



Turkish Studies

History

Volume 13/8, Spring 2018, p. 19-36

DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.13580>

ISSN: 1308-2140, ANKARA-TURKEY

Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi

Article Info/Makale Bilgisi

✍ Received/Geliş: Mayıs 2018 ✓ Accepted/Kabul: Haziran 2018

👤 Referees/Hakemler: Prof. Dr. Soyalp TAMÇELİK – Prof. Dr. Burak Gümüş - Dr. Nuri Gökhan TOPRAK

This article was checked by iThenticate.

ANTI-SOVIETISM IN TURKISH LEFT: CONCEPT OF SOCIAL IMPERIALISM, THREE WORLD THEORY AND PROLETERIAN REVOLUTIONIST ENLIGHTENMENT (PDA) MOVEMENT

*İhsan Ömer ATAGENÇ**

ABSTRACT

The tension between the USSR and China in 1960s has been known as the 'Moscow-Beijing Split' in the political history. The CPC's (The Communist Party of China) critiques against the CPSU (the Communist Party of Soviet Union) have reached the highest point by claiming that the USSR is a 'social-imperialist' country. The answer that is produced as a solution to the problem of defining the USSR as an imperialist state is the 'three world theory'. China has defined a new mission for herself by the 'three world theory'. China has wanted to lead a front consisted of the 'third world countries' against the USA's and USSR's imperialism. This tension has influenced Turkey as well as many other countries. In the post 12th of March 1971 coup d'état period, while the Turkish left was reorganizing itself, the PDA movement (The Proletarian Revolutionist Enlightenment) which originated from the MDD (the National Democratic Revolution) has had to become a party to this tension. The PDA, which has transferred the CPC's theory of 'social-imperialism' and 'three world theory' to Turkey, has reduced the struggle for socialism to the struggle against the USSR since the second half of 1970s. Amongst the various USSR critiques of the Turkish left, the one that the PDA circle holds has taken a peculiar place by declaring the USSR as 'the basic conflict' and through its attitude that reduces the struggle for socialism to the struggle against the USSR.

STRUCTURED ABSTRACT

This study aims to discuss the foreign policy orientations of the most prominent representative of the anti-Soviet tendencies in Turkish left, Proletarian Revolutionist Enlightenment (PDA) Movement. There are



* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Kırklareli Üniversitesi Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, El-mek: atagencomer@yahoo.com

two basic assumptions of the study. The first of these is that not all of Turkish left is involved in a project of USSR-oriented socialism. The second hypothesis is that the anti-Soviet orientations that the PDA possesses have made it look more favorable to the US in the process. This view also parallels to the "struggle against communism" perspective, which is equalized with the USSR during the Cold War era. Party programs and brochures of the TİİK- Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Party of Turkey (then TİKP), which represent the PDA Movement in the political arena, constitute the main sources of this work. The discourse analysis made on primary sources by taking the basic dynamics of Turkish political life, especially Turkish left, in the 1970s into the center forms the basis of this study. The process of "Moscow-Beijing Conflict" in the history of the Cold War has created negative effects on the Turkish left as in the entire socialist bloc. As an extension of these debates on the world scale, Beijing-oriented socialism, the Maoism with another name, seems to be ascending in Turkey. The leading representative of the Maoist movement in Turkey is Proletarian Revolutionist Enlightenment (PDA) movement led by Doğu Perinçek. PDA originated from the National Democratic Revolution (MDD), one of the leading representatives of the Turkish left in the 1960s. The MDD organized around *Aydınlık* magazine was divided into two groups under the names of *Aydınlık Sosyalist Dergi* led by Mihri Belli and *Proleter Devrimci Aydınlık* led by Doğu Perinçek towards the end of the 1960s. MDD, the origin of PDA, is one of the main groups as standing closest to Kemalism on the Turkish left. MDD, which sympathizes with Kemalism's founding will and wants to form its socialist struggle basis on Kemalism's legacy, has been one of the most active groups in Turkey left in the 1960s. The relationship plane established by PDA with Kemalism can be mentioned in origin. On the other hand, it is possible to say that especially in the process of organization under the roof of TİKP in the aftermath of 12 March there has been a change in the relations set with Kemalism. The PDA movement, gradually move away from the MDD's Turkish socialism understanding, has become a follower of Beijing-oriented socialism as the representative of Maoism in Turkey. Giving a limited place to Kemalism in discourse during the process of breaking from Kemalism of Turkish left is one of the main indicators of this change. At the same time, the similarities between the priority given to rural areas in the process of Maoism's socialist revolution and the National Struggle period in Turkey, seems to be another example of the limited relationship of PDA movement with Kemalism. As a representative of socialism based in Beijing, the PDA chose to read the ideological conflict over the resources of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). In this context, when we look at the general political analysis of the PDA, it will be seen that the concepts of "Three World Theories" and "Social-imperialism" are at the forefront. Yet the basic texts of the party are based on the translation of the main texts of the CCP. This has allowed the PDA to look at the world from Beijing's perspective. Moreover, the national interests of China are quite determinative in terms of PDA's world view. The main point of criticism of the PDA against the USSR is the same as the criticism of the CCP. Since the Khrushchev era, the USSR has been accused of betraying the Stalin's legacy. Along with the Khrushchev administration, the USSR has become an imperialist state just like the United States. By the 1970s, the threat of imperialism comes not only from the US, but also

from the USSR. In the first half of the seventies, the PDA considers the US and the USSR equal on the threat of imperialism. By the end of the 70s, however, it would be argued that the USSR is a more dangerous state than the United States. According to the PDA, the American imperialism loses its worldwide power and influence. In other words, American imperialism in the world comes to an end. For this reason, analyze of the US as an imperialist state lose their validity. In the second half of the seventies, the US began to lose its power and the gap was filled by the USSR. It must be said that the views on the US are even softer in the process. Yet the US is no longer a threat. In fact, by the end of the seventies, the US has become a balancing force that can offer peace in the world against the USSR imperialism. PDA states that it may be involved in a peace camp in which the United States may also take part in the period when Soviet imperialism is becoming increasingly aggressive. The extreme example of PDA's point of view towards the USA is also the result of the Soviet intervention to Afghanistan. The PDA has invited NATO to intervene at this point, giving direct support to the mujahedeen, which they define as "progressive Afghan people". It is necessary to state that PDA is the most contrary example about the relations with NATO in the process that Turkish left define NATO as an imperialist invasion organization. Besides inviting NATO to intervene against the USSR, PDA possesses a very different approach to the relations between Turkey and NATO, too. Turkish left is in line with Turkey's departure from NATO in general. In contrast, PDA argues that the revision of the regulations to the disadvantage of Turkey by bilateral relations is sufficient. Now, in terms of Turkish Left "principal contradiction" should be the USSR but US. The socialists who ignore this situation are in favor of the USSR imperialism. The imperialism analysis of PDA over the USSR also has a reflection in Turkey. Accordingly, Turkish left, which does not see the USSR as an imperialist threat were accused of "collaboration". Those who have not shown the necessary reaction to the USSR are betraying socialism. In terms of PDA, Demirel and Ecevit governments, which established relations with the USSR in various issues in the 1970s, have become commoners in this betrayal. Yet it was not understood that the USSR worked against Turkey in many cases that closely related to Turkey. They think it should be seen that in many cases such as Cyprus issue or Kurdish problem the Soviet imperialism intervened against Turkey. During the Cold War Turkey shaped her political life in "struggle against communism" perspective. Despite the frequent government change during the period, the struggle against communism represents stability in terms of Turkish politics. Considering the USSR as a main threat to struggle against communism perspective, the hostility towards the USSR in the socialist wing make PDA parallel to "struggle against communism" strategy not against it.

Keywords: Social-imperialism, Three World Theory, Communist Party of Soviet Union, Communist Party of China, Proleterian Revolutionist Aydınlik Movement

TÜRKİYE SOLUNDA ANTI-SOVYETİZM: SOSYAL EMPERYALİZM KAVRAMI, ÜÇ DÜNYA TEORİSİ VE PROLETER DEVİRİMCİ AYDINLIK HAREKETİ (PDA)

ÖZET

1960'lı yıllarda SSCB ile Çin arasında başlayan gerilim siyasi tarihe "Moskova-Pekin Çatışması" olarak geçmiştir. Çin Komünist Partisi (ÇKP)'nin Sovyetler Birliği Komünist Partisi (SBKP)'ne yönelik olarak başlattığı eleştiriler SSCB'nin "Sosyal-emperyalist" bir devlet olduğu iddiasıyla zirve noktasına taşınmıştır. SSCB'nin de emperyalist bir devlet olduğu iddiasına karşı üretilen çözüm ise "Üç Dünya Teorisi" olarak formüle edilmiştir. Çin, "Üç Dünya Teorisi" ile kendisine yeni bir misyon belirlemiştir. Çin, ABD ve SSCB emperyalizmine karşı "Üçüncü Dünya" ülkeleriyle kurulacak bir cepheye önderlik etmek istemektedir. Çin'in ABD ile ilişkilerini geliştirdiği bu dönemde ortaya çıkan "Üç Dünya Teorisi", ABD'den daha çok SSCB'yi hedef alan bir teori haline gelmiştir. Bu gerilim pek çok diğer ülke gibi Türkiye'yi de etkisi altında almıştır. 12 Mart darbesinden sonra Türkiye solunun yeniden örgütlendiği dönemde MDD kökenli bir yapı olan PDA hareketi bu gerilimde bir taraf durumuna gelmiştir. ÇKP'nin "Sosyal-emperyalizm" ve "Üç Dünya Teorisi" kavramlarını Türkiye'ye taşıyan PDA sosyalizm mücadelesini 1970'lerin ikinci yarısından itibaren SSCB ile mücadele noktasına indirgemıştır. Türkiye solu içindeki çok çeşitli SSCB eleştirilerinin yanında PDA çevresinin SSCB'yi "baş çelişki" ilan eden ve sosyalizm mücadelesini SSCB ile mücadeleye indirgeyen davranışı, bu yapıyı Türkiye solu içinde özgün bir konuma getirmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal-emperyalizm, Üç Dünya Teorisi, Sovyetler Birliği Komünist Partisi, Çin Komünist Partisi, Proleter Devrimci Aydınlik Hareketi

Introduction

The 1960s had a major crisis in the global system. This crisis, symbolized by the Cuban Crisis, brought the world to the brink of a nuclear crisis. Along with the transition from crisis to detente, the detente of USA-USSR relations resulted in another climb in the socialist camp. CPSU started a serious criticism process of the previous period in their 20th Congress, led by Khrushchev. This criticism is referred as the "de-Stalinisation" process in the literature. The process that started with Khrushchev resulted in China's great reaction and it was also the starting point of "Moscow-Beijing conflict". The "Moscow-Beijing conflict" resulted in the division of socialist block into two. This tension affected many countries of the world. One of them is Turkey. Because Turkish left that performed an important breakthrough after May 27, had the character of Kemalism, it is hard to say that this tension was transmitted into the centre of the Left directly. However, in the post period of March 12 coup-d'état, it could be seen that as 1974 the Left reorganised. The group led by Doğu Perinçek from these two groups divided under the leadership of Mihri Belli and Doğu Perinçek continued their activities around the "Proletarian Revolutionist Enlightenment" (PDA) magazine. This environment referred to by the name of the Magazine became an important part of Moscow-Beijing conflict as a part of Beijing axis in Turkey. This environment, which engaged with the important concepts such as "Social-imperialism" and "Three Worlds Theory", was at the forefront of the leading Maoist groups.

An Important Break in the Establishment of anti-Soviets: the Historical Background of Moscow-Beijing Conflict

February 1956 was an important turning point to determine the ideological tendencies of USSR; because in this period the historical 20th Congress of Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU) was held. This Congress was different from other congresses, because the decisions taken in 20th Congress were the denial of previous periods and represented a new starting point for the Soviets. 20th Congress was also the congress which Khrushchev made his famous "secret" speech. In this speech Khrushchev almost completely rejected the Stalin era and initiated the process of purifying the country from Stalin; in other words he started the de-Stalinisation process (Best et. al. 2012: 393). Besides he also drew a road map for Soviets. He stated that the aggressive and hostile attitudes in the past should be left and that the principle of "living together in peace" should be tried to ensure the environment of peace and tranquillity in the world. It was also accepted that socialism could be reached via many different ways. At this point we see that China had a more moderate attitude than the Soviet Union. Beijing did not agree with Soviets about the wading into the past era. Although he accepted the existence of some mistakes, he objected to the complete rejection of Stalin era. Although Khrushchev accepted the existence of some mistakes, he objected to Stalin's entire rejection. This was indicated very clearly in "Peoples' Newspaper" issue dated April 5 which was the media organ of Communist Party of China, that even before about three months after the 20th Congress. The Stalin period was criticized very softly by the article published with the title "On the Historical Experiences of the Proletarian Dictatorship". According to CPC, there may be a lot of mistakes. However those mistakes were natural; because mistakes were hidden in the reality of life. Everyone could have done wrong at any time. It was quite normal to make mistakes for someone who believed in dialectic, who thought that the contradictions would never end and that the opponents would solve each other all the time. Whatever it takes, Stalin era was a huge inheritance with pros and cons and this inheritance should be utilized all the way. It would be unfair to reject such a period by only emphasizing mistakes (Baby, 1967: 5-10). This may also constitute the beginning of ideological conflict between Moscow and Beijing; because after this article, the waters were not touched at all, but the criticism got harder and harder in order to get rid of this situation that Moscow was caught without preparation. When this article was published and when the conflict begins slowly in an ideological sense, there was another development that Soviets threw the Sputnik suit on October 4, 1957. The important point here is that the Soviets reached a technology that could send a satellite to the space, rather than just sending a satellite (Best et. al., 2012: 393).

Within the same year Conference of Communist Parties was held. This conference, which was held on November 14-19 in two separated sessions, aimed to prevent the weakening within the structure and de-linking in socialist camp started with Yugoslavia, and aimed to reform the socialist camp under the leadership of USSR. However, it seemed quite difficult to achieve; because although Communist Party of Italia, the biggest communist party of Europe after Yugoslavia, and communists in Poland were seen close to the Soviets, they were not pleased with the "boss" of the Soviets. In the Conference in 1957, Togliatti, the leader of Communist Party of Italia, made an important emphasis on independence and indicated that the way to socialism should be decided by each country itself and that the socialist camp should be multi-centred in this sense (Adelman and Palmieri, 1989: 160-161). While all these developments were taking place, China continued to develop and move from one side. Inspired by a Soviet-style development model, China made a huge leap forward, setting up "people's communes". On the other hand, it was also significantly supported by USSR in the field of nuclear power. However USSR did not provide enough support for important security issues faced by China. In 1958, it did not support the attack on the Taiwan Bay made by China and in 1959 USSR was beside India in the distress experienced on the Sino-Indian border Soviet Union did not support the development move tried to be made by China. According to them, the moves of China were demodded and quite primitive methods, and there was no validity in those days (Dallin, 1961: 491).

When all this was happening, a visit with breakpoints in relations took place. Khrushchev visited the United States between the dates September 15 and 27th in 1957. This visit was the last straw for Beijing; because Khrushchev made an end of nuclear aid to China, reached an agreement with the US on cooperation in the nuclear field. According to Beijing, this agreement was a concession to USA given by Khrushchev. This concession was also a result of "peaceful coexistence" policy mentioned by Khrushchev frequently (Zagoria, 1962: 226). Because Khrushchev was trying to be closer with the United States by softening relations with the West through this policy. This trip further harshened Beijing's attitude towards both the Soviets and the US. This work was one of the most fundamental sources that summarized how Khrushchev looked after socialism and revolution after Stalin and how the Soviets had to convert in an ideological sense. On the other hand, the main point of the dispute was the ridiculed article serial published by the CPC in the name of "Long Live Leninism!" apart from the "Peoples' Newspaper" and "Red Flag" newspapers (Hudson, Lowenthal, Mac Farquhar, 1961: 82-112). The main points which Mao tried to explain in this serial is that the idea of "living in peace" to block socialism and the war was a tool that must be used on the road to socialism. At the beginning of 1960s, two other main articles were published. Mao's aim was to explain that the "peaceful" path that Khrushchev preferred was used to co-operate with imperialism. On the other hand, based on Lenin's idea that socialism could not be reached without a people's war, Mao indicated that war was an inevitable result and at this point he needed to rely on Lenin, and by bringing to the agenda the reconstruction of Leninism against Khrushchev, Mao criticized that Soviets deviated from socialism. The U2 incident in May 1960 which was a sign that the United States could penetrated into the centre of Soviets to spy on, sparked the debate between the two countries. At the World Confederation of Trade Unions gathered in Beijing on June 5-9, the differences of opinion on "peace, war and imperialism" became evident thoroughly; not only the CPSU and the CPC but also the communist parties of other countries took positions in these issues and showed to what extent the clashes have moved (Baby, 1967: 68). China's greatest strain was to break the influence of the CPSU in the communist movement in the world whatever it takes. He showed every effort to do this, cooperating with all kinds of anti-Soviet fractions. Khrushchev did not give any direct nor comprehensive respond to the article named "Long Live Leninism". The only thing he stated that the principles of Leninism and worldview belong to the conditions of that period, that they could not be applied exactly the same day, and that no one could return them from the way the Soviets have drawn (Baby, 1967: 69).

There were two important crises at the beginning of 1960s. The first one was Albania issue. As it is known, the current management in Albania became more important for both Soviets and China when Yugoslavia had left the socialist camp. Winning Albania over other meant for the two countries to gain a position in Europe easier. However Soviets had more disadvantaged position than China, because Albania was not glad of the change in USSR with the power of Khrushchev and new Soviet thesis was not satisfied Albania. Additionally, Albania was also quite uncomfortable with the position of the Soviets as "the boss". However it was not adversity for Soviets, because they thought that, whatever they were, both Albania and China would return to the movement that began under the leadership of the Soviets. But the process did not evolve due to the expectations of the Soviets. China did not give up its struggle against Soviets, and won Albania over. Another occurrent was the Cuban crisis. As it is known, in return for the elimination of the US threat, nuclear weapons were slowly emerging and the world arrived at a "balance of terror" and to end of the threatening environment taking steps backward by Soviets brought Cuba away from the Soviet Union and resulted a number of members of the socialist camp sided against Soviets and supported China (Clubb, 1975: 452-453).

Although, in November 1960, there was a decision to hold a Conference in order to deal with the Sino-Soviet dispute, and a big meeting was held to pass as the "81s Conference", and there was

a limited decisions for settlement, the existing disputes prevented any agreement (Clubb, 1975: 456). Relations, which were tried to mend the fences, became more problematic during the developments in Chinese-Indian war of 1963. During the Chinese-Indian War, the Soviets re-ignited the debate that helped "capitalist" India rather than "socialist" China and this fuel the conflicts, and this process brought the two countries to the point of ideological debate through the correspondence echoing all over the world in June and July of the same year (Baby, 1967: 94-101).

One of most symbolic tension of the history labelled as "the Moscow-Beijing conflict" is that the Central Committees of the Chinese Communist Party (CPC) and the Communist Party of the USSR (CPSU) send letters filled with many accusations beyond their writings and criticisms. There were two important letters in this period. These were the letters "Proposals on the General Line of the International Communist Movement" dated June 14, 1963, sent to the CPSU by the CCP (Beijing-Moscow, 1998: 9-66). This letter focused on 25 main points. In the heart of this letter the definition of the current political position of the United States was central. For China, the United States was the largest imperialist state in the world. Since the greatest enemy of communism was imperialism, the biggest enemy of the movement was the USA. It needs to be clearly defined and acted according to it. The Soviet Union seems unstable in this regard. The USSR should leave the US ambivalence as soon as possible and choose its side. The other point is that the USSR lost its qualities as a "socialist" state and that it was a "social-imperialist" state. In order for the movement to continue in a healthy way, the USSR should get rid of this hegemonic grief as soon as possible.

The Soviet Union responded with a letter dated 14 July. This letter, in general, represents the shortcomings of China's cooperation with the USSR. According to this, although the friendship between China and the USSR, one of the most prominent countries of the socialist camp, has great prominence, the ideological debate that started in 1960 brought the two countries to a great split. At this point, the CCP did not hesitate to resolve the dispute over the issue, rather than to condemn the USSR further in the world public opinion. China, which does not care about the attitude of the USSR regarding "disarmament", ignores these steps taken to provide a truly peaceful environment in the world. In addition, China has assumed that the principle of "living together in peace" is proclaimed as a "peace" between the classes in a conflict of interest, the conflicts of interests and the imperialist states and the colonial countries. The USSR expressed in this letter that it is ideologically opposed to the concept of "coexistence in peace" at this point. The "crisis" news that China constantly made towards the international public created the impression that the developments in the socialist camp are causing a huge catastrophe. However, this crisis alleged to exist within the socialist camp harms the socialist camp; on the contrary, it benefits the development of imperialism (Beijing-Moscow, 1998: 67-134). The aim of the USSR to write this letter is to put forward "good intentions" in order to preserve the current situation in the socialist camp rather than to answer the charges, and to re-invite China to the struggle for socialism. Relations between the two countries did not come to a point that the USSR has demanded since this period. On the contrary, it is possible to say that this conflict led to deeper problems.

On the concept of "Social Imperialism" and "The Three World Theory"

Socialism, as well as other political ideologies, did not have a single counterpart. The views of socialism also showed an intellectual development in the geographies where they were born, by applying different meanings to the geographical areas where they found application field like the USSR. In the process of construction of socialism it is possible to say that one of the most obvious examples is the tension between the 2nd International and the 3rd International. In other words, the main differences between the ideas of socialism that developed in Europe and the ideas of socialism which rose in the USSR have led to various divisions which will continue until today.

The concept of "social imperialism" is also pervasive as a concept emerging in such a tension. When we look at the literature, it could be seen that the concept of "social imperialism" is expressed mostly in the context of the criticisms of China against the USSR after the Moscow-Beijing conflict in the Cold War era. However, this concept emerged from the more commonly used Sino-Soviet dispute in the tension between the 2nd and 3rd International mentioned above. The main reason for this tension is the leader of the USSR Lenin's reaction against Eurocentric socialism, one of the most important figures was Kautsky in Europe. According to Lenin, Kautsky and his environs took the place of petty bourgeois utopians who demanded equality and peace in a capitalist order. Kautsky, who was described as the "heroes of the second" of the Second International, and his environs were defined as "social imperialists" (Dawud, 1977: 16), as this came at the stage of policy making parallel to imperialist powers. After Lenin the concept of "social imperialism" enabled us to encounter criticisms of Chinese leader Mao against the USSR.

It is possible to see that the concept of "social imperialism" re-established in the period following the Moscow-Beijing conflict. The political crisis in the process of extending to the 1970s after the tension experienced at the beginning of the 1960s climbed steadily. Parallel to this climb, it is seen that the concept of "social imperialism" came into the scene again. The concept of "social imperialism" that China used critically by the USSR used since this period to describe the USSR under Khrushchev and later periods. However, this time it is necessary to state that the use of this concept differs to some extent. This is because the criticism associated with "social imperialism" is not directed at a specific environment, but rather a direct state, and more specifically, a government structure. From this period, it could be seen a critique of social imperialism centred on China, as mentioned above. We see that China has further developed its views expressed since the beginning of the Moscow-Beijing conflict in the following years. One of the most important texts based on these views comes from the "Leninism or Social-Imperialism?" Brochure, which was published in 1970 by the Peking Foreign Press, co-published by the writing boards of the Red Flag and Liberation Army newspapers, known as Renmin Ribao and translated as People's Daily / People's Newspaper. In this study, the most important representative of the Beijing-based socialism in Turkey in 1976, led by Dogu Perinçek's Proletarian Revolutionary Movement (PDA)'s publishing house, which introduced by Aydınlık Publications. This text is a fairly straightforward summary of criticisms of China towards the USSR.

Critics based on the concept of "Social imperialism" has its roots in the historical foundation of the criticism of the "revisionism" claims. Accordingly, after the death of Marx, Khrushchev-Brezhnev revisionism emerged after the death of Stalin, which was a revisionist continuation of Kautsky-Bernstein around the time of his death, and he took control of the USSR. It is possible to argue that there is an important similarity between the two uses at this point, with the exception that the concept is used in different forms in the two periods. It is because "Leninism" comes at the beginning of the concepts that both Lenin and China use. The fact that these two revisionists are close to each other is the establishment of a succession-premise relation between Kautsky-Bernstein and Khrushchev-Brezhnev. (Collaborative, 1976a: 11). Revisionism seems to be a very basic definition of criticism. Beyond this, however, in general, "social imperialism" is explained through two different dimensions, internal and external politics. The economic nature of the transformation that began with Khrushchev for the first time in order to define social imperialism in terms of internal political developments was opened to debate. Accordingly, Khrushchev-Brezhnev-centred power is not a revolutionary power but a bourgeois power. A proletarian revolutionary class took the place of a privileged bourgeois layer and occupied important venues in every area, from army to economy. The bourgeoisie class, which replaced proletarian power, abandoned the socialist economy and built the "monopoly state capitalism" model in the country. (Collaborative, 1976a: 16). The construction of this "capitalist" model established in the country brought with it the deviation of the USSR from

a "socialist" model. According to this opinion, which constitutes the external political dimension of the concept of "social imperialism", the deviation from the socialism model resulted in the realization of a real atmosphere of peace and freedom. The USSR is now an "imperialist" state, just like the United States. The US and the USSR are two principal states representing the imperialist camp in the world. When we look at the policies of the USSR in a global context, we can see this situation more closely. The basic claim of Beijing at this point is that the USSR gave up on establishing a relationship with other countries on the basis of equality and independence. The USSR established this relationship not on the basis of equality but, on the contrary, on a hegemonic basis, when establishing relations with other countries with the claim of expanding the scope of socialization. In other words, the USSR is trying to take control of the states in the domain. The struggle of the USSR to build its own hegemony, not socialism, is a new concept of colonialism. The steps that the USSR has taken in the direction of "living together in peace" are indeed a means of sharing the world with the United States. The USSR essentially did not aim to bring real peace to the world. It would also be seen that there are a number of criticisms against this allegation directed against the USSR. The point underlying these criticisms is that the USSR took a very clear step towards world peace. Accordingly, despite the fact that the world entered into a nuclear threat process, the USSR is a state that fulfilled its responsibilities in order to keep this threat in its midst. It is stated that the attitude of the USSR to reduce international tensions in this period, in which the importance of disarmament emerged, is also clear. On the other hand, the criticism of China towards the USSR is based on the discomfort that China has due to a world entering into a new peace process. In this period, when the USSR was supported by the peoples of the entire world, China was directly opposed to it (Delyusin, 1976: 67). In a step forward of this criticism, it could be seen that a more peculiar approach to criticism of China towards the USSR emerged. Accordingly, the Maoism strategy is not in the emergence but because of its own mistakes, it is in the world within Anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism front. As a natural member of the anti-Soviet frontier developed by American imperialism for world hegemony, China fulfilled the mission it undertook to divide the socialist camp and obstruct socialism struggle. China did not hesitate to put all these "dark" elements together, apart from the differences between all racist, fake liberal, neo-fascist, Trotskyist, right and left wing opportunists. (Girginov and Mshvenieradze, 1978, 32). An advanced dimension of China's criticism of the USSR is confronted as the "Three World Theory". China has been struggling to find a solution to this problem that it claims to exist with the "Three World Theory", which identifies a problem with the concept of "social imperialism".

The year 1974 represents a major breakthrough in terms of change in China's foreign policy. The politics, which was taken over from the Mao period, was officially announced in the Xiaoping period, in which the "Three World Theories", which were on the agenda during the Cold War era, were officially announced. Deng Xiaoping's speech in April 1974 at the United Nations represents a milestone in this regard (Yee, 1983: 239). The "Three World Theories" came about with the great development of Mao's views. The original of the theory was expressed in a meeting with Mao's correspondent in the United States. Accordingly, there is a "buffer zone" outside the hegemony areas of the US and the USSR in the world. The states defined in this "intermediate territory" are the capitalist countries outside the United States and the semi-colonial Europe, Asia and Africa. This view of Mao changed in the mid-1960s and began to be expressed in the world as two "intermediate zones". This renewed view is, in fact, the division of the geography, which in the past has been described as the only "intermediate zone". From the mid-1960s onwards, the outlook defines the capitalist world outside the United States (Japan, Canada, etc.) and Asia-Africa as two separate regions (An, 2013: 36-38). Mao's views have laid the groundwork for the "Three World Theories".

The "Three World Theory" is basically an approach that claims that the world is divided into three main regions. Accordingly, the global system is divided according to the degree of hegemony the US and the USSR, which are described as two superpowers, want to expand. According to this

theory that there are three different "world" concepts, "First world" is the world created by USA and USSR. This world describes the areas of absolute dominion of two superpowers. The "second world" is made up of developed capitalist countries such as European countries, Japan and Canada. What distinguishes these countries from other countries is that they will eventually struggle against the superpowers. Because these countries are made up of ever-advanced capitalist countries, they will come to the final position of the "Third World" as they feel very close to the threat of the USSR described as the world's most aggressive country (Yalın, 1977: 249). The other part outside these two worlds is the "Third World" created by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This region is a country that resists both the US and Soviet social imperialism. The revolutionary breakthrough in these countries will open the way for the world revolution. In order to combat a real socialism in the world, it is necessary to be in front of these two superstitious "Third World" countries.

It is stated that this theory has three different stages in the historical process. Accordingly, the "Three World Theory" has entered into a change in the process. These three stages belong to the first explanatory turn of the theory in 1974. The strategy in this period is the project of building a revolutionary line in foreign policy taken over from Mao. The second stage is a process that puts the USSR directly on the target board. Accordingly, a broader front against the USSR should be established. This could even involve any anti-Soviet element including the US. The third stage is a strategy that secures the Chinese state itself (Yee, 1983: 242).

Parallel to the strategy China has created under the "Three World Theory", important steps have been taken to strengthen the modernization of the armed forces and the military. China's decision to strengthen its armed forces, as well as its attempts to spread the "guerrilla" struggle on a global scale, also gives some messages about China's views on the "Third World" (Yee, 1983: 243-244). China's views on this issue seem to express more of its efforts to lead a new camp that is largely "leader" than establishing an "oppressed front" with Third World countries.

The Reflection of Beijing-based Socialism to Turkey: Proletarian Revolutionary Enlightenment (PDA) Movement

After May 27, one of the most important structures of Turkish left which left its mark on the period is the National Democratic Revolution (MDD) Movement which is headed by Mihri Belli. The political structure, which is named the "Enlightenment Movement" as a whole, contributed in the ranks of MDD to Turkish left mainly throughout the 1960s. However, the "Enlightenment" group could not stay as a whole, and separated into two groups as a result of the division between a group led by Mihri Belli and a group under the leadership of Doğu Perinçek. The "Aydınlık" (enlightenment) magazine separated into two within this period. After this separation, the group under the leadership of Mihri Belli continued on the path as "The Enlightenment Socialist Magazine" (Aydınlık Sosyalist Dergi), while the group led by Doğu Perinçek continued his political activities as "Proletarian Revolutionary Enlightenment" (Proleter Devrimci Aydınlık). As a result of this division, the name given to the magazine by Perinçek became the name of that group at that time (Aydinoğlu, 2007: 15).

The PDA Movement should be examined under two periods; because the political status of the movement differs due to the political environment of the country. The turning point at the emergence of this difference is the March 12th Coup d'état. It could be seen that the Turkish left entered into the process of a transformation to a large extent after March 12. This transformation process has affected not only the PDA but also a very large part of the Left. In other words, after May 27 and March 12, the political starting points of Turkish left have differences. The most important aspect of these differences is Turkish left's relation with Kemalism. Workers' party of Turkey (TİP), Yön Magazine and MDD environment, which are the three mainstream group marked

Turkish left post May 27 period, were sometimes directly related to Kemalism and sometimes they were in a distant relationship. Especially looking from *Yön Magazine* and MDD environment's perspectives, it could be seen that those two mainstreams utilised from Kemalism's historical and intellectual background. At this point, during the establishment process under the leadership of Mehmet Ali Aybar, TİP which was relatively a distance from Kemalism, attributed a certain value to Kemalism, but in the following years it also accelerated its criticisms towards Kemalism. In this period, Kemalism was not a political centre directly struggled and tried to be purified; it means a historical process that is respected and trying to preserve their values. It is not only limited to these three mainstreams but also was a source of many symbolic references of the "68 Movement". On the other hand, when we look at the post-March 12 period, it could be seen that Turkish left transformed in a large scale. The most obvious aspect was that Turkish left broke the relation with Kemalism. In the post March 12 period, Turkish left completely parted ways from Kemalism in which claimed that the obstacle to their development, and move on with a claim to establish a more independent and original line. The reasons of PDA's differences between two periods could be explained via the relationship of Turkish left with Kemalism; because it could be seen that PDA, which is a consecutive structure of MDD, did not take any position against Kemalism until March 12 period and had an attitude parallel with Leninist-Stalinist line. However, after March 12 when Kemalism's effects are largely purified, PDA became the representative of Beijing-based socialism in Turkish left, more commonly used the representative of "Maoism" movement.

PDA environment was one of the rare structures that protected its leadership position in Turkish left after March 12. Therefore, its organisation in the post-coup process was easier than other organizations. After March 12, PDA environment came after Socialist Workers Party of Turkey (TSİP) as the most organized structure in Turkish left (Ersan, 2013: 69). In the post March 12 period, PDA environment proceeded on its own way under the name of Revolutionary Workers Peasant' Party of Turkey (TİİKP). Although the made progress in a short time as organisation in the process when the left reorganised, they must wait to operate legally until 1978; because in 1978 TİİKP eliminated the word "revolutionary" from its name and was legally established on January 30, 1978 under the name of TİKP (Ersan, 2013: 70).

The emergence of the Maoist movement constructed by the leadership of Perinçek and his environment coincided with a turn that China almost burning bridges with the USSR. PDA environment that took over the attitude of China against USSR as a whole, designated its starting point as the fight against the USSR as well as the USA. This process changed towards PDA struggling only with the USSR. At the same time, the process was also a stage in the ideological division of the socialist camp at a very basic point. It could be seen the Maoism movement going up in the period when the division between "city" and "country/village" has been started. The general summary of the division based on the cities and countries was based on where the revolution begins and where it proceeds. The idea of socialism based on "country" or "village" brought with it a process of armed struggle called "guerrilla struggle". THKP-C (People's Liberation Party – Front of Turkey) and TIKKO (Liberation Army of the Workers' and Peasants' of Turkey) which are the primary structures that are centred on the armed struggle in Turkish left can be evaluated under a similar Maoist perspective. When THKP-C and TIKKO are evaluated at in the historical process, it could be said that both come out of the PDA environment. PDA environment, at the same time, has the leading position for left structures that continue to struggle through the concept of "rural guerrilla" (Aydınoğlu, 2007: 316).

It could be said that the current governments had a more limited place in the political critique of the PDA than the left. USSR has a centred role on the basis of the critics against current governments. Perinçek interpreted the period of rapprochement between the Demirel government and the USSR as the preparation of a new exploitation ground by co-conspirator bourgeoisie.

Accordingly, both Justice Party (AP) and Republican Peoples' Party (CHP) governments are very cautious towards the USSR. They even deliberately protected their silence about the USSR's rapprochement with the United States; because Turkey's dominant classes gained power through this rapprochement. CHP as the representative of bourgeoisie entered directly into the rapprochement process with the USSR. According to Perinçek, "Left of Centre" politics was a result of this rapprochement (Perinçek, 1976b: 35). The values about the "Left of Centre" had parallels with the slogan "Left of centre, Moscow way" of Right in Turkey. Because of the rapprochement between USA and USSR, for the most part, PDA environment was the representative of "Maoist" politics in Turkey. This political organization, based on the heritage of the Moscow-Beijing conflict, has greatly altered the struggle in the left wing. How CPC brought the struggle to the point that the struggle with USSR, concordantly, PDA environment that is the most effective organization of CPC in Turkey made their main agenda item which is the struggle against leftist structures conducted activities parallel with USSR that is claimed by PDA. Mihri Belli and his environment were confronted as one of the first examples at this point. The debate between Perinçek and Mihri Belli was closely related to the content of the activities of the USSR in the Third World geography. For Perinçek, being silence the activities of the USSR, which is trying to occupy the world, was equivalent to supporting "modern revisionism". In the debate that began over the example of the Charu Majumdar in India, Perinçek claimed that Belli reached a reformist and submissive level by defending Majumdar; because the power in India strengthened with the help of the revisionist USSR and land occupations under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist Party led by Majumdar were mainly reformism and they served as revisionist because it defeats the armed struggle. Within this context, Belli supported the revisionists (Perinçek, 1976b: 27-28). Another dimension of the struggle with Belli is the struggle with "bourgeois nationalism" attributed to Belli and his environment (Perinçek, 1976b: 38).

Another subject in the target of Perinçek is Communist Party of Turkey (TKP). For Perinçek, who summarized his criticisms in the book titled Critique of the Revisionist Program of the False TKP, TKP has a mission to make Turkey convenient for loot and plunder of the USSR. TKP's views on "development" make Turkey vulnerable to the USSR, because according to Perinçek, the investments of the USSR seem to be equivalent to the pillage of the social-imperialist capital. Perinçek evaluated the TKP's rhetoric of "development" with a similar quality to the development during the Bayar-Menderes period, and evaluated that both of them colonized Turkey (Perinçek, 1976c: 26). Perinçek also criticize the term "advanced democracy" of TKP. The term "advanced democracy", which is presented as a solution offer, means ceding Turkey to USSR. From the point of Perinçek, demand for "saving the army from NATO" advocated in the proposal of "advanced democracy" aims to throw Turkey into the arms of Soviet imperialism, while rescuing from US imperialism (Perinçek, 1976c:15). Doğan Avcıoğlu's Revolution Magazine environment, which has a quite distance with the USSR, has one's share of those criticisms. Avcıoğlu, who is the representative of "petty bourgeois radicalism" in terms of Perinçek, tries to show USSR as nice and revolutionist; in doing so they centralize the views of the leader of the "fake TKP". Revolution and its environment tries to weaken the relations with USA, while strengthening the relations with USSR. Besides, without the proletariat leadership referred to USSR, Revolution environment supports USSR revisionism, because they own the goal of reaching socialism under the leadership of intellectuals in the context of its own strategies (Perinçek, 1976b: 36). It could be said that as 1980 PDA environment took harsher feel against left side, when we look at the TIKP period. Left organizations in this period were evaluated at the same point as the Kurdish political movement and MHP. For Perinçek, there is no difference between the leftist organizations, "Apocular"¹ and "MHP" in this period when the discussions that started on "counterinsurgency" gained depth. Moreover, "fake TKP" and "Apocular" can survive thanks to the support of the Ecevit government. While

¹ Supporters of Abdullah Öcalan who is the leader of Kurdish armed movement in Turkey (tn)

Perinçek criticized the left, he turned his face to Mustafa Kemal and tried to clarify and further expand the ranks of the enemy in this context by equalizing the claims of "disrespect for the Turkish national anthem" and "silence against the occupation of Afghanistan" (TİKP, 1980: 72-74).

PDA Movement and USSR

The point of view of PDA, which is an exceptional instance that defends a Beijing-based socialism directly in Turkish left, to USSR shows parallelism with CPC's point of view to USSR. At the same time, it will be possible to see the projection of the change and transformation experienced in the CPC periodically on the PDA.

Doğu Perinçek, who is in the leadership position of the PDA, began to share his criticisms of "Soviet social imperialism" in the *Proletarian Revolutionist Enlightenment* magazine before the March 12 coup d'état. Although it is stated that those discussions on this issue rose in a period when the Turkish left is reorganised after March 12, discussions on this issue are witnessed begin at a certain level in the process reached March 12. Perinçek written three different articles on this issue in Proletarian Revolutionist Enlightenment magazine on 24 September 1970, 25 November 1970 and 2 February 1971. These three articles - possibly under the influence of the interruption brought by March 12 and onwards - were published by the Aydınlık Publications in the title of *Struggle in 1970 against Social-Imperialism and Revisionism in July 1976*. Articles in this book are the articles which are pioneering articles of the critics on "Soviet social imperialism" in Turkish left (Perinçek, 1976c).

At this point, it is needed to mention a different topic related to criticism of the USSR Turkish left. Criticism of the USSR was not made for the first time by PDA in Turkish left. In early periods, it is possible to see a quite critical attitude against USSR in Turkish left. Mehmet Ali Aybar is a very symbolic name in this regard. As it is known, Aybar shaped his critics of USSR, based on its intervention to the Eastern European countries, with the proposal named "Debonair socialism" (Gülyüzlü sosyalizm). The main point of the critics is the relationship with USSR's democracy and socialism terms. When it is regarded that the period, which Aybar's criticism of the USSR has not been on the agenda and the interest of Turkish left against USSR is very strong, it could be said that he made a courageous criticism from his own perspective (Şener, 2010: 263). However, it should be stated that within the scope of this study the mission loaded on the PDA is slightly different. First of all, PDA, as a structure that maintains its political presence through the CPC's theses, constitutes an emplacement in Turkish left. Secondly, the struggle for socialism is reduced to a struggle with the USSR and finding a similar example in the case of Turkish left scale is quite difficult. As will be examined in more detail in following, USSR criticism which is reduced into struggle with the USSR and it could be seen that, within the scope of this struggle, even USA and NATO are declared allies in a "peaceful" camp. The main differences, in the context of criticism of the USSR in Turkish left, raise the need to evaluate the PDA at a different point.

One of the most important points of Perinçek's criticisms of the USSR, which stand at the centre of his criticism, is the rise of the USSR as an imperialist state. According to this, there are two big super powers all around the world. One of them is USA, and the other one is USSR. As of the period, both of the powers are in the status of imperial state. The USSR has become, like the United States, a state that increases the imperialist pressure on the world. It even went one step further by the 1970s. When we look at the foreword of the book *Struggle in 1970 against Social-Imperialism and Revisionism*, we can see the change in the PDA's ideas for the USSR very clearly. In the foreword, Perinçek mentions that the equilibrium in the world is different when he wrote the articles included to the book. Accordingly, the enemy of the peoples of the world at that time was the USA. However, when the book was published in 1976, the situation has largely changed; because, as of this period, USA imperialism has declined, while Soviet imperialism has risen. USSR is now more dangerous than USA imperialism (Perinçek, 1976c: 10).

In addition to the decline of US imperialism as 1970s, Perinçek put principal contradictions for Turkey in the following periods in a historically plane. Accordingly, there were different principal contradictions in respect of different periods of Turkey. Turkey's first principal contradiction is occupying powers of first World War and Independence War. During the National Struggle, the camp formed under the name of "Entente States" has become Turkey's chief enemy until World War II. As from World War II, the main contradiction was American imperialism. Until 1974, American imperialism remained the main enemy status for Turkey. However, when it comes to the 1974, for Turkey a new principal contradiction has emerged which is Soviet social imperialism (Perinçek, 1979: 72-73). 1974 is a very critical year. For PDA the first characteristic of 1974 is the year when TİİKP was sued. TİİKP made a very comprehensive defence between June 14 and July 9. The defence of TİİKP is another text summarized the main ideas of PDA about USSR very simple. As first part of 1970s, while the book *Struggle in 1970 against Social-Imperialism and Revisionism* that was published in 1976 but included articles from 1970 and 1971 maintains a basic text property, the defence text of TİİKP in court in 1974 is also very important in terms of explaining the basic views of the movement.

Then, this defence text was published in September of the same year. The defence made in 1974 is the text that included PDA's first comprehensive political evaluation of post-March 12th. In this text, it can be seen that the USSR has left an important place. According to analysis in the defence, the USSR has become the accomplice of the USA. Moving from Lenin's definition of "social imperialism", they claim that USSR is so-called socialist, it is imperialist in practice (TİİKP, 1992: 325). The USSR shows this imperialist politics through the Warsaw Pact on Eastern European countries (TİİKP, 1992: 326). At this point in defence, it is mentioned that there is a resistance developed against two super powers in Japan, Australia and European countries one of the two intermediate regions expressed within the context of the "Three World Theory" (TİİKP, 1992: 330). "Third World", the other intermediate region, came a long way in the struggle for independence (TİİKP, 1992: 321-324). The main point here is that the resistance in the region which corresponds to the "Third World", especially in the geography expressed as two intermediate regions, is growing in the lead of the People's Republic of China and Albania. Here, the mission that is uploaded to China emerges more clearly. The emphasis on China is also largely reflected in the search for a new leader against two super powers (TİİKP, 1992: 330).

Apart from the PDA's political future, 1974 is important in terms of two perspectives; because when the year of 1974 is evaluated for Turkey, Perinçek's statement on the issue is related to the coup of March 12 and the USA role in the coup. Perinçek pointed out that the March 12 coup reinforced the position of the USA's main contradiction and that the struggle of the people against the fascist dictatorship took place with the USA (Perinçek, 1979: 72). However there is not any satisfactory explanation how this struggle ended in 1974 and on which plane the USSR had taken the place of the USA. Apart from that in 1974 the most significant event was Cyprus issue for Turkey. Although Perinçek did not elaborate in detail the reasons for the preference of 1974, it is possible to say that the Cyprus issue was decisive in this matter. The period in which the PDA periodically prints copyrighted and translated works is 1976; after the period of recession which followed the March 12 coup. As of January 1976, the PDA included two different works in Turkish left literature. The first one is the booklet named "*Leninism or Social-Imperialism?*" (Leninizm mi Sosyal-Emperyalizm mi?) which is a very important text in terms of determining the basic political position of the PDA. Another study published in January 1976 was *Cyprus Issue* (Kıbrıs Meselesi) written by Doğu Perinçek.

Perinçek's interest on Cyprus issue presented a quite radical raise in Turkish left. One of the most interesting claims in Perinçek's work is that the Soviets gave green light to the military intervention in the island. Even though the chief supporter is US imperialism and its dominant

classes, the intervention in the island and the accompanying "occupation" claim are a manifestation of the conflict between US and Soviet imperialism (Perinçek, 1976a: 21). Although the period, when the articles related to the Cyprus issue were prepared, is a period which PDA saw USA and USSR as the same threats, referring to the existence of USSR imperialism on the Eastern Mediterranean and stating that the problems existed in the island serve the imperialist interests of the two super powers represented a political position which did not become accustomed to Turkish left. Perinçek points out that the island should be saved from both US and USSR imperialism. The most basic requirement of an independent foreign policy is to follow a policy out of the two super power domains in this context. While considering options other than military intervention, which he described as "occupation" of the Cyprus issue, Perinçek gave China's military aid to the Korean people as an example. In this case, People's Republic of China should be taken as a best practice (Perinçek, 1976a: 75). According to PDA, Kurdish issue, which is another topic of interest as much as the Cyprus issue for Turkey, is also an issue which is under the pressure of Soviet social imperialism. The point expressed in the work of Mehmet Tekin is that Russia is the most reactionary country in the era and that there is an imperialist intervention in the geography where the Kurds live. Russia implemented a separatist policy in the region. It tried to divide this geography into smaller pieces by the dominance established on the actors such Talabani etc. Therefore, a real revolutionary struggle to be given in the region passes first through struggle with Soviet social imperialism (Tekin, 1980: 107-110).

Getting back to the subject, in sum, because of the experience of Turkey on Cyprus issue, it is a possible interpretation that 1974 was the centre. It is also necessary to say that there is an important gap here. The first dimension of this problem is that Perinçek did not give any explanatory information about 1974. Statement about March 12 in the relevant part of the work *Revolution Road of Turkey* (Türkiye Devriminin Yolu) is meaningful to reveal the reasons for consolidating the main contradiction status of the USA. However, there is not a further analysis about how the main contradiction status of the USA ended as 1974 and how the USSR took the place of the USA. The analysis here is largely concerned with the decline of US imperialism. For PDA that tries to give an indirect message on the assumption that the USA's draw back and so USSR could take the place, US imperialism has declined so far that it is no longer a threat to Turkey from the current period. For this analysis, it is necessary to draw attention to a striking point. Perinçek's study, published in 1979, claims related to the decline of American imperialism were associated with coups in Turkey. According to this analysis made just one year before September 12 coup d'état, USA is far from possessing the power to reinforce its situation in Turkey by organising coup d'état (Perinçek, 1979: 41). The second dimension of the problem arises when the Cyprus issue is included as the decisive factor for the year 1974. In this work of Perinçek, it is far to make clear in what conditions USSR took the place of the USA, because the period when the articles about Cyprus were prepared is accepted as a period that USSR and USA were seen as identical in some way. In order to explain this, it is so necessary to look at the implications of the CPC in this regard that needs to be looked at again in order to understand why the year 1974 is important. "Three World Theory", which was officially announced by Deng Xiaoping's speech in the United Nations in 1974, is quite explanatory in this regard. Although there was not any direct explanation in the related work of the PDA environment, it is very important that the year of Xiaoping's speech shaped the PDA's political position (Yee, 1983: 242).

The PDA was able to organize itself under the name of a political party towards the end of the 1970s. As mentioned before, the previous process is a period in which the movement is still out of legal political space. Although the first phase of PDA's partition process was TİİKP period, this party was not included in the legal domain. It should be noted that the criticisms made by the PDA so far are parallel to the TİİKP period. After TİİKP, this movement was re-established in 1978 as TİKP, which also refers to the period when PDA received a more radical attitude towards the USSR.

As of 1978, PDA's criticism of the USSR became even harder, and without any doubt, it can be seen that for PDA to fix the struggle for socialism in the struggle against the USSR. Likewise, the study *Revolution Road of Turkey*, written by Perinçek and mentioned above in various topics, is one of the basic texts. Two basic documents are used to examine the USSR issue in the period of TİKP started in 1978. The first one is TİKP's booklet named *Founding Declaration: Legislation and Programme* (Kuruluş Bildirisi: Tüzük ve Program). The other one belong to 1980 is the document named *Worker Peasant Party of Turkey's Political Stance: Central Committee Report Legislation Programme* (Türkiye İşçi Köylü Partisi'nin Siyasi Çizgisi: Merkez Komitesi Raporu Tüzük Program).

Founding Declaration is a quite basic text represented the basis of party's political tendencies. It would not be wrong to say that the USSR took its place from the first page in this text. TİKP mentions about the existence of US and USSR imperialism equivalently of in its form and generally invites the people to the "struggle against two super powers" (TİKP, 1978: 8). Managers of the new era are described as "New Tsars of Moscow" in terms of TİKP. These "new Tsars" follow Hitler's footsteps and continue their expansionist policies based on their military forces (TİKP, 1978: 11). TİKP, referred relations of Turkish governments with USSR, condemned the good relations occurred during Nationalist Front governments' era. It interprets the cooperation between the two countries and signed agreements as "submission" (TİKP, 1978: 12). They were also cautious against the current Ecevit government; they demand more courage for Ecevit's withdrawal from Cyprus Island, establishing good relations with Third World and counter-guerrilla issues. When the first two conditions are examined, it is demanded that Ecevit observe relations with the USSR and follow a policy parallel to the USSR (TİKP, 1978: 16).

The document titled *Worker Peasant Party of Turkey's Political Stance: Central Committee Report Legislation Programme* published in March of 1980 contains broader and more radical analyzes. This text contains very important information to understand the dimensions of the politics that PDA environment perceives towards the USSR. In the foreign policy analysis conducted at the beginning of this text, it can be seen that the USA played a central role. USA is examined through the transformation of its relations with the USSR. The United States was defined as an accomplice of the USSR and as an imperialist state until this turn. However, it can be said that the point of view towards the USA in the new period changed to a great extent, because in the new period the USA preferred to improve its relation with China, not USSR. For TİKP, this decision was really rational and suitable. American imperialism became increasingly depressed and lost its power. It is very difficult to define it as an "imperialist" state anymore, and the USA proven on the basis of its relationship with China that it is in favour of peace rather than war in the world (TİKP, 1980: 14-15).

On the other hand, this period is the period when the crises emerged in the geography called "Third World". The most up-to-date example of these crises is the military intervention of the USSR to Afghanistan. This topic, which was quite hot during the written period of the programme, was given wide coverage to the programme. This topic, which was quite hot during the writing of this program of TİKP, has found itself in the scope of the program. In the same period, the crisis in Cambodia is on the agenda of TİKP. The TİKP sees developments in this region as the rise of the Third World. The Afghan and Cambodian people were fighting against social imperialism. Additionally, the "progressive" Afghan people were "defending their country brutally against reactionary" Russia (TİKP, 1980: 18-19).

According to TİKP, the way to defend peace against USSR's imperialist" war is by standing next to China, because everybody in the world who really wants peace demands the empowerment of China. China is seen as a trustworthy friend and peaceful place of world peace that can stand up

to the spreading activities of the USSR all over the world (TİKP, 1980: 21). TİKP describes “duty” as follows:

“Today the duty is the establishment and strengthening the widest peace front that includes all counties around the world who support the peace including USA, against the spreading efforts of the Soviet Union.

(...)

As a super state the USA’s interests in protecting the present situation in the world and interests of world countries and peoples towards peacekeeping overlap in resisting Soviet social-imperialism” (TİKP, 1980: 23).

According to this assessment, PDA clearly states that the USA should be involved in this alliance, as long as it is against the USSR that the alliance is ready for any alliance initiative. Besides USA, about NATO, it is upheld to stay in NATO which is quite far from the overall attitude of the Turkish left, because there is a concern that cast a shadow on Turkey's independence when they quit NATO; this concern is undoubtedly related to the USSR. TİKP’s solution to this problem is not quit from NATO, they offer trying to resolve the problems in bilateral relations in favour of Turkey (TİKP, 1980: 90).

Conclusion

PDA Movement one of the most distinct “Maoist” groups in Turkish left. This structure became the most important part of Beijing-based socialism in Turkey through transmitting CPC’s thesis. Concordantly, the toughest critics against USSR in Turkish left were made by PDA environment. In Turkish left, there are a lot of critical behaviour against USSR made by most of the leftist groups. However, at this point, PDA environment represents very unique example; because it is very difficult to see an example about giving up American imperialism discourse and substituting it by a discourse which focuses on only USSR. Besides, it is also very difficult to face a political stance that puts the socialist struggle directly into the struggle with the USSR. When we look at one step further, it can be seen that the USSR is associated with the concept of "war", while the US and NATO are included in the "peace" camp. Seeking a strategic alliance with the US and NATO places PDA in a very unique position in this regard in Turkish left. In assessing about the USSR’s intervention in Afghanistan it is also quite striking to describe the movement as a "progressive Afghan people" which is the armed resistance movement that will create the nerve of the Taliban and Al-Qaeda that will become a global terrorist organization in the future. Another remarkable point, given the central role of the USSR within the scope of “Struggle against Communism” in Turkey, PDA’s perspective on “Struggle against Communism” has parallels indirectly with the official "Struggle against Communism" strategy of the era. It is one of the remarkable points that in Turkish left the PDA is more likely to trigger the fight in this period. In summary PDA Movement is a very obvious example of what is defined everything, which is reduced to a single subject that is politically opposed to a single "evil", as "good" unconditionally. Reduction of "bad" of a single body open the way for the change of the "good" as the bodies change, the transition between the concepts of "friend" and "enemy" will become more flexible in the process.

REFERENCES

- (1998), *Pekin-Moskova Çatışması: İki Komünist Merkez Arasında Dünya Kamuoyu Önünde Yürütülen İdeolojik Tartışmanın Belgeleri: Haziran-Temmuz 1963*, (Ankara: Bilim ve Sosyalizm Yayınları) (translation. Garbiköylü)

- (1992), *Türkiye İhtilalci İşçi Köylü Partisi Davası Savunma* (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları)
- (1978), *Türkiye İşçi Köylü Partisi Kuruluş Bildirisi: Tüzük ve Program* (İstanbul: TİKP Yayınları)
- (1980), *Türkiye İşçi Köylü Partisi'nin Siyasi Çizgisi: Merkez Komitesi Raporu Tüzük Program* (İstanbul: TİKP Yayınları)
- Adelman, Johnatan R., Deborah Anne Palmieri (1989), *The Dynamics of Soviet Foreign Policy*, (New York: Harper&Row Publishers)
- An, Jiang (2013), "Mao Zedong's 'Three World's' Theory: Political Considerations and Value for the Times", *Social Sciences in China*, 34(1): 35-57.
- Aydınoglu, Ergun, (2007), *Türkiye Solu (1960-1980)*, (İstanbul: Versus Kitap)
- Baby, Jean (1967), *Çin-Rus Çatışmasının İç Yüzü*, (İstanbul: Gün Yayınları) (translation. Orhan Eti).
- Best, Anthony, Jussi M. Hanhimäki, Joseph A. Maiolo, Kirsten E. Schulze, *20. Yüzyılın Uluslararası Tarihi* (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi) (translation. Taciser Ulaş Belge)
- Clubb, O. Edmund (1975), *China and Russia The "Great Game"* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Dallin, David J. (1961), *Soviet Foreign Policy After Stalin* (Pennsylvania: J.B. Lippincott & Co).
- Dawûd, M. Ali (1977), "*Sovyet Sosyal Emperyalizm*" Tezi Üzerine I (İstanbul: Yöntem Yayınları) (translation. unknown)
- Delyusin, Dev (1976), *Maoculuğun Sosyo-Politik Özü* (İstanbul: Yöntem Yayınları) (translation. Cengiz Sert)
- Ersan, Vehbi (2013), *1970'lerde Türkiye Solu*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları)
- Girginov, G. and V. Mshvenieradze (1978), *Günümüzde Anti-Sovyetizm Anti-Komünizm* (İstanbul: Bilim Yayınları) (translation. K. Nural)
- Hudson, G.F., Richard Lowenthal, Roderic Mac Farquhar (1961), *The Sino-Soviet Dispute*, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers).
- (Collaborate) (1976a), *Leninizm mi Sosyal-Emperyalizm mi?* (İstanbul: Aydınlik Yayınları) (translation. unknown)
- (Collaborate) (1976b), *Sovyet Sosyal-Emperyalizmi Dizisi I: Kruşçev-Brejnev Dönem Kliğinin Karşı-Devrimci Hükümet Darbesi* (İstanbul: Aydınlik Yayınları)
- Perinçek, Doğu (1976a), *Kıbrıs Meselesi* (İstanbul: Aydınlik Yayınları)
- Perinçek, Doğu (1976b), *Sahte TKP'nin Revizyonist Programı'nın Eleştirisi* (İstanbul: Aydınlik Yayınları)
- Perinçek, Doğu (1976c), *Sosyal-Emperyalizme ve Revizyonizme Karşı 1970'te Açılan Mücadele* (İstanbul: Aydınlik Yayınları)
- Perinçek, Doğu (1979), *Türkiye Devrimi'nin Yolu* (İstanbul: Aydınlik Yayınları)
- Şener, Mustafa (2010), *Türkiye Solunda Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset: Yön, MDD ve TİP* (İstanbul: Yordam Yayınları)
- Tekin, Mehmet (1980), *Sovyet Sosyal-Emperyalizmi ve Kürt Meselesi* (İstanbul: Aydınlik Yayınları)
- Yalın, Naim (1978), "Maoizmin Üç Dünya Serüveni", *Yurt ve Dünya*, (8): 239-251.
- Yee, Herbert S. (1983), "The Three World Theory and post-Mao China's Global Strategy", *International Affairs*, 59 (2): 239-249.
- Zagoria, Donald Z. (1962), *The Sino-Soviet Conflict 1956-1961* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press)