituting “one reactionary mass” against the working class and other incorrect and inaccurate formulations. After systematically explaining his criticisms Engels said:

“I shall stop, although almost every word in this programme, which has moreover, been composed in a flat and flaccid style, could be criticized. It is of such a character that if adopted Marx and I shall *never* be able to give our adherence to the *new* party established on this basis, and shall have very seriously to consider what our attitude towards it—in public as well—should be.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, **Selected Correspondence**, p. 358) And he added:

“In general, the official programme of a party is of less importance than what the party does. But a new programme is after all a banner publicly raised, and the outside world judges the party by it. It should, therefore, on no account take a step backwards, as this one does in comparison with the Eisenach programme. One should also take into consideration what the workers of other

countries will say to this programme, what impression will be produced by this bending of the knee to Lassalleanism on the part of the whole German socialist proletariat.” (Ibid., p. 358) And Marx in his letter of 5 May 1875 to Bracke told that it was his duty not to give recognition to “a thoroughly objectionable programme that demoralizes the Party.” Condemning this opportunist conciliation in the same vein as Engels, he wrote:

“Every step of a real movement is more important than a dozen programmes. If, therefore, it was not possible—and the conditions of the time did not permit it—to go *beyond* the Eisenach programme one should simply have concluded an agreement for action against the common enemy. But by drawing up a programme of principles (instead of postponing this until it has been prepared for by a considerable period of common activity) one sets up before the whole world landmarks by which it measures the level of the Party movement.” (Ibid., p. 360-01) Criticisms of Marx and Engels were not taken into account at the Gotha Congress, save for some improvements with regard to the importance of trade union movement and the international obligations of working class. After the unification of two workers’ parties, Marx and Engels were pleased to see that German Social-Democracy continued to grow, despite its opportunistic programme. But their fears with regard to this compromise program would be realized to a certain extent with the advent of Eugen Dühring and the rapidly growing popularity of his petty-bourgeois views within the German Party just **one year** after unification. With the full approval of Marx, Engels started the publication of his criticism of Dühring (that is, **Herr Eugen Dühring’s Revolution in Science** or more briefly **Anti-Dühring**) in the autumn of 1876. The low level of communist education of members of the German Party and opportunist vacillations of its leadership were amply demonstrated when Dühring’s supporters in the party tried to obstruct the publication of Engels’ polemical articles. Only after the intervention of Bebel and Liebknecht themselves, the publication of these articles, which blew Dühring’s eclectic system to pieces, were continued, and then only on the pages of the supplement of **Vorwärts**, instead of in **Vorwärts** itself. And a real fight to the end was once more averted, due to the conciliatory attitude of the leadership of Socialist Labor Party of Germany.

Engels harshly criticized this opportunist stand. Noting in his letter of 31 July 1877 to Liebknecht that the party organs which allowed themselves to be misled had in fact made “asses of themselves” he said:

“ I never said that the *bulk* of your people didn’t want real science. I was speaking of the *party*, and that’s whatever it makes itself out to be before the public, in the press and at the congresses. And there the order of the day is semi-literacy and your ex-worker dolling himself up as a man of letters. If, as you say, these people amount to no more than a tiny minority, then obviously the only reason you and the others have to pay any heed to them is that each of them has his supporters. The moral and intellectual decline of the party dates from the unification and could have been avoided had a little more caution and intelligence been shown at the time. Much can ultimately be sweated out by a healthy party, but it is a long and arduous process and the health of the masses is certainly not an adequate reason for injecting them unnecessarily with a

disease. “ (K. Marx-F. Engels, **Collected Works**, Vol. 45, p, 257)

After the adoption of Anti-Socialist Law (“Law Against the Exertions of Social-Democracy Dangerous to the State”) in October 1879 by Bismarck, which drove the party underground, led to the banning of its organizations, imprisonment of its most militant members and closing down of its newspapers; opportunist deviations once more made themselves felt. During this period, Marx and Engels fought first of all against the ‘left’ opportunism of Most and his followers, who advocated individual terrorist tactics in the struggle against the regime and in time degenerated into anarchism. But the more important danger lay with the right opportunism of Hochberg, Schramm and Bernstein, who advised the party to distance itself from the workers, to strive to win the propertied and educated strata, to embark on the road of legality and reform and to appease the ruling classes and Prussian militarism. The three Zurichers, as they were called by Marx and Engels, had published a right opportunist programmatic declaration with the heading “The Socialist Movement in Germany in Retrospect”, in a **Yearbook of Social Science and Social Policy**. This opportunist petty-bourgeois trio, whom the party leadership was about to entrust with the party newspaper, wanted to, “..draw the teeth of socialism (which they have fixed up in accordance with the university recipes) and particularly of the Social-Democratic Party, to enlighten the workers or, as they put it, to imbue them with ‘elements of education’ from their confused half-knowledge, and above all to make the Party respectable in the eyes of the petty bourgeoisie.” (Marx to F. A. Sorge, September 19, 1879, K. Marx and F. Engels, **Selected Correspondence**, p. 396) Their proposals in effect amounted to an attempt at the liquidation of the Party, to its transformation to a petty-bourgeois party following in the footsteps of liberal bourgeoisie. In his letter of 8 September 1879 to Becker, Engels sharply criticized the opportunists and said: “All in all, it’s just about time we took a stand against the philanthropic big and petty bourgeois, the students and professors who are forcing their way into the German party and seeking to water down the proletariat’s class struggle against its oppressors till it becomes an institution for universal fraternisation, and this at a moment when the bourgeois, with whom we are supposed to fraternise, have outlawed us, destroyed our presses, disrupted our meetings and delivered us up *sans phrase* to the caprices of the police. The German workers are hardly likely to join in such a campaign.” (Ibid., p. 384) Engels was not content with this intervention. After conferring with Marx, he prepared a long letter addressed at the leaders of the German Party, especially, Bebel, Liebknecht and Bracke. In this Circular Letter, which was also signed by Marx, he said the following among other things:

“There you have the programme of the three censors of Zurich. As regards clarity, it leaves nothing to be desired. Least of all so far as we’re concerned, since we are still only too familiar with all these catch-phrases of 1848. There are the voices of the representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, terrified lest the proletariat, impelled by its revolutionary situation, should ‘go too far’. Instead of resolute political opposition— general conciliation; instead of a struggle against government and bourgeoisie—an attempt to win them over and talk them round; instead of defiant resistance to maltreatment from above—humble sub-

jection and the admission that the punishment was deserved. Every historically necessary conflict is reinterpreted as a misunderstanding and every discussion wound up with the assurance: we are of course, all agreed on the main issue... The same thing applies to the class struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie. On paper it is recognized because there is no denying it any longer, but in practice it is glossed over, suppressed, emasculated. The Social-Democratic Party *Should not* be a workers' party, it should not bring upon itself the hatred of the bourgeoisie or, for that matter, of anyone else; above all, it should prosecute vigorous propaganda amongst the bourgeoisie; instead of laying stress on ambitious goals which are calculated to frighten off the bourgeoisie, and unattainable anyway in our own generation, it should rather devote all its strength and energies to those petty-bourgeois stop-gag reforms which provide new props for the old social order and which might, perhaps, transform the ultimate catastrophe into a gradual, piecemeal and, as far as possible, peaceable process of dissolution. These are the same people who keep up an appearance of ceaseless activity, yet not only do nothing themselves but also try to ensure that nothing at all is done save—chin-wagging; the same people whose fear of any kind of action in 1848 and '49 held back the movement at every step and finally brought about its downfall..." (Ibid., p. 406) In this letter of historical importance, Marx and Engels argued that, people from different classes should not bring with them the remnants of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois prejudices when joining the proletarian movement and in a petty bourgeois country, non-proletarian ideas can be tolerated only **outside** the revolutionary workers' party. They pointed out that within a revolutionary workers' party such people and their ideas constitute "an adulterating element." And they said:

"Should there be any reason to tolerate their presence there for a while, it should be our duty *only* to tolerate them, to allow them no say in the party leadership and to remain aware that a break with them is only a matter of time. That time, moreover, would appear to have come. How the party can suffer the authors of this article to remain any longer in their midst seems to us incomprehensible. But should the party leadership actually pass, to a greater or lesser extent, into the hands of such men, then the party will be emasculated no less, and that will put paid to its proletarian grit."

(Ibid., p. 408)

Marx and Engels considered the situation so serious and the influence of opportunism so alarming that, just the same way as in the period of semi-opportunist unification at Gotha Congress, they found themselves obliged to renounce their ties to the party in case the line of Hochberg, Schramm and Bernstein were adopted. They said:

"If the new party organ is to adopt a policy that corresponds to the opinions of these gentlemen, if it is bourgeois and not proletarian, then all we could do—much though we might regret it—would be publicly to declare ourselves opposed to it and abandon the solidarity with which we have hitherto represented the German party abroad. But we hope it won't come to that." (Ibid., p. 408) Things did not go that far. Bebel, Liebknecht and Bracke condemned the **Yearbook** article of Zurich trio. But, true to its tradition, German Social-

Democracy did not settle accounts with the opportunists and a superficial peace prevailed once more. Real divisions in the ranks of the Party, were kept out of sight temporarily, thanks also to its successful resistance against the persecution of bourgeois-Junker state and its impressive performance under the conditions of Anti-Socialist Law. Engels, in his letter of 20 June 1882 to Sorge said:

“In general things in Germany are going splendidly. It is true that the literary gentlemen in the Party tried to cause a reactionary... swing, but they failed miserably. The abuse to which the Social-Democratic workers are being everywhere subjected has made them still more revolutionary than they were three years ago....These people (the Party literary people) wanted at all costs to beg and secure the repeal of Anti-Socialist Law by mildness and meekness, fawning and humility, because it had made short shrift of their literary earnings. As soon as the law is repealed...the split will apparently become an open one, and the Viereks and Hochbergs will form a separate Right wing, where they can be treated with from time to time until they finally landed on their backsides.” (V. I. Lenin, **Marx, Engels, Marxism**, p. 219-20)

In 1884-85, the German Party was once more to become an arena of open struggle against opportunism. Social-Democratic deputies in the *Reichstag* had voted for the steamship subsidy and thus given their support to the colonialist and expansionist policy of German bourgeoisie and Junkers. This capitulationist policy went hand in hand with an attack by the same people against the revolutionary character of **Sozialdemokrat**, the central organ of German Social-Democracy. With the incitement and support of Engels and the help of the protests of class-conscious worker members and local organizations, Party leadership was able to take a stand against the opportunists, who once more were forced to back down. Engels condemned the “Philistinism” of Social-Democratic deputies, whom he dubbed of being petty-bourgeois.

In the face of the growth of revolutionary working class movement, despite the repressive measures taken against it by the bourgeois-Junker state, *Reichstag* was forced to cancel the Anti-Socialist Law in 1890, which was in effect for 12 years. Although considering the ending of Bismarck era an important victory for German Social-Democracy, Engels was aware of the problems facing his comrades and never ceased warning them again and again. As time would amply show, opportunist tendencies concealing themselves beneath the rhetoric of Marxist orthodoxy, continued to grow. The level of infection of German Social-Democracy with opportunism manifested itself in 1894, just one year before the death of Engels and the battle was soon to be joined again. In the summer of 1894 SPD faction in the Bavarian *Landtag* voted for the endorsement of government budget, thus betraying extreme opportunism and trampling upon the traditions of German and international revolutionary working class movement. The situation was aggravated by the espousal of Bavarian SPD led by Vollmar, of pro-kulak views openly.

That same Vollmar was a long standing advocate of “patriotic duties” of German Social-Democrats in the event of a war and had been propagating the idea of “peaceful growth into socialism” for a long time. He had put forward the opportunist principle:

“An open hand to goodwill, the fist against the bad intentions.” In effect, his “fist” was nothing but a second “open hand”. Taking into account the fact that unprincipled and mistaken stands were being taken by the French and German Parties with regard to agrarian question and the question of allies of the proletariat in the countryside, Engels felt himself compelled to mount an attack against opportunism. Pro-kulak views propounded by Jaures had been adopted by French Workers’ Party at the Marseilles Congress in 1892 and at the Nantes Congress in 1894. Thanks to the hesitant attitude of German Party leadership with regard to the similar stand of Bavarian SPD led by Vollmar, the conciliatory and opportunist line toward the rich peasants prevailed at the Frankfurt Congress of SPD in October 1894, despite the objections of consistent Marxists. This clearly showed that opportunism had to a great extent pervaded German Social-Democracy even before Engels’ death. Now at 74, and less than one year to his death Engels, did not in the least hesitate in opening a war against this latest outbreak of opportunism. He conducted the struggle by means of his letters to various leaders of revolutionary working class movement and his “**The Peasant Question in France and Germany**”, where Marxist views on the peasant question were eloquently expressed. In discussing this matter in his letter of 10 November 1894 with F. A. Sorge, he said:

“Next however Vollmar comes along in Frankfurt and wants to bribe the *peasantry as a whole*, though the peasant he has to deal with in Upper Bavaria is not the debt-ridden small peasant of the Rhineland, but the middle and even the big peasant, who exploits male and female farmhands and sells cattle and grain in quantity. And that can not be done without giving up the whole principle. We can win over the Alpine peasants and the Lower Saxon and Schleswig-Holstein big peasants only if we sacrifice the fieldhands and day laborers to them, and in doing that we lose more politically than we gain.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, **Selected Correspondence**, p. 557-58) And we see Engels sounding the alarm, in his letter of 22 November 1894 to P. Lafargue, one of the leaders of French Workers’ Party:

“The fact is you allowed yourself to lean a bit too much towards the opportunist tendency. At Nantes you came near to sacrificing the future of the Party to a momentary triumph...In Germany—Vollmar went so far as to suggest that the large peasants in Bavaria, each with his 10-30 hectares, should enjoy all the benefits that you had promised to the small French peasants—in Germany Bebel took up the challenge, and the matter will be exhaustively discussed; it will never come off the agenda again until it has been thrashed out. You will have seen in **Vorwärts** Bebel’s speech in the 2nd electoral constituency of Berlin. He complains with reason that the Party is going bourgeois. That is the misfortune of all extreme parties when the time approaches for them to become ‘possible’. But our Party can not go beyond a certain limit in this respect without betraying itself, and it seems to me that in France as in Germany we have now reached that point. Fortunately there is still time to call a halt.” (Friedrich Engels, Paul and Laura Lafargue, **Correspondence**, Vol. 3, p.343-44) Continuing his attack on opportunism, Engels, in his letter of 24 November 1894 to Liebknecht called Vollmar a “traitor” and told that his line with regard to peasant question goes “even beyond the petty-bourgeois to the right”. But his

hopes that the Party leadership would take a consistent and principled stand against opportunism and call a halt to the drift towards petty-bourgeois positions were not realized. After his death on 5 August 1895, the openly opportunistic line of Bernstein, David and Vollmar gained more ground gradually. Lenin summarized the struggle of two great founders of scientific socialism against opportunism in German Social-Democracy in these words:

“We thus see that for more than ten years Marx and Engels systematically and unswervingly fought opportunism in the German Social-Democratic Party and attacked intellectualist philistinism and the petty-bourgeois outlook in socialism. This is an extremely important fact. The general public knows that German Social-Democracy is regarded as a model of Marxist proletarian policy and tactics, but it does not know what a constant war the founders of Marxism had to wage against the ‘Right wing’ (Engels’ expression) of that Party. And it is no accident that soon after Engels’ death this war turned from a concealed into an open one. This was the inevitable result of the decades of historical development of German Social-Democracy.” (**Marx, Engels, Marxism**, p. 225)

Marx and Engels attached utmost importance to theoretical consistency and political clarity and tried to educate the leaders of German and international revolutionary working class movement in the spirit of irreconcilable struggle against all manifestations of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology and all opportunist deviations. They were completely aware of the danger emanating from theoretical vacillations and concessions, against which they always fought with all their might. Stressing the importance of theoretical clarity and praising the sense of theory among German workers Engels had said the following in 1874:

“For the first time since a workers’ movement has existed, the struggle is being waged pursuant to its three sides—the theoretical, the political and the economic—practical (resistance to the capitalists)—in harmony and in its interconnections, and in a systematic way. It is precisely in this, as it were concentric, attack that the strength and invincibility of the German movement lies.” (“Supplement to the Preface of 1870 for *The Peasant War in Germany*,” K. Marx-F. Engels, **Collected Works**, Vol. 23, p. 631) And he added the following remarkable observation:

“In particular, it will be the duty of the leaders to gain an ever clearer insight into all theoretical questions, to free themselves more and more from the influence of traditional phrases inherited from the old world outlook, and constantly to keep in mind that socialism, since it has become a science, demands that it will be pursued as a science, that is, that it be studied. The task will be to spread with increased zeal among the masses of workers the ever more lucid understanding thus acquired and to knit together ever more strongly the organization both of the party and of the trade unions.” (Ibid., p. 631) Lenin, referring to Marx, who criticized Bebel, Liebknecht and other leaders of the Eisenach Party for their capitulation to Lassaleans in 1875, said:

“... he *sharply condemns* the eclecticism in the formulation of principles: If you must combine, Marx wrote to Party leaders, then enter into agreements to satisfy the practical aims of the movement, but do not haggle over principles, do

not make 'concessions' in theory. This was Marx's idea, and yet there are people among us who strive—in his name!—to belittle the significance of theory." (*What Is To Be Done?*, **The Struggle for the Bolshevik Party**, p. 47) Engels too sharply criticized the deep rootedness and spread of opportunism "in a large section of Social-Democratic press" which was afraid of the renewal of Anti-Socialist Law. He censured it for propounding the realization of party demands by peaceful means and trumpeting that "present-day society is developing towards socialism." Pointing out at the utmost necessity of political clarity and of the correct relationship between the immediate and ultimate aims of revolutionary proletariat, he said:

"In the long run such a policy (that is, the policy of peaceful evolution of "present-day society" to socialism) can only lead one's own party astray. They push general, abstract political questions into the foreground, thereby concealing the immediate concrete questions, which at the moment of the first great events, the first political crisis automatically pose themselves. What can result from this except that at the decisive moment the party suddenly proves helpless and that uncertainty and discord on the most decisive issues reign in it because these issues have never been discussed?...This forgetting of the great, the principal considerations for the momentary interests of the day, this struggling and striving for the success of the moment regardless of later consequences, this sacrifice of the future of the movement for its present, may be 'honestly' meant, but it is and remains opportunism, and 'honest' opportunism is perhaps the most dangerous of all!" (K. Marx-F. Engels, **Collected Works**, Vol. 27, p. 227)

According to Marx and Engels, theoretical consistency and political clarity could be achieved only through a systematic effort to acquire knowledge, to master scientific socialism and to wage an incessant struggle against all manifestations of opportunism and revisionism. As Engels wrote in his letter of 20 October 1882 to Bernstein, who still was a revolutionary social-democrat at the time:

"It seems that *every* workers' party of a big country can develop only through internal struggle, which accords with the laws of dialectical development in general. The German Party became what it is in the struggle between the Eisenachers and Lassaleans where even scuffles played a major role. Unity became possible only when the bunch of scoundrels that had been specially trained by Lassalle to be his tools had outlived their day, and even then it came with too great precipitancy on our part. In France the people who while sacrificing the Bakuninist theory continue to employ Bakuninist means of struggle, and who at the same time want to sacrifice the class character of the movement to further their special ends, must also first outlive their usefulness before unity is possible again. To preach unity under such circumstances would be sheer folly. Moral sermons avail nothing against infantile disorders, which are simply unavoidable under present-day circumstances." (K. Marx and F. Engels, **Selected Correspondence**, p. 425-26) Therefore, when it came to questions of principle and the accomplishment and consolidation of the unity of revolutionary working class movement, they consistently opposed glossing over of differences, demanded exhaustive discussion and utmost clarification and expressed their disgust at the petty-bourgeois atmosphere of reconcilia-

tion and ideological peace that were so prevalent in German Social-Democracy and the Second International. Engels advised Bernstein in 1883, then the editor of **Sozialdemokrat**, the central organ of the German Party in these words:

“Not to twist and turn under the blows of our opponent, not to whine and moan and stammer excuses that you did not mean any harm...Hit back, that’s what you have to do, two or three blows for every one the enemy strikes. That has always been our tactic, and so far I believe we have got the best of almost every one of our opponents.” (**Friedrick Engels, A Biography**, p. 455) Lenin, in his “Preface to the Russian Translation of *Letters by Johannes Becker, Joseph Dietzgen, Frederick Engels, Karl Marx and Others to Friedrich Sorge and Others*” wrote:

“...Mehring was right when he said (*Der Sorgesche Briefwechsel*) that Marx and Engels had not much of an idea of ‘good manners’:‘... if they did not think long over every blow they dealt, neither did they whimper over every blow they received...If they think that their pinpricks can pierce my old, well-tanned and thick hide, they are mistaken,’ Engels once wrote. And they assumed that others possessed the imperviousness they had themselves acquired, said Mehring of Marx and Engels.” (Marx, **Engels, Marxism**, p. 222-23)

It’s no secret that there are people who have held and do hold Engels responsible for the right opportunist sins of German Social-Democracy and of the Second Interemocracy and of the Second Interas an advocate of peaceful road to socialism. This, of course is not correct. Those who are more or less familiar with Engels’ writings know that he—and Marx—waged a systematic fight against opportunist prejudices concerning the state. The founders of scientific socialism were very well aware of the pervasiveness of a sort of mystical reverence toward the state, which had none too little influence among German workers and social-democrats. A case in point is Engels’ letter of 18-28 March 1875 to Bebel, which was only published in 1911, thirty-six years after it had been written! Criticizing the ill-famed Gotha Programme, in his letter of 14 November 1879 to Bebel, Engels said:

“The free people’s state has been transformed into the free state. Taken in its grammatical sense, a free state is one where the state is free in relation to its citizens, hence a state with a despotic government. The whole talk about the state should be dropped, especially since the Commune, which was no longer a state in the proper sense of the word. The ‘people’s state’ has been thrown in our faces by the anarchists to the point of disgust, although already Marx’s book against Proudhon and later the **Communist Manifesto** say plainly that with the introduction of the socialist order of society the state dissolves of itself (*sich auflöst*) and disappears. As the state is only a transitional institution which is used in the struggle, in the revolution, to hold down one’s adversaries by force, it is sheer nonsense to talk of a ‘free people’s state’; so long as the proletariat still *needs* the state, it does not need it in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist. We would therefore propose replacing *state* everywhere by *Gemeinwesen*, a good old German word

which can very well take place of the French word *commune*.” (Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, **Collected Works**, Vol. 25, p. 444-45) Four years later, criticizing the Social-Democratic deputies’ report presented at the *Reichstag* during the debate on protective tariffs, Engels said:

“Why the altogether superfluous passage about ‘civil war’, why such deference to ‘public opinion’ which, in Germany, will always be that of beer-swilling philistine;

why, at this point, the total obliteration of the movement’s class character? Why give the anarchists that pleasure? And, what is more, all these concessions are utterly useless. The German; philistine is cowardice incarnate; he has no respect for anyone who does not inspire fear in him.” (K. Marx-F. Engels, **Collected Works**, Vol. 45, p. 419) Always warning German Social-Democracy—which had increased the number of votes it polled from 311.000 in 1881 to 549.000 in 1884 despite the implementation of Anti-Socialist Law—with respect to parliamentary illusions, Engels, in his **Origin of the Family, Private Property and State** said:

“Thus universal suffrage is the gauge of the maturity of the working class. It can not and never will be anything more in the present-day state.” (K. Marx-F. Engels, **Collected Works**, Vol. 26, p. 272) And only a few months before his death, he complained of Liebknecht who tried to present him as an advocate of “peaceful” tactics. In his letter of 3 April 1895 to P. Lafargue he said:

“Liebknecht has just played me a fine trick. He has taken from my introduction to Marx’s articles on France 1848-50 everything that could serve his purpose in support of peaceful and anti-violent tactics at any price, which he has chosen to preach for some time now, particularly at this juncture when coercive laws are being drawn up in Berlin. But I preach those tactics only for *Germany of to-day* and even then *with many reservations*. For France, Belgium, Italy, Austria, such tactics could not be followed as a whole and, for Germany, they could become inapplicable to-morrow.” (Friedrich Engels, Paul and Laura Lafargue, **Correspondence**, Vol. 3, p. 373) And one can not but mention the fact that, it was Engels, who in his criticism of so-called anti-authoritarians, emphasized the utmost necessity of the use of revolutionary violence and reproached the Commune for not having used it sufficiently! Here are his words:

“Have these gentlemen ever seen a revolution? A revolution is certainly the most authoritarian thing there is; it is the act whereby one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part by means of rifles, bayonets and cannon—authoritarian means, if such there be at all; and if the victorious party does not want to have fought in vain, it must maintain this rule by means of the terror which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. Would the Paris Commune have lasted a single day if it had not made use of this authority of the armed people against the bourgeois? Should we not, on the contrary, reproach it for not having used it freely enough? (K. Marx-F. Engels, *On Authority*, **Collected Works**, Vol. 23, p. 425)

FIRST CONGRESS OF İDLB HELD

İDLE (Istanbul Demokratik Liseliler Birliği—Democratic Association of Istanbul Lycee Students) held its first congress on 6 June 1996, in Istanbul with the participation of 400 people. The congress was attended by 48 delegates from 35 lycees. There were present at the congress delegates from various cities, such as Istanbul, İzmir, Bursa, Adana, Balıkesir, Mersin and from Germany and England. Rebel, the youth branch of MLPD (Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany) had also sent two guest representatives to the congress.

First congress of İDLB was the product of a long struggle, especially against fascism, national oppression and reactionary education system dating back to at least 1989. Democratic Lycee Congress held in December 1994, under the guidance and leadership of CYO* was an important turning point in this struggle.

İDLB's first congress was opened with a minute of silence in memory of three revolutionaries killed in Ümraniye prison, of all who have fallen in the decades-long struggle of lycee youth in our country against fascism and reaction and of all martyrs of revolution and socialism. Thereafter speakers began to take the floor. Following the speeches delivered by the representatives of various lycees, a representative of communist university students who were on hunger strike, a representative of revolutionary teachers, representatives from Germany and England and a guest representative of Rebel, the problems of revolutionary lycee struggle were discussed thoroughly and a series of resolutions were adopted. One of the most important of the resolutions was that concerning the extension of İDLB and its transformation into a really country-wide organization of revolutionary lycee youth of Turkey aouth of Turkey aistan.

COMMEMORATING THE 1. CONFERENCE OF MLKP

The convocation of 1. (Party and Unity) Conference of MLCP was greeted with militant actions in various quarters of our country. Here are some examples:

On 9 September 1995, communists staged a demonstration in Alibeyköy district of Istanbul, where the military-fascist coup of September 1980 was denounced. They conducted another unauthorized demonstration the same day in the Güzeltepe locality of Alibeyköy district. On this occasion MLCP militants carried placards bearing the slogans, "Down with 12 September fascism!", "12 September generals to the trial!" etc.

On 9 September 1995, communists stopped the traffic in a central crossroads "with molotov cocktails and raised a placard bearing the slogan, "Long live our party, MLCP!". They marched 100 meters shouting slogans, such as "Party, surge victory!", "Long live our party and unity conference!" etc and dispersed before the arrival of the police. The same day, similar actions and activities were conducted in other cities, such as İzmir, Ankara, Mersin etc. by MLCP and CYO. 1. (Party and Unity) Conference ws also greeted by the cadres and sympathizers of MLCP in numerous prisons, where our comrades are held hostage by the regime.

On 12 September 1995, about 200 communists gathered in Taksim Square of

* Communist Youth Organization (KGO)—Youth branch of MLKP

Istanbul and staged an unauthorized demonstration. In addition to slogans commemorating the proclamation of the establishment of the party, communist youth also shouted slogans protesting the 15th anniversary of the military coup d'etat of 12 September 1980. Taksim Square had been the scene of scores of revolutionary demonstrations in the 1960s and 1970s; but had not witnessed any such event during the 15 years following the fascist coup d'etat of 1980. Therefore, his action of MLCP was, in a sense the liberation of this ground from fascist occupation. The police was caught completely off guard and shocked at the audacity of communists, who raised four different placards bearing the signatures of MLCP and CYO and burned the effigies of fascist generals responsible for the military coup of 1980. Communists carried on and ended their demonstration in a disciplined manner and melted away among the crowd before the police were able to pull themselves together and tried to rush reinforcements to the area. The action was ended without any of the participants being caught by the "security" forces.

BUCA MASSACRE

On 21 September 1995 the hangmen and torturers of the fascist regime mounted an attack on revolutionary prisoners in Buca (Buja) prison in Izmir, Three of the revolutionary prisoners, who put up barricades and bravely fought back against the aggressors were martyred and more than fifty were wounded. Scores of members of "security" personnel of the fascist regime were also injured in the clashes.

About 250 people, including the relatives of revolutionary prisoners, human rights' activists, progressive lawyers, representatives of mass organizations and of some labor unions were also attacked by the police, when they organized an unauthorized" protest march the following day and tried to force their way into Ege University mortuary, where the remains of the martyrs were kept. These brazen acts of aggression of the servants of ruling classes didn't intimidate communists, anti-fascists and supporters of revolutionary prisoners; but on the contrary heightened their fighting mood.

On 24 September 1995, about 500 people came together in Izmir to support the struggle of revolutionary inmates of Buca prison. This action was organized on the initiative of a committee comprising relatives of revolutionary prisoners, representatives of some labor unions and of unions of public employees, of revolutionary journals and of representatives of some mass organizations. After a moment of silence in memory of Buca martyrs, a press statement explaining the course of events was made and various revolutionary slogans shouted.

Buca massacre was denounced by MLCP and other revolutionary organizations both verbally and through a series of actions in Esenyurt and Ümraniye districts of Istanbul and also in Izmir, Bursa and Adana and Duisburg, Germany. During a joint protest action organized by MLCP and DHKP-C* (the organization to which the three martyrs of Buca were attached to) in Istanbul on 24 September 1995, various slogans condemning the atrocity of the regime were shouted and placards displayed. A police car was destroyed in this action by molotov cocktails in which about sixty revolutionaries took part. CYO, youth branch of MLCP organized an unauthorized protest action in Unkapanı region of Istanbul on 27 September 1995 with the participation of 70 communist revolutionaries. They stopped the heavy traffic on the road and addressed to the thousands of people gathered there through a megaphone exposing the murderous face of fascism. Young militants dispersed after inviting workers to MLCP and indicting the ruling classes for Buca massacre.

A GIGANTIC STRIKE WAVE

Through September and October 1995, Turkey was shaken by the strike struggle of hundreds of thousands of public sector workers. This gigantic strike wave began to rise on 8 September with the strike of 32.000 agricultural workers employed in public sector. In time they were joined by workers employed in various sectors, such as railroads, marine transportation, leather and shoe manufacturing, highway construction and maintenance, petrochemicals, coal mining, iron and steel works, paper production etc. The immediate cause of this strike wave, embracing at its height more than 300.000 workers, was the deadlock in talks over wage hikes between labor unions and directors of public corporations. As usual, increases in wage levels were outrun by the galloping inflation, which has been on the order of 90-100 per cent in 1994 and 1995. Fascist dictatorship of collaborationist monopolist bourgeoisie, who with the prompting of IMF and World Bank had been trying to get out of the mire of economic recession by lowering the already low standard of living of toiling masses, had intensified its efforts toward privatization and deunionization, especially following the implementation of 5 April 1994 austerity program. These attempts had paved the way for a series of militant working class actions right after the announcement of this IMF-inspired step. September and October 1995 actions of public sector workers were an aftermath, an extension of strikes and demonstrations that characterized 1994.

These strikes of public sector workers did not proceed in a peaceful and passive manner. At the beginning of strikes, in a lot of factories and workplaces workers commemorated with joy the long-awaited action. Strikes were accompanied with marches, demonstrations, protest actions against employers and the governing bourgeois party, putting up of placards, reciprocal visits between striking workers etc. The 15 October meeting of workers in Ankara was the culmination of this gigantic strike action. 250.000 workers and their supporters came together on that day despite the threats of interior ministry of fascist dictatorship and sabotage of trade union bureaucrats. The police and gendarme took a series of measures to prevent masses of workers from coming to Ankara. MGK (NSC' National Security Council), a powerful body comprising top governing civilian politicians and chiefs of armed forces, the intelligence organization and the police, had already threatened workers and labor unions at the end of September and alleged that they wouldn't allow anyone "to infringe upon the laws." These measures included mobilization of local police and gendarme everywhere to prevent workers' groups from leaving their home towns, issuance of stern warnings directed against bus companies transporting workers to Ankara and putting up of barricades at the gates of Ankara to deter workers from joining the meeting. At various places there occurred clashes between workers' groups and the police and gendarme who tried to stop the marching masses. Workers, who lacked a revolutionary leadership and who despite all their militancy could not break the hegemony of trade union bureaucrats over themselves, overcame the barricades of 'security' forces and marched to Kızılay Square shouting various slogans such as, "We've Overcome the Barricades, We're in Ankara!", "We've Overcome the Barricades, Now It's Time to Overcome Capital!", "Long Live the Unity of Workers!", "A Single Fist, A Single Barricade Against Capital!", Militants and sympathizers of Marxist Leninist Communist Party actively participated in the strike movement in general and the great meeting in Kızılay Square in particular. Together with the militants and sympathizers of other revolutionary organizations they contributed a lot to the heightening of morale and fighting mood of the masses. But this didn't suffice to ensure the victory of September-October 1995 strike action. All the same this strike action served as a revolutionary school both for communists and class conscious and ordinary workers and displayed once more the immense revolutionary potential of fighting proletariat.

AN UNNATURAL DISASTER

Fifty-seven people were killed, fifty were wounded and nineteen lost as a result of a flood that affected toiling people's districts of Izmir on 4 November 1995. More than, 1.000 dwellings were flooded during the disaster that struck the poor people of the area at night hours. The high level of the death toll and of material damage were due to the fact that, no proper measures were taken by the authorities, with regard to brooklets that flow through this area.

Communists immediately organized a People's Committee as soon as they heard of the disaster, together with the representatives of the district and began to tackle the urgent questions of health, housing, clothing and food provision. The local and provincial authorities, who hadn't done a thing until then to help the affected people apart from making hollow promises, made themselves felt only through their harassment of the People's Committee.

The People's Committee issued a press release on 8 November on the occasion of a mass meeting where 150 people were present. Threats of the police didn't deter the people who answered them with slogans expressing their determination. Moreover, the police was forced to free one of the inhabitants of Yamanlar district they had detained prior to the mass meeting and deliver him to the representatives of the People's Committee upon their arrival at the local police station.

On the second day of the disaster, a 1.000-strong group gathered under the leadership and on the initiative of MLCP conducted a protest march in front of Çi_li-Guzeltepe municipality. Speakers criticized and exposed the authorities for their indifference to the problems of the people and indicted them and held them responsible for loss of human lives and material damage. Braving the big concentration of police in the area, they protested Mayor G. Öztürk and shouted various slogans, condemning the role of fascist state in the high death toll. Continuing their march into Güzeltepe district the protestors prevented K. Aktaş, (Aktash), Governor of Izmir and G. Öztürk, Mayor of Çiğli town from speaking to them. During the ensuing clash Mayor G. Öztürk was injured and attacking police was repulsed by the angry masses.

On 8 November, the people of Yamanlar district who had born the brunt of flood disaster took to the streets under the leadership of MLCP. The 500-strong group shouted various slogans condemning the indifference and crimes of the ruling classes toward the toiling people of the region and showered the police cars with stones. The police didn't dare to attack the angry people.

ANTI-FASCIST RESPONSE TO FASCIST HOWLS

For some time Turkish fascists have been trying to utilize the football matches of Turkish national team to whip up chauvinist feelings. They've taken to touring through the main avenues of big cities in processions of cars, waving Turkish flags and shouting reactionary, nationalist and chauvinist slogans, under the guise of extending support to the national team. Anti-fascist forces have started to organize counter-demonstrations and counter-attacks against these fascist-inspired actions lately. Here is an example:

When the fascists once again took to the streets in December 1995, in order to allegedly commemorate the victory scored on Sweden by Turkey in a football match, they received their due in some districts of Istanbul. In Bostancı (Bostanji) district a group of revolutionaries and anti-fascists numbering about 150, punished a fascist horde, who tried to stage a demonstration there. They reacted with revolutionary and internationalist

KGÖ IN ACTION

Communist and revolutionary student initiated a series of actions, which mainly took the form of hunger strikes, on 19 December 1995 to protest against high tuition fees, the presence of police, gendarme and special "security" units on university premises and to secure an increase in tuition aid to students.

This particular struggle was directed right from the beginning by KGÖ (=CYO, Communist Youth organization), youth branch of MLCP. It was started in the Faculty of Literature of Istanbul University with a meeting, where about 200 people, including representatives of some labor unions, of unions of public employees, of some reformist "socialist" parties and various democratic personages were present. Despite the attempts of above mentioned "socialist" parties, to end the action immediately and nip it in the bud, communist students and their allies continued the fight. When the head of the Istanbul organization of a revisionist party, who on the face of it seemed supporting students' struggle, tried insolently to declare the action ended after the preliminary meeting of 19 December, he was harshly criticized and dismissed by communists. On the other hand, the police persistently harassed the students on hunger strike and frequently attacked at them, took them into custody and tortured them.

The hunger strike of communist and revolutionary students was carried on at Yıldız University in Istanbul from 31 December on. In time the struggle of Istanbul university students spread to other cities and towns and received the support of lycee and university students in various places, such as, Ankara, İzmir, Adana, Bursa, Eskişehir, Trabzon, Balıkesir, Samsun,

Kayseri, Bandırma, Mersin, Çanakkale (“Chanakkale), _skenderun, Zonguldak, Hopa etc. and acquired a nation-wide dimension. Furthermore, this struggle began to surround itself with a wave of solidarity actions on the part of revolutionary journals, progressive teachers, intellectuals and artists, various labor unions and unions of public employees, organizations of toiling women, mothers and relatives of “disappeared” revolutionaries and martyrs, human rights activists etc. At that point, bourgeois media began to feel itself compelled to give coverage to the struggle of university students and admit, though in a hypocritical and demagogical manner the legitimacy of their demands. To a lesser extent, this became true for so called opposition parties of the bourgeoisie.

This outstanding action was culminated in militant marches and demonstrations in Istanbul and Ankara, on the 4th and 5th of February respectively. On 4 February 1996, about 3.000 communist and revolutionary students and their supporters triumphantly entered Taksim Square Overcoming police barricades after a brief skirmish. They sang 1 May hymn and listened to the speeches made by the organizers of the march. Throughout the march and demonstration in Taksim Square they shouted revolutionary slogans and raised various placards protesting reactionary education system, fascism and imperialism.

The following day, communist and revolutionary students were on their way to Kızılay Square in Ankara, capital of Turkey. Scared to death of the scale of revolutionary energy and resistance generated by the glorious action of students, fascist dictatorship had instructed its police chiefs not to allow the troublesome (!) demonstrators to “liberate” Kızılay Square. Therefore, the police had taken extraordinary measures and mobilized all its forces, including numerous panzers and all but occupied the premises of the Square. But they were to fail again miserably. More then 2.000 communist and revolutionary students and their supporters broke through police barricades and made Kızılay Square ring with revolutionary slogans, such as “Long Live Revolution!”, “End to the Occupation of Universities by the Police!”, “Funds for Education, not War!”, “ To the Streets, to Action, to Liberation!” etc.

HEROIC STRUGGLE OF ÜMRANIYE PRISONERS

On 4 January 1996, “security” forces of Turkish fascist dictatorship (gendarme, special teams and prison guards) mounted an attack on political detainees and prisoners in the high security Ümraniye prison in Istanbul. Three revolutionaries had been killed on the scene and a fourth died in hospital a week later. More then thirty revolutionaries were wounded, most of them seriously. Doctors and nurses in the hospitals where the wounded were taken, told the press that almost all the wounded revolutionaries had received serious blows on their heads. This clearly showed the homici-

dal intentions of the torturers and hangmen of the regime, who without doubt acted on orders from “high” places. The heroic resistance of revolutionary detainees and prisoners prevented the death toll from rising. They put up barricades and fought back against their oppressors. Scores of prison guards and soldiers were wounded during the clashes.

The authorities tried to justify this preplanned barbaric attack of theirs on the ground that there had occurred a so-called “uprising” in Ümraniye dungeon. Of course everybody knows that this is a despicable lie of US-backed reaction who has been trying to “pacify” the glorious resistance of revolutionary detainees and prisoners, especially since the military-fascist coup d’etat of September 1980. But it has failed miserably. It has not been able to prevent prisons from being transformed into revolutionary schools and one of the most important foci of resistance against fascism.

Communist, revolutionary and anti-fascist forces, including the relatives of revolutionary prisoners, progressive intellectuals and some mass organizations all over Turkey organized various protest actions against this latest outrage of fascist regime, during some of which, clashes occurred with the “security” forces of reaction. One of the most notable of these actions were the detention of scores of prison directors and prison guards by revolutionary prisoners in Bayrampa_a (Istanbul), Merkez Kapalı (Ankara) and Buca (Izmir) prisons. These hostages, who were not harmed in any way, would be released about a week later, upon the acceptance of various demands of imprisoned revolutionaries by the authorities.

Fascist regime, whose bloodthirsty features were thoroughly exposed and who was politically defeated in this particular confrontation, tried to avenge its fiasco by detaining more than 1.000 people during the funeral procession of three martyred revolutionaries (Raze Boyar, Orphan Özen and Abdülmecid Seçkin) on 8 January, and by destroying the wreaths to be laid upon the tombs, including that of Human Rights Association. Among those that were detained, a revolutionary press correspondent (Metin Göktepe) would also be massacred in police custody. His funeral procession, held on 11th of January was also transformed into a mighty anti-fascist rally.

MLKP (Marxist Leninist Communist Party) issued a declaration on 5 January 1996 in response to the massacre in Ümraniye dungeon. In sum it said:

“Fascist dictatorship of capital shedded blood in dungeons again. Hordes of murderers massacred three revolutionaries and wounded tens of them in their attack on Ümraniye Prison. These attacks are planned beforehand. The regime aims to destroy revolutionaries, who do not capitulate and reject enslavement. Defenseless captives who are interned behind prison walls are massacred with rifle butts, iron bars, clubs and with bullets where the former remain inadequate. The wounded and gravely ill revolutionaries are abandoned to death. This is nothing but the practical application of General Evren’s (head of the junta that carried out the US-inspired fascist coup d’etat of September 1980) policy, who has gained notoriety for saying, ‘Shall we feed the (interned) revolutionaries, instead of hanging them?’.

“The murderers and the people responsible for the massacre won’t get away with this. Our MLKP won’t remain silent in the face of these massacres and assaults.

“Workers, toilers, youth,

“Do not let the brave sons and daughters of our people unaided, who have been taken hostage in the struggle for freedom and socialism.

“Express your indignation against this massacre by shutting the machines off, by organizing demonstrations and boycott actions. Join the actions organized by communists and revolutionaries. Set up the freedom barricades of Gazi in all toilers’ quarters and shake the city squares with gigantic demonstrations...”

“PICTURES OF SAVAGERY”

On 13 January 1996, Özgür POLITIKA (-Free POLITICS), a daily newspaper closely connected with Kurdish national liberation movement and published in Germany, printed on its first and last pages, what became to be called “pictures of savagery”. In these pictures brought to public notice on the pages of Özgür POLITIKA were depicted Turkish soldiers posing with the chopped off heads of Kurdish guerillas in their hands. This is no new scene for Kurdish and Turkish peoples and progressive public opinion. Almost everybody in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan knows that colonialist-fascist dictatorship of Turkish ruling classes has committed and been committing countless murders and massacres in Northern



Kurdistan. In the “dirty war” they’ve been waging against Kurdish people and guerillas led by PKK (‘Workers’ Party of Kurdistan’) they’ve killed tens of thousands of people, burned more than 2,000 villages and forced millions of Kurdish poor peasants to emigrate to cities of Turkey and Northern Kurdistan where they face both oppression and hunger. But despite the ferocious attacks and scorched earth policy of Turkish army, the glorious resistance of Kurdish people and guerillas continues unabated.

The publication of “pictures of savagery” have greatly embarrassed the fascist regime and provoked an hypocritical reaction on the part of their mouth-pieces and stooges, especially after the wide coverage given to the event in Western European media. They alleged that Turkish and especially Kurdish and Western European media covering the event were prejudicial against Turkey and such events didn’t occur in a “law-abiding country” like Turkey! But, fascist dictatorship didn’t let it go at that. On 15 January 1996, Turkish armed forces and kontrgerilla burned to death 11 peasants in Güçlükönak (Basa) town of _irnak (Shirnak) province, apparently in an effort to sway public opinion against PKK. What is more, they blamed the massacre on PKK guerillas. This maneuver of fascist regime aimed at neutralizing the effect of the shock wave produced by “pictures of savagery” ricocheted. The provocative nature of this last crime of Turkish ruling classes was exposed soon, despite the paltry demagogu

of fascist and reactionary media.

Another aspect of this despicable massacre, is its connection with PKK's last peace initiative disclosed in December 1995. Fascist regime, unable to defeat Kurdish insurrection in spite of its mobilization of hundreds of thousands of troops, special teams and so called village guards, is also unable to negotiate at present a peaceful settlement with PKK, both for political and psychological reasons. US and Western European imperialists have been pressing Turkish authorities for about a couple of years for a non-revolutionary and non-popular solution of Kurdish question. Some sections Turkish bourgeoisie and high officials misleadingly called "doves" are in favor of such a solution. To a certain extent this also is the case for the petty-bourgeois leadership of Kurdish national liberation movement, which has been demanding a peaceful solution more and more emphatically. In this context Güçlükonak massacre should also be seen as a warning signal by "hawks" directed against "doves", PKK and imperialists, who for different reasons and from different standpoints favor a "peaceful solution" for Kurdish questions.

SAVAMA MURDERS IN TURKEY

Agents of SAVAMA, the secret intelligence organization of Islamic Republic of Iran have killed two people in Aksaray district of Istanbul, on 22 February 1996. The victims were Zehra Racabi and Abdul Alimaradi, both members of Mojahidin-i Khalq (People's Fighters) organization. Turkish bourgeois press has tried to present this act of counter-revolutionary terror as a "war of secret agents". But it is obvious that this cold blooded murder of reactionary mullah regime is only one of the freshest examples of the war, Persian reaction has been waging against revolutionary and progressive forces of Iran. Those who have emigrated abroad have not been spared of this "treatment" by fundamentalist ulema clique. It rightfully may boast of surpassing its predecessor, fascist regime of Shah Reza Pahlavi, in its cruelty against workers and toilers and oppressed peoples.

Turkish reaction is one of the accomplices of reactionary mullah regime in its war against revolutionary and Kurdish national opposition. Despite their rivalries and deep distrust in each other, Turkish and Iranian ruling classes do cooperate in fighting against revolutionary forces in general and against Kurdish people and national liberation movement in particular quite easily. Turkish fascism has not been content with extraditing hundreds and even thousands of Iranian revolutionaries and Kurdish national liberation fighters who had taken refuge in Turkey and sending them to death and torture. But it also has allowed SAVAMA agents, who with the aid of some religious fundamentalist groups sympathizing with Khomeinism to conduct operations in Turkey against the progressive enemies of reactionary mullah regime. To date more than 50 known political murders have been committed on Turkish soil and in almost none of the cases have the hangmen of Iranian reaction been apprehended.

