

“Vanguard of the Working Class”

The First Ideological Dispute within the Workers’ Party of Turkey, 1961-1971

[Working copy]

[Özgür Gökmen](#)

[July 2002]

The main objective of this paper is to reconsider the first significant ideological dispute within the Workers’ Party of Turkey (WPT) in the framework of the disputes that occurred during and following its First Grand Congress in 1964 around the implementation of a particular article of the party statutes, i.e. article 53, pertaining to the constitution of the board and the executive committee. This particular article and its implementation determining the position of the workers, and the relations between them, or their “representatives”, and the intellectuals in the party give way to interpretations arguing that the WPT was a party of an *ouvriériste* character. It also relates to the founders’ alleged desire to keep the WPT in their own hands against various fractions that eventually have gained strength during the internal struggles within the party.

The case around article 53 appears almost in all of the main publications pertaining to the history of the WPT. However, most of these publications do not have direct references to primary sources, especially when it comes to the “opposition’s line of reasoning”. Even in practically the most comprehensive work on the history of the party that was written by a pre-eminent member of the WPT, the author provides the headquarters’ position with direct quotations – if not always in full; whereas, he is contented with offering summaries of the opposition’s views – furthermore, not depending on the primary sources, but referring to an earlier unpublished work on the history of party.¹

¹ Nihat Sargın, *TİP’li yıllar (1961-1971) Anılar belgeler*, 2 vols (İstanbul: Felis Yayınevi, 2001), I, pp. 211-220; and, II, pp. 1123-1124, 1126. Cf. Nebil Varuy, *Türkiye İşçi Partisi tarihi 1961-1971: Olaylar belgeler yorumlar*, 1975?, Stencil, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam [hereafter, IISH], 1990/449 fol, pp. 105-108. The rest of the core of main publications on the WPT are as follows: Artun Ünsal, *Umuttan yalnızlığa: Türkiye İşçi Partisi (1961-1971)* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2002); Ercan Eyüboğlu, *Parti Ouvrier de Turquie – TIP, 1961-1971: Force désarmée face aux forces des armées*, Dissertation (İstanbul, 1994); Sadun Aren, *TİP olayı 1961-1971* (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1993) [for the English manuscript, see IISH, Sadun Aren Archives 1961-1971, 1990]; Ergun Aydınoglu, *Türk solu (1961-1971) Eleştirel bir tarih denemesi* (İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1992); Mehmet Ali Aybar, *TİP tarihi*, 3 vols (İstanbul: BDS, 1988); Rasih Nuri İleri, *Türkiye İşçi Partisi’nde oportünist merkezîyetçilik (1966-1968)* (İstanbul: Yalçın Yayınları, 1987); Murat Belge, “Türkiye İşçi Partisi”, in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. VIII (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1985), pp. 2120-2131; *TİP’in birinci on yılı (1961-1971): Türkiye işçi sınıfı siyasal hareketinin geçmişi üzerine* (Brüksel: İno-Türk, 1982); Behice Boran, “1961-1971 Türkiye İşçi Partisi” *Çark Başak*, 11 (1976), pp. 1-5.

Therefore, utilization of the primary sources available in the Kemal Sülker Papers, 1919-1993, deposited in the [International Institute of Social History](#), Amsterdam, will be a main concern of mine in my attempt to reconsider the case.

The Uniqueness of the WPT in Turkish Politics

The WPT has an exceptional place in the political life of Turkey. Contrary to the previous socialist experiences, the WPT was not established by a group of intellectuals but from the bottom up by trade union leaders that had broken away from the main trade union federation, Türk-İş, which had been originally founded with the sponsorship of the American Institute of Free Labor Development in 1952. Even though the party had a “strict *ouvriériste* ideology which attracted little support”² in the first year of its establishment, it began to turn into a flexible political organization with a broader and dynamic appeal that has embraced diverse social elements in due course after the invitation of socialist intellectuals to the party in early 1962.³ The WPT has managed to gather those different components under the “banner of socialism” during 1960s⁴, and had the privilege of being the first socialist party to send representatives to the Grand National Assembly contributing to the legitimisation efforts of the left in the Republic of Turkey.

Although the WPT can be considered as the inheritor of the previous “left” experience in Turkey, it was not a simple agent of historical continuation but a new organization in terms of its organic and ideological affections. Contrary to the older Turkish Communist Party, which remained small in numbers and monolithic in organization, the WPT distinguished by its “freshness and un-orthodoxy” was “heterogeneous to the point of populism”.⁵ Thus, the WPT was the first political party acquiring a social significance in the multi-party period that did not have its roots in the Republican People’s Party (RPP), but emerged on its own. It was the single political party claiming to stand for the benefit of the working class exclusively when its ideological stance, programmatic goals and activities are taken into consideration, as well.

It had the capacity of linking socialist arguments to the concrete problems of the masses that would make the WPT unique in the Turkish political life.⁶ The WPT would also be the “ideological and organizational cradle” for various left-wing trade unionist and political movements that would emanate from itself in the coming years. Even the RPP would change its policies trying to transform into a

² Ahmet Samim, “The Tragedy of the Turkish Left”, *New Left Review*, 126 (1981), pp. 60-85, 67.

³ On Mehmet Ali Aybar’s invitation to the party, see: IISH, Kemal Sülker Papers, 1919-1993 [hereafter, KSP], Inventory nos: 648, 661-662; Mehmet Ali Aybar, “Türkiye İşçi Partisi Bildirisi [February 8, 1962]”, *Bağımsızlık demokrasi sosyalizm: Seçmeler, 1945-1967* (İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1968), pp. 191-194.

⁴ Belge, “Türkiye İşçi Partisi”, p. 2131.

⁵ Samim, “The Tragedy of the Turkish Left”, p. 67.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

social democratic party adopting a stance called “left of centre” as a counteraction to the WPT.⁷

The Characteristics of the WPT

After its establishment, the first and foremost ideological dispute within the WPT has occurred around issue of the “*leadership* of the working class”. Some particular articles of the 1962 party statutes that were drawn up in person by Mehmet Ali Aybar, the new chairman of the party invited by the founders, have been influential in the designation of the ideological position and praxes of the WPT in the long run. The new chairman has explained the necessity for new statutes with the inconvenience of the old one that the founders have written out overnight.⁸

The WPT needed a new program appropriate for its recently gained, i.e. “socialist”, character. Aybar has recounted that he had thought of summarizing the main lines of the program in the introductory articles of the 1962 statutes since it would take time to set up a new program: “I wrote down the 2nd and 3rd articles that clarify the characteristic and the goal of the party, and article 53 that ensures the labourers [*emekçiler*] to have the right of comment and decision in the administration of the party.”⁹ Therefore, the new statutes appeared to be of an extensive character that would lay the basis of the forthcoming program.¹⁰

The first of these articles Aybar has put down on paper that was going to be amended to some extent in due course defined the WPT as the “political organization advancing to power, through legal means, of the Turkish working class, and of all the labourer classes and layers [...] that gathered around its democratic vanguard [*demokratik öncülük*]”.¹¹

This formulation, i.e. the usage of the concept of “democratic vanguard” which was thought to be more “moderate” than the conventional concept of “leadership” [*önderlik*], was a precaution against the notorious articles 141 and 142

⁷ Ünsal, *Umuttan yalnızlığa*, pp. viii-ix, xii; İleri, *Türkiye İşçi Partisi'nde oportünist merkeziyetçilik*, p. 5.

⁸ *Türkiye İşçi Partisi Tüzüğü* [hereafter, *Tüzük*] (Ankara: Doğu Ltd. Şirketi Matbaası, 1961), 8 pp. Cf. *Tüzük* (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1962), 35 pp.

⁹ Aybar, *TİP tarihi 1*, pp. 214-215; Sargın, *TİP'li yıllar*, I, pp. 86-89.

¹⁰ Nihat Sargın, *TİP'li yıllar*, I, p. 86. The first program of the party, *Türkiye İşçi Partisi Programı* [hereafter, *Program*] (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1961), amounts to 16 pages, whereas the second one, *Program* (İstanbul: Ersa Matbaacılık Kol. Şti., 1964), consists of 166 pages.

¹¹ *Tüzük* (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1962), p. 5. In the last edition of the statutes, *Tüzük*, 9th edn (Ankara: Eser Matbaası, 1970), p. 3, the first paragraph of the 2nd article defining the characteristics of the party reads as follows: “The Workers’ Party of Turkey is the *democratic, independent, socialist* organization advancing to power, through legal means, of the Turkish working class, and of all the labourer classes and layers that gathered around its democratic vanguard based on history and science, having reached consciousness and happiness in unity of destiny with it ([i.e.] of the agrarian labourers [*ırgatlar*], landless peasants and those with little land, artisans, small tradesmen [*küçük esnaf*], the salaried and the wage-earners, self-employed with meagre incomes, progressive youth and intellectuals).”

of the Turkish penal code adopted from the fascist Italian law in 1936 that proscribed all propaganda on behalf of communism and made it a criminal offence to engage in activity whose aim was to replace the rule of one class by another.¹² Although the Turkish constitution of 1961 allowed for the creation of socialist parties, the specific articles of the penal code continued to forbid an open communist party. Aybar, who was a professor of law himself, must have deemed it necessary to avoid any conceptual resemblance that would cause the banning of the party.

Article 53

Article 53 of the statutes determining the structure of the executive organs of the WPT pertains to the ideological position of the party in the same way. The article, and its implementation in the First Grand Congress of the WPT which convened in İzmir on 9-10 February 1964, have caused disagreements that were to last in different forms until the banning of the party in 1971. These arguments around article 53 almost explicitly reveal some of the main problems in the history of the Turkish left, such as the relationship between workers (or their representatives) and socialist intellectuals. The article written in 1962 by Aybar has been amended unanimously by addition of a sentence from the annulled article 38 of the 1962 statutes in the 1964 Congress.¹³ The article, which would remain, unchanged until the banning of the WPT reads as follows:

It is *observed* that half of those holding posts in all bodies of the party be elected from among those members, who earn their living by selling their labour power to the owners of the means of production since they do not own their own means of production or *those who are holding posts in the administrative bodies of labour unions*. Slates to be presented to the congresses by the administrative bodies are prepared in line with this principle. The congresses elect the delegates and the bodies inspired by this guideline.”
[Italics mine]¹⁴

Sadun Aren, a leading member of the party, who was a close associate of Aybar until 1968, would evaluate the case around article 53 as the first of the four ideological disputes within the WPT.¹⁵

First Grand Congress of the WPT

The dispute arose in the Congress when the elections for the board were held with two slates, and two ballot boxes, i.e. one for the “workers”, and one for the “non-workers”, “in accordance with the sentence of article 53”. Aren would state that the aim of materializing the significance of the working class was nourished in

¹² Sargın, *TİP’li yıllar*, I, pp. 86-87; Ünsal, *Umuttan yalnızlığa*, p. 132, fn. 16.

¹³ Türkiye İşçi Partisi Genel Merkezi, Genelge, no. 78, March 2, 1964, p. 4 [the WPT headquarters, circular; including the resolutions of the First Grand Congress], IISH, KSP, Inventory nos 603, 650; Türkiye İşçi Partisi Genel Merkezi, Genelge, March 14, 1964, p. 2, IISH, KSP, Inventory no. 660.

¹⁴ *Tüzük*, 9th edn, p. 30. This edition of the statutes was published after the 4th Grand Congress of the WPT. Cf. *Tüzük* (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1962), pp. 26, 32.

¹⁵ Aren, *TİP olayı*, pp. 207-209.

the WPT, and that the only possible way to achieve this aim was to provide a quota for them whose chance of being elected was little in comparison to the petit bourgeois intellectuals. He would relate that “two slates-two ballot boxes” were Aybar’s solution when the trade unionist founders of the WTP have asked how the sentence of the article would actually be implemented just before the elections.¹⁶

Nihat Sargın also would confirm that the chairman has put forward the idea of two slates after the proposal of Kemal Türkler who was one of the 12 trade unionist founders of the WPT.¹⁷

During the preparations for the elections, Türkler has made a speech “recommending” to pay far too much attention in order to assure that half of those to be elected are workers, and the other half intellectuals. He has not neglected to state that “inattentiveness” in this issue would cause serious trouble for the party. When asked by the delegates, Aybar has declared that he was of the same opinion, and his proposal for two different slates was accepted.¹⁸ Varuy would explain Türkler’s “bewildering” speech with the trade unionist founders concern to be elected for the highest executive organ of the party.¹⁹

Three of the 22 members who would soon oppose the implementation of article 53 were elected for the board in the elections. Two of them would then be elected for the central executive committee as well. It is noteworthy that one of these three, Doğan Özgüden, was nominated from the workers’ slate in the first place because of his position in the journalists’ trade union.²⁰

According to Aren, the disagreement around the issue of article 53 has not had any *theoretical difference* with regard to the understanding socialism. The basis of the dispute was primarily a technical problem, i.e. one relating to the method of two slates-two ballot boxes for the elections. Otherwise, the opponents were not against the essential perception that the working class must have a significant place in the administration of the party.²¹

Opposition and Expulsion

22 members have issued a memorandum that, contrary to Aren’s view, contained signs of theoretical differences with regards to the understanding of socialism, just after the Congress whose main arguments can be summarized threefold: (a) the sentence of article 53 is not obligatory, but advisory; (b) two slates-two ballot boxes practice is a mere reflection of corporatist system, and it is against freedom of choice and right to vote; (c) and given that intellectuals belong to the group of

¹⁶ Aren, *TİP olayı*, p. 95.

¹⁷ Sargın, *TİP’li yıllar*, I, p. 208.

¹⁸ “Türkiye İşçi Partisi büyük kongresi”, *Eylem*, 1 (1964), pp. 50-51.

¹⁹ Varuy, *Türkiye İşçi Partisi tarihi*, p. 104.

²⁰ Türkiye İşçi Partisi Genel Merkezi, no. 58, February 3, 1964, p. 1 [list of candidates for the general executive board], IISH, KSP, Inventory no. 601; Türkiye İşçi Partisi Genel Merkezi, Genelge, no. 78, March 2, 1964, pp. 4-5, IISH, KSP, Inventory no. 603.

²¹ Aren, *TİP olayı*, pp. 208-209.

those “who earn their living by selling their labour power to the owners of the means of production since they do not own their own means of production”, they are labourers [*emekeçi*], and their nomination from the slate of non-workers is a fault. The signatories have claimed that the administration of the “nation” was meant to be given to the priority of nine percent of the labourers²² with the system of two slates-two ballot boxes, and that the “vanguard of the working class” must not be understood as its precedence in the administration of the country. The memorandum also has drawn attention to the fact that Türkler’s “threatening” speech had not been condemned in Congress.²³

The headquarters’ reply would not be late. In the three pages circular bearing the signature of the chairman, the most striking point is the differentiation between the categories of worker [*işçi*], and labourer [*emekeçi*]. Aybar has claimed that according to the party statutes, the phrase pronounced by the 22s in defence of their argument – the expression that was sentenced in article 53 – was supposed to be the definition of the “worker”, but not the “labourer”. Although the intellectuals could be conceived as labourers, they could not be regarded as workers, neither in Turkey, nor in any other country in the world.

Aybar has also asserted that the sentence of article 53 was not advisory, but compulsory. The formation of executive bodies in the (British) Labour Party was presented in defence of article 53. The assertion that “two slates-two ballot boxes practice is a mere reflection of corporatist system” was claimed to be an unfounded, merciless allegation which would not be taken seriously by those who had a sound knowledge of fascism and who knew the characteristics, goal and three years efforts of the WTP.

A brief definition of the “democratic and historical vanguard of the working class” has been also provided in the circular with which it was observed to explain that it was not supposed to give any privilege to the working class in the administration of the country. It was stated that the benefits of the working class were not strictly peculiar to the working class itself, but actually covered the “national” benefits of all the people living on their labour in the general sense. According to the chairman, the Turkish working class has represented the main propulsive, creative, and unifying force that would solve the crisis in which the society was swerving, and consequently that would lead to the liberation of labouring classes and layers from this cul-de-sac. Therefore, it was claimed, the working class appeared to be a more efficient force in comparison to the other labouring classes in fulfilling fundamental reforms.

It was also noted that the concept of worker was defined in the broadest sense in the party statutes. Moreover, the articles defining the characteristic and the goal of the party were claimed to have made clear the aim of article 53 that it was arranging the internal relations of the party, and therefore, did not in any way

²² The signatories must have referred to the percentage of the industrial working class.

²³ The memorandum of 22s is dated February 28, 1964. For the text, see Varuy, *Türkiye İşçi Partisi tarihi*, pp. 105-106.

come to mean that the working class was given any privilege over the other labouring classes in the administration of the country.²⁴

Aybar would later claim that voting in separate ballot boxes was a peculiarity of the WTP. The intellectuals had to develop the sprout, i.e. the WTP that was found from the bottom up without their help. Hence, there was the article in the statutes which, in the chairman's view, was stating that half of those in the executive organs of the party had to be chosen from those who work with their manual labour [*koluyla çalışanlar*]. That was a principle that could not be abandoned.²⁵

However, there is an explicit vagueness in Aybar's explanation. The "worker" has really been defined in the broadest sense in the statutes in a way, which was not exclusively referring to the "industrial working class"; and, actually, there were no rulings prescribing or justifying the method of "two slates-two ballot boxes" in the statutes.

Aybar would try to eliminate this ambiguity in a forthcoming circular disseminated after the 1965 national elections, trying to emphasize the differentiation of the blue-collar worker, which was not clear at all in the sentence of article 53. Aybar would try to clarify that article 53 was written in order to ensure to bring the power of those members of the WPT who work with their manual labour [*kolu ile bedeni ile çalışan üyelerimizi*] into play, and that they have a fifty percent direct participation in the administration of the party. He would justify this goal with one of the reasons behind the failure of the fulfilment of the expected development of socialism [*toplumculuk*]²⁶ up till then, which he thought to have been the fact that the socialist [*toplumcu*] intellectuals and "our labourer people" [*emekçi halkımız*] had not joined forces:

Article 53 compels the socialist white-collar workers [*toplumcu kafa emekçileri*] to actually share a common fate with the blue-collar workers [*kol emekçileri*], and the blue-collar workers to solidarity with the white-collar workers. Those who see this article as a pretext to make a separation between the party members with respect to their being blue or white collar are those who did not understand the real meaning of the essence and *clear wording* of the statutes. [...] Our goal is to provide blue-collar workers to have right of comment and decision in the political life. But not to place them against the socialist white-collar workers and to make enemies of those layers which complete each other. [*Italics mine*]²⁷

A similar concern of clarification cannot be overlooked in his memoirs, or "party history" that was published more than three decades after the First Congress of

²⁴ Türkiye İşçi Partisi Genel Merkezi, Genelge, March 14, 1964, IISH, KSP, Inventory no. 660.

²⁵ "T.İ.P. lideri Aybar ile bir konuşma", *Yön*, 87 (November 27, 1964), p 7.

²⁶ "*Toplumculuk*" is the literal translation of socialism in Turkish. However, it was coined and used as an euphemism since the left has long been under pressure in Turkey.

²⁷ Türkiye İşçi Partisi Genel Merkezi, Genelge, October 25, 1965, IISH, KSP, Inventory no. 651; Aybar, "Emekçi halk, bozuk düzeni temelden değiştirecektir", *Bağımsızlık demokrasi sosyalizm*, pp. 426-432, 430.

the WPT. Nevertheless, a conceptual indistinctness still holds sway in his argumentation. Though trying to avoid ambiguity, Aybar uses the concepts of “worker” that was supposed to refer to the blue-collar worker, a member of the industrial working class, and “labourer” synonymously. Having justified the reasons behind article 53 with the desire to prevent the “hegemony of the left-wing intellectuals”, and to accomplish that labourers have the right of comment and decision in the administration of the party, Aybar picks up where he lefts off:

This question may be asked as well: Why just the workers and the trade unionists? We have used the term *worker*. We have said those earning their living by selling their labour power to the owners of the means of production. Industrial workers are undoubtedly covered by this definition. Nonetheless, landless peasants, agrarian labourers [*ırgatlar*], farmhands [*rengperler*], and apprentices [*çıraklar*] are covered as well. All those working with manual labour fall under this definition: blacksmiths, coppersmiths, tailors, shoemakers, electricians, repairmen of all kind... *That is to say all labourers... Living on by selling labour power is essential. Those who produce surplus value fall under this definition.* Trade union leaders are of peasant or worker origin, too. Their function as trade union leaders is to serve workers. They are an enlightened [*uyanmış*] fraction of workers. As a matter of fact, they have found the WPT. Their being in the administration was beneficial. We were not acquainted with the workers at all; they have been helping us to know them. [Italics mine]²⁸

Not having been assured by the headquarters’ circular, nine of the 22s have issued another memorandum that essentially criticized the logic behind the differentiation of the “workers” and “non-workers” during the elections, not only referring to Marxist texts, but also in a juridical framework.²⁹ This second memorandum would lead to the expulsion of seven signatories.³⁰ Remaining two signatories have resigned from the party. Those who were expelled have never acted against the WPT, and conditionally have even supported the activities of the party in the coming years.³¹

Reflections

The reason behind article 53 has been generally explained with the search for a solution to solve the problem of the disappearance of a bond between the intellectuals and the masses. The criticism of the 22s, and later 9s who have argued that the implementation of the article was against socialism has been found untimely on the grounds that it was necessary to establish bonds with the working class. However, the class composition of the WPT was neither depending wholly on the industrial working class, nor on the peasants.

²⁸ Aybar, *TİP tarihi 1*, pp. 216-217.

²⁹ Türkiye İşçi Partisi Genel Yönetim Kurulu adına genel başkanlıkça 14.3.1964 tarihinde yayınlanan genelgeye cevabımızdır, March 30, 1964, IISH, KSP, Inventory no. 660. The memorandum actually bears 11 members’ names, two of which then declared that they have not signed the petition.

³⁰ TİP İl Haysiyet Divanı, Karar, IISH, KSP, Inventory no. 660.

³¹ Sargın, *TİP’li yıllar*, I, p. 219.

The only research on the class structure of the WPT has been conducted by the Central Scientific and Research Council of the party based on 12,695 membership cards.³² A member of the council has made the following classification based on this research: “proletarian and semi-proletarian members” constitute 45 % of all members; “petit bourgeois members, which include small tradesmen, artisans, minor bureaucrats and intellectuals, middle peasants and peasants with small land, the low-earning self-employed, and house-wives”, make up % 52; whereas, “those of *bourgeois* origin” form 2.78 %.³³

Thus, in the forthcoming years, the founders and other trade unionists within the party have resorted to article 53 when practical or theoretical questions pertaining to the way to be chosen aroused, and they have made use of the article in their own favour since the WPT was not physically depending on the working class.³⁴

A member of the WTP would argue that there was an unwritten reconciliation between Aybar and the trade unionist founders. According to this resolution, socialist intellectual Aybar, and his associates would be invited to the party. Aybar would chair the party jointly with the central administrative board. In turn, the founders would be given a guarantee to have a 50 percent quota in every executive body of the WTP. Article 53 and the articles determining the chairman’s task and authority³⁵ were mere formulations of this reconciliation. The WTP was a product of such a balance.³⁶ Whereas it was aimed to enable the workers to have power in the party, “seemingly *ouvriérism*, in reality trade unionism was made dominant” in the party, where intellectuals such as trade unionists and their advocates were allowed to gain power. “The worker was meant to denote trade unionists.” Article 53 became the guarantee for the trade unionist founders, who were accused with pursuing political careers in the bourgeois sense.³⁷

In Lieu of a Conclusion

Article 53 has been generally defended by the leading members of the WTP, such as Aybar, Aren, Sargın, etc. Though, it was claimed that the sentence of the article could be evaluated as a “positive discrimination” which made possible the training

³² For the published result of this research, see Doğu Perinçek, “Türkiye İşçi Partisi Üyelerinin Sınıf Yapısı” [class structure of the WPT members], *Aydınlık Sosyalist Dergi*, 3 (1969), pp. 205-226. Also see, Ünsal, “TİP Yönetim Kurullarının Sınıfsal Yapısı” [the class composition of the WPT executive committees], *Ant*, 12 (1971), pp. 54-69.

³³ Türkkaya Ataöv, “The Place of the Worker in Turkish Society and Politics”, *Turkish Yearbook of International Relations* 1967, 8 (1970), pp. 85-147, 100-103.

³⁴ Çetin Yetkin, *12 Mart 1971 öncesinde Türkiye’de soldaki bölünmeler*, 2nd edn (İstanbul: Toplumsal Dönüşüm Yayınları, 1998), p. 171.

³⁵ See articles 33 and 34 in *Tüzük* (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1962), pp. 24-25.

³⁶ İleri, *Türkiye İşçi Partisi’nde oportünist merkezîyetçilik*, p. 11.

³⁷ “Türkiye İşçi Partisi eleştirisi: TİP’in on yılı”, *İlke*, 2: 10 (1974), pp. 81-121, 87; *TİP’in birinci on yılı (1961-1971)*, p. 3; Devrimci TİP Komitesi ve Aydınlik [revolutionary WPT committee and *Aydınlık*], “TİP içindeki mücadelede nereye geldik?”, *Aydınlık Sosyalist Dergi*, 24 (1970), pp. 439-447, 439.

of working class leaders,³⁸ this fact bears minor importance where the trade unionist founders never have wholly trusted the “socialist intellectual members” of the party, and never allowed the WPT to gain force among the workers of the trade unions they have led.³⁹ There has been a constant lack of confidence between the workers and intellectuals, who have seen each other, in the broader sense, “as agents of the state”, and “as a mass to be educated” consecutively.⁴⁰ Aren would accept that the article has been used in favour of the trade union founders in circumstances where it had been almost impossible to find members of working class origin eligible for executive positions with the exception of big cities.⁴¹

It appears that article 53 has not served its declared aim in the WPT, which has never been a genuine working class party. The socialist intellectual leaders have been forced to keep their relations with the workers at bay, obliged to content themselves with the trade unionists having a part in the executive committee of the party.

³⁸ Interview with Osman Sakalsız, October 26, 2001, Ankara, Turkey. Sakalsız was a working class member of the WPT who had been elected for the executive committee in the last years of the party. Also see, Sargın, *TİP’li yıllar*, I, p. 90.

³⁹ Ünsal, *Umuttan yalnızlığa*, p. 89, fn. 108.

⁴⁰ Interview with Metin Çulhaoğlu, August 28, 2000, Ankara, Turkey.

⁴¹ Aren, *TİP olayı*, p. 96.