The Mobilisation of the Tribal Kurds

Under the PKK

How the Kurds of Turkey were Revitalised

Ali Kemal Özcan

University of Kent

October 2002

The Mobilisation of the Tribal Kurds

Under the PKK

How the Kurds of Turkey were Revitalised

Ali Kemal Özcan

Abstract

This study attempts to analyse the internal dynamics of the most recent Kurdish resistance movement in Turkey. The main focus of analysis is the PKK's organisational existence – its ideational and material structure. As the leading entity of the Kurdish movement, the research focuses on the PKK's recent growth – asking how it became capable of revitalising the "buried" body of Kurdishness in Anatolia that has been incorporated (in both demographic and geographical terms) into the Turkicized Republic.

Within the framework of the case study method, much of the research is devoted to answering an indirect question: why wasn't it the *other* Kurdish "national" configurations that came to prominence? To this end, the study tries to appraise the extent of national and non-national ingredients in the make-up of the movement – the leadership, the grassroots and the masses that give their support.

The conclusion reached is that the successes and failures of the PKK in bringing about Kurdish opposition in Turkey are fundamentally related to its philosophy of recruitment and organisational diligence, rather than to its scrupulous use of arms or other contextual factors. The form, content and intensity of educational activities give the organisation its strength. This "education war" – concomitant with the contextual tension of Turkey's Kurdish question – produced a "sparking" Apo charisma. In its originating period, the "pure form" of this charisma contributed much to the PKK's ability to mobilise the Kurds. The later "routinised" form of the very charisma has become one of principal determinants in what is known as the movement's "shrinkage process".

It was also found that the substance of the party education – mainly involving Öcalan's talks – embodies a philosophy of human nature (rather than a strictly nationalistic content) in search of the re-appropriation of "human naturalness". In the party leadership's view, this human naturalness has to be extricated from the plague of civilisation's property mechanisms, which apparently have degenerated the humane faculties of man's spiritual structure. However, it ought not to be understood that the intensively worded philosophy depicts the extent of such extrication in the personalities of the cadre body of the Organisation. And the field research indicates that this is the Party's greatest internal contradiction.

2

Table of Contents

Introduction

This study looks at the internal dynamics of the Kurdish revitalisation in Turkey, as led by the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK – *Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan*).

There have been many rebellions recorded in Kurdish history – each bearing the ethnic demands of Kurdishness to varying degrees. In fact, with the PKK-led movement, Kurdish ethnicity has entered into supra-tribal resistance. It has moved towards becoming a nation, transcending the societal and geographic boundaries of tribal structures. The objective of this study is to examine the extent of the party's organisational share in this process.

In Southeast Anatolia, Turkey has been at war with a Kurdish guerrilla army led by the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) for 15 years. The war started in August 1984, and over 30,000 lives have been lost. Most recently, the high-profile abduction of Abdullah Öcalan, the leader of the PKK, from Nairobi, Kenya in February 1999, hit the headlines worldwide. Öcalan's capture, which was aided by "international cooperation", meant that he became the second "Turkish citizen" since 1923 to feature on the front page of *Time* magazine. The other was Mustafa Kemal, founder of the Turkish Republic.

Millions of Kurds in Turkey – the numbers range from twelve million to over twenty million – had been buried "on the sidelines of history" (White, 2000) or had "slipped off the pages of history" (Fuller, 1993) for more than half a century. At the end of the twentieth century, following a deadly silence for decades, "for the first time a Kurdish movement emerged from below" (Ergil, 1995) and "mounted its biggest challenge to the Turkish state" (Olson, 1996) in its republican history - by launching a guerrilla war and organising mass mobilisations. This study puts the "life segment" of the PKK's organisational entity - from the "incubation period" of the early 1970s to the "shrinkage period" that ended with Öcalan's abduction in 1999 - into perspective. In short, this study asks: how did the PKK turn from a group of university students into a mass movement?

I A General Picture

The nature of the PKK is the subject of much contentious debate. The PKK has been described as both the *"most violent terrorist organisation in the world"* and a *"re-humanisation movement headed by a revolutionary socialist"*. Öcalan's arrival in Rome, Italy, highlighted the disagreement over whether he is a terrorist or a freedom fighter. While the *"Baby Murderer"* and the *"Head of the Separatist-Terrorists"* are used as titles for Öcalan by almost all the Turkish press, some western journalists have called him *"the last revolutionary of the century"* and *"the last of a dying breed of old-style Marxist-Leninist revolutionary"* (Rugman, 1998).

The PKK insists on identifying itself as Marxist-socialist – and it flourished even in the tumultuous years following the collapse of the Soviet Union at the end of the 1980s, when many socialist countries and parties suffered a crisis of confidence. The PKK, founded by (in the words of a Turkish official) "a handful of bandits", continued to grow as a mass movement in the early months of 1990, immediately after the collapse of "socialism" – even though it persisted in calling itself socialist.

In subsequent years, the PKK has again proved itself as the largest party in the Kurdish territories under Turkish rule, winning a large number of votes in various general and local elections throughout the 1990s. It won slightly more than 50 per cent of votes through the legal parties it backed - election results that were obtained despite the oppression and underhand techniques of the Turkish state forces.

The PKK spread itself beyond Turkey to such an extent that it managed to assemble two hundred thousand people at a festival in Germany, where the scattered Kurdish population is estimated to be around half a million. As a result of such mass participation in Kurdish politics within Germany, German leaders have initiated a semi-official dialogue (Gunter, 1998 pp. 84, 85; Özkan, 2000, p. 58) with the PKK. In 1997-98, Germany released several leading PKK figures who had been imprisoned on charges of organising violent attacks on Turkish targets, while the United States still brands the PKK "the most dangerous terrorist organisation in the World". Despite pressure from the U.S. and Turkey to seek Öcalan's extradition from Italy (he was wanted for murder in Germany in an international arrest warrant issued in 1990), a senior government source in Bonn declared (23. 11. 98) that Germany did not want

Öcalan extradited. Worried about the potentially explosive impact of mass mobilisations following any trial involving Öcalan, the German source claimed that "if [Öcalan] had to stay in Rome it might help to launch a peace initiative between Ankara and the Kurdish rebels" (Traynor and Walker, 1998). Some commentators emphasised that the fear of the "potentially explosive" impact of Kurdish mass protests outweighed the legal system and the constitution of Germany.

One might think that such a "profitable area" of research would be to the student's advantage. However, the reality of the situation could potentially jeopardise the objectivity of scientific deductions, as the issue is surrounded by an atmosphere of obscurity – largely created by the opposing sides' tendency to exaggerate and propagandise. Furthermore, because of my own standpoint – I politically dislike the Turkish regime inherited from the Ottomans, and have both a pity for and solidarity with the Kurdish people – my own conclusions might be particularly vulnerable to the foggy atmosphere.

To reduce this vulnerability, I will diligently follow the basic methodological principles of science in the course of my research. In this context – that is, in the field of political science – one of the prime remedial measures for retaining one's objectivity is by relying on figures and facts, which cannot be forged or twisted. Hopefully, this will minimise the subjective nature of my work.

Accordingly, it would be best to begin picturing the movement and its power of mass mobilisation by using the quantitative evidence recognised by the antagonistic parties – Turkey and the PKK. Sociology, I believe, requires observation and the testing of facts, just as other scientific disciplines do. So I shall refer to the figures and facts; and further, to those figures on which the rival parties almost "compromise".

My study shall primarily be concentrated on up-to-date facts and figures on the PKK. This will help preserve a sense of direction in my studies. Also, while shedding light on the most up-to-date picture of the "case" being studied, to begin by presenting a perspective from the Western – or Post-industrial – World on an "incident" occurring in its homeland will enhance an accurate assessment of the dimensions of international concern, controversy and consensus surrounding the issue.

a. The "Rome March"

On the morning of 13 November 1998, Turkish national TV channels turned their entire programming schedules over to continuous news feeds under a single flashing title: *"Apo Roma'da Yakalandi"* (Apo Captured in Rome). The details of his detention released by Italian officials were sketchy – it soon became clear that he was not in custody or prison but in hospital, and later in a privately rented house – but this particular news story enjoyed prime space in the Turkish media for weeks.

In the days immediately following the news of the "capture", Madeleine Albright, then US secretary of state stressed that "there is a problem with Mr. Öcalan" and "he should face justice in Turkey". Turkish Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz called on the United States for assistance, "although Italy has emphasised that the matter is in the hands of the courts". *(The Guardian*, November 14, 1998) In response to the Turkish Prime Minister's call for help, James Rubin, the U.S. State Department spokesman, said: "...we hope a way will be found to extradite him to Turkey, consistent with international and Italian law"; and he added: "we have no doubt that this man is a terrorist, and he therefore should receive no safe haven" *(International Herald Tribune*, November 19, 1998).

The American Ambassador's statement demonstrated the extent to which the US holds the initiative in struggling against the PKK and its leader. Verging on backing Italy's resistance against the Turkish offensive in the case of Öcalan's extradition, the European Union's principal powers and diplomatic sources from Russia and Iran released carefully worded statements to the press in the following days. Yet at the same time, the European Commission produced a report on Turkey's progress towards joining the European Union (EU), and called on Turkey to start a dialogue with the Kurds and to look for a non-military solution to the conflict. Then, under pressure from Turkey and the US, Italian Prime Minister Masimo D'Alema and German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder met in Bonn on 27th November for talks on Öcalan. There were also a number of visits to the other principal member states of the EU – France, UK and Austria. Furthermore, the EU Parliament made a declaration in support of Italy, through the Austrian term president, which underlined the EU's "full

solidarity with Italy in her determination to fully implement her laws and treaty obligations" (*Turkish Daily News*, November 23 1998).

During that time, Germany revealed its invalidation of the 1990 international arrest warrant, which culminated in abandoning the extradition of Öcalan. Soon after the parliament's declaration, the European Commission adopted a resolution concerning threats of a trade boycott by Turkey, warning Ankara that "it could face retaliation from all EU members if it went ahead with threats to ban Italian products in protest at Italy's refusal to hand over the leader of the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK)" (*The Guardian*, November 25, 1998).

But despite the official statements from the principal powers of the European Union in support of Italy's resistance against the US and Turkey – and consequently in support of Öcalan's asylum in Rome – the whole of Europe participated in a deadly silence following the meeting of the NATO Ministers' Council held in Brussels. Italy then blamed Bonn for the crisis, asserting that "Öcalan would not have been arrested when he arrived in Rome on November 12 had it not been for an international arrest warrant issued by Germany in 1990". Likewise, in spite of Öcalan's publicised insistence (*Med TV*, live telephone interviews, 25. 12. 1998; 31. 12. 1998 and 01. 01. 1999) on a dialogue with Turkey through Europe, he has been dragooned into leaving not just Italy but the whole territory of the EU. Repeated statements in which "a dialogue through Europe" was highlighted as the only cause for his "Rome Venture" –for he had often previously identified the "Republic of Turkey" as the "illegitimate child of the West, which the West had dragonised"– did not have any effect.

Öcalan eventually departed from Rome on 16th January 1999, provoking much speculation about his next "strategy". Again, Turkish TV made it the top story for days. The United States released an official statement the following day, expressing its "worry" about Italy's position on "international terrorism".

b. Individual and Mass Reactions

While European and American powers got increasingly concerned about Öcalan's presence in Rome, mass mobilisations and horrific acts of individual self-immolation broke out among the Kurdish community both abroad and at home. As the breaking

11

news appeared under the title of "Apo Captured in Rome" on Turkish TV, Kurds in various European countries began to gather in Rome and at once went on a mass hunger strike in Chellio Square. Subsequently, on 17th November, a march called *"You Cannot Extinguish Our Sun"* was held in Rome. Estimates of the numbers participating in the march varied from ten thousand (*The Times, Le Repubblica, L'Unita, Corriere della Sera,* 18 November, 1998) to thirty thousand. In Bonn, on 19th December, there was another mass demonstration organised in favour of the Öcalan's demand for political asylum and a peaceful solution to the Kurdish question. Here, numbers were estimated at around forty thousand (*Associated Press,* 20 December; *Süddeutsche Zeitung,* 21 December; *Frankfurter Rundschau,* 21 December). From the day after Öcalan's arrival at Rome Airport onwards, widespread mass hunger strikes took place in 147 Kurdish associations (KON-KURD, Federation of Kurdish Associations in Europe) all over the European, Scandinavian, Caucasian, and Middle-Eastern countries, Russia, and symbolically in the US, Canada and Australia.

Eventually, Öcalan himself sent out word to stop the hunger strikes on 21st November, the day he settled in a private house. The "preliminary" hunger strikes had actually started when, in the course of a live telephone interview on Med TV on 19th October, Öcalan had mentioned a *"non-accomplished* Great International Plot" against him and the PKK. At the same time, he asserted that the button for the plot had been pressed on 9th October 1998. But there was a sudden increase in the number of hunger strikers following the "capture of Öcalan" news.

The striking reaction to what Öcalan called a "Plot" seems uniquely peculiar to the Kurdish movement. From the date of Öcalan's emphasis on the "Great International Conspiracy" in the interview by Med TV (19. 10. 1998) to the aftermath of his capture (19. 02. 1999) – that is, within the space of four months – 69 people set themselves on fire and 15 of them burned to death (See Apendix 3). They included an *eleven* year old school girl from East Kurdistan (Iran) and a *fifty-six* year old housewife from Istanbul.

Several attempts at organising hunger strikes or demonstrations were also made in or around the premises of some HADEP[1] branches in Kurdistan and the metropolitan cities of Turkey following Öcalan's appearance in Rome. These were "disguised" with the slogan "A Peaceful Solution to the Kurdish Question". There

were also general hunger strikes in prisons by around ten thousand PKK prisoners –
but these were soon raided and crushed. Such incidents culminated in two deaths.
Hamit Çakir was found dead in custody in Diyarbakir[2]. Metin Yurtsever was lynched
to death in front of a HADEP branch in Izmit (a Western city in Turkey near Istanbul)
during the police raid on the premises.

"Turkey's First and Only English Daily" paper summarised the tense events with
the headline: "PKK sympathisers face angry crowd, saved by police" (*Turkish Daily
News*, November 18, 1999). In reality, the trouble was the result of specific
instructions by the authorities issued under the heading "Activity Programme of
Interior Ministry Concerning the Preventive Measures to be Taken Due to the Capture
of Apo in Rome". The first article of the "Activity Programme" is worth extracting in
order to assess the "how" of the "social movement" (McCharty and Zald, 1977; Turner
and Killian, 1957) – particularly regarding the "physical" circumstances required for
an effectively organised movement to build up the mass mobilisation of crowds in
Turkish and Kurdish provinces.

Activity No: 1.
   The subject-matter of Activity: Taking psychologically impressive physical
measures against the Organisation's cadres and supporters.

Activity Time: 17-30 November 1998.
   Executing Institutions: The Military Headquarters, The Interior Ministry, The
Headquarters of Gendarmerie, National intelligence Organisation (MIT), General
Directorate of Security Forces.
   Co-ordinator Institution Responsible for Execution: The Interior Ministry.
   Targeted Community: Members of the Organisation.
   The way of Execution: Psychologically impressive physical measures will be taken
and executed by governing bodies of provinces against the Organisation's cadres
who attempt demonstrations or hunger strikes or passive resistance etc. within the
appearance of a legal framework which tends to raise the sympathisers' morale.
   The General Directorate of Security Forces will be in co-ordination with the
Headquarters of Gendarmerie when necessary.

In addition to other articles pointing to specific targets (such as how to command the means of mass communications, how to wield religious institutions, how to motivate the kin of soldiers who lost their lives in clashes, and so on), "Activity No: 10" of the "Program" focuses on HADEP and the newspapers or the periodicals sympathetic to the party. The "Activity Program" was brought into effect on 17th November. On 19th November, police raided all HADEP premises and the offices of pro-Kurdish newspapers *Ülkede Gündem* and *Welat* based in Turkey and the "Southeast", following an order by the Ankara State Security Court (DGM). The "balance sheet" for a month's implementation of one article of the "Activity Program" was as follows:

– the mass detentions of 3,215 people in total, the arrest of 130 members of HADEP, including 9 administrators of headquarters and the leader of the party himself, Murat Bozlak (who was badly wounded in an attack on his house on an earlier occasion),
– heavy casualties with many serious injuries,
– the lynching of a man by an "angry crowd" and a dead body in custody.

The vast majority of HADEP's leading members were arrested (three members of the Executive Organ, 11 chairmen of administrative provinces, and 86 members with administrative duties [Kemal Peköz, General Accountant of HADEP, Live tele-interview by Med TV, 04.02.1999] and the head of the party, Murat Bozlak). This happened shortly before the general election of 18 April 1999. Yet, on 29th January 1999, Vural Savas, Attorney General of the Republic, brought a lawsuit in the Constitutional Court against HADEP and called for the Party to be banned, claiming he had discovered proof of "organisational links" between the Party and the PKK.

A sequence of pro-Kurdish legal parties known to be HADEP's predecessors (HEP, ÖZDEP and DEP in order) had been banned in previous years by the Constitutional Court for the very same reason (Kartal, R., 1995, pp. 183-187). Furthermore, Murat Bozlak's attempt to enter Diyarbakir, for an officially arranged mass meeting, was prevented a short while prior to his arrest by the region's military-dominated security forces due to "lack of security measures".

c. The Abduction of Öcalan

The "Great International Conspiracy" - in fact the explicit international hunt for Öcalan (led by the USA) since his disclosure in Rome – came to its conclusion on 16 February 1999. Öcalan thought he had received clearance from the Kenyan authorities to go to the airport and fly to the Netherlands. The car in which he was travelling pulled out from the convoy of cars (provided by the Kenyan security police) and disappeared on the evening of 15th February. Öcalan was bound, gagged and drugged, and placed on a jet back to Turkey from Nairobi. The plane arrived safely at 3.15 am on 16th February.

While Turkish authorities declared 16th February the most historical day in the history of the Republic, the "Council of Presidency of the PKK" announced 15 February as *"milat"* (Birth of Christ) for Kurds.

Some states denied participating in the abduction of Öcalan – but it wasn't enough to convince papers unsympathetic to Öcalan and the PKK.

> Despite strong denials from the United States and Israel, it appears that Ankara was able to call on the service of the American and Israeli intelligence services to keep track of Mr. Öcalan's movements across Europe and to provide positive proof that he was in hiding inside a Greek diplomatic compound in Nairobi, ... Although the full story behind the plot to kidnap Mr. Öcalan was being deliberately 'muddied' yesterday by all those involved, ..." (*The Times*, February 18, 1999).
>
> ...However, one US official at the state department, who requested anonymity said: "We were engaged for months *diplomatically* (italic –AKÖ) to bring him to justice". (Howard, 1999. p. 83.)

But in his first statement through his lawyers after being abducted, Öcalan emphasised that Turkey was not involved in his abduction. Further, Tuncay Özkan, a Turkish journalist close to intelligence services, suggested that the U.S. had decided to hand Öcalan over to Turkey following a detailed report presented by Michael M. Gunter who interviewed him in Damascus on 13th to 14th March 1998 (Özkan, 2000, p 57).

Clearly, the exact details of Öcalan's abduction from Nairobi or the parties' stances on the day of his delivery to Turkey are not the main issue here. But these

"minor" details do show his importance for both regional parties and global powers. There is considerable data indicating Öcalan's importance, and the influence of his charisma among Kurds in four parts of Kurdistan, and abroad.

As news broke of Öcalan's delivery to the Ankara authorities, Kurdish activists across the world once more mobilised to protest at what they saw as an international conspiracy. Greek embassies and consulates (along with some property of Israel, Kenya and international bodies) were stormed in more than twenty cities across Europe, where almost 1.5million scattered Kurdish people live.

In Berlin, four Kurdish protesters were shot dead by security guards when they attempted to storm the Israeli embassy. Another six protesters were shot dead during several demonstrations against Turkish diplomatic premises in the principal Kurdish cities of Iran. Tens of thousands of Kurds of the south (North Iraq) participated in mass demonstrations held in "safe haven" provinces ruled by either KDP or PUK. And yet again, demonstrators engaged in horrific acts of self-immolation. Some protesters set themselves on fire, including a 15-year-old girl in London, a 56 year-old housewife in Istanbul, and even an 11 year-old child in Iran.

Following the self-immolation attempt by the young girl in front of the Greek embassy in London, an American reporter asked protesters: "Why is this man so important for you?" The question may be a simple one, but the answer is not so straightforward. However, by examining the facts, researches and data, a sociological answer can be found.

d. The Wave of Mass Demonstrations of the Early Nineties

In presenting a general picture of the mobilising dimensions of the Party, we must not bypass the widespread mass riots (*serihildans*)[3], including the participation of an overwhelming majority of the quasi-rural population.

The "unexpected" demonstrations erupted on the streets of many Kurdish provinces in March 1990 and continued until the late months of 1993 (examined in Chapter 6). Both the state forces and the other Kurdish political circles who intended to be the "vanguard parties" of the "National Liberation Movement" were reluctant to recognise this fact at first (*Yekitiya Sosyalist*, April, 1990; *Pêseng*, April/May, 1990;

Riya Azadi, April, 1990 *et al*). For the military-dominated State sources, "this group of people were 'just a bunch of bandits' who had taken to the mountains and/or young adventure-seeking activists" (Imset, 1992, p. 7).

Similarly, when a mass reaction to the exhibition of the corpses of 13 PKK guerrillas in Nusaybin[4] led to the most recent rebellion, the rest of the Kurdish national groupings tended to explain the phenomenon within a feudal-tribal frame of reference by pointing at the tribal origins of guerrillas. But the fact remains that the paragraphs outlining "A Revolutionary Organising Plan For Kurdistan" in the early issues of the Organisation's official periodical, *Serxwebûn*[5], present an detailed plan of how to "build up" crowd behaviour (Turner and Killian, 1957, p.58) under the social circumstances of the Kurdish populated territories. The "Revolutionary Organising Plan" had to be made because, according to Öcalan, "society has been de-organised from top to bottom by the Turkish colonising system" (*Örgütlenme Üzerine*, 1983).

The "*Serihildans*" gradually expanded until 1993. Mass participation in them increased and spread into many other Kurdish towns and territories. The largest was the funeral procession of the head of the Diyarbakir branch of HEP, Vedat Aydin, who was murdered by assassins. Around 150,000 people were attacked by heavily armed security forces – supported by armoured vehicles and helicopters – leaving twenty-one dead and hundreds wounded.

Ragip Duran, a specialist Turkish journalist in the region's affairs, wrote about these casualties in a report submitted to the "International Conference on North West Kurdistan (south-east Turkey)", held on 13th to 14th March 1994 in Brussels. Duran's words give some clue to what lay behind the mass mobilisations in the region:

> Nineteen journalists, nearly all of whom are of Kurdish nationality (including Musa Anter who was 70 years old) have been shot and killed over the last two years in south-east Anatolia. Government authorities claim that these deaths are the work of unknown assassins. (More than 500 people have been shot or hacked to death.) A document from the Turkish Minister of the Interior says that the victims "were people who had links with terrorists and were consequently victims of the internal battle within terrorist organisations". Delegates from the Turkish Grand National Assembly (of Turkey –AKÖ.), the European Parliament, Amnesty International, the Association of Human Rights and the Committee for the Protection of Journalists,

who made detailed, on-the-spot investigations of these assassinations, conclude that "the security forces were involved, in one way or another, in these assassinations". (Duran, 1995, p.71.).

e. "Official" Figures

Before we finish outlining a general picture of the movement, it is worth noting that even pro-State sources recognise the mass dimensions of the Party.

The first English book published by the *Turkish Daily News*[6] addresses the extent of what it labels "massification".

> The fact that the PKK is now rapidly gaining mass support throughout the Southeast [implying Kurdish populated areas – A.K.Ö.] and is now bidding for further control in the region, has led to tension on the part of Turkish officials based here.
>
> Many of the smaller settlements, with populations ranging from between 10,000 to 60,000 have been converted into self-styled PKK fortresses. Even regional officials accept that "the PKK is everywhere" or in the hearts of everyone. (Imset, 1992, p. 264.)

The pro-Kurdish legal party, HADEP, for which the PKK sources announced their support, won 19.5 per cent of the votes in 18 provinces where more than "15 per cent of the population declared their mother language as Kurdish" in the 1995 elections (Kirisçi and Winrow, 1997). The percentage in the "capital" city of "Turkish Kurdistan" was 73 in the general elections.

Estimates of the number of deaths caused by the 14-year Kurdish guerrilla war against the Turkish army (which began on 15th August 1984) range from between 29,000 to 37,000. (*The Independent*, 14. 11. 1998: 29,000; *Financial Times*, 14/15. 11. 1998 and *The Guardian*, 14.11. 1998: 30.000; *International Herald Tribune*, 16. 11. 1998: 30,000-37,000; *The Times*, 18. 11. 1998: 37,000. The numbers given by human rights analysts are also between 30,000 and 37,000).

There may be controversy over the identification of the PKK, but there is a greater "consensus" concerning the leader of the Party. The point on which almost

18

everyone agrees is the extent of the *"determinativity"* and "indispensability" of Öcalan. This will be discussed further in Chapter 6.

In general, my study is designed to throw light on the processes of the PKK's "massification" - its mobilising sources and dimensions among the people of Kurdistan. These people are divided by solid physical, as well as spiritual, borders – and they retain active and vital pre-feudal institutions. In addition, the effects of the PKK's influence in the process of Kurdish nationalisation, in terms of *detribalisation,* will be discussed at length.

However, the central question I shall endeavour to answer is *how* the movement came into being – how it went from a "single man's efforts", developed, "massified", and eventually became part of an international controversy.

To this end, the study will attempt to examine the Organisation's role in the process, partly by examining theorisation on social movements, but mainly through the analytical framework of nation and nationalism, and of Marxist conceptualisation on the "national question". So the main question shall be concerned with the inner dynamics of the movement. *What is the determinative internal factor in the organisational growth of the Ankara-born PKK* – which has enabled it to extend Kurdish resistance beyond provincial borders, and to expand resistance not just nationally, but internationally? In view of the effective, functional "primordial loyalties" (Alavi, 1973) and rivalries (clannish, tribal, religious, sectarian and regional) in Kurdish society – which appear as a point of consensus in the literature on Kurds – there may be such a decisive factor.

Considering the multi-causal nature of the development processes of social phenomena, historical and up-to-date realities must not be ignored – particularly within their contexts.

The initial proposition is that the circumstances that gave rise to the PKK are intimately linked to the emergence and formation of Turkish capitalism and the Republic. Namely, it is linked to the "manufactured character of the Republican Turkish identity" (Kadioglu, A., 1996, p.177). Further, the "manufactured" character of Turkish identity and the Republic is both an effect of and part of the process of the Republic's *way of "colonising"* part of Kurdistan. Without studying and understanding the nationality of Turks and the Statehood of the Turkish Republic, it is not possible to assess the true nature of the PKK.

To summarise: subsequent chapters shall search for the dominant cause of the PKK-led Kurdish insurgency ("29th revolt")[7], which developed from a "group of 15-20 university students" (Aydin, 1992) into the "biggest challenge to the Turkish state in the twentieth century" (Olson, 1996). I am aware that when an inquiry orientates itself towards the most operative *internal* factor of a process, there is always a risk of ignoring – or at least lessening the importance of – the context in which the phenomenon is considered. I shall therefore strive to maintain this study's intellectual, theoretical and empirical balance – and avoid confusing phenomena and context.

II Methodological Framework

a. Scope of the Study

The PKK's organisational insight and its relation to Turkey's Kudish question are the principal items under investigation.

Together, they (Turkish State and the PKK) form an antagonistic manifestation of the earlier contradictory process that led to the emergence of the "Republic", in the form of a solidly Turkicised nation-state out of the defeated Ottoman Empire. Within the cause-effect frame of reference, the nature of Turkey's Kurdish question was handled as the context in which the PKK was situated as the main issue of the study. Namely, the method and strategy of the research and the presentation of the thesis were organised in accordance with an exploratory study of structural aspects of the Kurdish movement in Turkey. The efforts of the research's theoretical survey, observations and fieldwork were orientated towards gaining insight into the organisational structure of the Party.

Instead of just looking at the PKK's inner workings or its formal constitutional rules and regulations, I investigated its practical functions – in terms of motivating individuals as part of mass mobilisations. The study's objective is to ascertain the extent and/or composition of "national" and "humanisational" sentiments, aspirations, longings and impetuses that determine the recruitment of individuals to the Kurdish cause as represented by the PKK.

Accordingly, the core focus in searching for the source of individual Kurd's motivations are the educational "activities" and their self-contained philosophy. In other words, the central inquiry of this study is into the peculiar nature of individual-organisation interrelations in the PKK, which rest mainly on the over-emphasised philosophy of cadre education – otherwise known as the "education war".

Both the theoretical and empirical research have primarily looked at how the *non-national* insights of the PKK's philosophy of education have generated incitement among the party militants and adherents, and how far this philosophy relates to the successes and failures of the organisation. That is, the intensively worded philosophy, which substantially engages with the notion of the "self-shaping spiritual re-formation of personalities" of the Party's operating cadres, has become the core theme of my argument in relation to the fate of the Kurdish movement in Turkey.

The peripheral objective of this study is to look at the relation between the nature of Turkey's Kurdish question and the mould of the PKK's theory and action. So the study seeks to assess whether the rise (and fall) of the PKK is determined by certain conjectural factors formed by the rivalry between regional and imperial powers and Turkey's Kurdish policy – or determined by the Party's peculiar philosophy of cadre education and organisational performance.

To date, no systematic study of the Kurds in Turkey, as an ethnic entity, has been carried out. Most textbooks concerning Kurds and Kurdistan make two simple arguments:

a) "primordial" loyalties: the tribal, kinship and religious institutions of Kurds; and,

b) the political, economic and/or military tensions between regional and imperial powers over the strategic significance and riches of the Kurdish homeland.

As a result, the inner dynamics and processes of Kurdish society have been almost totally neglected. The scarcity of attention paid to the internal dynamics and the political insights of Kurdish societal entities within upper Mesopotamia, those Kurds assimilated into Turkey, is particularly stark. The *first and only* doctoral thesis (in the domain of English and Turkish sources) on the PKK appeared recently in Turkey. That study, however, concludes in its first chapter that "the existing findings prove that the PKK was founded by the intelligence services of the two countries of the Eastern

21

Bloc, Syria and Bulgaria, which acted on behalf of the Soviet Union" (Özcan, N.A., 1999b, p. 48). So my study aims to fill a massive gap – by examining what main dynamics of Kurdish societal structure, in the final analysis, determine the nature of the "question" of "Turkish Kurds".

An interesting point worth noting about the Kurdish movement is the remarkable participation of women. In the sphere of both civilian (mass protests, marches, celebrations, festivals) and military (guerrilla) activities the noteworthy presence of women appeared to me to be an important phenomenon. Considering the unusually high percentage of women in Kurdish guerrilla forces and the fanatically religious and largely pre-feudal state of Kurdish society - and also in view of the fact that the Party persists in identifying itself as Marxist-socialist – the women issue cannot be ignored. However, this issue necessitates an additional study in itself. Furthermore, as a man I felt discouraged from examining an issue that I might not fully understand, subjectively.

b. The Literature on the Kurds

The studies on Kurds and Kurdistan – excluding some historical works – are limited to analyses of conflicts within the region and tend to assume that Kurdishness is only an element of either an international or regional conflict. The studies of relatively objective scholars –mostly of western diplomatic missionaries– have either been the works of conflictual analyses in terms of inter-state politics or historical narratives. The works of indigenous authors are stuck with political or vulgar nationalistic concerns. There is almost no proper sociological study of the Kurds beyond informative paragraphs within the pages of political or historical works – at least, so far as I could ascertain among English and Turkish sources. If there are any studies in Arabic, Persian or French, they probably concern themselves with southern (Iraq) or eastern (Iran) parts of Kurdistan. Alas, there would not be much benefit from such sources in my inquiry inasmuch as I hypothesise that the socio-political structure of the *possessor* of Anatolian Kurdistan (Turkey) has been the fertilising and shaping ground for the PKK and the Movement it leads.

22

Most works on the Turkish-ruled part of Kurdistan and the PKK[8] appeared following the wave of large-scale mass demonstrations, which commenced in the spring of 1990. These studies and articles which appeared throughout the nineties have devoted their intellectual efforts towards discussing either how the Kurds became an element of the cosmopolitan conflict in the region or how they became a ready-made tool of the powers taking part in the "wolfish" quarrel over the rich natural and cheap labour resources of Kurdistan.[9] The overwhelming majority of these scholars focus on the aspect that the Kurds have always, in the ultimate stage of each rebellion, been betrayed by the ex-allied powers as soon as the parties of the conflict reached a compromise. No doubt, the aims of these works are not in vain, nor are they pointing at illusory features of Kurdish sociality. On the contrary, they highlight a pandemic trait of the social history of the Kurds. However, these attempts have by-and-large passed over the need for a comprehensive sociological study of the Kurdish social structure. The works have exhausted their intellectual efforts on the Kurdish "problem" or the Kurdish "question". Many titles of books and articles (e.g. Kirisci and Winrow, 1997; Olson, 1998; Barkey, 1993) engaged with Kurds include the words "question" or "problem" – if not "dilemma", "imbroglio" or "puzzle" etc. Olson rightfully devoted his latest book "To the Kurdish peoples: may they live when their existence is no longer defined as a 'question' or a 'problem' " (Olson, 1998).

The principal studies or books dealing exclusively with the PKK and Öcalan – at least the ones of which I am aware – are either concerned with journalistic (Imset, 1992; Birand, 1992) or political (Olson, 1996; Kirisci and Winrow, 1997) aspects. The works with a pro-State bias (Aydin, 1992; Kirzioglu, 1968 *et al.*) rather resemble "made to measure" products.

In short, there has been no comprehensive study of the Kurds of the Turkish Republic and the PKK in sociological terms, except for the Turkish sociologist Besikçi's works. His works include his doctoral thesis (Besikci, 1969a) on a Kurdish nomadic tribe (Alikan), the subsequent work based on the thesis and his experiences during PhD research (Besikci, 1969b). More recent studies by Besikci rest mainly on his restricted observations, readings and dialogues with PKK militants while he was incarcerated in various prisons in Turkey and Kurdistan (Besikci 1992 and *et al*).

The works of pro-Kurdish sources on "Turkish Kurds" provide more factual, historical and political information. Yet from a sociological point of view, they are

23

not much more helpful than "made to measure" books by pro-State professors. These pro-Kurdish publications, which are either sponsored or directed by various Kurdish political circles (Göktas, 1991; Asan, 1991; Kaman, 1997), purvey propagandising or agitating exaggerations about the "national" dimensions of Kurdish society, in reaction to the State's policies of oppression and denial.

Furthermore, in the studies dealing with the concepts of "nation" and "nationalism" which appeared before the 1990s – when theorisation and hypotheses are exemplified with ethnic communities from various continents – the Kurds of Anatolia are ignored, probably due to a lack of knowledge about them. For instance, in his scholarly work, *State and Nation*, Akzin mentions the Kurds twice (Akzin, 1964, pp. 85,108), when he describes the assimilation and integration of a "subordinate" ethnicity by the dominant ethnic group in the context of State-nation relations – but in both instances the example is the "Kurds in Iraq". Yet the assimilation programme of the Turkish State in relation to the Kurds of Anatolia is a far better case in point for Akzin's argument than the "Kurds in Iraq".

In fact, Iraq's assimilation policy does not include denying Kurdish ethnicity, nor denying their land, nor banning the Kurdish language – all of which takes place in Turkey. In the official language of Iraq – and also of Iran – the Kurdish-speaking population is called "Kurds" and the territory where they live as a majority is called "Kurdistan". In Turkey, however – with more than half of the whole Kurdish population and homeland – they have been officially and "scientifically"[10] declared to be *mountain Turks* or a *sub-branch of Turks*, since the transition from the Ottoman State to the Republic of Turkey. Recently, they have even been "recognised" as *Turks of Kurdish origin*. The territory they have inhabited for almost four millennia is strictly named "Dogu" (East) or "Güneydogu" (Southeast) – a way of denying them their national legitimacy.

But despite the lack of sociological studies and reliable sources concerning the "Kurds of the Turkish Republic", there are substantial questions to be studied, answered and demystified surrounding this particular social phenomenon.

When surveying the "available" literature on Kurds, one cannot help but conclude that the tribal structure is essential to the existence of Kurdishness. It is acknowledged that tribality[11] does not only apply to traditional Kurdish society, but is also fundamental to its political, economic and cultural life. The tribal phenomenon

24

helps explain the sense of disunity among Kurds, the absence of accord, the pitiless internal clashes, and therefore the "intrinsic" traitorous sentiments. However, the tribal existence (*ashiret*) has been handled as an entity of feudatory extension, whereas the Kurdish *ashiret* that has preserved itself as a basic property of the society up until the twenty-first century descends from pre-medieval history. My study does not include the *ashiret* itself, but rather its cultural manifestation in the form of "treason" as an inseparable element of the Kurdish ethnic personality. I have argued that "treason" has been the "dormant resource" of the Kurdish "semi-nationalist" resistance against Turkey, and has been well-grasped and converted into its opposite (an effective sentimental base of "national" awareness) by the leadership of the PKK.

c. Fieldwork and Theoretical Setting

Contemporary students of social movements seem to appreciate the holding of ideological positions. According to Pakulski, such students "are divided by their political and ideological allegiance" (Pakulski, 1991, pp. 29, 30). This seems no less true of the theorisation on nations and nationalism, as Nairn emphasises: "the theory of nationalism has been inordinately influenced by nationalism itself" (Nairn, 1981, p. 94). This may be fitting for the "scientific" atmosphere of post-industrial "rationality" – but holding ideological positions would never be fitting for the science produced by students who aim to examine "the *spirit* and *power* of philosophy". Nor is it fitting for the students of political sociology "*to whom the question of whether any new knowledge could be made useful in their art is one of living and urgent importance*" (Wallas, 1910).

Studying a highly controversial phenomenon carries a grave risk of becoming biased. This risk increases when the "case" being studied is most commonly the object of averse or hostile approaches (Berkant, 1998). Then, research from an alternative ("sympathetic") point of view may well be partisan. So although I have claimed to be "otherwise", I have made every endeavour not to introduce bias into the research or to allow bias into my inferences and deductions.

The empirical ingredients of this study rested mainly on my prolonged observations, an unstructured interview with Öcalan and an "illegal" questionnaire. I

25

also conducted a number of unstructured – and strictly unrecorded – interviews with ordinary guerrillas and middle-rank commanders during my several visits to the region in 1998 and 1999. I had to spend seven or eight weeks in the summers of each year to have the chance of these *focused* interviews. However, direct observations – and partly participant observations – over almost a decade constituted a larger proportion of my field material than is usual in sociological fieldwork.

So what sparked my initial interest in carrying out this research? It started with my experiences as an interpreter with a Kurdish community association in London between 1987 and 1996. The preliminary empirical knowledge drawn from partial participant-observation is based on my voluntary work for the community centre from 1990 to 1995. Being a voluntary interpreter "upgraded" me to being an "activist", and consequently I was regarded as deserving to be included in a "one-week intensive education" programme held by the PKK in 1992.

Then, in the summer of 1996, I was allowed to interview Öcalan himself in his base. I travelled to Syria via Lebanon, and stayed there for four weeks, where I was allowed to join the education programme of the Party Central School (*Parti Merkez Okulu*) in which Öcalan's "Analyses" (*Çözümlemeler* – his recorded and edited inculcation talks – took place after the closure of the guerrilla camp in Bekaa Valley, Lebanon, in late 1992.

I spent three weeks in the Turkish-language[12] training school, during which time I interviewed Öcalan twice in the presence of over one hundred and fifty of his pupils. These interviews were recorded by video camera. I strictly followed the rules and regulations of the school. In fact, I wanted to be treated as a participant of the education programme, with all that that meant, rather than being treated as a "guest student".

During my final week in Syria, I was due to travel to Qamislo and surrounding townships (Derik and Endiwar), which neighbour south-east Turkey. These areas are totally populated by Kurds, most of whom fled in the first half of the century from the "North" (Turkey). I carried out unstructured interviews with parents (and other family members) of PKK guerrillas who had lost their lives.

I selected three localities for my questionnaire to be filled out. They were Diyarbakir, Mersin and Ankara. Diyarbakir had to be selected for it was the "heart" of "Turkish Kurdistan" in which every sort of class and stratum of Kurdish society were

26

condensed – in particular following the inflow of the rural population which fled from the war that intensified in the period from 1993-97. The selection of Mersin was because of the outstanding presence of the newly fled population from all Kurdish provinces of Turkey, insofar as it has begun to be counted as a Kurdish metropolitan city.[13] The reason for selecting Ankara as third locality in the "field" is twofold. It is on the one hand the capital city of Turkey in which the most solid grasp of state control over Kurdish affairs is evident. On the other hand, the presence of Kurdish immigrants in Ankara is the steadiest one, and it has been far less affected by the total war of fifteen years than the other major metropolises. In addition to these selected cities, I had a few completed questionnaires from Izmir[14] just because of the availability of a contact person there.

Just under half of the total amount of respondents (91) were taken from Diyarbakir, and the rest from other places.

But finding PKK activists to fill out the questionnaire was not as easy as selecting localities! First of all, I had to remove the name of the party "PKK" from the questions and replace it with either "Party" or "HADEP" in its Turkish version. This, despite my additional diligence, caused some confusion. I strove to reduce the perplexity among the respondents to its minimum level by verbal emphases on the PKK "beneath" HADEP to every "person" to whom I handed the questionnaire. However, the responses contained much less confusion than I expected.[15] Eventually, I managed to gather 184 substantially completed questionnaires. This was not all done through a one-on-one basis, but by occasional in-groups ranging in general from five to ten. For that reason, I have to call it "illegal" fieldwork.

Because of the nature of my questions, I received some manipulative or slightly deceptive answers from some "sophisticated" respondents – but not a great number. Also, the essence of my inquiry made it important for me to find out what the Kurdish people *think* rather than just what they *are*. To my mind, this reduced the level of problematic data in terms of the generalisability of findings in my questionnaire.

A final confession: I made every endeavour to draw the most from a questionnaire carried out *illegally*, but the fact remains that I could not prevent myself from leaving a number of wasted questions and considerable portion of unused findings behind.

The extent of the relevance of theories of collective action and/or social movements is, beyond a doubt, problematic for the study that I undertook. But this, of course, does not mean that I could do the study of the socio-political phenomenon of a *tribal* or *pre-feudal* society without some light thrown upon it by the theoretical formulations originating in American and European *post-modern* experiences. Both the combination and the mobilisation of the grassroots of the Party and the nature of the actors in the Movement necessitated making some references to the intellectual perspectives of the sociology of social movements. That is, when I had striven to understand the "why" of the mass mobilisations, I had to refer to conceptualisations of collective action to some degree. When I turned to explore the "how" of the individuals' motivations, I needed the intellectual means to argue over the "new paradigm" of Western "new social movements".

However, both in the realm of collective action analyses and theoretical accounts of social movement studies, there are already, as a corollary to the theories' controversial nature, enough enduring problems of interpretation. For instance, despite Diani's optimistic conclusion that there's "a greater underlying consensus in the field than one might assume" (Diani, 1992), there appears a "greater" disparity than resemblance between Diani himself and Pakulski (1991) on even labelling or classifying the main trends within contemporary social movement analyses. Diani places social movement approaches in *four* main streams, each with a group of representative scholars, and, for example, mentions the names of Touraine and Melucci as leading figures in the "new social movements" interpretation. He particularly refers to Turner and Killian (1957) in relation to the "collective behaviour" perspective; whereas Pakulski talks of *six* main theoretical accounts, and labels the fifth stream as the "action-identity approach" citing Touraine's name, and attributes the "consistent 'classical' account of collective behaviour" to Smelser's *Theory of Collective Behaviour* (1962). Furthermore, Klandermans and Tarrow (1988) brand the "new social movements" trend as a "European" approach and the rest as "American", whilst Pakulski traces it back to both European and American scholars.

Wary of falling into too much scrutiny on the matter, Tilly's noticing of "a good deal of agreement about the characteristic life history of movements and widespread disagreement about why and how movements arise in the first place"

(Tilly, 1978, p. 41) makes me feel more confident. However, his "parabolic" passage is probably a good illustration of my point of view:

> The analysis of collective action is a risky adventure. For one thing, there are too many experts around. It is a bit like food, or sex, or speech. Almost all of us know enough about food, sex and speech to survive in our own environments, and none of us likes to be told he is ignorant in any of these three regards. Yet from a scientific point of view, we all have lots to learn about all three. The same is true of collective action. ... (Tilly, 1978, p. 5).

The same is consequently true of social movements and of my concerns. For example, the following conclusion drawn from American experiences intimately refers to the mode of action of the PKK: "Social movement leaders use bargaining, persuasion, or violence to influence authorities to change. Choices of tactics depend upon prior history of relations with authorities, relative success of previous encounters, and ideology. Tactics are also influenced by the oligarchisation and institutionalisation of organisational life." (McCarthy and Zald, 1977, p. 1217).

This certainly provides a framework for explaining the Kurdish Offensive's "terrorism" or "revolutionary violence". But it must be appreciated that studying an extremely peculiar phenomenon, as an outcome of the fusion of the "manufactured character" of Republican "nationalisation" or "modernisation" (Kirişçi and Winrow, 1997) and the "dehumanised/degenerated" (Öcalan, 1995, 1996 et al.) condition of Kurdishness, creates difficulties with making broader generalisations. That is, This study does not encourage one in constructing all-embracing generalisations vis-à-vis some receptive concepts such as "ethnic violence", "terrorism" or "revolutionary impetus". On the other hand, using theories of "over-civilised" individual motivations to explain the intensity of the self-immolation protests in an "over-tribalised" ethnic community, which reached their apex after Ocalan's arrest, seems inappropriate.

So theorisation on the concepts of nation and nationalism –though they are highly "mongrelised" and confusing– has been my main analytical framework. For a clearer application of the theories of nationalism, I began by revisiting the most recognised scholars' works in the field, and attempted to distil the "twin concepts" (nation and nationalism).

d. Outline of Chapter Headings

The initial part of introduction draws an up-to-date picture of the Kurdish movement led by the PKK, with some indisputable facts and figures recognised by both rival parties to this conflict. This, I hope, provides a context for the study of the subject matter.

In Chapter 1, I revisit general theorisation on "nation" and "nationalism", in an attempt to provide a conceptual framework for interpreting facts about the PKK. The main aim in this chapter is to escape the "trap" that is engendered by the "mongrelisation" of the main concepts. Because the Organisation under study claims to be Marxist-socialist, the "national question" of Marxism is also incorporated into the chapter's literature research.

The basic focus of Chapter 2 is the source and peculiarity of the ethnic – not national – question of Kurds under the Ottoman State and the Turkish Republic, and the historical background of the particularity of the conflict between Turkey and the Kurds. This chapter draws attention to the roots of the tension between Turks and Kurds in the new "nation-state", which was shaped during the struggle for "Turkish National Independence".

Chapter 3 looks at how the PKK emerged in the 1970s, following the silent decades which began in the aftermath of the repression of the most recent revolt (before the current attempt) in Dersim province in 1938. The emergence of the PKK from a group of six housemates in Ankara (the capital of Turkey) to the foundation congress of the Party in a village affiliated to Diyarbakir (regarded as the capital of Kurdistan) is put in perspective in an approximate chronological order.

Chapter 4 discusses the formation and development of the ideology and programme of the Party, its initial political demands and objectives, and the tactical and strategic transformation at specific stages of the struggle in conjunction with the Party's organisational expansion, massification and confrontations. The chapter examines the alterations in the PKK's ideology and programme with the totality of its consistent, flexible and metamorphosed aspects. In particular, the chapter discusses the nationalist undertakings of the Party in comparison with its socialist aspirations.

Following a summary of the "intrinsic" tradition of the socio-political history of the Kurds, Chapter 5 focuses on the particular character of the PKK's organisational structure with the birthmarks of a traditional communist party. To explicate individual-organisation relations, I investigate the form and content of cadre education and the limits placed upon a militant's life in the party. At micro-level, I look at the leadership's source of power in the recruitment process, which consequently orientates and motivates the constituency of the Party. The chapter is devoted to exploring the Organisational "share" in the actualisation of the movement, in the light of the findings of data collected from Turkey and Kurdistan during the fieldwork.

The first section of Chapter 6 tackles the fundamental reasons for the PKK's success, which have transformed it from a "bunch of bandits" in 1984 to the mass movement of the early 1990s. I explore this evolution to facilitate an understanding of the process of the PKK's decline, which led to Öcalan's abduction from Kenya.

The second section of Chapter 6 examines organisational problems within the Party, to extend the argument about the inner dynamics of the Kurdish movement. The exploration of the PKK's "subjective share" in the "revitalisation" process of the Anatolian Kurds is broadened with reference to the paradox-like entanglements of the Organisation. And these investigations also draw upon the fieldwork.

In the Conclusion, I first summarise the principal conclusions of the items explored in the main chapters following a brief outline of preliminary chapters. Finally, I present a general discussion on an essentially unchanged aspect of human history – attempting to argue that the most universal question of humanity, which manifests itself in the uniqueness of the Kurdish phenomenon too, in fact bears the stamp of a perpetual feature throughout class societies.

Notes

1 Pro-Kurdish legal party (People's Democracy Party – *Halkin Demokrasi Partisi*)

2 The city in eastern Turkey often considered as being in effect the capital of "Turkish Kurdistan".

3 *Serihildan*: a Kurdish term equivalent to the Palestinian "*intifada*".

4 A town in a Kurdish province neighbouring Syria.

5 These writings were later gathered in an unsigned book published by the party (*Örgütlenme Üzerine*, 1983, pp.210-223).

6 *Turkish Daily News* defines itself as "Turkey's First and Only English Daily" paper, and, it is widely regarded as the State's official bulletin, targeted at foreign diplomatic missions.

7 The term "29th Revolt" was employed by the State authorities – after the PKK launched its initial attack – to emphasise that it was only a repetition of the previous "28" bandit-like Kurdish revolts.

8 The principal among them are Gunter, 1990, 1998; Imset, 1992; Robins, 1993; Brown, 1995; Ergil, 1995; Olson, 1996, 1998; Kadioglu, 1996; Kirisci and Winrow, 1997; Barkey and Fuller, 1997; Atiyas, 1997)

9 Paul White's recent work, *Primitive Rebels or Revolutionary Modernisers* is an exception (White, 2000). Even if the study contains limited sociological argument and corresponding conceptualisation, its main theme concerns the Kurds of Turkey, the PKK and Ocalan.

10 For instance, academics such as Ord. Prof. Dr. S. Dönmezer, (1989), Prof. Dr I. Giritli, (1989) Prof. Dr. A. K. Bilgiseven (1991), Prof. Dr. O. Türkdogan, (1998), Prof. Dr. M. F. Kirzioglu (1968; 1984) devoted their overall intellectual efforts to demonstrating that the Kurds are actually Turks – the Turks who forgot their Turkish language because of their lengthy mountain life.

11 The concept of tribe is subject to controversial definitions in the relating disciplines such as anthropology, history and sociology. However, the conceptualisation that dominates the concerned fields reefers the pre-feudal segment of human's societal development (Morgan, 1919; Davis, 1978; Gellner, 1983; van Bruinessen, 1992; and *et al.*). Tribe, as a socio-political device of humanisation, is most generally defined in terms of kinship relations, but in which the initial governmental form of sociality as the nucleus of future State that has ever been the indispensable entity of class societies was fertilised. The remarkable consensus among the scholars vis-à-vis tribe is that its coalescence, amalgamation, integration and dissolution give rise to nation because it becomes the "fetter" for the adolescent bourgeoisie's desire to "national market". The Kurdish tribe (*ashiret*) does not differ in nature from the universal experiences but, in occasions, the fusion or confederation of several kinship structures composes an individual tribe. (The concept is further discussed in Chapter 5, I b)

12 There existed a similar Kurdish-language school in the vicinity of Damascus to which I went on occasion for interviewing wounded and mutilated guerrillas.

13 In a local election held in 1999, the pro-Kurdish party HADEP (known as a PKK backed legal party) lost the mayoralty of Greater İçel (Mersin) following a contentious vote count. The HADEP won the election in the largest sub-district of Mesrsin (Akdeniz) nevertheless.

14 The third largest metropolitan city of Turkey.

15 This may be attributed to the PKK's organisational "vulnerabilities" concerning *legal* activities for the HADEP, which has frequently been accused of being the "legal branch" of the PKK.

Chapter 1

NATIONALISM

REGURGITATED OR DEMYSTIFIED?

The PKK emerged as an illegal organisation in the late 1970s, claiming a national liberation struggle for the Kurdish "nation" within the official borders of Turkey.

Its programme is a "Kurdicised" copy of those customary communist parties that undertake a nation's "national" liberation as an "initial stage" of the ultimate socialist revolution. The ideology by which the PKK formulates this initiative's aims and objectives is a Middle-Eastern translation of traditional Marxist socialism. So for the purposes of interpreting the nature and dynamics of the ethnic resistance movement that the Party generated and led, we should begin with outlining a general theoretical framework.

In so far as this study's primary unit of analysis is a political party that claims to be ideologically Marxist-socialist and programmatically undertaking a "national" emancipation, we need to revisit the concepts of nation and nationalism along with their communist conceptualisation. By doing this, we will be able to outline the equivocal nature of the Organisation's claims about its "national liberationism" and "socialism". This will, hopefully, sharpen our analytic focus – as the nature of Kurdish nationhood itself is also susceptible to further equivocalness.

There are two needs that this theoretical chapter proposes to meet. First, it will provide a conceptual framework for the codification of the study's findings and corresponding conclusions with regard to the particularities of Kurdish experience in Turkey. Second, we shall see that we ought not to, at least, impute further multifariousness to these "vulnerable" concepts, because the literature in this field is not just utterly confusing but also convoluted. To achieve such an uneasy task, a brief

and selective combing of the conceptualisations offered by mainstream scholars in the field seems to be the only option to begin with. Whether or not I make a contribution towards distilling the concepts "nation" and "nationalism" under the pressure of a burgeoning critical literature, it ought to be fairly certain what I shall denote by employing these terms.

Because the central concepts are inherently problematic, the confinement of the boundaries and main objectives of my arguments need to be stated here to better enable the progression of my argument.

A generally recognised definition of nation continues to be left unresolved, no matter how fast the literature grows. The classification of "types" of nationalisms also continues to be deeply controversial, in addition to the absence of a consensual definition of the concept.

A great deal of theorisation on ethnicity, nation and nationalism in the Marxist tradition excludes the "large" nationalism –namely, the national politics of pre-existing states for preserving and/or furthering their market interests in hinterlands or peripheries. Also, as an unavoidable logical extension of this, the nationalism of "small" nations is generally evaluated as "progressive" or "good", and consequently the tradition is tempted to pose nationalism in terms of a "healthy"/"morbid" dichotomy. This, in turn, locked Marxists into the self-contained "enigma" of the "national question" for it has never been possible to distinguish the healthy from morbid. It would thus be my concern to "immunise" my reasoning against additional enigmas of the "national question" arising from the Marxist mainstream approach, as well as the ones already there in the general conceptualisation on nation and nationalism.

As final introductory remark: despite the occasional overflows beyond modernity in various respects, it is overwhelmingly acknowledged that nations and nationalism are –as either contingent invented or unavoidably emergent– entities of modernity's industrialisation. Favouring neither the former nor latter accounts, I share the view on the timeline, and, therefore, I do not find it a prerequisite to incorporate a discussion on segmental timing into the argument.

I Distilling the "Mongrelised" Twin Concepts of Modernity

Although they are largely elided, scholars' attempts to *decouple* the "twins"[1] do exist. David McCrone, in his recent attempt to employ sociological scrutiny to this subject, *The Sociology of Nationalism*, summarises part of the problem by, first, alluding to the suggestive coupling statements by writers such as R. Miles, W. Connor, S. Bruce, L. Greenfeld, S. Hall. Of these, Connor –when justifying why he did not simply call his collection of essays "nationalism" but "ethnonationalism"– claims that "there is no difference if nationalism used in its pristine sense" (Mc.Crone, 1998, p. 22). Bruce draws lessons from the case of "Scottish nationalism" by deducing that "it is precisely the lack of a single identity of 'people' with common ancestors, common language, shared religion and a glorious history which prevented nationalism emerging in Scotland..." Quite likewise, Greenfeld also couples ethnicity with nationalism, and expresses that

> "nationality" became a synonym of "ethnicity", and national identity is often perceived as a reflection or awareness of possession of "primordial" or inherited characteristics, components of "ethnicity", such as language, customs, territorial affiliation, and physical type[2].

According to McCrone's interpretation, Miles more radically argues that "'nations' have no independent existence without the discourse of nationalism" - just as in the "couple" of race and racism. Anthony D. Smith titles his work *National identity*, in which the very identity is defined in a scholarly way and distinguished from the principal set of other identities by basing it on the ethnic entity of social man (Smith, 1991, pp. 19-42). Smith, however, devoted the larger share of the book to studying the nation and nationalism for he, too, interweaves the twin phenomena with the ethnic catalyst. In fact, the term "ethnicity", McCrone calls to mind, has been referred to as a social scientific concept "only in mid-twentieth century" (1941, 1953) before it made its "official appearance in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as late as the 1970s"

(McCrone, 1998, p. 24), while we all know that this phenomenon began to steer the modern segment of history over one and half centuries beforehand. And then, in the face of these and the other very many similarities, Hall state that there awaits "a great deal of work to do to decouple ethnicity, as it functions in the dominant discourse, from its equivalence with nationalism, ..." (*op. cit.* p. 25).

In the wide-ranging debates on nation and nationalism, the competing arguments in search of distinguishing/merging the *cultural* and *political* occupy much space. Students of nation and nationalism will encounter, in Nairn's metaphor, a Janus-like entanglement when plunging into the literature. We will come back to this. But before that, in order not to vacillate between the "twins", it seems more viable to handle them one by one, and to begin with "nation". A Turkish saying asks: "If meat starts to become smelly you salt it; if salt smells, what then do you do?" Since disagreements arise on both concepts, we need to decontaminate, so to speak, the "salt" first.

a. Nation

The definition of nation is more problematic among the scholars than the question of the nation (or the "national question") itself as the emphatic politics of the past two centuries.

Is an exhaustive definition of this "elusive-evasive" concept possible? This is the question that every author of a study endeavouring to address the subject begins by posing. The question is a simple but dazzling one: what is a nation? Smith talks of "the chimera of universally valid, once-for-all definitions" pursued by "earlier writers" which, he believed, were *not* pinning down the same elusive 'essence'" (Smith, 1983, pp. 165). McCrone complains about the absence of "neat definitions of key concepts" at which "the student of nationalism can quickly become disillusioned". And he adds, "There simply is no agreement about what nationalism is, what nations are, how we are to define nationality" (McCrone, p. 3). Seton-Watson felt driven to conclude, "no 'scientific definition' of a nation can be devised; yet the phenomenon has existed and

exists" (Seton-Watson, 1977, p. 5). Anderson also recalls this very observation of Seton-Watson while in search of support (Anderson, 1983, 13) for his argument. While Nairn finds it a "by nature ambivalent" phenomenon (Nairn, 1981, p. 348), Gellner names it an "elusive concept" (Gellner, 1983, p. 7), and so forth. Or, from the same perspective expressed in the reverse, Hobsbawm in the final paragraph of his influential work, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*, comes back to the very same recurrent concern and concludes that

> "nation and "nationalism" are no longer adequate terms to describe, let alone to analyse, the political entities described as such, or even the sentiments once described by these words. (Hobsbawm, 1990, p. 192)

So the central source of competing standpoints among social scientists and historians is the question of whether "nation", as a societal phenomenon, is primarily a cultural entity facing back to history or a political entity based in the present with a futuristic outlook. Because of this divergence of views, it is vital to glance at the most condensed definitions by the recognised scholars in the field. This will hopefully show how to conceptualise the phenomenon and illustrate the concerns behind the shifting approaches to it, owing to the "evasiveness", "elusiveness" or "equivocalness" of the concept "nation". A juxtaposition of the main arguments - bearing the historical order in mind - will help us address the "question" of the nation.

The Most Discussed Definitions of the Nation

In his famous seminal lecture in 1882 on "what is a nation", Ernest Renan provides the most realistic, if not revealing, picture of the "nation" as the realpolitik of the adolescent bourgeoisie. Even if his standpoint is characterised by the vindication of the French Revolution in the face of the Germanic nationalism that overemphasised ethnic-primordial ties, the approach is free of self-deception and the temptation towards playing with the facts. Renan eliminates the widely recognised criteria and reduces them to a *single impetus* for the invention of a nation. Elements such as "race, language, religious affinity, interests, geography and military exigency" are

37

"insufficient". That is, they are by no means compulsory pre-requisites of a nation but a *soul* is the one that makes nations.

> A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. Two things, which strictly speaking are just one, constitute this soul, this spiritual principle. One is in the past, the other in the present. One is the common possession of a rich legacy of memories; the other is the actual consent, the desire to live together, the will to continue to value the heritage that has been received in common (Renan in Woolf, 1996, p. 57, 58).

Renan, while implying the cultural background of the "soul" by emphasising the "common legacy" that existed in the "past" of a would-be nation, rewrites a slight racial base. Nonetheless, in context, he tends to state that if needed, a nation may well be imagined, manufactured and invented from a collection of *ethnicities* in a newly discovered land or in newly made satellites with a newly proclaimed official language made of all *ethnies'* languages.

For Renan, the determinacy attributed to the *pasts* of a nation, race (in the sense of ethnic stock) and languages are also artefacts. "Race, as we historians understand it, is something that is made and unmade. ... and Europe's first nations are essentially mixed blood". And, he continues: "nothing is more false" regarding languages, to which additional political importance is attached by almost all scholars, "as signs of race" (Renan in Woolf, 1996, pp. 54,55). In sum, nations are politically and socially constructed communities by "strictly one" impetus –a soul, a spiritual principle in Renan's definition.

Otto Bauer, one of the earliest theoreticians on the "national question" in the Marxist tradition, defines the nation in terms of ethnic-primordial roots –just in the sense of cultural *natio* independent of any political aspect. He calls this "a psychological theory of nation" (Bauer in Woolf, 1996, p. 78), from which Stalin derives his notorious "spiritual" definition. He, in effect, defines ethnicity but calls it "nation". "A nation's inherited qualities are nothing other than the sedimentation of its past, its *history frozen*, so to speak" (*op. cit.*, 1996, p. 61) according to Bauer. He thereby reaches the "condensed" definition of his conceptualisation: "The nation is the

totality of people bound by the community of destiny in a community of character" (*op. cit.* p.71). When one replaces the "nation" with "ethnicity" or adds the suffix "ality" to it, then no questions remain. But the essay's heading is "The Nation" and it is subtitled with "The Concept of Nation" before the formulation above appears. Moreover, Bauer traces the nation as far back as our earliest humanisation from an anthropological perspective, by relying upon Marx's teaching of materialistic conception.

> A nation does not come into being at the early stage at which men merely seek their food without having to work for it and support themselves by simply appropriating or occupying ownerless property they find, but instead *at the stage where man extracts the goods he requires from nature by labour.* The emergence of a nation and the special characteristic of each nation is thus determined by people's mode of labour, by the means labour they deploy, by the productive forces they control and the relation of production they enter into. It is the Karl Marx's historical method which has enabled us to solve the great task of understanding the emergence of the nation of every single nation, as part of mankind's battle with nature. (*op. cit.* p. 64)

The argument proceeds with not very much involvement in the *cultural* and *political* debate. This is because he is engaged in a discussion about rights (of self-determination) for the "oppressed nations". He devotes the rest of his argument to the conceptualisation of "national sentiment" and "national consciousness". But we should not solely attribute his conception of nation "as a community of culture" (*op. cit.* p.69) to Marxist understanding. For example, the views of Gwyn A. Williams, a radical anti-nationalist historian with a pro-Marxist approach, are in sharp contrast to Bauer's.

> Nations have not existed from Time Immemorial as the wrap and the woof of human experience. Nations do not grow like a tree, they are manufactured. Most of nations of modern Europe were manufactured during the nineteenth century; people manufactured nations as they did cotton and shirts. (Williams in Woolf, 1996, p. 192)

This is the Stalin's definition of "nation" which, despite his harsh critique of Bauer, was copied from Bauer's "psychological theory":

> *A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in community of culture* [Italics as original] (Stalin, 1936, p. 8).

Stalin arrives at the definition above following a sequential set of four "characteristic features": language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up or the "spiritual complexion of the people ... which manifests itself in peculiarities of national culture" (*op. cit.*, p. 7). It is not easy to situate the definition in either *cultural* or *political* categories, as it seems to be a "made to measure" definition in search of "criteria" that comply with the "right of self-determination".

More interestingly, it is followed by a mechanical or mathematical condition, if you like. "It must be emphasised that none of the above characteristics is *by itself* sufficient to define a nation. On the other hand, it is sufficient for *a single one of these characteristics to* be absent and the nation *ceased* [italics added] to be a nation" (*op. cit.* p. 8). It also "must be emphasised that" this well-known essay by Stalin was arranged under Lenin's tutelage –and Lenin's pragmatic politics– for the purpose of vindicating the "right of self-determination for nations" which was believed to overcome the "national question". The essay is crucial, not because of its scholarly merit, but because the politics and intellectual circles of the "communist world" were dominated and guided by it until the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The next clear *political* conception of nation is presented by the political theorist Elie Kedourie, with no reference to an ethnic ingredient – like Renan.

A nation came to be understood as that body of persons who could claim to represent, or to elect representatives for, a particular territory at councils, diets, or estates. (Kedouire, 1966, p. 14)

He also cites a neater definition from Sieyès who asks himself "What is a Nation?", before answering: "A body of associates living under one common law and represented by the same legislature" (*op. cit.* p. 15).

Ernest Gellner is the closest we have to a contemporary version of Renan, in terms of his conceptualisation of nation and nationalism. He poses the very same question in his book, *Nations and Nationalism*: What is a Nation? (Gellner, 1983, p. 53). While the former revealed that "getting its history wrong is part of being a nation", the latter constructed a useful maxim, stating that "nationalism, sometimes takes pre-existing cultures and turns them into nations, sometimes invents them, and often obliterates pre-existing cultures: *that* is reality, for better or worse, and in general an inescapable one" (*op. cit.*, 1983, p. 49). The second distinguishing facet of Gellner's theorisation is the contrast he draws between "culture-mediated nationalism" and "structure-mediated tribalism" which more neatly provides the framework of his understanding of the concept "nation". He defines the phenomenon by relying on the *objectivity* of subjective fact. "In this sense", he concludes,

> nationalisms are simply those tribalisms, or for that matter any other kind of group, which through luck, effort or circumstances succeed in becoming an effective force under modern circumstances. They are only identifiable *ex post factum.* Tribalism never prospers, for when it does, everyone will respect it as a true nationalism, and no-one will dare call it tribalism. (*op. cit.*, p. 87).

For Hobsbawm, the phenomenon represented by the concept "nation" may be recognised —"as conceived by nationalism"— prospectively: "the real 'nation' can only be recognised *a posteriori*". That is, he tends to say, nation is a political entity in which its shifting components and criteria are "imagined" and "invented". He then explicates further.

41

It [nation] is a social entity only insofar as it relates to a certain kind of modern territorial state, the 'nation-state', and it is pointless to discuss nation and nationality except insofar as both are relate to it. Moreover, with Gellner I would stress the element of artefact, invention and social engineering which enter into the making of nations" (Hobsbawm, 1990, pp. 9,10).

His condensed conclusion is that "nationalism comes before nations" – and also "nations do not make states and nationalisms but the other way round" (*op. cit.*, 1990, pp. 9,10).

In the preface to the second edition of his comprehensive study, *Theories of Nationalism*, Antony D. Smith makes the "vital distinction" between "cultural" and "political" nation, stating that it was first formulated by Friedrich Meinecke and elaborated by E. K. Francis. But he takes no risks by favouring one or the other. He suggests that Francis "contrasts 'ethnic' with 'demonic' nations" and "prefers to reserve the term 'nation' for the dominant ethnic community or '*ethnie*' within a state" (Smith, 1983, pp. xii, xiii). Smith views the "statist" and "ethnicist" approaches of parties as being coterminous with the *political* and *cultural* approaches. He evaluates the former as being misleading for it "obscures what should remain as a fundamental distinction –between 'nation' and 'state'", and the latter as "itself ambiguous" (Smith, 1983, p. 180).

Later, in the early 1990s, Smith contrasted these approaches again, while referring to Kemilainen's definition of nation "as a community of people obeying the same laws and institutions within a given territory" (Smith, 1991, p. 9) and the non-western model as an "ethnic" conception of nation saying that "a nation" is "first and foremost a community of descent" (*op. cit*, p. 11). Smith, however, decides on a version of "ethnicist", or at least non-statist, conceptualisation by constructing the italicised definition below by which he "intended to convey the essentials of the many images of the ideal nation held by nationalists everywhere".

The nation is a large, vertically integrated and territorially mobile group featuring common citizenship rights and collective sentiment together with one (or more)

common characteristic(s) which differentiate its members from those of similar groups with whom they stand in relations of alliance or conflict (Smith, 1983, p. 175).

He refers to states as being made up of multiple nations and nations of multiple states when citing the dialogue in which Kostic "explained" that "one nation can live under several different governments, and again several nations can form a single state" (Smith, 1983, p. 177). That is, he employs the term "nation" that at any time one may replace with ethnicity or nationality.

Karl W. Deutsch's *Nationalism and its Alternatives* begins with the following sentence.

"A nation," so goes a rueful European saying, "is a group of persons united by a common error about their ancestry and common dislike of their neighbours" (Deutsch, 1969, p. 30)

In *Imagined Communities*, while he points out that scholars suffer from a misunderstanding of the twin concepts, Anderson goes further when stating his point of departure. He recognises not only nation but also nationality –or, nation-ness as he prefers to call it– as "cultural artefacts of a particular kind". In agreement with Renan, Gellner, Hobsbawm, Deutsch, Kedourie and Williams, Anderson conceptualises the term "nation" as a political community that has been imagined prospectively and invented accordingly - "because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (Anderson, 1983, p. 15).

Although Anderson applies to the support of his argument for the imaginative element of the nation in its formative process, Hugh Seton-Watson at first glance seems to perceive the nation as a political entity but, in effect, defines it in solely cultural terms. "A nation", for Seton-Watson, "is a community of people, whose members are bound together by a sense of solidarity, a common culture, a national consciousness". (Seton-Watson, 1977, p. 1). In accordance with this logic, he quite convincingly states in the second paragraph of his major work, *Nations and States*, that

A nation can be coterminous with the population of one state, or be included together with other nations within one state, or be divided between several states. (*op. cit.,* p.1).

Within the framework of Seton-Watson's approach, one is bound to talk of the single nation of tens of Arab states or of the four nations of Switzerland, or the two nations of Belgium, and of many similar others in the East and West.

Because of the fear of the "concealed contradiction" between the "demand for an exhaustive definition" of nation and the "relatively rapid development" of its "distinguished features", Miroslav Hroch prefers not to interfere with the "opinions of other authors", but instead to "put before the reader" the "author's own conception of the nation". And the author's view is "decisively to be differentiated from the notion that nationalism is the primary formative factor and the nation is derivative" (Hroch, 1985, p. 3).

That is, the nation does exist there as a cultural entity with the sequential components of the "sedimentation of its past" before nationalism arrives, for Hroch, in effect, views nationalism as the device of "small" nations whose struggle for a nation-state or a similar form of emancipation is the case. He is comprehensive in his illustrative comparative study on several European examples, but nevertheless confines the discussion to "small" nations' "national liberationist" nationalisms.

McCrone analyses the varied approaches instead of favouring or advocating a particular perspective - similar to what Smith does. But in contrast to Smith, he is neat enough when focusing on the "common error" (Deutsch, 1969) vis-à-vis primordial ancestry and the "obliterated" (Gellner, 1983) character of pre-existing cultures in the chapter titled "Inventing the Past" –by referring, in particular, to Renan's precondition for being a nation, in which the nation gets "its history wrong". His selective reference to Renan is more than clear.

'Getting history wrong' is the precondition of nationalist history because it requires not only collective remembering but collective forgetting. This 'forgetting' said Renan, 'I would go so far as to say historical error, is a crucial factor in the creation

of a nation, which is why progress in historical studies often constitutes a danger for [the principle of] nationality' (McCrone, 1998, p. 44)

What I shall Denote by "Nation"

It is evident from the selection of principal scholars above that the most "condensed" definition of nation leaves out some essentials, since the *cultural* and *political* are not in a dialectical interrelation.

Rather than engaging in ethnic quarrelling between neighbouring culturally diverse social entities, nation-states are historical results of an "internecine" struggle between modernity's fellow ruling classes. The adolescent bourgeoisies of industrialisation emerged one after another within their various outdated dynasties as the result of the leap forward of productive forces. There exist notoriously prosperous American, Belgian and Swiss nations of two or more *ethnies* and over 20 modern or semi-modern nations of a single Arab *ethnie*, whose borders were drawn up on the maps with slide-rules by the local and global rulers of the time - including Syria-Palestine and Iraq whose "founder-fathers" were two brothers, Feisal and Abdullah (Rodinson, 1968, p. 23). Not to mention the Spanish-speaking nations of Central and South America, the other English-speaking advanced nations of Canada and Australia, the German-speaking and neighbouring nations of Germany and Austria, separately institutionalised Scandinavian nations of Northern Europe and so forth.

No one would think of considering these states as anomalies. There are the intimate neighbours, France and Germany, each of which is one of the most advanced nation-states in "native" Europe, and which no one could deny arrived at their modern nation-statehood through the poles of the processes of becoming a nation-state (McCrone, 1998, p. 9) – the former on a non-ethnicist path, the latter on a non-statist one.

There are also convincing *non-anomalous* examples to suggest that language too is not a determining component in the rise of nations and nation-states. Scholars largely agree that the French language was a scarce minority language among Parisians before the Great Revolution produced the "prototype" of the nation-state recognised by everyone. Likewise, after only three quarters of a century, M. Kemal's

Nutuk[3] has been translated into Turkish from the previous official Ottoman language for the current generation in Turkey. Hobsbawm, with regard to "national languages" refers to Hebrew and firmly states that they are "almost always semi-artifical constructs and occasionally, like modern Hebrew, virtually invented" (Hobsbawm, 1990, p. 54). And, I suggested earlier, no one would dare to brand either those successfully post-industrialised states with two or more official languages or those neighbouring states with the very same languages in the heart of Europe[4] as anomalies.

Therefore, one of the most endemic essentials of nationalism's ideological obligations is the preservation and exaggeration of the sovereigns and, in turn, the assimilation and integration, and –if needed and managed– the annihilation of the subordinates. The dustbin of history is full of assimilated and/or annihilated ethnic entities of various kinds.

> Nationalist discourse is historicist; it relies on genealogy for the legitimation of the nationalist cause, on the historicization of the national origin for the affirmation of the self and denial of the other (Vali, 1996, p. 23).

Vali, too, does not avoid emphasising the nature of nationalist historical discourse, which entails "distorting the truth, misrepresenting the historical reality of the formation of nations and nation-states" (*op. cit.*, p. 23). Although it has been the fate of every example ranging from France to Turkey – as some prosper, some do not– the fact is best expressed in Renan's epigram: *Getting its history wrong is part of being a nation.*

Neither the pre-existent homogeneity of ethnicity, nor that of a common language are the precondition for a sovereign nation-state. Further, in these very cases around the world, given that they are among the most prosperous nations rather than being anomalies, a would-be definition of nation must encapsulate these phenomenal examples. At least, it ought not to omit the examples of United States, Switzerland, Belgium, each of which continues to represent a conspicuous mode of the nation-state in the post-national (global) world of our time: the USA as the head of both "world politics" and the "free world"; Switzerland as the most secure and stable nation with

its diverse economical, political and cultural components; and Belgium as the "capital state" of the European Union.

Unfortunately, as the most potent "impetus" which forces the concept "nation" to be either "evasive" or "elusive" or "equivocal", there exists a *hidden concern* pre-occupying people's minds and prejudicing who (which *ethne*) may or may not qualify to be a "nation-state" – or who may be "recognised" as having the right of "national self-determination. Or, in Nairn's citation, who qualifies to take things (the "national" market) into one's own hands (Nairn, 1981, p. 339)?

A corollary to this "concern" has been the misrepresentation of facts. This solely political concern, as it arises from the form and positions of the vacillating arguments, appears to be the fundamental source of a great deal of hesitation regarding what the concept "nation" should primarily encompass.

What then should I denote by the term nation in order not to, at least, contribute to its "elusiveness"?

The versions of *political* –or at least non-cultural– denotations of "nation" are more clear and unbiased, and consequently more viable for discursive deductions. The usage of the term "nation" in this study's discussions shall mean "an *institutionalised* political, economical and legislative-jurisdictional *unit* of community that is realised in the form of what is called a 'nation-state', independent of a pre-existing homogeneous ethnic and/or cultural entity". In order to make the logic of this study more lucid, this will be the only framework by which a community may "qualify" to be a nation. This is also a "viable" conception of "nation" through which we can circumvent the "question" of definition that misses out the examples of those nations which in respect of fame, prosperousness and also quantity are more than mere exceptions. In addition, this is the "political value" that modernity contributed to the course of human history, which had already produced appropriate cultural superstructures. It is because the form of the nation, in its overall societal sense, is an artefact that denotes a qualitative "onslaught" towards socio-political-economical human reorganisation, that the adolescent bourgeoisie of rising capitalism was led to introduce it to social man's history for the sake of capitalism's "home" market. The artefact, either as contingency or inevitability, was made possible by the leap forward of productive forces, known as

industrialisation. And nation was manufactured and distributed by superstructural forces of nationalism, which were made of innate ethnic-primordial-patriotic human sentiments. One consequence of this social development was that Americanness, Britishness and emerging Europeanness have already been the undeniable subjects of "*trans-ethnic*" identities that associate not with "inner" *ethnie* but "outer" *patrie*. And as a necessity of this very "spiritless" logic (the logic of development of the forces of production that bears a constant reproduction/reconstruction "faculty" based on the interrelation and/or interdependency between the elements of a "three-ring circus" –man's will to live better, man's labour productivity and the means of production), which in our time largely manifests itself in the growing "sentiments" of growing markets, late capitalism will foster and proliferate trans-ethnic "nations" of trans-national-states of various kinds in the motion towards a "world nation". Renan prophesied the European Union more than a century in advance, in 1882:

> ... Human wills change; but what does not change in this life? Nations are not something eternal. They began, so they come to an end. A European confederation will probably replace them (Renan in Woolf, 1996, p. 59)

Deutsch's prophecy of an integration that "changes" circumstances towards a trans-national "nationalisation", which indicates a *fusing* fate of nations, lies in a similar understanding of the logic of development of productive forces (Deutsch, 1969, pp. 34,35).

In my argument above, at least in this study's approach if not in general, the concept of "nation" is fairly decontaminated. When employing the term "nation", we will *not* imply any "qualified" cultural/ethnic entity in a community which is akin to the sedimentation of its past –"history frozen"– but very simply *the population of a modern state*. We do not find it necessary to mean by the word "nation" any culturally homogeneous, ethnically self-satisfactory communities' "frozen history". There are sufficient words for such phenomena, such as ethnicity, nationality or the familiar French word *ethnie*.

Here is the next, indirect, question: Does nation relate to nationalism? For this, we need to revisit the definition of nationalism through the question of how it well played on the totality of the individual's innate-primordial sentiments, which is termed "mass nationalism".

b. Nationalism: Regurgitated or Demystified?

While the concept of the nation suffers from a sometimes overly "scientific" definition, nationalism suffers rather from a mass of classifications – both vertical and horizontal. Among the vertical classifications we may count ancient, medieval, modern, post-modern, neo- or supra- and eventually "post-communist" nationalisms. Horizontal classifications appear to be liberationist (small) and colonialist (large) nationalisms or the nationalism of oppressed nations and of oppressing nations, or unity nationalism and expansion nationalism, progressive and regressive nationalism and so forth.

In sociological terms, however, the primary question vis-à-vis nationalism ought not to be how an all-embracing definition should be structured or how wisely we classify it in horizontal or vertical dimensions but, more crucially, *how it operates*. A provisional definition, then, would be more embracing and consequently more viable.

The Departures and Arrivals of National Politics

So the impetus that steers the course of history is not the innocent-naive innate sentiments towards primordial and geographic-patriotic "values" but the insatiably greedy *market* "sentiments" of *market forces* – in the case of modernity and industrialisation, the adolescent bourgeoisie. The modern segment of human history has provided more than enough evidence to prove this. The Hundred Years' War, the Thirty Years' War, the Seven Years' War, the Seven Weeks' War or the Napoleonic Wars and many other equivalent wars provide no symptoms indicating that the naïve innate sentiments of the masses were the driving force behind these wars. These wars

of greater Europe were precisely those that gave birth to richly modelled modern nation-states in their "native land".

True, "there exist no more arresting emblems of the modern culture of nationalism than cenotaphs and tombs of Unknown Solders" (Anderson, 1983, p. 17) on which the countless names of "ordinary" patriots are engraved whose bodies were not found or collected. But this fact does not present us with any evidence to infer that the masses (the *herd* or *mob* in Nietzsche's metaphor) have had a share in steering the course of history. It merely stimulates the question of *"how faithfully the nationalism* –of the nation-state for a national market and of the imperial-state for a trans-national market– *operated"*.

Secondly, this fact tells us how the naïve ethnic-primordial-patriotic sentiments of ruled masses were refined as the most vacant and viable "raw material" at the service of *market* "sentiments" by competing adolescent bourgeoisies to manufacture nations of "indivisible territorial dignity" for their respective nation-states. However, we should not be misled into inferring that "stupid" mobs have been totally manipulated for the sole purposes of market wars. No doubt, many within the masses devote themselves to "national" struggles[5]. At first glance, the masses partake of the gains of triumphant liberation movements, such as being free of "foreign rule", enjoying the freedom to experience the particularities of primordial and local identities, and so on.

But this only represents a "tiny", or more accurately dysfunctional, facet of the historicity of prosperous "national liberation" or "national union". Soon after the "victory", the longings for indigenous cultural "values" and the particularities of "home" identities are smoothly followed (most visibly, in almost all cases of the liberation movements of "oppressed" or "small" nations) by the former ruler's "more civilised" equivalents and the new home ruler's incentives. For instance, while the Turkish language has been reinvented to the extent that Ataturk's *Nutuk* (the speech of a nationalist hero) is barely comprehensible to the current Turkish citizen, the TV and radio programmes that perform Turkish national particularities are evidently marginal. Moreover, in the case of "Turkish Kurds", *Medya TV* (Pro-PKK Kurdish Satellite Television –formerly *Med TV*) broadcasts have long been dominated by mongrelised

and badly copied or translated versions of Turkish/Western cultural artefacts. More interestingly, this was implemented simultaneously with the "heavy struggle" to unearth the oppressed Kurdish identity faced with serious annihilation, just as the Turkish media has done with overemphasised Turkish nationalism. In response to critiques of the spectacle, the current "broadcast politics" is justified by new or potential rulers' claims about the vacant availability of the "present state" of the people –that is, the easiest cultivatable "raw material" for the sake of "victory". What then does *national victory* represent?

What ought not to be overlooked here is that the *departures* and *arrivals* of "national" movements are without exception doomed to be alien to one another. The primary "things" longed for in the *hearts* of the entrepreneurs of national emancipation, generally within the intelligentsia, and the "things" envisaged in the heads of the bureaucrats who accomplish the national construction are gravely distinct. In a general way, while the former departs from "national sentiments", the latter arrives at "home market" longings. The former is driven by the impetus stemming from aspirations to enjoy and experience their innate ethno-cultural elements in the face of others'. The latter are attracted by the gains of "control of the distributive system" (Hah and Martin, 1975) against respective others'. The former moves from the "heart", and is consequently emotional and maximalist, the latter moves from the "head" and so is by nature calm, rational and realistic, and also pitiless. An old Turkish saying expresses: "While the sheep concerns itself with its life, the butcher concerns himself with its meat". In the case of *national* movements, however, the "butcher" is always the eventual winner.

The alienation of arrival from departure, not in terms of theory and/or discourse but in terms of the *realpolitik* of nationalism, is a striking aspect in a national movement's overall history. This is without exception the most striking and, at the same time, the most *elided* facet of the factual politics of nationalism. *"National"* movements are always initiated and theorised by a bunch of *romantic* intelligentsia[6], but, in effect, they are always triumphed over by a *rational* class that emerges from the fusion of bureaucratic, military and financial components, no matter what it calls itself. With regard to this aspect of the modern segment of history, the

experience of the Giuseppes of Italy is the case that one may derive with least effort from the historical clues. Mazzini, the founder and theoretician of Young Italy who would also be called "the prophet of European nationalism", was eliminated when Garibaldi (who joined Young Italy as Mazzini's disciple, and later was to be the military-political leader) decided to form an alliance with Victor Emmanuel II, the King of Sardinia. The entrepreneur intellectual Mazzini was *right* in his "heart" to be an "undeviating republican" in keeping with his beliefs, but Garibaldi was *realistic* in his "head" for the sake of assuring "victory". When discussing "bureaucracy and intelligentsias", Seton-Watson refers to Kuomintang's China and conveys how first the intellectual elite were eliminated, and then how "a new bureaucratic structure" took the sole initiative following the Japanese occupation.

> ... in the following years a large part of the intellectual elite was alienated from the Kuomintang, and came to prefer its rivals, the new revolutionaries –that is, the communists. Communist victory was achieved by a new military and political elite, enjoying massive peasant and workers' support. With the communists in power, a new bureaucratic structure took shape, which was then deliberately combated by the leaders through the Cultural Revolution. ... The results of this remarkable struggle, continuing in the 1970s, could not be predicted (Seton-Watson, 1977, p. 424).

It could not be predicted, but what has since unfolded is the pitiless truth that the recurrently "naïve" intelligentsia, like its predecessors around the world, lost the battle in the Cultural Revolution. That is, the Cultural Revolution, along with the "Great Leap Forward" which was launched to combat the emerging bureaucratic structure, turned against itself –against its launchers. And the elimination of entrepreneur intellectuals was finalised, including Mao Zedong himself in his presence at the Ninth Party Congress in 1969, in spite of Mao's "unchallenged" re-election as Chairman. Mao's harsh fight-back through mobilising youth in the Red Guard's bloody riots to attack the party establishment and accomplish the near destruction of the party in late 1960s did not have an effect. The sovereignty of the "bureaucratic structure" was consolidated in the following congress held in August 1973. Mao's name was preserved as Chairman at the new apparatus' service owing to his charisma. While the

bureaucratic apparatus "jealously" appropriated the charisma of the "national" hero, the person of charisma has in fact been rendered ineffective. This would be more evident at the Forth National People's Congress (January 1975), at which the "rehabilitated victim" of the Cultural Revolution Deng Xiaoping was allowed to rise.

A fairly similar process in Bolshevik Russia provides is also instructive. In Russia too, the romantic intellectuals, in Gramsci's term "the Russian maximalists" (Gramsci, 1977, p. 31), were brutally annihilated. The process began with Lenin himself during his later years and ended with Leon Trotsky being assassinated in Mexico. This was a fate from which few escaped, including most prominent early Bolsheviks such as Bukharin, Kamanev, Zinovyev and so on. It is known that Stalin climbed to the top of the party and consequently to the head of the state in spite of Lenin's initial warnings and his later calls for Stalin's removal in his political "testament".

The widely emphasised idea that "luck, wise tactics and adroit manoeuvrings" enabled Stalin to suppress Lenin's opposition is nonsensical from a sociological viewpoint. Such important phenomena cannot be reduced to a personality's rise to the throne through charisma. Further, Stalin's charisma was endowed upon him owing to his particular state of personality and intellectuality[7] and so was in keeping with the aspirations of the rising Russian adolescent bourgeoisie out of the "ashes" of the Bolshevik Intelligentsia. Charisma does not function *for* the person of charisma and it by no means operates *through* the person of charisma. Both the person and persona of charisma are only "bewitching sticks" in the hands of the bureaucratic apparatus wherever this apparatus is built[8].

The "founding four" of Young Turk's *Ittihat ve Teraki*[9] (Union and Progress) were pushed aside as the Initiative spread rapidly, and were superceded by the army's "high officials". A similar version of this "inescapable fate" is the case, for instance, with Germany's *Burschenschaft*, Vietnam's Vietminh and even with the Jacobeans of the Great French Revolution. When one reads between the lines of history, it does not seem hard to follow that the Jacobeans were first terrorised and then eliminated. Also, in the case of revolutions in ancient and medieval times, the history of religions tells us that prophets were eliminated *for*, so to speak, being proclaimed and being qualified

to be recognised *as* prophets. This appears to be the most recurrent fate of all revolutionary apogees of class societies in the course humankind's socio-political development. In the modern era of history, this recurrent feature reaches its climax in the form of the politics of nationalism. The entrepreneurs of nationalist movements of any kind have been, at certain stages –depending on the dynamics of the given "proto-nation" (Hobsbawm, 1990)– eliminated, from Italy's Mazzini to Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh. This spectacle has been evident in the most notoriously triumphant movements, such as in France's Jacobeans, Italy's Young Italians, Turkey's Young Turks, Russia's Bolsheviks, China's Kuomintang, Vietnam's Vietminh and so forth[10].

"Types" of Nationalism

The wisest taxonomy of nationalism, thus, would only contribute elusiveness, ambivalence and ambiguity to the concept of nationalism, rather than helping. Rather, I maintain, an exclusion of "non-historical" features at the point of departure will stabilise this very "volatile", "evasive", "equivocal", "elusive" and so forth concept.

For the purpose of bypassing an illusory argument on nationalism, one point of pre-exclusion and another point of further diligence must be made clear. First, the nationalism which the principal central and West European nation-states generated in the early phase of the rise of capitalism, and which is widely personified in the irredentism of Italy, is classified by Seton-Watson as "nationalism fighting for unification" (Seton-Watson, 1965, p. 15). I shall exclude this "type" of nationalism –apart from necessary references– because this social-political phenomenon no longer exists and is not the source of blame for making nationalism a "bric-a-brac" concept. The second type merits additional scrutiny: the "mass nationalism" which is in effect *not* a nationalism. While we shall largely exclude the first type, we shall pull the second into focus for it relates to how nationalism operates as an ideology within masses.

If we come back to the question posed above at the end of a previous section; nationalism, of course, does relate to nation as a political artefact of modernity. That is, one should say, it *does* if we take the nation to be the population of the nation-state institutionalised in its "national borders" and coterminous with the "home" market,

which I found to be the most accurate definition and the one which does not force the researcher to forge the facts, following my argument above. Quite understandably, it does not at all relate to "nation" in the sense in which one means the natio*nality* or *ethnicity* of "frozen history", for which nationalism invents a politically institutionalised, culturally assimilated and integrated, socially re-identified community in the form of the so-called nation-state. This is well delineated by several prominent scholars in the sphere such as Renan, Gellner, Hobsbawm, Anderson and *et al*. Therefore whilst revisiting the analytic conceptualisations of nationalism, I take it for granted that nations are made of ethnic entities – with either single or multiple ingredients – but nonetheless nations emerge as new phenomena qualitatively differentiated from their constituents. My argument will then not be engaged with decoupling the mongrelised "twin" concepts of nation and nationalism –I have made an endeavour above to de-mongrelise the latter– but to decouple *ethnicity* (well-utilised –if not exhausted– in the work of "market wars") and *nationalism* (McCrone, 1998, p. 25).

So then, "are there genuinely different types of nationalism" (Smith, 1983, p. xi) deserving categorisation? Smith poses this question as being the fundamental concern "that underlies a good deal of the attempt to construct an all-embracing typology of nationalism or nations". Most generally, three ways of emergence of nation-states are acknowledged by the scholars, each of which would give rise to respective types of nationalisms: 1) from unification of dynasties to, 2), from dissolution/reunification of empires to, 3) from "liberation" to: belated unification[11]. However, insufficient distinctness exists between them to categorise the nationalisms of each under separate subtitles. Since, as Nairn rightly states, "taking things into one's own hands' denotes a good deal of the substance of nationalism" (Nairn, 1981, p. 339), or in the conceptualisation of the synthesis theory of Hah and Martin, (1975, pp. 361-386) since "control of the distributive system" is equally the *central concern* in the unification, reunification and belated unification movements and is led by the ideology of nationalism in each, categorisation would not contribute to our understanding of the phenomenon. In a way consistent with the essential nature of the

phenomenon, Seton-Watson classifies "nationalist movements", rather than nationalism itself, into three types.

> Nationalist movements can conveniently be divided into three types. The first type is the movement fighting for independence from foreign rule. The second type is the movement fighting for unification with an already independent state of its fellow-nationals. The third type is the movement which has achieved independence and unity, but has still to create a deeply-rooted national feeling among its subjects (Seton-Watson, 1965, p.15).

Although the third type Seton-Watson lists needs further clarification about creating "a deeply-rooted national feeling among its subjects"[12], he in fact emphasises that each of the three types of movements actually entails not three separable individual nationalisms but *one*. He adds that all "three situations may be described as struggle for independence, irredentism and nation-building. Only when the process of nation-building is completed does the dynamic explosive force of nationalism begin to die down" (*op. cit.* p. 15). That is, the overall objective of all "types" of nationalism is a *statehood* that is territorially unified, socially re-identified, ethnically re-forged or re-formed. In sum; the sole objective is an economically, culturally and politically re-institutionalised independent state – what Smith calls "an essential goal of every nationalism" for which "possession of territory is, after all, a *sine qua non*" (Smith, 1983, p. xiii), no matter how "diverse" the "types" of the movements are.

Another general temptation is to classify nationalism into two sorts: a) state or official nationalism (*unionist, assimilationist*), b) liberationist nationalism (*secessionist*). Put that way, we have the nationalism for *existing* state and nationalism for *potential* state. In other words, the nationalism of "oppressed nations" for the rights of "poor" and/or "backward" periphery (Nairn, 1981, p. 339) and the nationalism of "oppressing nations" for the further rights of the "rich" and/or "advanced" centre. Smith adds to the latter's name ("official") the phrase "*institutional nationalism*" by which "the ruling class seeks to assimilate ethnic minorities through an educational programme of nationalism, backed by major

institutions, so to "homogenise the population into a compact nation" (Smith, 1991, p. 102).

Nairn also talks of "two kinds of nationalism" coterminous with the classification above. In Nairn's understanding, one is the "*main*, essentially healthy sort we applaud in Indo-china and Mozambique" and the other is "the *derivative* (italics added), degenerate sort we oppose in, for example, the American working class, Gaullism, the Chilean *Junta* and so on". For him, the "main" kind is progressive as it is the "mainspring of nationalism" by which the periphery targets the centre's "foreign" or colonialist rule. So the "derivative" kind is a regressive, "abusive" version of the former, tending "towards the encouragement of social and psychological atavism, the exploitation of senseless fears and prejudices, and so toward violence" (Nairn, 1981, p. 347). First, although his general emphasis on a progressive and regressive dichotomy[13] seems to be a fair reflection of the truth, Nairn's branding of the nationalism of the periphery as the main one and that of the centre's expansion as derivative is misleading.

Nairn situates his conceptualisation of nationalism in the interrelation of *centre* and *periphery* that is necessitated by the uneven development of capitalism. This is an insightful explanation of the phenomenon of nationalism in the dialectic of cause and effect relations within the logic of the development of productive forces, despite Nimni's strong objections (Nimni, 1991). But it is not clear how he finds the periphery's *reaction*[14] to the centre to be the "main" type. He contradicts himself –in his reading of the phenomenon within the framework of uneven development– in recognising the "reaction" as the main type. Here, it is not the "reaction" of the periphery that is *primary* but the "action" of the centre's expansion[15]. Nairn, nevertheless, continues with a frankly illuminating passage with regard to separating nationalism into sorts.

> Without for a moment denying that these political and moral distinction are justified, and indeed obvious, one is none the less forced to point out that the *theoretical* dimension attaching to them is quite mistaken. The distinctions do not imply the existence of two brands of nationalism (Nairn, 1981, p. 347).

That is, Nairn clarifies; any classification of nationalism in terms of its real nature will not fit smoothly into an unbiased sociological theorisation –a theorisation which is not "influenced by nationalism itself" (*op. cit.* p. 94). However, the premise on which the conclusion is structured is the "ambivalent nature" of nationalism, and he consequently fails to escape from Gellner's or Renan's vindication of nationalism according to which, the latter believed, the nation is generated as "One great aggregate of men" (Renan in Woolf, 1996, p. 59).

> The point is that, as the most elementary comparative analysis will show, all nationalism is both healthy and morbid. Both progress and regress are inscribed in its genetic code from the start. This is a structural fact about it. And it is a fact to which there are no exceptions: in this sense, it is an exact (not a rhetorical) statement about nationalism to say that it is by nature ambivalent (Nairn, 1981, pp. 347,348).

Two Faces of the "Modern Janus"

If one ventures into an abstraction about the seemingly tricky "two-faced" state of nationalism, then neither nation nor nationalism will be "elusive" or "ambivalent". One would then be free of the difficulty to see that each actual "face" of nationalism is not so tempted to interfere with the affairs of the other. Once this is done, one would also not find it difficult to see that the philosophy of "periphery" (small nation, oppressed nation, hinterland people etc) nationalism in terms of its "hard core" is by no means distinguishable from the "central" nationalism. So, one would not deviate to applaud the "progressiveness" and "healthiness" of the "poor" periphery against the centre's morbidity. While the periphery's nationalism lies in "taking things –the "things" of "home"– into one's own hands", the centre's in *keeping* the "things" –the "things" of neighbouring or distant lands as "theirs". Let's see what abstraction I am talking about.

The crux of the issue is the *cultural burden* involved in the "work" of the *national*, which has become the real subtlety due to the exhausting "core exigency" of the realpolitik of nationalism. The task of a viable abstraction is precisely an untwisted

separation of "national sentiments" and *market* "sentiments". The former sentiments are to do with the individual's cultural self. The totality of individuals constitutes the "masses" for which Nietzsche used the term *herd* or *mob*, for he knew that it has been dysfunctional throughout history. The latter, meanwhile, are to do with the insatiably burgeoning market desire of unevenly developing capitalism –the "love" of both "home" and "non-home" objects with which its abundance and scarcity, its richness and poorness have so far decided how the course of history has run. That is, once the task of abstraction has been accomplished, one will have no hesitation in saying that nationalism has nothing to do with ethnic –or "national"– identity. In his study of identity, *National Identity*, Anthony D. Smith, analyses ethnic identity as a collective cultural phenomenon by distinguishing it from a set of other human identities such as gender, regional, class, religious identities; and he endeavours to juxtapose some components of nationalism. Those, in brief, are: "a consciousness of belonging", "a language and symbolism", "an ideology", "a social and political movement" (Smith, 1991, p. 72). Then he arrives at an italicised definition of nationalism, which is repeated in almost same words on the following page.

I shall define nationalism as *an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity on behalf of a population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential 'nation'* (*op. cit.*, p. 73)

The argument followed and the definition structured above are settled in the chapter titled "Nationalism and Cultural identity" for he thinks –and states in the first sentence of the chapter– that "it is nationalism that creates national identity" in the "'modernist' image of the nation" (*op. cit.*, p. 71). Namely, Smith strives to delineate how nationalism as a "movement" relates to *cultural* identity in its form of "ethnic" or "national" identity. Later, he refers to Gellner's idea of "invention" about the nation and Kedourie's conception of the "doctrine" of nationalism, and raises a double question which concerns my argument about separating the two "faces" of nationalism: "How shall we understand such 'invention'"? In what sense does nationalism invent or create nations 'where they do not exist'?"

First, as a crucial point, Smith takes nationalism not as *ideology* but as "ideological movement" in which ideology is only one of the components –the component which Seton-Watson rightly recognises as the "form" of the constant "core of nationalism".

> Nationalist movements have usually been strongly influenced by whatever political ideas were current at the time of their struggle. ... But always the hard core of nationalism has been more important than its ideological form (Seton-Watson, 1965, p. 15).

At first glance, Smith is not in agreement with Gellner's conception of the nation as "invented" by nationalism or with Hobsbawm's nation as "made" by nationalism - but he is nonetheless fairly consistent with them by grasping nationalism as an ideological movement "for *attaining* and *maintaining*" a potential or existent nation. Smith's definition of nationalism repeats that it "is an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining the *autonomy, unity* and *identity* (italics in the original) of a nation" (Smith, 1991, p. 74). The repeated definition scrutinises the "hard core" of the politics of nationalism: *attaining* and *maintaining* the nation. This interprets the nationalisms of both "periphery" and "centre" as an ideological movement for either *taking* or *keeping* things – no matter whether these are "home" or "non-home" things. So, Smith, in the final analysis, is not in disagreement with Hobsbawm or Gellner or Renan in the "sense" of how "nationalism invents or creates nations". In fact, none of the scholars above imply that nationalism invents nations from nothing in a religious conception. Gellner's notorious remark on the invention of nations by nationalism "where they do not exist" is followed by a transparent explanation on the manner of invention: "...–but it does need some pre-existing differentiating marks to work on..." (Gellner, 1964, p. 168), which Smith himself does not think to elide.[16] The central issue here, which concerns my argument, is that "inventionist" approaches to the linkage between nation and nationalism do conform to the view that nationalisms "work on" some pre-existing entities when inventing the nation –that is, ethnicity or ethnic communities of

Hobsbawm's "proto-nation" as the most viably vacant entities pre-existing there to be refined, redefined and re-identified.

Nations are made of ethnic entities by the nationalisms of either existing states or of emerging liberation movements. Nationalisms are made of innate sentiments of the most available sorts as "raw material", such as ethnic, primordial, patriotic and –eventually– laborious (contributed by "communist nationalism") ones. While the basic "raw material" for nations is ethnic entities, they provide their *innate sentiments* to nationalism. But just as nations are not ethnicities any more, nationalisms are not individuals' innate sentiments in its full-scale operation for the realpolitik of rising industrial capitalism. Who can say that the impetus behind the two World Wars of the first half of the past century and the wars and quarrels of its second half between *national* "communist" states was due to the totality of the masses' innate cultural sentiments?

In its very sense, not as an entity of theoretical *discourse* but as a *course* of politics, nationalism is a non-eschewal of the bourgeoisie's desire and its love of geography and demography for which it had to foster devices cultivated from varying aspects of man's primordial inwardness which "*is* inherent in the nature of things" (Gellner, 1964, p, 157), and which manifests as innate patriotism among the masses vis-à-vis "language, race, culture, and sometimes even religion" (Kedourie, 1966, p. 73).

What the sociology of nationalism needs to decouple here is the masses' innate ethnic-cultural sentiments from the insatiable market "*sentiments*" of capitalist enterprises while decoupling ethnicity from nation. Hobsbawm states that "official ideologies of states *and movements* (italics added) are not guides to what it is in the minds of even most loyal citizens and supporters" (Hobsbawm, 1990, p. 11). Here, he precisely points at the non-linked visions in the heads of the ruling apparatuses of states and of the elite of institutionalised national liberation movements in the stage of the "proto-state" when the "naïve" initiator intelligentsia is eliminated or rendered dysfunctional. When Seton-Watson subordinated the "ideological form" of nationalism to its "hard core", in particular highlighted in the "form" of "Marxist nationalism" in the 1950s and 1960s, and added that "nationalist leaders of nationalist

movements who are influenced in a more general way by Marxism seem usually to turn out more nationalist than Marxist" Seton-Watson, 1965, p. 15), his argument also, I assume, revolves around the distinction between prospects in the *head* and pursuits in the *body* of nationalism[17]. Here, I have to recall the metaphor I mentioned above regarding the concerns of the "sheep" and the "butcher" with which the parties are respectively occupied, with no interest in the views of one another. The sheep's concern is the innate-instinctual will to live free; the butcher's is a freshly emerged desire to a self-contained market – and so far history has always witnessed the final triumph of the latter.

The nationalism of the nation-state, as the rising bourgeoisie's politics of unity, envisages a geographical market (as large as possible) and a demography –not necessarily entailing an ethnic homogeneity– (as massive as possible) independent of the extent of the manipulation of the masses and the severe exploitation of "raw material" to depletion as "purely passive recipients" (Woolf, 1996, p.29). The skilful use of "cultural freedom" –culture as the principal premises of the spiritual existence of humankind as social beings– by both power-holders and power-pursuers (Nairn, 1981, p. 333) to keep/gain "the control of distributive systems" (Hah and Martin, 1975) ought not to "force" one to confuse these two disparate "faces" of nationalism as an "ideological movement". Rather than the interests beyond national borders, the distillation of the concepts of "national interest" or "the interests of the nation" and the cultural "interests" within the nation needs to be the primary concern of a sociological conceptualisation. Seton-Watson claims that "nationalism is an explicit doctrine and a movement" and accordingly emphasises an evident aspect of the phenomenon.

> The doctrine declares that the interests of the nation, as interpreted by spokesman, come before all other interests within the state, of all other communities beyond its borders, and in the case of extreme totalitarian nationalisms, before all considerations of morality and religion. Nationalist movements aim to realise the interests of the nation at the expense of its enemies. (Seton-Watson, 1965, p. 5).

It is true that the nationalist politics of either the states of "large" nations or of the liberation movements of "small" ones aim to realise their interests at the expense of an external enemy. However, while the interests of the community within the borders are themselves fairly explicit, they do not lie in the "doctrine" of nationalism as such. On the contrary, they are obscured and concealed in the discourse of any form of nationalism. Home communities have no noticeable interests in values beyond their borders but millions of them have died for these values –in, for example, the two World Wars of last century and they did so in the earlier wars of weeks, months, years, decades and hundred-years. Their names are engraved on the cenotaphs and tombs of Unknown Solders in the absence of their bodies. The pursuit of external interests during the seventy years of Russian nationalism with its communist ideological form contributed much to Russia as a State which became a superpower, but we all acknowledged, following the demystification of 1989, that nationalism did little or nothing for the community of insiders. This was unearthed and "caught virtually everyone unawares" (McCrone, 1998, p. 149) as an undeniable fact, in spite of the absence of the ordinary form of private property in the means of production, which Marx diagnosed as the only source of surplus exploitation. The same is true –but still implicit in discourse– in the case of liberation nationalisms (I argued above under "The Departure and Arrival of National Politics") once the movement comes to the threshold of power. Nairn arrives at the very same point from a different angle.

> Mass nationalism was good up to a point, in certain specific conditions, in the fight against alien oppression, and so on. Beyond the point it immediately degenerated again into a morbid delusion and an instrument of bourgeois reaction (Nairn, 1981, p. 351).

That is, the mass "nationalism" of human expectations of freedom is, without exception, doomed to an inescapable "betrayal". The spectacle illustrates that nation is not a compact entity whose interests are inseparable. There lies within the nation a truth of non-resembling interests, which rather equates to the interests of the "sheep" and the "butcher". Here, in the discourse of any nationalism, the term "national" itself

may well have been merely a means of obscuring two disparate phenomena. Rosa Luxemburg, an uncompromising anti-nationalist and an opponent of the "right of national self-determination", recalls three factors as "typical aspects of a bourgeoisie society" with reference to Karl Kautsky which indicate, she asserts, "what is actually hiding behind the mask".

> ...the desire of the bourgeoisie to assure for itself an internal or domestic market for its own commodity production; second, the desire for political freedom – democracy; and finally, expansion of the national literature and culture to the populace (Luxemburg, 1976, p. 159).

In my view, the extent of the latter two aspects has actually fulfilled and determined the illusory ability of the "mask" that veils the "first" one, which in the final analysis has an impact on the fate of so-called nation-sate.

The vital question in the light of the most recent developments –in particular surrounding the unfolding of "post-communist" nationalism– shall have to concern itself with what nationalism *does* rather than what it *says*. That is, is nationalism a discourse of verbal and textual wordings or a course of premeditated action that locks onto the needs of a self-contained "free market", independently of what is being theorised?

It has became less easy to assert the former answer to this question following the dissolution of the pseudo-communist regimes of "iron curtain" world, because nationalism in their experiences has been demystified rather than "regurgitated". Rather than heralding the "end" or "beginning" of history, the distortion and perversion of the "national sentiment" in the service of market forces has emerged increasingly following the fall of the "iron curtain". Gellner, in his "introductory" analysis on nationalism in *Thought and Change*, blames the people "who had heralded the decline of nationalism" for underestimating "the power and hold of the dark atavistic forces in human nature" and for overestimating the "power of reason" over what he calls "Dark Gods" which include "apparently the call of ethnic and territorial loyalty" He goes into deeper discussion of the philosophical and psychological roots

of the "atavistic gods" by referring Freud, Mill and Dostoevski. However, Gellner does not endeavour to analyse[18] *how* and *for whom* these "gods" come to operate on such a fateful scale "with a shallow psychology, one which saw man as finding his gratification in pleasure" (Gellner, 1964, pp. 148,149), and which did for no more common men than carrying their names on the plates of Unknown Soldiers' cenotaphs. One is compelled to ask why these gods of "atavistic force" –as part of human nature–, which include the call of ethnic and territorial loyalty, have been rendered so inactive or "dormant" among the single ethnicity of 22 Arab states in search of a greater unity? "An utterance of Schleiermacher's" selected by Kedouirie has a lot to say vis-à-vis the extent of the distortion and perversion of humankind's innate sentiments which are generally conceptualised as "patriotism" and briefly defined as "affection for one's country, or ones group" before they deviate to become nationalism.

'How little worthy of respect is the man who roams about hither and thither without the anchor of national ideal and love of fatherland; how dull is the friendship that rests merely upon personal similarities in dispositions and tendencies, and not upon the feeling of a greater common unity for whose sake one offers up one's life; how the greatest source of pride is lost by the woman[19] who can not feel that she also bore children for her fatherland and brought them up for it, that her house and all the petty things that fill up most of her time belong to a greater whole and take their place in the union of her people!' (Kedourie, 1966, p.73).

A parodic columnist Bekir Coskun in *Hurriyet*, a Turkish daily, satirises the living experience of such a perverted "Dark God" in Turkey in relation to the nationalists' severe reaction against the European Union's demands for the democratisation of Turkey, which prompted the sudden "united front" composed of extreme right and left circles (*Hurriyet*, February 26, 2002). Cockun raises a plain question: "Why are these *National Forces*[20] not visible and why do they not act or react when the IMF and World Bank have their monthly inspection into our country's every privacy but are so prompt when democratisation is brought to attention by the EU?" (Coskun, 2002). What "communist nationalism" contributed to this factual essence of

nationalist politics – and the essential source of pivotal force drawn from "mass nationalism" – is a perversion of "laborious" sentiments (Lester, 1997, pp. 37-40).

Further, the distortion and perversion of patriotic sentiments are not the sole case within a single nationality. They may well deviate far more to the extent that the members of one ethnicity can be exhaustedly motivated for another ethnic nationalism. Not only can they be mobilised for "another" nationalism, but they can be mobilised against their fellow ethnic population –as is in the case with the Kurds of Turkey. The most notorious activists of extreme Turkish nationalism are among the Kurds of poorly Turkish-speaking youth. The strongest mass base of the pro-state nationalist parties of Turkey resides in three Kurdish populated cities –Elazig, Erzurum and Malatya.

I have argued above that nationalism is made of national sentiments just as nation is made of ethnicity. Things are not called by what they are made of. No one would think of calling "bread" "dough" simply because it is made of dough. Alternatively, we never confuse an ashtray with a bottle because they are both made of glass. Why then do not we invent a single term to denote "iron" and "hammer" for the hammer is made of iron? Or, why do we express "dough" and "bread" by ethnologically distant terms even though they are made of the same prior materials? This is the most elided, but essential and *consistent*, part of the reality of nationalist practice. This is the most hidden part of the phenomenon with which the theory or sociology of nationalism needs to reengage, if the primary task is to delineate how nationalism has worked and continues to work –at least for some further decades– in the face of the full-scale expansion of globalisation.

The researcher is compelled to ask why one should not employ *similar* or at least *kindred* terms, but should insist on the *same* one for these remarkably distinct concepts – so called *national* (identity) *sentiments* and *nationalism*? Smith talks of distinguishing "nationalism" and "national sentiments" for analytical purposes (Smith, 1983, pp. 169) but does not allocate them to "above" and "below" of the nationalist movements – to the leading elite and the supporting combative masses of nationalism. Rulers have no national sentiments in their governmental practices. Smith's exemplification of some African movements who are or were "durable 'nationalist'

movements, but hardly any 'national sentiment' outside the adherents of the nationalist movement itself" is inconceivable. Further down the page, it becomes clear that he is tempted by the conception of nation as "ethnicity" for he believes that "you can have a 'nation' (say Poland in the nineteenth century) without a 'nation-state'..." (*op. cit.*, p. 169).

The pivotal agenda that is needed to be raised and refreshed, in terms of sociological understanding, ought to be how nationalist agitation has its effect among the politically dysfunctional masses That is to say, the point is not what nationalism is but rather how fatefully it operates. Hroch produces a penetrating comparative study in this sense (Hroch, 1985). But because it is confined to liberation movements of "small" nations due to a zealously traditional "Leftist" approach, the study becomes disabled in terms of embracing generalisations vis-à-vis how states' official nationalisms work among their citizens with no need for the "three stages" of collective action. What is vital in studying nationalism from a sociological approach is to delineate the most general processes through which the masses are mobilised and utilised in the service of the insatiable bourgeoisie. These processes can not be confined within the national liberation struggles of the "small" nations. In addition, it is not possible to distinguish between the respective processes of "large" and "small" nations in terms of agitation, mobilisation and manipulation of the masses.

The real shortcoming of theorisation on nationalism is the ostensibly coinciding disparate needs and aspirations of distinct social entities which are in effect directed against one another (Hah and Martin, 1975, p. 369) – highly attractive *surplus values of market forces* and *inward-innate values of individuals* that are not easily dispensable. Since these two totally distinct (as in the saying: the worries of "sheep" and "butcher") phenomena are taken to be an "interwoven compound", the attempts towards the clarification or classification of nationalist theory and politics will only contribute to the proliferation of "facets" of the "multifarious" nation and nationalism. Thus, the contribution will effect continuous ambivalence, double-facedness, symbiosis, multifariousness and so on surrounding these concepts.

By and large, nationalism as the realpolitik of modernity, which was entailed by the leap-forward in the development process of productive forces manifested in the

form of industrialisation, is being further demystified as a mere politics rather than an ideology. The fall of the "Iron Curtain", behind which the depressed –and consequently underdeveloped– nationalistic dissatisfactions blazed and promptly proliferated, contributed a great deal not to the regurgitation of nationalism but to its demystification (This will be briefly taken on board in "Marxism and nationalism" below). It is an intimately destructive and constructive –however, mostly internecine– form of politics of a historical arc during which the respectively rising adolescent bourgeois classes (of the centre and periphery) quarrelled about *taking* or *keeping* things in one's own hands. And this politics took shape in accordance with the needs and results of modernity's industrialisation –in fact, its severe "uneven diffusion" (Gellner, 1964, p. 166). An additional "catalyst" for over-pushing the implantation of nationalism's power of perversion into the "national consciousness" of the lower social strata is that it has been well grasped as a reaction or counterattack by everyone from the young bourgeoisie in its heyday to infantile Marxism: a political and ideological antidote.

The perverted ethnic-primordial sentiments among Nietzsche's *"herd"* has duly produced a European saying. It deserves repeating: "A nation is a group of person united by a common error about their ancestry and a common dislike of their neighbours". The fortunate thing appears to be that the bourgeoisie of global capitalism in our time is, as a mater of fact, not adolescent any more. And accordingly, the flooding "localisation of globalisation" (Deutsch, 1969, pp. 169-174) –in keeping with *supranational* market "sentiments"– has been pushing nationalism of any "type" towards obsolescence. This has also been the fate of the communists' nationalism of "laborious sentiments".

II The Twilight of "Communist Nationalism"

No argument can be held by the scholars on nation and nationalism without taking on board what Marxism has said and done. Although both Marx and Marxism –with all

its variants– have so far, since "scientific socialism" was introduced, had no significant effect upon the factual course of the history segment called "the era of nationalism", this is conspicuously so. And this is why Anderson rightly states that "nationalism has proved an uncomfortable *anomaly* for Marxist theory and, precisely for this reason, has been largely elided rather than confronted" (Anderson, 1983, p. 13). That is, I interpret Anderson, the adolescent bourgeoisie's *rational* nationalism triumphed over infantile Marxism's *emotional* proletarianism and its over-exaggerated internationalism.

Since there will be no major gains in tracing this "failure" back to the early "founding-fathers" of scientific socialism and "infantile" Marxism, it will not be wise to exhaust much of the argument on bygone years. However, in order to advance the reasoning from the central views on nationalism to the "national question" of Marxist tradition, we need to look at the mainstream opinion of the early days.

a. The Banal and Naïve "Realpolitik" towards the "National Question"

A temptation to self-deception is the case among the maximalist intelligentsia (not executors) of the premature revolutionary communist power-project by which "Marxism's great historical failure" in relation to the "national question" is generated. While the "wise" or "realistic" politicians of the early communist "odysseys" have, soon after they ascended the throne, "persuaded" themselves to obey the necessities of the objective and subjective vacancies of the history there; whoever resisted the "flow of history" to some degree was ultimately eliminated. I partly argued this above when highlighting the deviant trajectory of the practice of nationalism between its departure and arrival. This, of course, is not only a fate of pre-adolescent communist enterprise. It is also a factual facet of recorded human history – with sufficiently instructive recurrent experiences from Jesus Christ to Lenin, from Hz. Ali to Trotsky, from Mazzini to Mao, from Napoleon Bonaparte to Ocalan, and so forth. This, no doubt, does not fall into the realm of the current study and surely deserves a self-contained

research. However, if we come back to Marxism's "great failure" in its confrontation with the "national question", the picture may become more lucid.

It is frequently said that Marx and Engels –especially the latter– were hostile towards "oppressed nations" for they considered them to be "non-historical". True, Marx and Engels did largely ignore the non-historical ethnic entities, which were assimilated or annihilated. Nevertheless, this was not because they *wanted* these entities to be non-historical but because they *saw* them to be non-historical. This was also a consistency in their theory of the irreversible development of the forces of production. In the time of nationalism as "uneven diffusion" (in Gellner's words), the economy as the "base" of sociality or the relations of production, which Marx and Englels called infrastructure, did assimilate and annihilate many of the "small" ethnicities because they were "non-historical". The dialectical equilibrium between the forces of production and the relations of production, as manifested in the form of the "uneven diffusion" or "uneven development" of industrialisation in modern era, did and still does determine the trajectory of the social history of humankind just as Marx formulated.

Thus, the need to search for the "sins of the past" in the legacy of Marx and Engels concerning the "national question" is not vital. Their standpoint was more than clear in the *ad hoc* articles written mostly on the colonial questions of the time. This standpoint was positioned in the "heat" of the episode from the 1848 Revolutions to the Paris Commune in keeping with their conception of –and sympathy towards– the development of productive forces. This has been fairly *unequivocal* in the light of the extensive and impressive lessons of Soviet "communism" in general and of the "communism" of National Liberation Movements in particular.

Thus, it would not contribute much to go far back to what the "founding-fathers" said in the first place –in Nimni's words, "the perplexing legacy of Marx and Engels (Nimni, 1991, pp. 17-43). Arguing Marxism's essentials, in effect, contributes more to the question of nation and nationalism than the Marxist theory on the "national question" for the "failure" relates to the "infantile" nature of the theory. That is, "nationality theory ... is in fact a central part of Marxist theory" (Davis in

Luksemburg, 1976, p. 12) that represents its "pre-puberty", which rendered it "sterile" in its confrontation with "national question".

However, in order to relate the "question" under discussion to the blameable essential(s), it will be useful to explain the main concerns of the competing standpoints. The "essentials" of Marxist theory that lie behind the "failure" in its confrontation with nationalism and the "national question" are the over-emphasis on the proletariat and its internationalism. This of course is not the whole edifice of the theory but it is the *one* which fundamentally underlies the "question" –the "question" which rendered the so-far socialist branded revolutions "national liberation" of each individual adolescent bourgeoisie's capitalist severe swing.

The Right of Nations to Self-determination

The positions moulded on the "national question" by the Marxist mainstream manifest in the concept of "national self-determinations", which –as is in the general lack of consensus on nationalism– concerns politics rather than theoretical conceptualisations. Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg represent the best of the positions taken vis-à-vis "the right of nations to self-determination".

Just like Marx and Engels, Lenin has set out no systematic thoughts on the theoretical aspects of this issue. Rather, he instructed Stalin to fulfil the "task", which I discussed above in brief. What Lenin provides in his related writings, mainly in his notorious pamphlet *The Right of Nations to Self-determination*, is a polemic on the rights of "oppressed nations" against "national oppression". Lenin was additionally determined, clear and uncompromising on the side of the "rights of nations to self-determination" for he believed that the right implied "only a consistent expression of struggle against all national oppression" (Lenin, 1968, p. 159). However, he was not that unequivocal in relation to *how* of its implementation in proportion to his firmness on the "indispensable" right. Although he talks of the "complete freedom to agitate for secession and for a referendum on secession by the seceding nation", the how and who of such "free" conditions are not discussed because if there is such an opportunity for the "seceding nation", then there is no "national oppression". Lenin justifies his

"proletarianist" position in the traditional self-misguiding naivety of the entrepreneur intelligentsia.

> The proletariat of the oppressor nations must not confine themselves to general, stereotyped phrases against annexation and in favour of the equality of nations in general, such as any pacifist bourgeois will repeat. The proletariat can not remain silent on the question of the *frontiers* of a state founded on national oppression, a question so "unpleasant" for the imperialist bourgeoisie. The proletariat must struggle against the enforced retention of oppressed nations within the bounds of the given state, which means that they must fight for the right to self-determination. The proletariat must demand freedom of political separation for the colonies and nations oppressed by "their own" nation. Otherwise, the internationalism of the proletariat would be nothing but empty words; neither confidence nor class solidarity would be possible between the workers of the oppressed and oppressed nations; ... (*op. cit.*, pp. 160, 161).

As has been rendered indisputable by the break-up of the "Iron Curtain", the proletariat did not do this. Lenin's naïve "pragmatism was then fossilised by the post-1917 history" and "the revolution" did "easily fall victim to a renascent Great Russian nationalism" (Nairn, 1981, p. 85). While Lenin acutely draws attention to the sense of "empty words" if the proletariat do not demand and fight for "freedom of political separation for the colonies and nations oppressed by 'their own' nation", he is not as concerned with the contingency that the "right of self-determination" may be doomed to receiving only lip service. Davis quotes an interesting excerpt from Amilcar Cabral's *Revolution in Guinea*, which penitently questions how Lenin's position was "fossilised" by the subsequent course of affairs and, moreover, how it served just the opposite purpose.

> I would even go so far as to ask whether, given the advance of socialism in the world, the national liberation is not an imperialist initiative. Is the judicial institution which serves as a reference for the right of all peoples who are trying to liberate themselves a product of the peoples who are trying to liberate themselves? Was it created by the socialist countries who are our historical associates? It is signed by the imperialist

countries, it is the imperialist countries who have recognised the right of all peoples to national independence, so I ask myself whether we may not be considering as an initiative of our people what is in fact an initiative of the enemy? Even Portugal, which is using napalm bombs against our people in Guiné, signed the declaration of the right of all peoples to independence. ... The objective the of imperialist countries was to prevent the enlargement of the socialist camp, to liberate reactionary forces in our countries which were being stifled by colonialism and to enable these forces to ally themselves with the international bourgeoisie. The fundamental objective was to create a bourgeoisie where one did not exist, in order specifically to strengthen the imperialist and the capitalist camp (Cabral in Luxemburg, 1976, p. 39, quoted by Davis)

But what Cabral was not aware of, just like almost everyone in favour of the "socialist camp", was that those "socialist countries" themselves who were their "historical associates" at that time, had long been converted to states which created a "bourgeoisie where one did not exist". This was to be further demystified by the "1989 revolutions".

The position of Rosa Luxemburg was respectively firm and uncompromising on the "rights" of "oppressed nations" to secession and "self-determination" against Bolsheviks. Cabral's radical questioning appears to be the heir to her approach on the early disputes of Marxist politics. Luxemburg did emphasise decades before him that "especially striking about this formula is the fact that it doesn't represent anything specifically connected with socialism nor with the politics of the working class". For her, the so-called remedial formula for the "nationality question" had been reproduced from the "paraphrase of the old slogan of bourgeois nationalism put forth in all countries at all times: 'the right of nations to freedom and independence'" (Luxemburg, 1976, pp. 102, 103). What actually stands out in Luxemburg's standpoint is not the "thing" demanded by the formula but the applicability of this demand. "There can be no self-determination under capitalism", she insists.

It is true that socialism recognises for every people the right of independence and the freedom of independent control of its own destinies. But it is a veritable perversion of

socialism to regard present-day capitalist society as the expression of this self-determination of nations (*op. cit.*, p. 289).

She adds a question to highlight the concern above: "Where is there a nation in which the people have had the right to determine the form and conditions of their national, political, and social existence?" Contrary to Lenin, she strove to bring before the socialist movement that the proletariat was not reluctant to achieve "freedom of political separation for the colonies and nations oppressed by 'their own' nation" but merely talking about the "right" itself would be "empty words", for this right is impracticable under capitalism. The course of subsequent decades has corroborated Luxemburg's persistent assertion that "in a class society; to speak of self-determination for the 'people' would ordinarily mean the self-determination of ruling class; the workers would be left in a subordinate position as before" (Luxemburg, 1976, p. 15).

Revolutionary Romanticism Versus the Fact of Social

Societal historiography has been so fragile against the triumphant advances of the history. This appears to be one of the greatest vulnerabilities of historiography with regard to the recorded affairs of humankind's overall socio-political trajectory in general, and to the discourse of experienced socialism in particular. In the case of the "national question" of the Marxist mainstream, both the theorisation and political practice of this tradition have been victims of this "soft" side of history. The spectacle from behind the shattered "Iron Curtain" has further revealed that the acute anti-nationalist Luxemburg was a victim of this misleading historiography and the corresponding self-deceptive theorisation of the "romantic" intelligentsia. Her ideas have been rendered nonsensical by Lenin's pragmatism and, of course, his great success in introducing the first communist endeavour in Russia –the October Revolution of the Bolshevik intelligentsia. While early theoreticians of the Marxist mainstream such as Otto Bauer and Antonio Gramsci are not exempt from being heirs to the banal romanticism of the entrepreneur intelligentsia in historical leaps forward, Luxemburg was defeated by the prosperity of Lenin's Soviets. Bauer, in this sense,

74

represents an initiating figure in the Marxist tradition that confined nationalism to the struggles of "oppressed nations" and rendering nation ethnicity. His vindication of "cultural nationalism" in a multi-national state has also been elided by the protagonists of the "right of self-determination" in the prosperous Bolshevik endeavour. I partly discussed his associated ideas above. In a similar manner, Gramsci represents the romanticism of the early tradition of the Marxist intelligentsia. One of n his articles written in 29 April 1917 comments on the events of the "February Revolution" and is a clear mirroring of the spiritual fact. The article begins by posing the question: "Why is the Russian revolution a proletarian revolution?" After comparing the French and Russian revolutions and emphasising the resemblance that is "only on the surface" in terms of the "act of violence", Gramsci evaluates the Russian Revolution in its early stages.

> The bourgeoisie newspapers have attached no importance to another intriguing event. The Russian revolutionaries have not only freed political prisoners as well. When the common criminals in one prison were told they were free, they replied that they felt they did not have the right to accept liberty because they had to expiate their crimes. In the Odessa they gathered in the prison courtyard and of their own volition swore to become honest men and resolved to live by their own labours. From the point of view of the socialist revolution, this news has more importance even than that of the dismissal of the Tsar and the grand duke. The Tsar would have been deposed by bourgeoisie revolutionaries as well. But in bourgeois eyes, these condemned men would still have been the enemies of their order, the stealthy appropriators of their wealth and their tranquillity. In our eyes their liberation has this significance: what the revolution has created Russia *is a new way of life.* It has not only replaced one power by another. *It has replaced one way of life by another.* It has created *a new moral order,* and in addition to the physical liberty of the individuals, *has established liberty of mind* (italics added) (Gramsci, 1977, pp. 29,30).

What the new "way of life" or "new moral order" generated in 72 years, which "virtually caught everyone unawares" (McCrone, 1998, p. 149) was a mere picture of the Russian capitalism of the "greenhorn" Russian bourgeoisie. This bourgeoisie was

well-institutionalised in the form of the bureaucratic apparatus of the communist party with the nationalism's ideological "form" of socialist utterance. And one of the most disappointing results of the "way of life" of almost three quarters of a century has emerged as the flood of prostitution into Turkey, the nearest profitable market, to the extent that this flood replaced the Turkish word for prostitute *orospu* with the Russian female name *Natasa*. Gramsci makes himself believe that even if there were a "material base" for the qualitative significance of liberation that effected the change in the lifestyle of the peoples of Russia.

> Only in an atmosphere of social turbulence could such an event occur, when the way of life and the prevailing mentality is changed. Liberty makes men free and widens their moral horizons; it turns the worst criminals under an authoritarian regime into a martyr for the cause of duty, a hero in the cause of honesty (*op. cit.*, p 30).

And he ends the article with the following sentence.

> And once again it is from the East that light comes to illuminate the aged Western world, which is stupefied by the events and can oppose them with nothing but the banalities and stupidities of its hack-writers (*op. cit.*, p. 30)

This naïve and self-misleading romanticism dominated the Marxist theoretical tradition not only on the "national question", but on social affairs in general, except for the enduring intellectual essays[21] admired by the humiliated Trotskian standpoint up until the "1989 revolutions".

When pointing at the "intimate link between nationalist politics and *romanticism*, although he defines it as the "cultural mode of the nationalist dynamic", Tom Nairn provides an attractive generalisation on the insight of romantic spirit.

> In the context, all romanticism's well-known features – the search for inwardness, the trust in feeling or instinct, the attitude to 'nature', the cult of the particular and mistrust of the abstract, etc. – makes sense (Nairn, 1981, p. 104).

This very spirit is a recurrent case among the patriotic intelligentsia. But it is not less true of their Marxist fellows. The point that I seek to bring out here is that, the finalising factor in the actual course of history is not the banal truth of the intelligentsia's naïve romanticism in relation to either nationalism or Marxism but the realities of class interests and class struggle entailed by the irreversible progress of the forces of production and its conflictual equilibrium with the relations of production. This, however, occupies a great deal of the arguments with regard to Marxism's "historical failure" in the politics of nationalism and the "national question". In this field, the positions of Tom Nairn and Ephraim Nimni are illustrative of the principal approaches to the "question".

b. What is to Blame for "Historical Failure"

In his book, which is evaluated by some scholars as path-breaking, *The Break-up of Britain*, Nairn devotes his 9th chapter to nationalism and, in particular, the "national question" of Marxism. Although he handles some basic aspects and elements of nationalism in an earlier chapter on "Scotland and Europe", the actual argument follows in "The Modern Janus"–Chapter 9. The chapter begins with a frank statement to which many refer: "The theory of nationalism represents Marxism's great historical failure" (Nairn, 1981, p.329). "My thesis", he asserts, "is that this failure was inevitable. It was inevitable, but it can now be understood".

> The inevitability lay in the fact that, during the era when Marxists struggled most desperately and brilliantly with the enigma – before the onset of the Stalinism – the general process of capitalist development had not gone far enough. The overall characteristics of "uneven development" had not yet been sufficiently delineated by history itself (Nairn, 1981, p. 355).

Nairn breaks new ground by relating this inescapable "historical failure" not to the founding-fathers' "*ad hoc* dealings in the real issues of each individual case" but to the

essentials of the theory of Marxism in its historical context. His confidence that the cause of inevitable "failure" "can now be understood" rests on his understanding of the need to reinterpret history itself with the historical materialist system of thought which "can perfectly escape from the prolonged and destructive impasse in which it has been on the issue" (Nairn, 1981, p. 329). Nairn points towards the need to rescue materialism from its "native" idealism and to provide an outlet from the "prolonged and destructive" ordeal. Thus,

> to perceive the cause of *this* failure is to see something of Marxism's real place in history, some of its limitations, some of the unconscious roots which tied it blindly to the course of modern historical development. It means seeing Marxism itself as a part of history in a quite uncomplimentary sense, one which has nothing to do with the holy matrimony of theory and practice. It means losing for all time that God-like posture which, in the guise of science, Marxism took over from Idealist philosophy (and ultimately from religion) (*op. cit.*, p. 329).

Because socialist theory, "whose intellect and heart lies more in the Marxist tradition, is the heir of the Enlightenment", it also, for Nairn, involved theoretical errors, and the error concerned class. And because socialism was born prematurely, "it was not yet possible to employ the concepts of historical materialism in relation to their proper object, the only object which gives them genuine meaning: that is, the world political economy" (op. cit., p. 352). Thereby he endeavours to lay down the prerequisite for "unlocking" the Marxist theorisation on nationalism, which resides at its centre, and which history now allows thrive. Nairn suggests in confidence that

> the task of framing a "theory" of nationalism is that of understanding the destructive mechanisms and contradictions of uneven development – and this, in turn, is the task of re-interpreting modern history as a whole. In this sense the puzzle of Marxism's "failure" over nationalism is simple: the problem is so central, so large, and so intimately related to other issues that it could not be focused on properly before. History itself is now helping us towards a solution (Nairn, 1981, p. 357).

The logical extension of Nairn's account would probably be as follows. What the "infantile" revolutionary socialism did not apprehend or could not afford to respond to, was not the "perplexing" *ad hoc* articles of Marx and Engels printed in various journals of the time and referring to individual cases. What they could not do was to experiment on monopoly capitalism to germinate the two World Wars at the apogee of nationalism before these things occurred —that is, what they could not do was analyse the coming course of history!

By contrast, Ephraim Nimni searches for the theoretical-conceptual roots in the early writings of Marx and Engels. Referring to the primary sources of socialist theory, Nimni is, to a degree, right when vilifying the tradition's class-reductionist approaches to the "national question". He vilifies the temptation to reduce nationalism to the only disguised form of class struggle. But, he also longs for the eventual discarding of all the socio-economic devices of socialist theory. When drawing attention to Marxist parameters (Nimni, 1991, p. 6,7) to which he traces the "historical failure", Nimni refers to Trotsky's "futile attempt" in Russia.

> Trotsky's well-known theory of combined and uneven development is a significant acknowledgement of the difficulties experienced by doctrinaire and eurocentric theories of evolution in Russia and, at the same time, an ingenious but ultimately fatal attempt to overcome those difficulties *without discarding the overall universal and developmental logic of Marxist thought* [italics added] (Nimni, 1991, p. 196).

Along with this demand, which seems to be a reactionary impulse, Nimni searches for the "origins" of "Marxism's great historical failure", through which the "perplexing legacy" of the "founding-fathers" of scientific socialism is found to take the central blame. Frequently referring to the Marxist parameters, he pays great deal of attention to the role attributed to the productive forces in the process of human social development. Nimni never attempts to say what the "forces of production" actually denote, but though they are not analysed under a title bearing their name, the concepts of the forces of production and the relations of production, and their dialectical interdependence are delineated in a fairly understandable way for an ordinary

academic reader. True, in *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (Marx, 1971, pp. 20,21,37), the conceptualisation of the relation between these universal dynamics of social development is confined to an abstract discussion. But it is at least understandable in other writings by Marx. In the first volume of *Capital*, as the crux of the concept of productive forces, the notion is individualised into its elements. And from there, it is noticeable how the notion of the forces of production in Marx is even intimately linked with human will through the productivity "device" of human labour – though the latter is not in effect analysed by Marx[22]. On some occasions, Marx talks of productive forces as the "means of production". However in Section 1 of Chapter VII, under "The Labour-process or the Production of Use-values", he explains the inseparable relation between *instruments* of production (labour tools) and the *productivity* of human labour as each of the elements of the social forces of production.

> The elementary factors of the labour process are 1, the personal activity of man, *i.e.*, work itself, 2, the subject of the work, and 3, its instruments (Marx, 1974, p. 174).

A little further on, after referring to Franklin's definition of man "as a tool-making animal", Marx re-contemplates the means of production and the productivity of man's labour, and their interdependency.

> If we examine the whole process from the point of view of its result, the product, it is plain that both the instruments and the subject of labour, are means of production, and that the labour itself is productive labour[23] (*op. cit.*, p. 176).

What is not familiar from Nimni's overall arguments regarding the social forces of production, as one of the prime Marxist parameters that is also used for analysing the "national question", the human element –the productivity of labour as the defining faculty of humankind– in which the intellectual and spiritual wholeness of the human species resides, and which encapsulates human's will to develop and to live better. Thereby one may unequivocally talk of the ineluctable "desire" of the forces of

production to develop in themselves. This is what Nimni finds so abstract and acutely avoids including into his argument but, in fact, it is this for which he abstractly blames the Marxist approach for being over-deterministic.

On the other hand, with the same line of reasoning, Nimni grasps Nairn's concept of "Marxism's great historical failure", but he is reluctant to handle Nairn's related argument of capitalist "uneven development" and corresponding socio-economic theorisation vis-à-vis nationalism's fertile material base. Whereas, Nairn's overall argument on nationalism revolves around the "absolute relative deprivation" of the peripheries caused by the uneven spread of capitalism (Nairn, 1981, p. 128) in which he analyses these processes with the materialistic codes of the Marxist conception of history[24]. Nimni does not interfere with the "backbone" of the argument whatsoever.

Conclusions

Three interwoven premises of Marxism appear to be the essentials that are imbedded in the "questions" about the theory, which also undermine its confrontation with the "nationality question". The initial point of critique of the Marxist tradition that had to be raised here is the vulgar conception of the materialist dialectic from which many facets of class reductionism and the corresponding subordination of the *material inwardness of human's spiritual satisfaction*[25] emanate. Following the fall of the "Iron Curtain", one may more confidently state that humankind as a spiritual-social agent is in a deadly battle for spiritual-cultural values even ahead of material ones. This may well head the agenda of scientific socialist theorisation as the most general philosophical deficiency of the Marxist account of the dynamics of society. Marxism's second essential defect, which has been totally refuted by post-Marxian history, and which has been re-demonstrated by its post-Soviet segment, is the "historical role" endowed to the proletariat as both the "class in itself" and "class for itself". This seems, more than ever before, to be a Messianism[26] in Marx and Engels under the "depressive" wave of the 1848 Revolution. This has been unearthed by the most recent

spectacle of "communist nationalism" as the actual question of the theory that germinated the "national question" for itself, as well as the questions of nation and nationalism in general. And this, of course, is a political manifestation of the former defect –the fundamental materialist weakness of philosophical materialism. Finally, the third interrelated "question" of Marxism's materialist conception of history is the presentation of history as the "history of class struggles", which Nairn calls upon for reinterpretation –not only modern history but the history of class societies "as a whole". Accordingly, one might begin with a modification of the first sentence of the first chapter of the *Communist Manifesto* saying "The history of all hitherto existing society$**^{27}$ is the history of class struggles" between, "in a word, oppressor and oppressed". Instead, while not ignoring the struggle between power-holders and "labour-holders", the sentence needs to be modified to say, "the *written* history of human sociality is overwhelmingly the history of struggles between respective ruling classes" – from the times of Gilgamesh to Muhammad, of Alexandra the Great to Saladin, of Caesar to Napoleon, of Hitler to Stalin, and so forth. The fundamental impetus behind this unstable sequence of struggles is the power-holding ruler's insatiable *market* "sentiments", just like the broader episode of modernity's nationalism, and like the manifest form of the conflict between the social forces of production and the relations of production.

Therefore, we may deduce some rudimentary conclusions.

In terms of both the conceptualisation and the politics in Marxists' agenda, the concept of the "national question" is confined to the "small" nations' national liberation movements. This is the initial illusory aspect of Marxism when handling the "question" because the phrase "national question" equivocally encapsulates two disparate issues. One is the belated bourgeoisie's rational aspirations; the ineluctable desire for the "home" market. The other is the innate cultural values of the masses, which are subject to emotional-spiritual satisfaction, to which an individually distinct political approach is required. The second illusory aspect of Marxism is that the concept of "nation" is understood as an ethno-cultural entity from Marx and Engels themselves onwards. This adds the additional illusion to the "prolonged and destructive impasse" of the "national question".

Deutsch's significant remark calls for attention of the student of politics and nationalism. "The real progress of human knowledge has usually been achieved by a dialogue between a succession of theories and a succession of findings or data" (Deutsch, 1969, pp.129, 130). Within this frame of reference, only the fact of "fratricidal" fights inside the Kremlin Palace between *radical* and *moderate* pursuers of re-capitalisation at the outset of the "1989 Revolutions" as the chief protagonist of the revolutions may guide one to conclude that the experience of Russia deserves to be the most notorious explanatory case of nationalism in its "communist" ideological form. Soviet experience, by and large, denotes a relatively belated capitalism's leap-forward during which it initially insulted, then deceived, and eventually metamorphosed the Bolsheviks' "greenhorn" endeavour at a socialist revolution. In this sense, Leninism and the Bolshevik revolution was, so to speak, an attempt by "infantile" Marxism to have a baby by impregnating Russia while the "couple" was still shy of reaching puberty. In consequence, "Leninism" has fascinatingly enabled a gigantic leap-forward for Russian capitalism[28]. In the light of this "succession of findings or data", the *blend* of communism and nationalism in the form of either "communist nationalism" or "national communism" in the person of the rejuvenation of the CPRF[29] (Lester, 1997, pp. 37-45) would be no more than an old platitude. The "blend" of communism and nationalism is doomed solely to be a nationalism polished with communist eloquence.

The endeavours of socialism through national liberation victories −including the legendary Vietnam of Vietminh− have solely built nation-states for their respective "adolescent" bourgeoisie. No modest exception in which one may observe an institutionalised communist social transformation, let alone a cultural transformation of the premises of superstructure, exists in the current world. Further, how far have the triumphant national liberation outcomes contributed to the "confinement of terrain for imperialist exploitation", including Lenin's unhesitating support for Mustafa Kemal in the emerging Turkey?

Some are discontented with the general theorisation on nations and nationalism for they find it Euro-centric. Though this discontent draws attention to the significant lack of engagement with non-European phenomena, the theorisation deserves not to be

branded as "Eurocentric" because it *was* generated by Europe, just as the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and industrialisation were –just as we ought to be "Middle-East-centric" when classical civilisation is the case. It is a corollary to the factual course of history that one can not "get it wrong".

To summarise, the "question" of the "national" does not lie in the lack of theoretical formulations or in unwise conceptualisations, but in the course of the development of the material forces of production as Renan and others prophesied.

Since the philosophical endeavours of socio-political aspirations have not been materially institutionalised and spiritually *"coagulated"* in the form of societal *aberrations* from the persistent course of the private property-based cultural lineage of class societies, they will continue to persist as masturbatory intellectual odysseys. Since the remedial theoretical devices for social maladies do not institutionalise and thereby *culturalise* themselves, they will bear no more significance than being the subjects of resilient academic arguments from which banal exam questions are drawn, for college students to pass. This is, by and large, what the Bolshevik endeavour and subsequent fellow experiences taught to everyone, which may divert or reshape the "realpolitik" and the corresponding theorisation of the banal-naïve Marxist intelligentsia.

Although the PKK has been partially critical of Bolshevism and especially of the overall socialism of the Soviets, the Kurdish experience under its leadership provides a less "sophisticated" –in other words, a caricatured– version of the Soviet style. That is, Kurdish "national liberationist communism" has, to a significant extent, been heir to the banal Marxist tradition and its "naïve" intelligentsia. We, therefore need to have a brief look at the "form" of nationalism and the "national question" of the Kurds of Anatolia

III The Kurds' Nationness and Nationalism in Modern Turkey

The emergence of a modern Turkey with its "reborn" Turkishness came into being following the dissolution of the multi-ethnic Ottoman Empire. That is, it came into

being through one of the three basic, but also the most classical (via the dissolution/reunification of empires), ways of inventing nations. The Ottoman Empire was a multi-ethnic religio-feudal state, but with the Turkish ethnicity at its core. Its cultural and ideological complexion was based on religious sentiments, rather than on ethnic ones. In response to the Allies' attempts to dismantle the Ottoman State, a coalition of the military and civilian elite led by the Ottoman Army general Mustafa Kemal promptly organised an Anatolian resistance movement composed of mainly Turks and Kurds, with a conspicuous over-emphasis on religious concerns. This response succeeded and culminated in the Republic of Turkey in 1923. Up to this point, the movement was solely a "religious liberation movement" (discussed in Chapter 2) in terms of its "form of ideology" (Seton-Watson, 1965, p. 15) and its utterance.

The proclamation of the Republic of Turkey was then followed by the Turks' "war of national liberation" – in fact the over-condensed struggle of the invention of Turkish nationhood. Once the elimination of the "primitive" Kurds and other minor ethnic entities was accomplished, the genuine "liberation war" was launched immediately. This is the most striking particularity of the way in which Turkish nationness, and hence the "modern" Kurdish question, was invented and implanted in the new Turkey.

Following the "silent decades" from 1938 to 1968, which began with the most recent historical phase of Kurdish tribal resistance (and its absolute suppression) and ended with the knock-on effect of the Europe's "68 Generation", a group of university students gathered under Abdullah Ocalan's leadership and their organisation gained momentum in the early 1970s. The group emerged from within the Turkish radical Marxist left and was composed of members of various ethnic groups – the most prominent of which were Kurds and Turks. The gathering first became known as *Apocular* (followers of Apo). Then, in 1978, it declared itself a party (PKK) which would undertake "the war of national liberation" of the Kurds of "Northwest Kurdistan" against Turkey.

In the experience of the Kurds of Turkey under the PKK, a kind of caricaturised endeavour by "adolescent" Marxist entrepreneurs seems to be the case.

Along with the attributes or the unique societal facets of Kurds in general and of "Turkish Kurds" in particular, the conspicuous birthmarks of the banal Marxist tradition are evident in the emergence and development of the Party's discourse and practice. Bearing in mind this aspect of the phenomenon under study, we need to look more closely at both the theorisation and agitation that relate to the PKK's Marxism - that is, to the "national question" of the Kurds of Anatolia.

Relying on his multi-comparative study, Miroslav Hroch begins by warning everyone to avoid the "urgent temptation to consider their own national history (and therefore their nation as well) as a unique, specific and incommensurable component of the world's development" (Hroch, 1985, p. xi). The warning, of course, is not at all nonsense or baseless. But, on the other hand, every nation or ethnic entity *is* subject to some uniqueness. Each individual person out of billions on this planet has unique personal characteristics, including the most diligently "programmed" test-tube twins from the same ovaries. So too with social entities and ethnicities. Theories in the discipline of psychology are constructed with the "cement" of individual uniquenesses. In our case, the fair treatment would be to grasp the uniqueness in the light of most generalities, and then reach another "most general" level through the totality of uniqueness. Within this framework, both the Organisation (PKK) and the ethnicity (Kurds) bear unique particularities. But surely, neither is an "incommensurable component" of this world.

The Organisation, the central focus of research in the current study, has come into existence as a corollary of "uneven development" in Anatolia, manifesting in the Kurdish periphery's "vindicated" nationalism. It emerged with a customary struggle for "national liberation" and a "reprinted" programme of "national-social emancipation" stamped with the communist utterances of preceding fellow entrepreneur intelligentsias. Following the capture of the organisation's over-charismatic leader Ocalan, the movement eventually converted itself from "Party" to "Congress" in its 8th ordinary congress, which ended recently in April 2002. The PKK has become KADEK (*Konreya Azadiya Demokrasiya Kurdistan* – The Congress of Freedom and Democracy of Kurdistan). Its programme is by no means the one aspiring to "national liberation". In fact, the PKK as a "party" had already adopted a

non-national liberationist programme in its 7th extraordinary congress held in January 2000 (Chapter 4) at which, instead, the "Democratic Transformation" of Turkey became the principal "strategic target" that would enhance the "solution of Kurdish question". That is, the programme of a party of "Kurdistan" has basically become a party with a socialist perspective on Turkey in general. At the latest congress at which KADEK was generated, it was declared that the point of the metamorphosis from "party" to "congress" was that the "movement" should become a non-power-envisaging organisational entity. And, after all, these dramatic organisational changes have taken place in accordance with Ocalan's "perspectives" passed on through the "notes of meetings" with his lawyers in Turkey's Imralli prison.

The "Marxism" of the movement has been adopted from the wave of the Marxist Left in Turkey in the 1960s and 1970s (Chapter 3). Although the "national communism" of the organisation has totally diverted from the Turkish Left in the emergence of the party as the PKK, the group originally appeared under the name of *Apocular* as one of the minor components of Turkey's Marxist-socialist movement. The Marxist ingredients and the ideology of the PKK are the main theme of later chapters – Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.

What needs to be initially stated is that the "uniqueness"[30] of Kurdish existence (as the "intrinsic" nature of the Kurdish ethnic tradition which has "coagulated" in its "national consciousness") will, I assert, be the Kurds' "indispensable" temptation to be on the alert *not to miss out on a subordinate "space"*. That is, the ethnicity has a consistent tradition of seeking not to be the leading entity but a trusty "right arm" of the superior power. This seems to be the most "unchanged" trait of Kurdish ethnic existence throughout its history since the Enkidu of Gilgamesh[31] –discussed in the first part of Chapter 5.

The roots, the shaping and the nature of the Kurdish question in Turkey in its peculiar course of affairs are the points of concern in the following chapter.

Notes

1 By "twin concepts", the inventions of *nation* and *nationalism* are meant here. However, I may quite interchangeably use the term "*ethnie*" or "ethnicity" or "nationality" or "nationness" along with "nation" up until I clearly distinguish the political nationhood of market borders and the cultural nationhood of "frozen history" (Bauer in Woolf, 1996, p. 61).

2 Cited by David McCrone (1998, p. 23).

3 *Nutuk* (Speech) is the only book by M. Kemal Ataturk and is edited from his six-day address to the Great National Assembly in 1927.

4 Ernest Renan also has an aphorism-like saying vis-à-vis the space of language in the formation processes of nations. "The political importance we attach to languages stems from our regarding them as signs of race. Nothing is more false" (Renan in Woolf, 1996, p. 55). He continues with some famous examples in various parts of the world, such as Prussia, Wales, Spain, Egypt and so on.

5 Miroslav Hroch, in his richly exemplified comparative study (Hroch, 1985, pp-22-30), explores how this is effected, and analyses this process by allocating it into three phases. The study is additionally explanatory in terms of delineating the processes of mass participation in "small" nations' liberation movements.

6 A. D. Smith asserts convincingly in his influential work first published in 1971, *Theories of Nationalism*, that the intelligentsia "do, indeed, play a definitive part in the rise of nationalist movements –everywhere" (Smith, 1983). Also, Tom Nairn presents a brief and scholarly analysis on "The Role of Intellectuals", and points towards its place "behind and beneath the more visible 'rise of bourgeoisie'" (Nairn, 1981, pp. 99-103).

7 Stalin's personality was occasionally described by Lenin as being "too rude" towards and too "tempting" to Great Russian Nationalism.

8 This aspect of the argument, I suggest, is the most phenomenal insight which Max Weber left out of his penetrating analysis on "The Types of Authority and Imperative Co-ordination", in particular on "Charismatic Authority". Weber distinguishes "Legal Authority" from "Charismatic Authority" by explaining that the manner of its implementation through "a bureaucratic administrative staff" is the particularity of the former. However, "a bureaucratic administrative staff" is not a less factual case in "Charismatic Authority" than in the legal one. It is probably the background concern of Weber's tempting vindication of the "spirit of capitalism" that drove him to such an elision (Weber, 1947, pp. 324-423.

9 The organisation which was founded by a group of military medical doctors at the close of the 19th century for Turkish emancipation from the dissolving of Ottoman Empire. It will be discussed further in Chapter 2 under "The Vital Concern of the Republican Turkish Political Elite".

10 Antony D. Smith talks of the role of the intelligentsia as "a necessary condition of all nationalist movements" in the approach of the "third group of sociological theories of nationalism" which he considers as "a more historical theory" (Smith, 1983, pp. 86,87)..

11 Antony Smith reduces it to a more general separation: "...the civic-territorial and the ethnic-genealogical, and the two rotes of the formation of nations, that of bureaucratic incorporation and that of vernacular mobilisation" (Smith, 1991, p. 123; *op. cit.*, pp. 59-68) according to which he, however, does not tend to approve of "genuinely different types of nationalism" including "religious nationalism" (*op. cit.*, p. 49).

12 I understand this as the assimilation and integration of subordinate ethnic entities to be shaped as a corollary to the would-be nation that is qualitatively differentiated from its former constituents. Seton-Watson is here precisely consistent with a *non-cultural* or *non-ethnic* conception of nation, that is, with the *political* one.

13 Horace B. Davis takes this on board as "good" and "bad" nationalism by referring to the prominent British Labour Party politician of the 1930s, Harold Laski, in the very sense that Nairn discusses. He begins by saying "Nationalism may be considered on balance good; or on balance bad; or neither good nor bad; or both good and bad at the same time" (Davis, 1978, p. 46).

14 The 'nationalism' in that sense which has dominated historical development since early in the 19th century, was in essence the forced reaction of one area after another to the spread of capitalism (Nairn, 1981, p. 127)

[15] This seems somehow to be an heir to the volatile temptation of the leftwing tradition towards rendering nationalism as the struggle of "oppressed nations"; the "progressive" nationalism whose success was believed to be restricting the exploitation of territories of imperialist expansion. The temptation needs to be traced back to infantile Marxism's dizziness on the "national question", and in particular to Lenin's historical mistake – being the principal proponent of the "right of nations for self-determination" in opposition to Rosa Luxemburg. This will be argued further below in relation to the "question" of Marxism.

[16] What contributes some confusion to Smith's argument is that he does not clearly distinguish between *ethnic identity* and the *identity of nationhood* by employing the term national identity for both. The terms "national" and "nationality" already bear problems in their English usage. So, instead, using the terms "ethnic" and "ethnicity" escapes the possible confusions. And in the case of identities, the usage of the "identity of nationhood" for, say, Swissness in Switzerland or Britishness in the U.K. and of the "identity of ethnicity" for Frenchness, Germanness and Italianness in Switzerland, or Englishness, Scottishness, Irishness and Welshness in Great Britain.

[17] In the conclusion of his *Nations and Nationalism*, under "What is not being said", Ernest Gellner talks of nationalism as "a very distinctive species of patriotism" in terms of its "higher" manifestation but "only under certain social conditions". But nevertheless, he does not want to be involved with distinctions between the history-making insatiable desire of the emerging class of the "modern world" –that is, the adolescent bourgeoisie– and the masses' expectations of freedom. This, of course, is merely a consistent extension of Gellner's vindication of nationalism, which he evaluated as "the consequence of a new form of social organisation, based on deeply internalised, education-dependent high cultures" (Gellner, 1983, p. 48). Whereas, the "insatiable desire" of the modern world's rising bourgeoisie in its "teens", which has, up to this very moment, had the last word on the course of history, has nothing to do with the "patriotic" desires of the "*herd*" or masses.

[18] The very elision in Gellner is Hobsbawm's "major criticism of Gellner's work" which he expresses as lack of "attention to the view from below" (Hobsbawm, 1990, pp. 10,11). However, his understanding of nation and nationalism does not differ from Gellner in terms of handling them as "dual phenomena". Although he, in a sense, distinguishes the "national sentiments" of "below" from the market "sentiments" of "above", for him the "assumptions, hopes, needs, longings, and interests of ordinary people" are "not necessarily national and still less nationalist". This (the *worries* of below) is precisely what I strive to separate from nationalism and nationalist politics as an "ideological movement".

[19] In a video-cam recorded interview held by myself with a Kurdish woman in her late 50s in Qamislo (Syria), whose four children –boys and girls– lost their lives in the clashes with Turkish army, she calmly says, in response to a question, "Thank god, I have four martyrs".

[20] "National Forces" is a verbal translation of "*Kuvai Milliye*" which was an unofficial movement composed of civil and military elements in the Anatolian struggle against the Allies' attempts to dismantle the Ottoman State in the late 1910s following her defeat, before the Grand National Assembly of Turkey was proclaimed on April 23, 1920. The prompt emergent unity of left-right reaction had defined their "spirit" in terms of *Kuvai Milliye's* spirit. Coscun refers to the conditions of Turkey at the time in which this movement emerged, and makes humorous comparisons due to funnily inappropriate circumstances.

[21] Frank Furedi's work, *The Soviet Union Demystified*, is a distinguished study of this sort supported by extensive quantitative information. Further, the study was accomplished some years prior to the "1989 Revolutions" and, following the illustration of how the "adolescent" bourgeoisie of Soviet-Russia took over and *over-developed* the works of belated Russian capitalism by an absolute control of labour-value allocation in the whole of its society, Furedi heralds that "bureaucracy is more than a caste, but not yet a class" and "bureaucrats would like to become a class" (Furedi, 1986, p. 179).

[22] This very point, I suggest, appears to be the most vital and most elided shortcoming of scientific socialist theory, on which severe vulgar materialism settled – the wholeness of the *materiality* and *spirituality* of both forces and relations of productions.

[23] The footnote that Marx left here for further explanation is as follows: "This method of determining, from the standpoint of the labour-processes alone, what is productive labour, is by no means directly applicable to the case of capitalist process of production."

[24] In fact, the concept of class or class struggle is not at all the central premise of Marxist theory but only an aspect of it. The central theme is the materialist conception of history with the dialectical grasp and depiction of the "development of production", that is, the logic of development of productive forces in constant relation-contradiction with the relations of productions. Marx himself put emphasis on such a misinterpretation: "...I do not claim to have discovered either the existence of classes in modern society or the struggle between them. Long before me, bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this struggle between the classes..." And his claim of a contribution is "to show that the existence of classes is merely bound up with certain phases in the development of production" (Marx in Marx and Engels, 1983, p. 62).

[25] The concept "spirit" or "spiritual" is taken here in an Epicurean sense. Epicurus endeavoured to define spirit/soul in physical terms in about the third century BC. Later, Descartes of the Enlightenment was to analyse humankind's "spiritual world" further in medical terms as being "really joined to the whole body" (Descartes, 1988, pp. 218-238).

[26] Reinhold Niebuhr use the term in relation to Marxist utopianism as a "religio-political form of Messianism" which

> is really an old form of religious self-righteousness, and combines the two forms of interpretation with which we are concerned - realism and idealism. Thus, Marxism is realistic about the human nature and behaviour of the "sinners", the competitors, the bourgeoisie, but is idealistic about the "redeemed" group, in this case not the church or the chosen nation, but the messianic class. (Niebuhr, 1965, p. 38)

[27] Engels footnoted this in 1888 by adding the word "written": "**That is, all *written* history. ..." (Marx and Engels, 1975. P. 32).

[28] Horace B. Davis has an illustrative table showing the growth of industry and agriculture in the Soviet republics from 1913 to 1966 (Davis, 1978, p. 121).

[29] The Communist Party of the Russian Federation under Gennadii Zyuganov.

[30] Quite probably it has an equivalence with the Scottish case regarding its superior (the English or British state) for which Grieve came to say that "the absence of nationalism is, paradoxically, a form of Scottish self-determination" (Cited by Nairn, 1981, p. 126).

[31] The Middle Eastern epic known as the first literary work in human history, by which Biblical writers and many stories of Greek mythology were influenced. Gilgamesh is the eponymous hero of the epic. A "wild-brutish man", Enkidu, lives with his tribe (of Gutians or Horrits which means the "people from mountains" in the Summerian language who are claimed to be the ancestors of the Kurds) in the forests, and later is "domesticated" by Gilgamesh and used against his tribe. With the help of Enkidu, the epic narrates, Gilgamesh captures the leader of the tribe. Gilgamesh decides to "domesticate" him too in order to support for himself better. But Enkidu persuades his senior Gilgamesh to kill him, for Enkidu believes that he would lose his secondary position if the leader of the tribe stays alive.

Chapter 2

THE SEEDS OF TURKEY'S KURDISH QUESTION

While setting out the study's questions concerning the PKK and the "Turkish Kurds" in the introduction, I posed a fundamental question:

> *What is the determinative internal factor in the organisational growth of the Ankara-born PKK* which has enabled it to extend Kurdish resistance beyond provincial borders and to expand resistance not just to the national geography but to an international scope – wherever "a bunch" of Kurds exists in Jewish-like Diaspora?

I also assumed three principal hypotheses, which may be formulated as follows:

1) The "why" (and, to some extent, the "how") of the PKK is an outcome of the peculiarity of the "Turkish War for Independence" and the artificial – or "manufactured" (Kadioglu, 1996) – character of Turkish "nationalisation".

2) The PKK has led to the first Kurdish "*national*" movement in terms of the supra-tribal mobilisation of the Kurdish masses.

3) The leading body in the Party is not in itself a national liberationist leadership.

So it is now necessary to take a closer look at the specificity of the Turkish Republic's emergence and of the survival struggle of the Ottoman Turks in Anatolia – through which Turkey's Kurdish question took shape.

In short, we need to look at the transition process from the Ottoman State to the Republic of Turkey, and we need to grasp the First World War's relationship to

Turkey's formation. The historical context in which the "birth" of the "republic" occurred has been crucial to the Kurds' destiny.

I The Last Push for the Last Refuge

Both the establishment of the Turkish Republic and its "colonisation" of Anatolian Kurdistan are anomalous in the sense one may assert that the Turkish state is not a republic and that Turkish-ruled "Kurdistan is not even a colony" (Besikci, 1990). Common exaggerations in pro-Western textbooks about "*Atatürk* (Father Turk) Revolutions" seem motivated by Turkey's stabilising role for the West, against the potential threat of Bolshevism and Islamicism, both coming from the east of the globe. Such exaggerations do not provide useful data for sociological argument. It is more beneficial to deal with the *factual process* of the period concerning "The Rebirth of a Nation" (Kinross, 1964), which has either not been mentioned at all or has not received detailed analysis.

a. An Aesthetic Expression: The National War of Independence

In almost all studies of the Turkish Republic by Western scholars, the Movement of Ottoman Turks led by Mustafa Kemal is labelled "The Turkish War for Independence" or "The National War of Independence" or "The War of National Resistance" or the "Turkish Revolution" against imperialist invasion. (Luke, 1936; Frey, 1965; Lewis, 1968; Shaw and Shaw, 1977; McCharty, 1997).

For now, I will omit the interesting "accounts" of the transition period of the Turkish state from a multinational Empire to a unitary Republic - accounts which have been manipulated by many Turkish historians. Suffice to say that this tradition is strikingly commonplace among the non-Turkish authors engaged with the subject. The facts conveyed in these same works do not manifest the symptoms of a people's national resistance or liberation movement but a State's desperate dash to salvage her shrunken body from the victorious "Allies' attempt to dismember the Empire"

(McCharty, 1997, pp. 366,374; Barkey and Fuller, 1998, p. 9), "the Turkish state under Ottoman Sultans" (Luke, 1968, p. v).

When we bypass the speculative extracts, the real nature of Kemal's movement stands out.

McCharty, who expresses his gratitude to staff at the Turkish Embassy in Washington, illustrates the circumstances of the Ottoman State's last push, as stamped onto the *strategic* pattern and the *tactical* innovations of the Ottoman Army led by Mustafa Kemal through "the rebirth of a nation" – 1919 to 1923.

> It is difficult not to cast the War of Independence in heroic, even melodramatic terms, because the cause of the Turks at first looked so impossible. For more than a century, Turks and other Muslims had been forced their homes in the Caucasus region the Crimea, and the Balkans. One generation might have been forced from the Crimea or the Caucasus into Bulgaria, the next generation forced from Bulgaria into Ottoman Macedonia, the next generation forced into Anatolia. Now the Ottoman Empire had been finally defeated; its provinces in Europe and the Arap world were lost. Anatolia, the last refuge, was certainly all that remained to the Turks, but Anatolia too was threatened. (McCharty, 1997, p. 371).

McCharty gives us a melodramatic picture of the Ottoman Turks at the culmination of the First World War. The point is to illustrate whether this situation was a stimulus for the Turkish people to enter into a National Liberation War or a stimulus for the Ottoman Army to invent a *new* outlet for salvaging the body of the Turkish State, which had been shrunk after the First World War, in "the last refuge" – Anatolia. This exploration is necessary if researchers want to reach unbiased conclusions, rather than conclusions reached through intuitive, sometimes unreliable statements.

Another description of the period before the "Kemalist Revolution" from a non-Turkish observer would prompt us to search for the factual processes of the transition period, in order that we may draw more reliable conclusions.

> ... They (Turks – A.K.Ö.) saw Nationalism grow, and bear fruit, among their Greek, Rumanian, Serb, Bulgar and even Arab fellow-subjects before they felt that the time had come to develop the ideal among themselves. It now seems surprising to the non-Turkish observer that while the nineteenth century had witnessed

throughout its length spread of Nationalism among the Christian peoples of the Balkans, it was not until the twentieth century that the Turks began to realise that they alone of all its components races had no place of their own in the Empire which they had created, and began at long last to envisage the possibility of a Turkish instead of an Ottoman Turkey. (Luke, 1936, p.167).

It is inaccurate to compare the growing nationalistic tendencies of the Balkans' Christian peoples and the equivalent sentiments among the Muslim Ottoman Turks at that time. These two communities differed in their socio-political and socio-psychological composition. Even if we put aside the non-Muslim Balkan peoples' close contact with the modern wave of nationalism in Western Europe, the Turks and Turkey were not conquered and ruled by an *alien* power (Ottomans), but by a theocratic "Empire which they had created".

Since its inception, the Ottoman State as a sovereign imperial power had fellow Muslim Turks at its core. There are no reliable sociological data in the archives of historical documents to indicate that the Turkish people "saw and began to realise that Nationalism grew, and bore fruit", and "began at long last to envisage the possibility of a Turkish instead of an Ottoman Turkey". This is the critical question relating to the seeds of the complex conflict of the "Turks of Kurdish origin".

Such a "national consciousness" in "Turkish Turkey" was indeed a veiled aspiration within the Turkish core of the Ottoman Army and its "civil" organisation, the Committee of Union and Progress" (CUP). This would have become apparent after the consolidation of Turkishness in the "new" Turkish State. But Turkish nationalists "never disclosed such views" (Atatürk, 1938, p.19), as any emphasis on "Turkish nationalist sentiment" or any demands in favour of Turkish ethnicity would have jeopardised the "only possible" (Atatürk, 1938, p. 9) outlet to salvage a last refuge for the Empire – a participating State on the losing side in the First World War. So they would have prevented the other Muslim ethnicity's (in fact, the Kurds') participation in the Anatolian war.

Mustafa Kemal, at the beginning of his famous six-day speech of 1927 reviewing the years leading up to the "revolution", unveils the nature of his struggle.

The Ottoman State, its independence, padishah, calip, government, all these were without meaning and consisted of senseless words. ... Gentlemen, in the face of this situation there existed only one possible decision. That was to establish a new Turkish State, unconditionally independent, based on national sovereignty (Atatürk, 1938, p. 9).

These striking words provide an insight into what Kemal actually did: "...in the face of this situation there existed only one possible decision. That was to establish a new Turkish State". Nevertheless, before understanding the extent of the *newness* of the State revised under his leadership or what Kemal meant by describing all of the *old* institutions as "meaningless and nonsense", the "unconditionally independent" character of the "new State" also requires clarification; for it also relates to Turkey's Kurdish Question.

b. Kemal's Initial Proposal

At the beginning of his initiative, Kemal sought "aid" from some great power, implying America, at the Erzurum Congress (July 23 – August 7, 1919). This action is recognised as the first major step in the so-called National Liberation War. He raised the question in Erzurum but astutely avoided mentioning the name because the word "America" was associated, in the popular mind, with the detested proposal of an Armenian State, which would claim annexation of Erzurum.

Yet four weeks later, at the Sivas Congress, the matter – not "American aid" but rather the debate of the *mandate* – was located almost at the centre of the Congress' agenda by Kemal. An emissary (Mr Louis E. Browne, ostensibly the correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News*) of Mr. Charles R. Crane, "whose King-Crane Commission was appointed by the Big Four in Paris to study the mandate question", was sent to the Congress at M. Kemal's request through Ms. Halide Edip.

... The only non-Muslim to attend it, he was well received by Kemal. In a series of talks with him Kemal used the term 'American aid' rather than 'mandate' as being more acceptable to Turkish pride. It should have a social and economic as opposed

to a political character. Asked whether the Congress would pass *a resolution inviting America to take such a mandate*, Kemal replied, 'yes, but added *the crucial reservation*, 'Provided you can assure me that America *will accept it, if offered.'* [italics–A.K.Ö.] Brown expressed doubts as to whether his country would do so. (Kinross, 1964, p. 188).

Kinross also states that M. Kemal envisaged an authoritarian "big brother" relationship at the meeting held with the American General Harbord and his mission, (which arrived in Sivas a week after the end of the Congress) and that the General "replied that no self-respecting nation would accept a mandatory responsibility without complete authority" (Kinross, 1964).

In fact, the historical record shows how the relationship was formed. The "interrelations" between Turkey and the USA after the First World War resemble neither a "big brother" relationship nor a "mandate" nor "only a social and economic" relationship. The nature of relations prove, at least, that Turkey has never been "unconditionally independent" since the triumph of the "National Independence War". Ottoman Turkey was certainly less modernised than Republican Turkey but not less independent considering her sovereign power over a realm stretching across the "three continents" and encompassing peoples of various nationalities and religions.

c. Revolution or Reforms and Revisions?

The term "new" that Kemal employs in describing what he had to do is significant for two reasons. In one sense it is a concession. First, it is a concession because Kemal concedes that the old state was also a bona fide Turkish State. Second, the term is an exaggeration because Kemal did not alter the essential body of the state.

The genuine Turkish-cored Ottoman State was still there, with its powerful structure and deep-rooted traditions. Reforms and transformations in the remaining Ottoman country were substantially targeted at, on the one hand, the assimilation of the Anatolian society, and on the other, at Western modernisation and imitative westernisation. Furthermore, the changes were made for the sake of the consolidation

of the State apparatus and for securing subordinate ethnic entities' (mainly the Kurds') appreciation of the State's Turkicised character.

Some scholars draw attention to this intrinsic feature of the Turkish State (Rustow, 1959; Szyliowicz, 1969 and *et al.*). Among these scholars, Davison's remarks seem to be more instructive. "What Mustafa Kemal did", he states, "was to decapitate the Ottoman Empire. The head of the state was lopped off the Turkish body politic. Two strokes disposed of the Ottoman sultan ... and of the caliphal title that the later sultans had assumed. But much of the body remained". Davison continues to explain the crucial aspect of the *transitional* reforms by referring to Kemal's *Speech*.

> ... He calls the sultanate "a gang of madmen with no ties of conscience or of thought to the fatherland and nation." But he refers without any condemnation or stricture to constitution, cabinet, parliament, election, deputies, vilayet, vali, mutasarrif. These facts of life, these heritages of political concept and institution from the Ottoman Empire, he accepted. (Davison, 1990, p. 243).

One of Davison's asides is more interesting in relation to the essential point of the argument. For unknown reasons, he omits the "backbone" of the argument.

> He [M. Kemal–A.K.Ö.] referred also to the army, another fact of public life inherited from the Empire. Although the army was essential to the state as its bulwark and sometimes its backbone I shall omit it from my discussion. (Davison 1990, p. 260).

Davison means to show the insignificance of the changes that Kemal made within the state structure of the Ottoman Empire during the transition to the Republic, by using the metaphor of "decapitation". But the metaphor is exaggerated because the "head" of the State, as well as the backbone, was in fact still there – indeed, the *old* head was the Subject who was in charge of these very changes. First, the sultanate and the caliphate were actually one institution, because the later sultans had as Davison emphasises, assumed the caliphate. Second, the sultanate itself was not at all a significant institution of the State apparatus, in the sense of functional power, in the

latter decades – if not throughout the whole life – of the Empire. In the Republican era, the "Presidency of the Republic" (*Cumhurbaskanligi*) replaced the sultanate.

The army constitutes the "backbone" of the State structure in any country – but in the Anatolian history of the Turkish State the army's role is additionally important in accordance with the *Turks' nomadic status in the region.*

Almost a century ago, Sir Charles Eliot drew attention to the Turkish army's role: "The Turkish army is not so much a profession, or an institution necessitated by the fears and aims of the Government, as the active but still quiet (*sic*) normal state of the Turkish nation" (Eliot, 1908, pp. 91,93). Eliot suggested that the roots of such a peculiar tradition are to be found in the nomadic origins of the Ottoman Turks.

Ramsaur cites "another writer [who] declared in 1908, 'The whole Ottoman race is an army permanently encamped upon its conquests'" (Ramsaur, 1957, p. 115). Likewise, in his detailed discussion of the Turkish political elite, Frey concludes that all Turkish revolts to date follow a strict tradition of "revolts from above" (Frey, 1965). In addition, the Sultan at the culmination of the *Tanzimat*[1] era who had reigned for the preceding 33 years of the "First Constitutional Revolution", Abdulhamit II, was deposed by the Third Army corps, which arrived from Salonika in 1909 with no signs of resistance. The sultan viewed these events "as the will of God" (Shaw and Shaw, 1977, pp. 281,282). Essentially, the "Second Constitutional Revolution" (1908) had also been executed by the Committee of Union and Progress, for which "Ismet had been working with the Second Army in Adrianople, as Kemal had been working with the Third in Salonika" in co-operation with an "active group of patriotic young officers" – "Fethi, Rauf, Kiazim Karabekir, Rafet, Ali Fuad, Tevfik Rustu, an army doctor, and some others..." (Kinross, 1964, p. 37). These very same names would become the prominent figures of the "Republican Revolution" (Lewis, 1968, p. 247; Selek, 1987, pp. 276,289; Tuncay, 1990, pp. 59-70; Kutlay, 1990, p. 3; Baskaya, 1991, p.36).

The use of the word *"revolution"* by western or non-Turkish scholars to describe Turkish political history is difficult to understand as a sociological term. Two examples: if Frey concludes in his sophisticated study, *The Turkish Political Elite*, (which Lasswell and Lerner cited as the "conclusion of capital importance" in the Foreword) that "all Turkish revolts to date, including the Young Turks, the Atatürk Revolution, and the 'Gentle Coup' of May 27, 1960, ... were revolutions *primarily to*

maintain or enhance the prestige of the state, not essentially to admit a rising new class to power or adjust a society to major economic or social changes" (italics added), why then should he call them "revolutions"? In particular, Kemal's reforms followed not even an ordinary *coup d'état* but a comprehensive reorganisation of the State elite, with the consequent transfer [*tebdil-i mekan*] of necessary governmental officers to Ankara (Baskaya, 1991, p.36) in co-operation with the Istanbul government (Tuncay, 1990, p. 60) due to the desperate needs created by the unpleasant outcomes of World War I. Davison, under his quite reasonable title, "*Atatürk's Reforms: Back to the Roots*", initially writes: "The Republic owes much to the Empire; the Empire also owes much to the Republic, for some concepts and institutions that the Empire developed but could not make workable, the Republic took over and made workable." (Davison, 1990, p. 243). Davison cites Siddik S. Onar's remark that "...The Republic inherited the system, bureaucracy, and schools. Second, the *Tanzimat* created a top-to-bottom provincial administration with the vilayet law of 1864 and its subsequent revisions, again on a European model, which the Republic took over. ..." (*op. cit.* p. 258). Then, by some system of reasoning Davison has come to believe that "...the revolution continues. Its work is not yet done. One might speak of it in terms which historians have used of the great French Revolution of 1789: The Turkish Revolution began long before it occurred, and continued long after it stopped" (*op. cit.* p. 260). If one were to employ the word not metaphorically but literally, then the term *evolution* may well be more explanatory and more plausible for the process of Turkish westernisation or modernisation. These terminological confusions may stem either from sympathies towards Kemal's westernising efforts or from aesthetic concerns. Otherwise, the use of the term "revolution" denotes, as Lasswell and Lerner state, "major economic" and "social changes".

An ordinary English dictionary definition of revolution says the "overthrow of a system of government by force". The Ottoman Army never loosened the ropes of governance and, in the case of the Republican reformers, Kemal's clique had obtained full control of the power to rule from 1908 onwards (Kinross, 1964, p. 29; Shaw and Shaw, 1977, pp. 267,282).

d. The Central Aim of the Efforts

In addition to these social and political reforms, the scholars in this field ironically draw attention to the *central aim* of the Turkish political actors. The aim of a social or political action may best be recognised by its concrete end-results because the *aim*, in large measure, dominates – and consequently manifests itself in – the quality of changes. Through its actions, the aim engenders the factual end-results which should give considerable clues for the researcher to identify the social or political phenomenon. However, scholars of various persuasions share common ground as to the *eventual ends* of the agents of the "Turkish Revolution". They describe these ends as being to either "salvage" or "maintain" or "strengthen" or "enhance" or "keep alive" the existing State apparatus. For instance, several scholars describe the situation as follows:

> The Young Turks who came into power in 1908 were Ottoman Imperialists as much as were the representatives of the previous regime, but, as men of the left, believed in other methods of government and hoped to keep the Empire alive by substituting for autocracy a limited monarchy... (Luke, 1936, p. 153, 154).

> ... they saw reforms as a means of strengthening a dying empire rather than as an end in itself. (Ramsaur, 1957, p. 4).

> ... But the essential point is that most of these reforms were characteristically devoted to securing the grip of the state over the society, ... (Frey, 1965, p. 41).

> ... The actual purpose of the leading cadres of the *Millet* Movement was to revive the collapsing State. ... (Baskaya, 1991, p. 42)

> ... The young officers were little interested in ideologies and social panaceas as such. The fundamental question that concerned them was survival, the survival of the Ottoman state which they and their fathers had for generations served, and both their actions and their discussions revolved around this central problem. *Bu devlet nasil Kurtarilabilir?* – How can this state be saved? (Lewis, 1968, p. 212).

II The Vital Concerns of the Republican Turkish Political Elite: A "National War" Without Nationalism

It should now be easier to understand why Kemal declared the "Ottoman State" to be meaningless, and called the sultanate "a gang of madmen with no ties of conscience or of thought to the fatherland and nation". We can also see why he avoided "any condemnation of or strictures upon constitution, cabinet, parliament, election, deputies, vilayet, vali, mutasarrif" and above all why he did not condemn the State's "backbone", the army. Moreover, we can understand how Kemal managed to triumph in "An Anti-Imperialist War [against a block of imperialists –A.K.Ö.] Without Opposing Imperialists" (Avcioglu, 1977a). Finally, we can see why he did not need to invoke Turkish nationalism in order to motivate the Turkish people for a "Turkish National Liberation War" but, on the contrary, diligently refrained from doing so.

A little further in the *Speech*, Kemal reveals that he has previously disguised his political cause and that he has taken "the only practical and safe road" to achieve his goal:

> It would undoubtedly have been of little advantage if we would have put forward our demands at the very beginning in a resolution of such far-reaching importance. On the contrary, it was necessary to proceed by stages, to prepare the feeling and the spirit of the nation and try to reach our aim by degrees, profiting meanwhile by our experience. This is actually what happened. If our attitude and our action during nine years (referring to the period of direct rule by the CUP, 1909-1918 –A.K.Ö.) are examined in their logical sequence, it is evident from the very first day that our general behaviour has never deviated from the lines laid down in our original resolution, nor from the purpose we had set out to achieve. ... But we never disclosed the views we held. If we had done so we would have been looked upon as dreamers and illusionists. ... The only practical and safe road to success lay in making each step perfectly understood at the right time. ... This was how I acted. (Atatürk, 1938, p. 19; cited by Frey, 1965).

As a result, we cannot find any hint of a nationalistic programme – or even a nationalistic rhetoric – during the "Turkish National Liberation War" or the "Turkish

Revolution" until after the proclamation of the Republic – the culmination of the struggle for survival. Davison suggests that Atatürk's language in the *Speech* – some four years after the proclamation – "is almost pure Tanzimat language" (Davison, 1990, p.260). Baskaya argues that the ideology of Kemal's leadership is nothing more than mere *Tanzimat* Westernism (Baskaya, 1991, pp..29-36). The language of Republican "ideology" is indeed the extension of *Tanzimat* language except for the considerable purging of Arabic, Persian and other vocabularies. This view is shared by many other studies.

In some cases, the Republican "ideology" worsened, as is evident in the 1961 and 1982 constitutions. But the vital point that reveals the roots of the "Turkish Style Kurdish Question", is that the words "Turk", "Turkish", "Turkey" were withdrawn from view, to be replaced by "Fatherland and Nation" (*Vatan ve Millet*) during the years of the Turkish State's Salvation and Survival Struggle (1919-1923).

The dominance of Turkishness erupted in the provinces of Anatolia immediately following the proclamation of the Republic by the "Nationalist" Leadership under Kemal. [The terms *vatan* and *millet* were, of course, deliberately chosen. In particular, "*millet*"[2] is a vague term obscuring the Army's hidden Turkification purposes, as the word is associated with a religious context rather than an ethnic one in the Ottoman Turkish language (Dodd, 1980) as in the "Muslim Nation" (*Müslüman Milleti*)]. In contrast with such obscurity until the safe announcement of the Turkish Republic, the bombardment of Turkishness onto the Kurdish populated regions was extreme, to the extent that Atatürk's famous maxim, "*Happy is the one who call himself a Turk*" was displayed not only on the public squares and the streets of towns and counties, but also on countless rural hillsides with huge lettering made of stone and concrete.

There is one odd question: "How could a National Liberation War be organised, mobilised, executed and brought to fruition over approximately three years (May, 1919–Sept, 1922) by a leadership whose *views* on the 'Holy Cause' *were never disclosed* in the course of struggle; i.e. a leadership without any nationalist propaganda, nationalist slogans, nationalist ideology or a nationalist programme?"

In seeking an answer, I will briefly go through the documents about the fundamental stages of the "National War" and its organisational entities. This war and

its significance underlie the Kurdish Question in Anatolia and, consequently, the nature of the Kurdish movement of "Turkish Kurdistan" and its leadership – the PKK.

a. The Ottoman Committee of Union and Progress

The Committee of Union and Progress (*Ittihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti*) was not vital to the Turkish State's transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic. But the facts of its foundation, organisation, transformation and activities, and especially of its intervention into the State's affairs, illustrate the process of transition.

Both Turkish and non-Turkish observers converge on the importance of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) with respect to the roots of the invention of the Turkish nation. This matter falls substantially outside the realm of this study for it relates to Turkish history, but aspects of the Organisation's nationalism and its composition are crucial to the argument here nonetheless. This is because the seeds of the Republican Turkish State's – but not the Ottoman Empire's – Kurdish question took shape in accordance with the ideological and structural transformation within the "Young Turk" movement during approximately a decade of its history.

CUP's formation took place during the final decade of the nineteenth century. A group of students at the Military Medical School in Istanbul – who became known as the "Young Turks" – tried to set up the committee, which marks the beginning of the movement. Historians and researchers writing after the event have misnamed the "Young Turks" (Ramsaur, 1957, pp. 3-7; Kutlay, 1990, p.4 and *at al*) as was the case for the Ottoman Empire's earlier modernist generation of the *Tanzimat* era (1839-1876) who called themselves "*Yeni Osmanlilar*" (New Ottomans). The official title of the latter is the "*Ottoman* Committee of Union and Progress".

In the basic documents of the CUP we scarcely come across such terms as "Turk", "Turkish" or even "Turkey", though it has been used by western authors "since its (*Anatolia's*–A.K.Ö.) conquest by the Turks in the eleventh century" (Lewis, 1968). The first clear view of the CUP appears in M. Ahmet Riza's article published in the society's journal, *Mechveret*, (Dec. 1895) under the heading, "Our Programme". Ahmet Riza,[3] is counted as being the prime figure with nationalistic sentiments among the principal members of the early group. He took a distant viewpoint on religion due

to the strong influence of Auguste Comte and of his modernist vision. Riza took the post of director of *Mechveret*, the official organ of the CUP. In this first programme, which was "clearly more the work of Ahmet Riza than of the society" (Ramsaur, 1957) we by no means witness any signs of Turkism. The term "young Turk" is mentioned in the programme once, in the sentence concerning foreign readers: "A French supplement will put foreign readers au courant with the tendencies and desires of the Young Turk party". A striking article emerges in the "programme", regarding the party's "ethnic" dimension: "We demand reforms, not especially for this or that province, but for the entire Empire, not in favour of a single nationality, but in favour of all Ottomans, be they Jews, Christians, or Moslems." (Ramsaur, 1957, pp. 22-25). In the language of the programme, the various religious communities are referred to by the term "nationality".

Following the Turkification practices of the Society's first governmental experience (1908), during which Ahmet Riza was the first president of the new Turkish Chamber of Deputies, it became evident that the programme was rather superficial. But at the inception of the society, Turkification was not the real aim of the founders. Further, there was not a Turkish founding member at the first meeting of the Group. Two founder members were Kurds (Abdullah Jevdet and Ishak Sukuti)," the man of "driving spirit Ibrahim Temo was Albanian, and the other, Mehmet Resit, was Caucasian (Cherkez). Yet following several initial meetings, symptoms of the endemic Ottoman tradition of the "Army-Nation" or "revolts from above" started to appear. After a while, the Initiative "rapidly spreads" to "high officials", i.e. army personnel, and climbs "above". In fact, it is gradually taken over by the army.

> Within the Military Medical School the movement spread rapidly and soon overflowed into the other government higher schools in Constantinople, such as the Military Academy (*Harbiye Mektebi*), the Veterinary School (*Baytariye*), the Civil College (*Mülkiye*), which was a school for training government officials, the Naval Academy (*Bahriye*), and the Artillery and Engineering School (*Topcu ve Mühendishane*). (Ramsaur, 1957, pp. 17,18).

Ramsaur elaborates further:

We can only say that in the two or three years prior to 1896 a number of prominent men joined the society and that the leadership commenced to pass into their hands. Chief among these men were Haji Ahmet Efendi, a civil servant in the bureau of accounting of the *Seraskerat* [War Office], ... (1957, p. 21).

The horizontal growth of the society among military officials accelerated dramatically following the take-over of the leadership by 1896 – to the extent that the society became mature enough to schedule a *coup d'état* for August of that year.

The *coup d'état* conspirators who were guilty of treason were exiled by the ruthless Sultan Abdul Hamit, even though procuring their execution would not have been difficult. During the years of the "exile period", throughout Europe, the leadership eliminated the groupings of the subdivided liberal wing, "favouring progress in terms of a decentralised regime, on more democratic principles, and with autonomous rights for the minorities" (Kinross, 1964, p. 34).

It also developed intimate relationships with Freemasonry (Luke, 1936, p. 145-153; Ramsaur, 1957, pp. 103-107; Shaw and Shaw, 1977, p. 265). By the end of this period, the society had opened many branches within the territory of the Empire. These branches were founded by serving high-ranking commanders.[4] In less than two years, Kemal had transferred his society's headquarters and himself to Salonika. He managed this by leaving his post in Damascus at first "without permission", then on the ostensible reason of "recovering his health" and in the end having secured "official permission". And within this time he had accomplished the "fusion" of *Fatherland and Liberty* and the CUP, based in Paris. Just eleven months after the *fusion* of the societies, the "Young Turk Revolution" – the revolution "without any real revolution" (Shaw and Shaw, 1977) – took place as a result of the *threat* of a "revolt from above" by the Third Army Corps in Salonika (July 1908). The "revolution" was seen through without any sign of opposition from almost *twenty* other Army Corps in the enormous Ottoman State.

Sultan Abdul Hamit was compelled to reinforce the constitution of 1876, to suspend the parliament and "for all practical purposes" to give up most of his powers. A year later, the Sultan was deposed after a thirty-three year reign, due to a "counter-revolutionary" plot involving "the murder – supposedly at the hands of the Committee [of Union and Progress–A.K.Ö] – of the insignificant editor of a liberal newspaper"

(Kinross, 1964, p. 34). Thus, the years of the direct rule of the *Party* of Union and Progress commenced, to which M. Kemal would later refer to as "our experience of nine years", in the Speech of 1927. He considered these years to be the only guide of his action during the period of the Salvation War.

Among the seven articles of the "fusion" declaration we still do not see any evidence of Turkism. It had even withered away a little in comparison with the first programme, in spite of the far stronger consolidation of the Turkish core of the CUP. In the last article, "Turkish" and French are mentioned as the languages of the society's "instruments of public dissemination", *Surayi Ümmet* and *Mechveret*. The "revolution" unexpectedly motivated the Christian peoples of Balkans.

> ... The Revolution, far from arresting the disintegration of the Empire, as the Young Turks hoped, at once accelerated it. The response was in effect a Balkan counter-revolution. Within a bare three months of the establishment of the Constitution, Bulgaria proclaimed her independence; within the same week, Austria annexed the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Crete voted for union with Greece. (Kinross, 1964, p. 31).

Nevertheless, the revolution did not have similar effects on Muslim nationalities because of Islam being the State's official religion. The level of societal development (in terms of national consciousness and of its structural equivalence in terms of its organisational dimension) was not comparable with the peoples of Balkans. Kemal was well aware of this phenomenon. Therefore, he rightly did not lose his hopes of profiting from the predominantly Islamic ethnicity of Anatolia (Kurds) and never underestimated the "experiences of nine years" of the CUP's rule. He proceeded "by stages" along the pathway to the goal they had set out from the very first day of the Republican struggle. The leadership did not by any manner of means invoke Turkish nationalism. They did not need to use it, either prior to or throughout the "Turkish National Liberation and Independence" war. More importantly, just the opposite – the concealment of nationalist envisages – was vitally necessary. This is apparent without exception in the language of all the documents of the CUP's history. The deep concern in Kemal's overall tactics throughout the struggle for the Holy Cause was to perpetuate the survival of the State as the last refuge of the Ottoman Empire.

b. The Steps Subsequent to the CUP's Experience

The principal primary steps – which Kemal calls "stages" – of the struggle and its declarations were as follows:

Amasya Protocol (21 June 1919). The protocol was constructed and signed by Mustafa Kemal, Rauf Orbay, Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Rafet Bele, Kazim Karabekir[5] (Shaw and Shaw, 1977, p. 344) with no reaction from the rest of the Ottoman Army. The seven articles of the protocol, largely considered to be the "Declaration of Independence of the Turkish Nation", do not mention words *Turk, Turkish, Turkey* (Kirisçi and Winrow, 1997, p. 92). Likewise, these words do not appear in the three articles of the telegram distributed to a number of civil and military authorities (Lewis, 1961, p.247). Nothing more explicit than *Fatherland* and *Nation* is used to express the ethnic or national aspects of the struggle.

Erzurum Congress (July 23–August 7, 1919). This, as an initial step, was held with *54* delegates of the eastern provinces, including a large number of Kurdish tribal and religious leaders (Selek, 1987, p.276) in Erzurum, "the 'capital' of eastern Turkey" (Kinross, 1964). One is struck by the strict diligence in refraining from the use of any term that may be associated with Turkishness throughout the ten-point resolution, which later came to be known as National Pact (*Misak-i Milli*). The repeated emphasis on preserving "the integrity of the Fatherland and Nation (*Vatan ve Millet*)", and on the "defence and protection of the sultanate and caliphate" is also very clear in the ten articles (Shaw and Shaw, 1977).

Sivas Congress (September, 4–11, 1919). The congress opened with the participation of *39* delegates from all over the regions of the *Vatan* (Fatherland), including far-off Thrace. At Sivas, the aim was to extrapolate the decisions taken at the Erzurum Congress to cover the whole country. Although the aims discussed at Sivas were not as clear as they were at Erzurum, the Congress reaffirmed its loyalty to the Sultan along with the well-worn rhetoric of "Fatherland and Nation". The first sentence of the oath taken by delegates was "I shall follow no personal interest or ambition but the salvation and peace of my Fatherland and nation" (Kinross, 1964, p187). In the telegram which was sent to the Sultan by the participating army commanders at the end of the congress, they were "begging him to 'deign to order the

formation of a new government, loyal and respectful of the privileges of Your Majesty and of the Caliphate' " (Lewis, 1961, p.249).

Grand National Assembly. The last resolution of the Erzurum Congress entrusted the Representative Committee (*Heyet-i Temsiliye*) it had elected with the task of establishing "national unity on all levels". This task was also approved at the following Sivas Congress. The Committee accomplished the task in seven months, and the so-called "first phase of the National Independence War" culminated in the announcement of the Grand National Assembly in Ankara (April 23, 1920), with the participation of 120 deputies chosen by countrywide branches of "The Society to Defend the Rights of Anatolia and Rumeli" (the renamed state of the CUP). The deputies included a large number of Istanbul Parliament members (Selek, 1987, p.341). In the debates and resolutions of the Assembly's first, second and following days reflected in the recorded sources, words associated with Turkishness were totally excluded from its language (Komal, 1975; Shaw and Shaw, 1977; Besikci, 1969b; Selek, 1987). Even the Assembly gathered with no pre-determined name with which the Law of Treason –*Buyuk Millet Meclisi* (Selek, 1987, p.344) could acknowledge Assembly members. The word *Tükiye* (Turkey) was added afterwards. Particularly in the early days of the Assembly, M. Kemal emphasised the loftiness of the CUP's multi-ethnic composition (Barkey and Fuller, 1998, p. 9). In a speech given in May 1920, Kemal explicitly highlighted this ethnic assortment.

> The individuals which constitute our Assembly are not only Turk, or Kurd, or Laz, or Cerkez; but the components of the *Nation of Islam* composed of all. It is a sincere community. Consequently, the nation that we strive to defend and protect does not consist of single element. It is composed of various Muslim nations [italics added].
> (Atatürk, 1952, p. 28).

The Lausanne Conference. In a session on 23 January 1923, while the Ankara Government representative Ismet Inonu was conveying the official view of the Turkish State, he reduced the national components of the Government and the Assembly to two fundamental equals.

The government of the Grand National Assembly is also the government of the Kurds as much as of the Turks. This is because the bona fide and legitimate representatives of the Kurds have taken part in the National Assembly, and have been enjoying the right to participate in the government and to rule the country (Besikci, 1969b, p. 399).

Later in the negotiation - in response to the British delegation which accused Turkey of rejecting the Kurds' demands for autonomy - Inonu considered such a position to be humiliating for the Kurdish people: "... the rights which claimed to be given to the peoples of so-called autonomous territories will by no means satisfy a people of such noble descent as the Kurds" (*op. cit.* p.401).

Yet in the course of the discussions referring to the Treaty of Sévres, the question of the Kurds' aspiration for an independent state was at issue, and the Conference decided to gauge the opinions of the Kurdish members of the Assembly by telegram. M. Kemal gathered the responses of Kudish deputies in a secret session and telegraphed them back to the conference at once. In this secret session, H. Anvi Bey, deputy for Erzurum, stated in the presence of Kemal: "This country belongs to the Kurds and the Turks. Only these two nations have the right to speak on this platform: the Turkish and the Kurdish nation" (Hasretyan, 1995, p.76). Similar categorical statements taken from many other Kurds in the Assembly – such as " Kurds never think of separation from Turks" or "We Kurds and Turks are brothers, we do not want to separate, there exists no difference between us" – were submitted to the conference. As a result, the articles concerning the issue took shape, and the *Lausanne Conference* signed a peace treaty on July 24, 1923. In the treaty, Turkey was entitled to the "legitimate right" to deny (Nikitin, 1986) not just the Kurdish national share of victory against *gawurs* (non-Muslims), but also the very existence of Kurds as an ethnic entity.

The Constitution of 1924. Just three months after the signatures at Lausanne, the Grand National Assembly declared the "Republic of Turkey". The following year it accepted the new constitution. The bombardment of Turkishness onto the Kurdish population and the landscape began to manifest itself in the Constitution, which insisted that "anyone who is a citizen of the Turkish Republic" is a Turk. Article 88 of

the constitution was clear: *Inhabitants of Turkey shall be deemed to be Turkish irrespective of their religion and race.*

In the 1924 constitution, the terms "citizenship" and "citizen" had been equated with Turkishness. Accordingly, the document stated that one had to be a Turk to become a member of parliament and the like. Certainly the Kurds could qualify as "Turks," but only at the expense of denying their own ethnic identity. Here then the seeds for eventual Kurdish dissatisfaction were planted: In a state now officially defined as "Turkish" the Kurds were not Turks, and only by giving up their ethnicity could they be treated as Turks. (Barkey and Fuller, 1998, p. 10).

From here onwards, there was a flow of "scientific works" by professors, demonstrating the origins of the Kurds. These books mainly agreed on the Kurds' identity as "Mountain Turks" because of the "kirt-Kürt" sounds heard when walking on the frozen surface of snow on the mountains. Accordingly, the "K" pages of Turkish dictionaries were rewritten (Chaliand, 1980, p.58). The explanation of the word "Kurd" in an encyclopaedic dictionary published in 1971 is worth translating: "A community composed of Turks who have largely changed their language, speak a broken Persian and inhabit Turkey, Iran and Iraq; and an individual who belongs to this community". In others, terms associated with Kurds were entirely withdrawn from the pages.

This "new ideology" and policy of the "new" Turkish State managed to hide the Kurdish question for half a century – causing social pathologies intensified. These pathologies eventually led the most recent constitution of 1982 to be the first constitution which bans mother tongues. The pathologies also led the Kurds of East Anatolia to give birth to the PKK.

No language other than Turkish shall be thought of as a mother tongue to Turkish citizens at any institutions of training or education (Article 42.).

Kurdistan is the place where humanity itself fades away in its most solid form. ... if in some place humanity descends so sharply and deeply, then the concomitant rise of humanity will be as strong and splendid (A. Öcalan in Küciik, 1993, p.125).

III The Sharp Contrast between the Two Policies

a. The Nature of the Battle

Turks and Kurds fought together against *"gavurs"*[6] in the Turko-Greek war[7], subsequently known as the "National Independence War of the Turkish Nation". The spokesman of the Ankara government at Lausanne, Ismet Inonu, had to emphasise the Kurds' cotribution carefully.

> Our delegation deems it our task to convey the great emphasis placed by all commanders of the Turkish Army, who participated in both the Great War and the Independence War, on their full respect and adoration for the Kurdish People's service and self-sacrifice. ... against the Greek invasion, as in the various fronts of Anatolia which was under the intensive attacks of our enemies, Kurds and Turks worked in perfect co-operation with one another for the common purpose and the ideal (Besikci, 1969b, pp.400,401).

Kurds fought for the salvation of the *ummet* (Muslim nation) enthusiastically, but the veiled and disguised purpose of the Ottoman elite was quite distinct – to keep the dying Empire alive in the last refuge. Or, as Bernard Lewis (1968) formulated the question: *Bu devlet nasil Kurtarilabilir?* How can this state be saved?

The saved Turkish State had by no means been involved in a war of National Liberation or Independence. Turks did fight – again together with Kurds – against Imperial powers (Allies) between 1914 and 1918, but no one talks about a National War of Independence in these years. The years from here onwards became the stages of the Turko-Greek rivalry. At the Aegean (West Anatolia) Congress, held in Alasehir a week after the Greek offensive at Izmir (23 August 1919), a telegram was sent to the British General Milne on full approval of all delegates. It emphasised that *no one among them thought of opposing the Allies* and added that "if certain needs necessitate the invasion of Izmir, we will appreciate it if it is accomplished by the Allies' humane and civilised army instead of the cruel Greek army" (Avcioglu, 1977, pp. 21,22). The victorious Allies' plans to dismember the Ottoman State had become nonsense, even dangerous, due to the unexpected occurrence of the Great October Revolution. From

this angle, some scholars have stated that the Turkish War "of Independence" with the Greeks and Armenians was in fact a diplomatic continuation of the First World War, in the sense that it constructed barriers against Bolshevik Soviet expansion (Baskaya, 1991, pp.29-44). That is to say, "the First World War ended in 1923" (Keyder, 1989, p.61).

Years later, in his statement released on the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation, Inonu revealed that "the success of the Independence Struggle had essentially become feasible after Britain compelled other Allied nations to accept it (Baskaya, 1991, p. 33). Over and above, its *Turko-Greek* character, the scale of the "private" war has been exaggerated. The total number of deaths in the frontline of the war was 9,167, whereas a loss of 22,543 lives was recorded in these very same years as a consequence of various diseases (Baskaya, 1991, p. 47).

In addition, a "Civil War", which usually follows national struggles, did not exist at all in the Turkish case. The two substantial components [*Yesil Ordu* (Green Army) and the guerrilla forces led by Cerkez Ethem] of the *Kuva-yi Milliye* (National Forces) – which operated against the non-Muslim civilians of Anatolia for some time after the Greek invasion of Izmir – were completely eliminated without hesitation by late 1921, two years before the declaration of the Republic (Shaw and Shaw, 1977, pp.352, 353).

As well as the victorious Allies' share in the Ottoman Republic, the contribution of Freemasonry to the Turkish Cause is certainly worth a mention. I have to exclude the large body of literature that searches for the roots of the "Turkish Revolution" in the "world-revolutionary conspiracy" of the Freemasons for it falls outside of my realm of study. However, the words of a prominent figure in the CUP, Refik Bey, in an interview with a Paris newspaper, tell us something about the extent of the Freemasons' part in the rise of "Turkishness" in Anatolia: "It is true we found moral support in Freemasonry, especially in Italian Freemasonry". They "rendered us real service and offered us a refuge. We met there as Masons, for many of us are Freemasons, but in reality we met to organise ourselves. Besides, we chose a great part of our comrades from these lodges, ..." (Ramsaur, 1957, p. 107). That is, the arguments revolving around the international network of Masonry's contribution to the *nationalismless* "national" triumph of Turks are significant.

b. The Seeds of the Question are Planted

Despite all, the surviving Empire did invent a Turkish nation, no matter how paradoxically it was manufactured and constructed following the "astute" war with its neighbouring non-Muslim nations (Greeks in the West, Armenians in East Anatolia). The paradox does not arise out the triumph of Ottoman elite saving the Ottoman State, without employing nationalist ideology and agitation, from the Allies' attempts to dismember her. The fact which engendered the paradox of Turkish nation-building –and which simultaneously planted the seeds of Turkey's Kurdish question– is that the Turkish imitation of the "nation-state" did not come into existence following a *national movement* which was socially based on either the bourgeoisie's or the people's national demands, but an existing state's Salvation War led by its existing military body, based on the support of the Muslim peoples (mainly Turks and Kurds) of Anatolia with fundamental religious concerns. Accordingly, the operating state elite constructed a careful contrast between the policies prior to and after the proclamation of the Republic of Turkey. In sharp contrast with the former period's "intimate brotherhood," when "distinct components of the Muslim nation" considered *"How this state can be saved"*, the consistent policy of the latter period, from 1923 to today, was to somehow manufacture a "single-bodied" *Turkish Nation* out of many Muslim entities, who questioned *"How can this state survive?"*. Thus, the Turkish national identity "was hardly posed as 'Who are the Turks?' but rather as 'Who and/or how are the Turks going to be?'." (Kadioglu, 1996). Naturally, the envisaged Turkishness would basically emerge from Turks and Kurds, because of the demographic and religious reality of the "raw materials" of Anatolia.

Ismet Inonu, firmly stated that "The government of the Grand National Assembly is also the government of the Kurds as much as of the Turks". Only two years later, in 1925, Inonu's position was the extreme opposite.

> ... In the face of a Turkish majority other elements have no kind of influence. We must turkify the inhabitants of our land at any price, and we will annihilate those who oppose the Turks or "le turquisme". (Simsir, 1991, p.58).

In 1930, Mahmut Esat BozKurt, the Minister of Justice, was more confident when he was talking to a crowd in the presence of the press.

> We live in a country called Turkey, the freest in the world. As your deputy, I feel I
> can express my real convictions without reserve: I believe that the Turk must be
> the only lord, the only master of this country. Those who are not of pure Turkish
> stock can have only one right in this country, the right to be servants and slaves.
> (Kendal in Chaliand, 1993, p. 56).

The way in which Turkish nation-building was conducted, in the context of the demographic reality of the new Turkey, left no ideological exit for the Ottoman elite: Atatürk Nationalism (*Atatürk Milliyetciligi*) was to be formulated by Kemal's well-known maxim, *"Ne Mutlu Türküm diyene"*. Happy is the one who *calls himself* (not who *is* – A.K.Ö.) a Turk. In other words, the happy ones are not original Turks but Turks with other origins, or as a matter of fact, the "Turks of Kurdish origin" in view of the demographic map of Anatolia. On the other hand, the "invention" was, in certain respects, a remoulded extension of Ottoman's profound tradition of recruiting *devsirmes*[8] and *dönmes*[9]. A "remedy" would thus necessitate a categorical denial of the ethnic existence of Kurds (who populate almost one-quarter of the whole country) and their spiritual elements: name, language, culture, history etc. So, the Kurds became "mountain Turks", Kurdish "broken Persian", Kurdistan "the South East" and the Kurdish question "the South East question". As a result, the regularly repeated rhetoric of the State's official view "demonstrates" the absence of the question as well as the absence of Kurdish material and spiritual existence. Of course, every Kurd "can be a businessman, a professor, a governor, the Prime Minister, even the President of the State" providing he is happy to call himself a Turk, and thus happy being doomed to deny his/her own identity. In explanation of the phenomenon, Besikci makes a comparison between South Africa and Turkey.

> In South Africa, the Apartheid policy essentially tended to say "You blacks do not
> resemble us, you are bad, you therefore should not join us". But Turkey tells
> Kurds "you are us, you should live with us as Turks, you must resemble us". This
> racism is much more destructive than the "you do not resemble us, you then should

live separately" type of racism. This is Turkish-style racism. (Besikci, in *Serxwebun*, 1998, issue 199, p. 6).

Hobsbawm quotes from Ernest Renan: "Getting its history wrong is part of being a nation." And he adds: "Historians are professionally obliged not to get it wrong, or at least to make an effort not to". In the case of Anatolian Kurdistan, "where human beings have such deformed and destroyed personalities" (Balli, 1991, pp.15, 16), not only the historical record but also the social consequences of this history stretch very far beyond that. It seems to me that genuine historians, sociologists and psychologists have encountered an inverted phenomenon.

Since the inception of his struggle, Öcalan's distinct approach to both his own people and the Turkish State might be the very result of apprehending this fact. As he frequently repeats: "the Kurdish people is a *düsürülmüs* [degenerated/debased] people". Or as he suggests at the outset

We are the movement responsible for repositioning justice from its *basasagi* (upside-down) position (Öcalan, 1986).

However, from the proclamation of the Republic onwards, the process of inventing the Turkish nation is not dissimilar to fellow processes that occurred in the "native land" of nations –Europe. Turkey, in effect, has endeavoured to imitate the experience of France as a typical example of nation-building. The new Turkish State with its new solid Turkish nationalism has invented the Turkish nation precisely according the generalisations of Gelner, Hobsbawm[10] and many other scholars. What was unusual and unworkable, and what has consequently become the real "seed" of Turkey's Kurdish question was the historical state of the ethnic nature of Turks and Kurds, and their form of interrelation throughout the Ottoman rule. Kurds were not assimilable, due to their deep-rooted cultural existence and indigenous large population with a homogeneous demography, and Turkey could then not "digest" them. True, the state of the Kurds under the Ottomans was subordinated and far more backward to the Turks politically and socially, but they were nevertheless more than semiautonomous in their home affairs. And, in addition –probably more importantly with respect to the

particularity of Turkey's Kurdish question– the Kurds had taken a significant part in the "liberation war" of the Ottoman State and its transformation into a Republic.

Notes

[1] *Tanzimat* (reformation or reorganisation) is the term employed for political reforms introduced by Sultan Abdulmejit in 1839, which were applicable to the era followed.

[2] The word *millet* is also used in daily language to mean "nation" but it rather denotes the "people".

[3] Ahmet Riza was son of an Austrian mother and a father with Anglophile tendencies – who was consequently called "*Ingiliz* (English) *Ali*".

[4] For example, M. Kemal founded the *Fatherland and Liberty Society* while he was Commander of the Fifth Army in Damascus. The *Ottoman Liberty Society* was led by Talat Bey, a local postal officer who later become a major Young Turk figure, Cemil Bey, adjutant to the military governor of Macedonia, and some other high officials of the Third Army; and others did likewise in Jerusalem and Jaffa (Shaw and Shaw, 1977, p. 265; Lewis, 1968, p. 205).

[5] The positions of signatories other than M. Kemal were as follows: Rauf Orbay, former minister of the navy and Ottoman delegate to Mondros; Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Commander at Ankara; Rafet Bele, commander of several corps in north Anatolia; Kazim Karabekir, the Fifteenth Army Corps commander in the East.

[6] *Gavur* is a derogatory term for non-Muslims in the Turkish and Kurdish languages

[7] The Turko-Greek war was "pronounced to be a private war between Greece and Turkish Nationalists" (Luke, 1936, p. 175) by the Allies at the London Conference of March 1921.

[8] *Devsirme* is the term used to denote convert non-Muslims (Davison, 1990, pp.13-17).

[9] *Dönmes* is the Turkish word for converted Sephardic Jews, (Ramsaur, 1957, p.96).

[10] "Nations do not make states and nationalisms but the other way round" (Hobsbawm, 1990, p. 10) or "Nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist" (Gerllner, 1964, p. 168).

Chapter 3

ENTER THE PKK

To further provide a context for the study of the Organisation's growth, we have to look at the ground in which the phenomenon was rooted. In this chapter, the PKK's development from a group of housemates (early 1970s) to the founding congress of the Party (1978) will be looked at in perspective.

I The Accumulative Period

According to Turkish State officials, the offensive launched by the PKK on 15 August 1984 was the work of a "bunch of bandits". The offensive was later considered to be the "29th revolt", which would be smashed in weeks or months just like the preceding 28 attempts. The most recent revolt, "the 28th", took place in *Dersim* province in 1937-38 and was over in less than six months – the longest one to date.

But the 29th revolt sparked a destructive 15-year war (1984-1999). The revolt took place after a period of relatively uninterrupted peace. Its political and social ramifications extended far beyond Kurdish and Turkish territories.

a. The Silent Decades

The sudden appearance of the *Turkic* face of the "new state" – the translation of the pre-republic terms *vatan* (fatherland) and *millet* (nation) into Turkish and the negation of Kurdishness following the proclamation of the republic – engendered three big Kurdish armed uprisings in 1925, 1930 and 1937, all led either by religious figures or

tribal chieftains. Their suppression by the "Young Republic" took no more than several months in each case. The quiet years followed the suppression of the 1938 and continued until the 1960s.

The crushing of the 1938 Dersim Revolt was designed by the authorities to be an unforgettable lesson for future generations. A guidebook published by the Governor and army commander of Dersim described how to destroy a village in an artillery attack and how to burn down individual houses (*Göktas*, 1991, pp.140,141). Indiscriminate massacres, massive deportations and the elimination of anything that might be associated with Kurdishness – all of these were used to intimidate the population into silence, submission and obedience. The effects lasted for at least three decades.

A paragraph in a report by Osman Mete, correspondent for *Son Posta*, the Turkish paper of the time, details these effects some ten years after the suppression of the Dersim rebellion.

I went to Tunc Elli, the old Dersim. The place was desolate. Tax collectors and policemen are still the only state officials the people have ever seen. I tried to meet people, to get to know their way of life, their spirit. But unfortunately very little remains from the period before the revolt. There are no more artisans, no more culture, no more trade. I met unoccupied people whose whole life now seemed to revolve around a flock of a hundred goats. No trace of civilisation has yet penetrated the area. There are no schools, no doctors. The people do not even know what the word "medicine" means. If you speak to them of government, they translate it immediately as tax collectors and policemen. ... (*Son Posta*, April 1948).

Following the Second World War, the military "republic" led by Kemal's successor, Ismet Inönü, felt obliged to give its regime a democratic facade. Inönü, the *Milli Sef* (National Leader), liberalised the regime to a limited extent, so that it could be deemed a "multiparty parliamentary system". This led to the founding of several political parties in 1946. In the Republic's first general election (1950), the Democratic Party backed by the bourgeoisie came to power on a wave of popular support by pooling more than 50 percent of the votes. Led by bourgeois landlord Adnan Menderes, the Democratic Party ruled Turkey for 10 years. This "Menderes period", with its limited

anti-military and/or anti-Kemalist initiatives, was undoubtedly a considerable move forward for Turkey. Yet the Kurdish issue remained marginal. The appearance of a small number of *"Dogucu"* (Eastist) publications in these years, demanding desperately infrastructural developments in the "East" (that is, Kurdish territories), was an isolated example of the coverage of Kurdish concerns. These documents did little to lift the pall of silence, which had descended over the Kurds following the ruthless oppression of the thirties.

However, the "backbone" of the state, the military body, could not endure the modest attempts of the bourgeoisie at self-rule and liberalisation for more than 10 years. On 27 May 1960, the rule of the Republic's first civilian party was ended by a military *coup d'état* led by the chief of staff, Cemal Gürsel. Prime Minister Menderes and two ministers of his cabinet were executed for infringements of the constitution. "The Committee of National Unity" composed of the principal participants in the coup took over the government of the country for almost a year and a half until the elections. It then handed power to a "civilian government" – which must have learnt its lesson well – with the new constitution of 1961. The Gürsel coup d'état is known as the "27 May Revolution" in Turkish Republican history.

b. The Emergence of the Turkish Left through the Democratic "Gaps" of the Coup

Ironically, the soldiers' new constitution introduced the society to some important democratic rights – probably as a symbolic manifestation of the Ottoman tradition of "revolts from above" (Frey, 1965), or in Kemal's words: "If communism is needed for this country, *we* will bring it". Among the new rights were public freedom of expression, press freedom, the right to organise public meetings and demonstrations, and the right to form trade unions and associations. (Turkish Constitution of 1961, articles 20, 23, 24, 25, 28). Moreover, by 1963, ambitious and progressive interpretations of some articles had led to the granting of the right of strike and to make collective agreements.

After the constitution was pushed through, three political parties were founded – including the Workers Party of Turkey[1]. This party attracted people's attention, and

constituted a parliamentary group in the National Assembly with 15 MPs after the 1965 elections. In the 1960s, some other leftist political factions and trade unions emerged. But such democratic liberties did not apply to the Kurds. Several "pro-East" Turkish and bilingual publications were banned as soon as they appeared, and after the declaration of the Republic, the monthly magazine *Yeni Akis* (The New Current), which used the term "Kurdish people" for the first time, was banned in 1966. When its fourth issue was published, the editor was imprisoned for writing "the Kurdish people".

After the launch of an armed struggle by southern Kurds in the north of Iraq, Cemal Gürsel, leader of the military coup, stated his position on the probable aspirations of the "mountain Turks" of Turkey who might think of benefiting from some democratic articles in his constitution. "If the mountain Turks do not keep quiet, the army will not hesitate to bomb their towns and villages into the ground. There will be such a bloodbath that they and their country will be washed away." (Chaliand, 1980, p. 65).

Despite all the obstacles, the Kurds did manage to benefit from the limited democratisation in the 1960s. In addition to the emergence of various radical leftist groupings gathered around certain publications and youth associations, a few public associations led by *Kürtcü* (Kurdist) intellectuals of aristocratic or feudal origins also arose towards the 1970s. While Kurds attempted to raise the "Eastern Question" in spite of the clear warning by the leader of the "democratic junta" General Gürsel, many other threats appeared from *civilian* sources on the pages of various papers and magazines. Kendal talks of more than twenty such articles and cites a paragraph published in June 1967 issue of the "nationalist" journal *Ötüken*, by Nihal Atsiz, one of the authors:

If they [the Kurds] want to carry on speaking a primitive language with vocabularies of only four or five hundred words, if they want to create their own state and publish what they like, let them go and do it somewhere else. We Turks have shed rivers of blood to take possession of these lands; we had to uproot Georgians, Armenians and Byzantine Greeks...Let them go off where ever they want, to Iran, to Pakistan, to India, or to join Barzani. Let them ask the United Nations to find them a homeland in Africa. The Turkish race is very patient, but

when it is really angered it is like a roaring lion and nothing can stop it. Let them
ask the Armenians who we are, and let them draw the appropriate conclusions.
(Kendal in Chaliand, 1980, p.77).

By the late 1960s, opposition movements increased in size and influence, coinciding
with a wave of student movements in the West. As well as moderate socialist trade
unions and student and youth organisations, professional associations of teachers,
medical doctors, engineers, public officers and even police officers emerged
throughout Turkey, all of which expressed disenchantment with the system. Soon, the
Workers Party of Turkey (TIP) began to suffer from internal conflicts – which started
to split into factions after 1969. These included moderate "parliamentarists" and
radical "Leninists", as well as the "Turkish Left" and "Kurdish Left".

Even if the Party carried a motion on the Kurdish question, which later caused
it to be banned, the "Eastist" figures in the Party acted separately. The faction known
as the "Eastern Group" had organised *"Dogu Mitingleri"* (East Meetings) in the
principal towns of Kurdistan in 1967. The Group later evolved into a "Kurdish"
political circle.[2] Meanwhile, in 1969, a series of mass and/or youth associations were
set up by various patriotic Kurdish figures from mainly aristocratic and feudal
backgrounds.

These associations initially operated in the two largest metropolises of Turkey,
Istanbul and Ankara, then in several main towns in the "East". These groups were
influenced more by the Kurdish armed struggle under Mustafa Barzani's KDP in the
south, than by the Turkish socialist factions. Associations named DDKO (Eastern
Revolutionary Culture Guilds) were embracing organisations for the emerging Kurdish
nationalists in Turkey, as was the Turkish Workers Party (TIP). Consequently, the
disintegration of the Turkish Workers Party led to the formation of a dozen pro-
Kurdish organisations in the 1970s (Imset, 1992, pp. 379-406).

c. The Radical Tradition of Youth Movements

While the TIP was striving to benefit from any democratic "gaps" in the 1961
constitution for a socialist orientation in Turkey, the Turkish youth organisation, DEV-

GENC, influenced by the tradition of the Latin American revolutionaries (and later by the Chinese and Vietnamese revolutionaries), became widely known and organised strikes all over the country. This organisation evolved out of the earlier Federation of Debating Clubs (FKF). The Federation of these debating societies originally came into being in 1965 "as a side-arm of the *Türkiye Isci Partisi* (TIP)" and was modified into the Federation of Revolutionary Youth (DEV-GENC) in October 1969 (Imset, 1992, p. 407).

The DEV-GENC was a movement organised in reaction to the TIP's parliamentarist and pro-Soviet policies – and its militants were aggressively critical of the "pacifist" and "stencilist" practices of the Workers' Party. They initially got involved in violent activities against the State backed armed militias of the MHP (Nationalist Action Party) and they later formed the armed organisations of various political mainstream movements, whose members were trained in Palestinian camps. The three radical "adventurer" mainstream groups of the Turkish pro-Marxist left had appeared under different names and leaders by the end of 1970, and they provided fertile ground for the cleavages of many further factions during the rest of the 1970s:

1) The Popular Liberation Party of Turkey (THKP) under Mahir Cayan remained an imitator of the Latin American revolutionaries, in particular Che Guevara, and was quite critical of the socialist powers of the time, the USSR and China;

2) The Popular Liberation Army of Turkey (THKO) under Deniz Gezmis adopted the oppositional policies of Eastern European socialist states against the Soviet Union, particularly the policies of Albania;

3) The Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist-Leninist (TKP/ML) under Ibrahim Kaypakkaya affiliated itself to Mao's China.

Abdullah Öcalan, the founder and leader of the PKK, was a sympathiser with the THKP and its leader Mahir Cayan until 1973.

The Organisations of the "Kurdish Left" were, Olson rightly states, offshoots of three political trends: the Democratic Party of Kurdistan–Iraq (KDP), the Workers Party of Turkey (TIP) and the DEV-GENC (Olson, 1996, p. 22). But there is a vital detail missing from Olson's valuable work, *"The Kurdish National Movement in the 1990s"*: namely that, while more than 20 Kurdish parties or party-like political configurations in Turkish-ruled Kurdistan stemmed from either the TIP or DDKO (in fact the KDP of Northern Iraq) or both, the PKK alone originated from the DEV-

GENC – or more accurately from its further sub-faction, the DHKP, or later the DHKP-C. Öcalan explains his position as a "very ordinary sympathiser" as being the cause of his escape from the "sword" of the Military Intervention in 1971 (Öcalan, 1995a, p. 40).

II The Emergence of the "*Apocular*"[3] Group

a. The Army Marches in Again

Due to the rapid growth of legal and illegal pro-Marxist organisations, the Army believed that civilians were once again meddling dangerously with the "democratisation opportunities" they had been presented with. On 12 March 1971, the Chef of Staff of the Turkish Armed Forces overthrew the Demirel[4] government, which was considered to be a successor to Menderes' mainstream government. A state of emergency was imposed, associations of all sorts were dissolved, the Workers' Party (TIP) was banned, the right to strike suspended, ongoing strikes were ended and widespread arrests of politicians and "extreme" activists took place.

The "Adventurer" Left did not intend to surrender and attempted to initiate an armed struggle against the "oligarchic" or " the "boss-lord" state. But their romantic aspirations were at odds with reality. Deniz Gezmis, leader of the THKO, and other leading members of the organisation were captured or killed in various clashes.

Gezmis and his two closest comrades, Yusuf Aslan and Huseyin Inan, were hanged on 6 May 1972. Mahir Cayan, eight leading militants of his party (the THKP-C), two prominent members of Gezmis' organisation (the THKP) and three English radar technicians were surrounded on 30 March 1972 in a house in Kizildere[5]. The foreign technicians were being held as hostages for the purpose of preventing the execution of Gezmis and his two friends. All the occupants of the house were killed by rockets and bombs, including three English staff from the military base in Turkey. Only Ertugrul Kürkcü, who met and interviewed Öcalan in Damascus twenty-two years after the event (Öcalan, 1995a), survived. Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, the leader of the TKP/ML, died on 18 May 1973 in Diyarbakir Prison "under torture" according to

leftist circles, but official documents describe him "committing suicide" (Imset, 1992, p. 437).

However, the Turkish Army handed over power to the government formed following elections held in October 1973, as they had done on the earlier occasion – probably feeling that they had successfully re-established law and order.

b. The Impact of Particular Events on Öcalan's Leadership

On 7 April 1971, Öcalan was arrested in Ankara and imprisoned for seven months, after being found guilty of taking part in an illegal protest against the Kizildere Massacre in the Political Science Faculty of Ankara. Öcalan's political adventures began on a personal level with the Kizildere Massacre. Öcalan was released from Mamak Prison in October 1972.

In an interview, Öcalan "naïvely" replies to a question about the beginning of his story.

> If the "Defeat of 71" have not occurred in the form of Kizildere, I would have remained a good sympathiser or member of the DHKP-C at the very most; I could not have ventured on structuring a new theory. ... The emergence of myself would have been impossible if Kizildere had not happened. (Yüce, 1997, p. 188)

In the course of the interview with Ertugrul Kürkcü, the only person who survived in Kizildere, Öcalan refers to the impression made on him by the execution of the THKO leaders while he was in Mamak prison: "They fell into earth, and we sprouted from there" (Öcalan, 1995a, p.42). The first meeting with Kürkcü made Öcalan feel excited. His first words to Kürkcü were: "Twenty-two years later, we took your revenge [on the State for the Kizildre massacre]". He also adds in the same interview:

> If I were to state a commencement date, one of the most important beginnings would be this [the Kizildere event]. Because I was imprisoned and these months were an incubation period for me. (op. cit., p. 40).

When he was released from the prison in October 1972, Öcalan began looking for friends who might be willing to take the same course as him during what he envisaged as the "incubation period", but he moved steadily and took diligent steps. He even acted in a contradictory manner. Öcalan was involved in the activities – and was elected to the management committee – of the AYÖD[6] (Ankara Higher Education Association) which was in fact a legal platform for THKP-C sympathisers. On the other hand, he simultaneously continued to compose the nucleus of a future organisation. (He later chaired the management committee of the student association for some time before it was banned in 1975).

> In fact, as soon as I came out [of prison], I tested my options. I took my chance in a manner that did not draw attention. ... [I was a] THKP-C sympathiser, but a *Kurdish group* appeared [Italics–A.K.Ö.]. (Öcalan, 1995a, p. 43).

The contradictory nature of Öcalan's political performance dominated his style towards the announcement of the Party in the late 1970s, it faded away in the 80s, then returned during the mid-1990s together with unilateral ceasefire policies. "Until the end of 1975", one of his early friends states, "it was not clear whether President Apo led either a Group of Kurdish or Turkish Left." (Yüce, 1997, p.200). So the twofold nature of the Leadership of the "Kurdish National Movement" in Turkey was not just a characteristic feature of the movement at the outset, but has always been the case in the PKK to varying degrees.

While the Group was being formed, Öcalan's two close Turkish associates within the AYÖD, Kemal Pir and Haki Karer, hesitated to participate in the very first meetings – but joined the group after several meetings had taken place. The "incorporation" Pir and Karer had included a slogan, which would become well-known in pro-PKK publications: "The Revolution of Turkey has to pass through Kurdistan".

The strategic target of the PKK for an independent Kurdistan has always been contradictory and vague. Likewise, Öcalan's project of the "Anatolian Revolution" published in 1997 under the heading "Towards the Great Revolution of Anatolia" (*Serxwebun*, December 1997, issue 192) and the proposal for a "Democratic Republic" – in which the Turks and Kurds, who share the "common fatherland",

Anatolia, aspire to enjoy equal opportunities. These concepts, formulated in his fundamental defence document (Öcalan, 1999a, 1999b), are essentially an extension of a consistent line. On his first appearance in a Turkish court, when Öcalan stated that he would be proud to serve the state in a democratic republic –because, for him, it was "a virtue to serve a democratic republic" (*Sabah*, 24 June 1999) – many observers inferred that Öcalan had submitted and/or betrayed his ideals. However, a few who were more familiar with the PKK's background referred to interviews given in early 1990s and showed that Öcalan was merely keeping to his previous line with these seemingly "shocking" statements before the court (Can Dundar, *Aktuel*, March 1999). Ismet G. Imset, the former editor of the *Turkish Daily News*, draws attention to another aspect of the "contradictory" nature of the PKK.

> Thus, the story of the PKK dates back to the early 1970s. It emerged not in the guerrilla camps on the rugged terrain of Southeast Turkey, and not in any other neighbouring country in the Middle East but in Turkey's capital city one day in 1974. In other words, as far as its original roots are concerned, the PKK came to being not in the Kurdish-populated eastern parts of the country but in Central Turkey. It has, however, always been dominated by Öcalan. (Imset, 1992, p. 9).

D. McDowal points towards a similar distinctive feature of the PKK.

> ...The Apocular [Apoists: Derogatory name given by opposition circles but later used by themselves with pride – A.K.Ö.] were unlike all other Kurdish groups in Turkey (or elsewhere) in that they were drawn almost exclusively from Turkey's growing proletariat. (McDowal, 1996, p. 418)

By emphasising the Turkish and Ankara-related roots of the PKK, it is not my intention to suggest that Öcalan's leadership and the PKK were built on the ruthless suppression of Turkish romantic revolutionaries to whom Öcalan had previously been sympathetic, or the Army's similarly oppressive and cruel actions during the 12 March Coup of 1971. The factors mentioned above were not the *causes* of the PKK, but they had a significant influence on its organisational style. When we view it like that, these

factors are actually not clues to help us explore the *why* of the PKK, but largely the *how* of the PKK.

On many occasions in the course of interviews or during dialogues with his pupils, when talking about the beginning of the Movement or about the "Mamak Days"[7], Öcalan has repeated: "Once I get out of here, I was saying to myself, the organisation I must create should guarantee its continuity: An organisation and the insured assiduousness". And, "I must not be back here again" (Öcalan, 1995a, p. 71).

Öcalan has "fulfilled his promise" on continuity. The organisation has extended its active existence for more than two and half decades so far. But he was somehow recaptured in Kenya after some 27 years, following an international abduction operation in which the World's superpowers were involved (Ucar, 2000). He is now "back there again" in a one-man prison on an island (Imralli) encircled by the Turkish inner sea (Marmara). He awaits the death penalty, to which he was sentenced on 29 June 1999.

c. Preliminary Steps towards the Group

The idea of founding a group arose in Öcalan's mind when he was experiencing his first imprisonment.

> Towards the end of the year [1972] we were released. I still remember; the first thing I had to do was to pass my exams in fifteen days and have the right to attend the second year of the faculty. As soon as I achieved that, I had one-to-one meetings in the utmost secrecy with each individual probable person for the nucleus of the group. The idea of colonialism was emerging at that time. "The Kurdish question is a colonial matter," I said. Nobody had thought of such a diagnosis [about Kurdistan] if you remember. But the terms "Kurdistan", "colony" came to my mind. ... do you believe that when I was going to tell someone I used to go to the deepest room, if there were two doors I shut them both, and I was simply whispering into the ears. (Öcalan, 1995a, p. 44).

These terms were what Öcalan always refers to when he says: "I began with *two words*", which he regards as the "key words" for initiating the struggle for National Liberation.

> These ["Kurdistan" and "Colony"] were only *key words*. You have to place the key in the door and turn it in the relevant direction before you can open the door and see inside the room. (Özcan, A. K., 1999, p. 35).

He considers National Liberation to be "only a means" of his struggle: "... I keep asking: How will a human type of our era be formed? There are humanist ideologies; what is human and what is the thing that is humane? In this sense, national liberation is only a means of my struggle." (*Serxwebun*, 192, December 1997)

Öcalan's first attempt to implement his plans for forming the group envisaged during his "incubation" months was at a meeting in April 1973, arranged as a picnic with seven people (including Öcalan) in a rural area of Ankara. "Taking the picnic was not the ostensible task in my mind," Öcalan states. The meeting was organised "with the intention of gathering a group". ... "This is a style in my manner of acting. I smelt the atmosphere there as an opportunity for a meeting, and I did it" (Yüce, 1997, p. 44).

These six persons did not know one another very well, but rather they had one-to-one connections with Öcalan. Some of them kept asking: "When are we climbing up the mountains?". However, they sided with Öcalan only for a few months before returning to their ordinary life – except one, Ali Haydar Kaytan. He is currently one of the chief guerrilla commanders at the PKK's main headquarters. In fact, there has been no remarkably permanent participation in the group for more than a year: "It was not so easy to pull someone into the group. Whoever joined us first, they were listening for one or two months, then going back to their work and duties". The on-and-off recruitment subsequent to the first "unofficial" meeting continued in this vein until the end of 1974, during the time which activities revolved around the student association mainly based in the Political Science Faculty, AYÖD.

The first meeting in terms of organisational structure was the one held in Tuzluçayir (a district of Ankara) at the end of 1974 when AYÖD was on the verge of being closed down. There were again seven people present at the meeting, but unlike

128

the preceding meeting they are known and recorded in the history of the Party. The participants, who were to rise to fame later in the history of the PKK, were Abdullah Öcalan, Haki Karer, M. Hayri Durmus, Kemal Pir, Mazlum Dogan, Cemil Bayik and Sahin Donmez (Yüce, 1997, p. 251). Along with Öcalan, only Cemil Bayik, a current member of the Presidency Council of the PKK[8], is still alive. He appears to be the most influential personality among the top ranks of the party following Öcalan's capture. The other early members have been eliminated or have died in various ways. Haki Karer, known as the first martyr of the Party, was killed by an emerging Kurdish group (*Isterka Sor*) in Antep on 18 May 1977. M. Hayri Durmus and Kemal Pir died during a hunger strike at the Diyarbakir Prison in 1982. Mazlum Dogan "committed suicide" on *Newroz* day (21 March, Kurds' national day) of the same year in protest against the "brutal torture practices of the Diyarbakir Dungeon". Sahin Donmez was killed by PKK militants in Izmir for "betraying the cause" following his release from the Diyarbakir prison.

In this meeting, Öcalan created a strong position for himself, and from then on he began to be recognised as the obvious leader. He "was gradually becoming a leader for their nameless gathering" and the rest of the participants noticed that *Apo*, "among all of them, was the most outspoken voice on 'Kurdish rights', then a major taboo, in Turkey" (Imset, 1992). Unlike the earlier "provisional" meeting, those present knew one another, knew each other's standpoints and were also aware of what Öcalan envisaged, for they were gathering and debating issues of the major importance in the course of the "legal" activities of the AYÖD. However, these years were the time at which the twofold character of Öcalan's emerging group predominated.

... Naturally, 1974 and 1975 were the two important years during which I devoted myself to the revolution in Turkey. In those years ADYOD [the replacement of AYÖD after its ban] was set up and I was the prime person responsible for it. (...) I was engaged in its primary organisational works as one of the main figures. I subordinated the duties of my own group to it [the perspective of a revolution in greater Anotolia]. (Kücük, 1993, p. 74,75)

d. The Declaration of the Group and the "Return to the Source"

The next major step in the formation process of the Group was the "Dikmen Meeting" arranged at the end of 1976 following several sub-gatherings. The exact number of the participants is not clear. "Between 20 and 25 people" is the figure mentioned in the Party sources.

The importance of this meeting held in Dikmen (a suburb of Ankara) stems from its two vital resolutions.

First, a "central" committee composed of Öcalan, Haki Karer and Kamer Ozkan was elected to lead the Group. This was the first organisational committee in the history of the movement. But in terms of Öcalan's leadership, it was the first and *last* organisational election in the PKK's history. Öcalan has since been the "indisputable" and "indispensable" acting leader of the movement, to the extent that he was again elected as the "General President" in the sixth and seventh (extraordinary) congresses of the PKK while he was in a one-man prison in Turkey[9]. No one has even been put forward as Deputy President, in order to prevent any confusion about Öcalan's "indispensability". Instead, the actual leadership has been replaced with a "Presidency Council" composed of nine known members. Moreover, any suggestions that Öcalan passes to the Party through his solicitors, including extremely vital decisions such as the ending of the 15-year long armed struggle – and the consequent withdrawal of the Party's armed guerrilla forces from the official territories of Turkey – are approved and implemented at once by the PKK without any resistance or opposition. An extract from his dialogue with Ertugrul Kürkcü focusing on this particular point is instructive.

Kürkcü. Right, have you, for example, ever been elected [in the organisation] in any form of procedure?

Öcalan. The election has never been required.

K. Natural leader.

Ö. It is something beyond naturalness, …

K. At this point for instance; when you make decisions on these issues, do you consult about, or…?

Ö. An extensive consultation process does in fact take place in these circumstances. Namely, I give a precise opinion; then I do not step back until I convert that opinion into the opinion of the person I am in contact with. This is another secret of my success. That is to say, I work with the person who has come to the point where he/she is ready to die in defence of the opinion, which I gave as my opinion.

K. Is it still like that?

Ö. Yes, it is still. This is my style of constructing the organisation.

K. The number of people is now very many. It is not 20, but 20 thousand.

Ö. It is still like that.

K. Are the words enough for 20 thousand people?

Ö. A work cannot be accomplished unless a profound grasp of the work is acquired. It is not a matter of making common decisions. We cannot execute these great activities by an ordinary organisational determination unless the opinions are appropriated to one's spiritual structure, heart, or to the whole personality as a great aim. My whole talent lies behind this; to play the role of a great artist. I mean, by saying an artist, being like an artisan. ... I spare no effort and do not leave a dot of imperfection in devoting my whole life to this belief. They believe and then make their decisions. The need for elections consequently does not appear. And the way in which works are executed is still the same. ... (Öcalan, 1995a, p. 56,57)

The second and more important distinguishing "event" of the meeting was the resolution on returning home to Kurdistan, a resolution recorded as the "first organisational determination towards undertaking not an imitative but a real revolution" in the history of the Party. Considering other Kurdish political initiatives' — aspiring to a "Kurdish National Liberation Revolution" in "Turkish Kurdistan" — while their headquarters were based in Ankara or Istanbul,[10] the resolution on returning home would have drawn and deserved more attention.

Öcalan designated a large meeting of the Architects and Engineers Association of Ankara, where a wide range of leftist political circles were expected to be represented, as an opportunity to declare the Organisation's resolution and his determination to implement it. The Organisation did not yet have a publication as a means of distributing its views, whereas many of the other groups or parties had taken their names from the periodicals published prior to their formation, such as *Devrimci Yol* (Revolutionary Path), *Halkin Kurtulusu* (People's Liberation), *Rizgari* (Liberation)

Özgürlük Yolu (The Road to Freedom) etc. This lack of a publication was one of the distinct features of the group and it continued until the foundation of the Party.

The Organisation's publications are neither the exclusive nor the most reliable sources for study – but these are the best sources available to the researcher in Turkey, where data concerning the Kurdish issue are difficult to locate. Information based on quantitative investigations into the Organisation's period as a group is kept by Turkish security agents and has never been published. Nor will it be until the Kurdish question is completely settled. Although he worked on behalf of the State, Ismet G. Imset, the editor of the *Turkish Daily News*[11], also complained about the lack of sources relating to this period: "In 1986, a detailed study on the formation, foreign contacts and structure of the PKK was prepared by two official security departments but has never gone into print" (Imset, 1992, p. 13).

e. The Meeting in Fis: The Founding Congress of the PKK

In accordance with the resolution to "Return to the Source" and related sub-resolutions, "Apocular" initiated a propaganda campaign targeting the "home" population. A series of accompanying meetings focused on certain provinces. The first provincial targets were Gaziantep, Maras, Elazig, Dersim (Tunceli) and Agri.[12] Several meetings had been held in and around these selected "pilot territories" by 15 May 1977, many of them chaired by Öcalan himself.

Despite their radical diagnoses of the Kurdish question, the PKK did not get substantially involved in violence until Haki Karer was killed in Gaziantep[13] on 18 May 1977, three days after the accomplishment of the sequence of meetings. Karer was shot dead in the course of an argument provoked by the member of an emerging group of the "Kurdish Left" (*Isterka Sor* – Red Star), which had only been in existence for several months. Karer became the "first martyr" of the "*Apocular*" (Followers Apo) group with his Turkish origin providing additional pride. The Group had lost its "Second Man" – one of the three members of the first leadership committee. Nevertheless, the expected clashes between the two groups did not take place. Instead, the "*Apocular*" accelerated the meetings oriented towards the establishment of a party. They had occasional clashes with groups on the Turkish and Kurdish Left such as

Halkin Kurtulusu in Gaziantep and Maras, *Özgürlük Yolu* in Agri, *Devrimci Sol* in Elazig, *Partizan* in Dersim and with the KUK and DDKD in Diyarbakir and parts of the country towards the Southeast.

"When Haki Karer was killed in Gaziantep, we said: 'The state decreed the death sentence for us' ", the "adventurer"Öcalan narrates, when conveying the atmosphere of those days. They were in a serious quandary as they sought to answer two questions: "Will the Group survive or not? Or, will it upgrade itself or not?"

> ... The process from 1977 to 1978 was a determining process to decide whether "we shall be a party or continue as a group". After having a very hard time, we had come to the point: "Let's give ourselves a party name; we are weak, we are powerless but it would at least be good if a party name was to go down in history". (Kücük, 1993, p. 77).

Due to the death of Karer, the Group was prompted to decide on the foundation of the party and it drew up the Party Program Draft "in memory of him" following the meeting held in *Bagcilar* district of Diyarbakir. The Draft was later published with the title of *Kürdistan Devriminin Yolu* (The Path of Kurdistan Revolution), also known as the "Manifesto".

Following another intensive propaganda campaign in the light of the Manifesto, the foundation congress of the Party in Fis[14] was arranged for late November 1978. The congress took six days, gathered with 22 delegates and ended on 27 November. The "Fis Meeting" produced the PKK (*Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan*) with General Secretary Abdullah Öcalan and the first Central Committee, including M. Hayri Durmus, Cemil Bayik, Mazlum Dogan, Mehmet Karasungur, Kesire Yildirim and Sahin Dönmez (Serxwebun, 1982). It also decided to set up the magazine, *Serxwebun*, to be issued monthly as the central organ of the Party. From then on, all communiqués would be signed with the party name, the PKK.

Notes

[1] The Workers Party of Turkey [*Türkiye Isci Partisi* (TIP)] is the first leftist party of the republican era in which all left-wing groupings merged. I later banned due to its sounding Kurdish issue in Turkey.

[2] The "circle" first begun to be known as *Özgürlük Yolu* (Freedom Path) and later became the most influential and massified movement of the late 1970s in the main provinces of "Turkish Kurdistan" while the PKK was only a marginal group. The leaders of the group revealed that their organisation had been party (TKSP– Socialist Party of Turkey-Kurdistan) since 1974. However, the Group was dissolved following the coup d'état on 12 September 1980.

[3] *Apocular* literally means the "Followers of Apo"

[4] Suleyman Demirel has been one of the main political figure in Turkish parliament since mid 1960s who was eventually elected as eighth *Cumhurbaskani* (The president of the Republic) following the unexpected death of Turgut Ozal in 1993.

[5] A village near the border between Turkey and Kurdish populated Eastern Anatolia.

[6] AYÖD: *Ankara Yuksek Ögrenim Dernegi* (Ankara Higher Education Association) was a student association, which was founded by the youth group, *Dev-Genc*, as legal platform for sympathisers of Mahir Cayan.

[7] Here, by "Mamak Days" (the "first and last" experience of imprisonment in Mamak prison up until his abduction from Nairobi, Kenya) Ocalan implies the imprisonment months which he terms his "incubation period".

[8] Following the resent (April 2002) dissolution of the PKK in eighth congress Cemil Bayik has been elected to the Presidency Council of KADEK and appears to be the "co-ordinator" of the Council.

[9] Ocalan was re-elected with no opposition in eighth ordinary congress as the General President of KADEK.

[10] The "Politburos" of these groupings continued to operate in Turkish metropolises until they were banned and dissolved by the harsh military coup on 12 September 1980).

[11] The paper is in fact a State bulletin targeting foreign readers.

[12] Interestingly the targeted provinces did not include, at the outset, the "capital city" Diyarbakir and other South-eastern towns which were relatively more "developed" regions in terms of national sentiments, and which consequently bore a profitable potential.

[13] Gaziantep is a large semi-industrial city on the border of Turkey and Kurdistan.

[14] A village in the town of Lice nears the city of Diyarbakir. [14] The Workers Party of Turkey [*Türkiye Isci Partisi* (TIP)] is the first leftist party of the republican era in which all left-wing groupings merged. I later banned due to its sounding Kurdish issue in Turkey.

Chapter 4

THE IDEOLOGY AND PROGRAMME OF THE PKK

This chapter puts the mutation of the PKK's ideology and programme into perspective. The ideology, aims and objectives are examined in their totality. The discourse, views and ideas of the Party are examined in relation to setting objectives and corresponding activities.

I The Theoretical Development of the Party and its Programme from its Foundation to Öcalan's Arrest

To understand how the organisation was formed and how it works within the scattered Kurdish population, we have to look at the ideology and theory of the PKK[1].

Even more importantly, considering this study's highlighting of the weight of the "subjective element" in the rise of the Kurdish movement in Turkey in the 1990s, a critical knowledge of the ideological and programmatic evolution of the PKK will help shed light on the organisational growth.

The apparent theoretical-programmatic orientation and transformation throughout the large number of party publications – from *Manifesto* (1978) to "My Defence", *Declaration on the Democratic Solution of the Kurdish Question*, ("Second Manifesto", 1999) – reflect the organisational confrontations within the *Movement*. The evolution of the PKK's theory of the revolution manifests the ground of individual motivation, and consequently of the resources of mass mobilisation surrounding Kurdish nationality and/or sociality.

a. Ideological and Programmatic Framework

Just before the founding congress was held in a village affiliated to Diyarbakir, the first written Party document appeared. In a highly concealed and camouflaged flat in a "posh" ward of Diyarbakir, Öcalan, with one of his senior comrades, M. Hayri Durmus, laid down the basic principles and objectives of the foetal PKK – "a manifesto for proletarian revolutionaries of Kurdistan" (Öcalan, 1978, p.12). The paper was introduced in the first issue of an illegal magazine, *Serxwebun*, the official organ of the Central Committee of the PKK, and later printed as a booklet: *The Path of Kurdistan Revolution (Manifesto)*. A brief overview of this document will be very helpful – for understanding the Group's early initiatives and how Öcalan arrived at his defence against the prosecutors of the State Security Court of Turkey.

The document is the first literal expression of the Group's conception of the world and its basic socio-political aims and objectives – even if the emergence of the gathering can almost be traced back to 1973. So it has been labelled a "Manifesto". Unlike other Turkish and Kurdish leftist political parties and circles, *"Apocular"* (Followers of Apo) did not have periodicals for propaganda purposes and for recruitment, until the Party's foundation meeting. There was only a "Draft Programme" in hand distributed to the prominent members of the group to "study" in early 1978. Öcalan frequently refers to this "discretion" as the necessary measure taken against the State's operations.

The content and rhetoric of the *Manifesto* look like an ordinary copy of any conventional Communist Party's programme – however, it does present ideas for a distinctive future, unlike many of the other Kurdish political and cultural groupings. The "symptoms" are nevertheless not ideological nor are they theoretical formulations, but rather show the spirit of the language and the additional emphasis on the extent of the armed struggle, such as:

> ... our Movement, ... would deem leading our people with ideological, organisational and political means to be a sacred and historical task. (*Manifesto*, p.190),

> Having a life distant from the Kurdistan Revolution would be no different from a bestial lifestyle. (*op. cit.* p.211)

or,

... If the people of Kurdistan venture into a war, they should be absolutely prepared for a protracted people's war which will have to pass through long and various stages. (*op. cit.* p. 198)

Apocular[2] proposed the party to be Marxist-Leninist and "a revolutionary party of proletariat and peasants of Kurdistan" (Öcalan, 1978, pp. 153-158). A brief definition of the early PKK was provided: "a political organisation under the guidance of scientific socialism" which would be pursuing the "holy and historical task" of leading the "Kurdistan Revolution" (*op. cit.* pp. 190, 194).

They begin with the historical explanation of the social and political roots of "colonialism", in view of Marx's "materialist conception of history", with frequent references to the terms "class societies", "class struggle", "surplus value" and "labour exploitation, and so on. Then, they summarise the general picture of world politics with particular emphasis on the contention between the Imperialist and Socialist camps – the Cold War following the "Second Imperialist War". The "Kurdistan Revolutionaries" group takes its position in favour of the "progressive struggle of the Socialist System under the USSR against imperialist expansion", as well as being critical of the "revisionist" and "opportunist" policies of the Soviet Union of the time. Still, the group welcomes the Soviets' active support for the "national liberation struggles of oppressed peoples" around the world.

The focus of the second part is the "Society of Kurdistan" – where the history of the "colonisation of Kurdistan" is presented. They also give an account of the socio-political structure of Kurdish society, with a more detailed map of the classes and the strata of "Mid-Northwest" Kurdistan (the Turkish-ruled territory).

In the last part, the national, regional and international dimensions of the Kurdish Revolution are discussed: the positive and negative legacy with which the "Kurdistan Revolutionaries" started their initiative; the objective and subjective aspects of the conditions; the features, targets and duties; the method and tactics; the fundamental source of power and the allies of the Revolution; and the Revolution's place in the "Middle-east and World Revolutions" – all are discussed and clarified (*Manifesto*, pp. 183-214). The revolution is defined, outlined and, to some degree, scheduled in this early draft programme.

According to this:

a) Our era is the era of transition from capitalism to socialism and proletarian revolutions.

b) Kurdistan is an inter-state colony.

c) A national liberation struggle is an unavoidable duty in order to gain the freedom and independence of the Kurdish people.

d) The Kurdistan Revolution shall be a *national and democratic* one, and the ultimate end would, in long term, be the *socialist revolution* with an uninterrupted transition to a "classless and non-exploitative" society.

e) The revolution's political objective is to establish an *independent, united and democratic Kurdistan.*

f) The revolution must be led by a revolutionary party of the proletariat which needs to be initiated by a "minority" composed of patriotic youth and intellectuals (enlightened) who are disassociated from material production.

g) The primary social base and the leading class of the revolution has to be, in spite of its numerical and ideological weakness, the working class. The secondary social base of the revolution and senior ally of the working class are the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeois. The international allies are socialist countries, the working class parties of capitalist countries and the liberation movements of oppressed peoples of the world.

h) The targets of the revolution are the conquerors of Kurdistan (the Turkish state) and its native feudal-collaborators, and the imperialist powers behind them.

i) The all-in-one use of ideological, political and military forms of the struggle is necessary for the success of the national liberation of the colony Kurdistan.

The striking point is that the views, diagnoses, proposals, aims and objectives outlined so far are simply a copy of all the other fellow political initiatives' programmes claiming to undertake Kurdish national and social emancipation. This was contrary to the widely received idea that the rest of the Kurdish political circles did not have a bias towards armed struggle. Those who gathered around certain periodicals advocating national aspirations in the 1970s, and later in the 80s, argued over who was the "oldest party" while issuing extreme programmes following their safe escape to Europe from the Turkish coup of 1980, had emphasised the inevitability of the military means of struggle since their groups had existed. The relevant lines in the programmes of these initiatives were fairly identical. We will now briefly go through the expressions

employed about the "armed struggle" by the three principal groups which had remarkably drawn more popular support among the Kurds of Turkey than the PKK in the late 1970s.

The Vanguard Workers Party of Kurdistan (PPKK – *Partiya Pesenga Karkeren Kurdistan*) known as DDKD or *Sivancilar*:

> The PPKK, during its national and social liberation struggle, does employ legal, illegal, semi-legal, peaceful, non-peaceful (from mass riots to armed people's war) and all the forms and means of struggle according to the concrete circumstances. (PPKK, Program, 1984, p. 26).

The Socialist Party of Turkish Kurdistan (TKSP) known as (*ÖzgürlükYolu* – Freedom Path) which later changed its name to Kurdistan Socialist Party:

> We hitherto, in a policy towards the victory of the national democratic revolution, insistently emphasised the importance of the followings:
>
> • ... ; according to circumstances, also including the armed struggle, to apply many ways and forms of struggle either individually or one in another. (Burkay, 1989, pp. 66, 67)

The Kurdistan Liberation Party (PRK – *Partiya Rizgariya Kurdistan*) also known as *Rizgari* (Liberation):

> Even if our general strategy is peace and democracy, we must battle against this unjust war to which we are compelled. ... Kurdistan Liberation Party is determined to continue this war until all colonialist and imperialist powers get out of our country and until one single man survives. ... Kurdistan Liberation Party will organise PESMERGE UNITS[3] in urban and rural districts in order to DREAD, DRIVEAWAY and DEMORALISE[4] the military corps of invaders. ... Kurdistan Liberation Party will initiate the preliminary destructive attacks ... such as sabotage, assassination, provocation etc. prior to launching the general offensive of the Pesmerge forces. (*Siyasi Program*, rizgari, Kurdistan Kurtulus Partisi, 1988, pp. 66, 67, 68, 69).

These groups used this language because the term "armed struggle" was so impressive a means of agitation and there was an indisputable belief among the Kurds under Turkey that they had no chance without arms.

b. Implementation Followed by Evolution

Yet the rest of the Kurdish nationalist configurations, despite the intensive use of the agitation "value" of such language, did not attempt any implementation of proposals for armed struggle.

I had a principle for myself: Why did I dare to initiate and believe in this war?

Because the greatest harlot is one who does not fight.

My word at the very beginning was this; I moulded myself to believe this. All of these men [implying the leading figures in the Kurdish groupings which claimed to undertake the national cause –AKO] are dishonest. Why? Because, I said, they prostitute themselves more than a prostitute. I said, I will not be like them, I will fight for loftier aims. In short, in those early times I orientated myself in believing this, and this belief, look, is my nutriment, my sap. It still drives me. Naturally, the belief on its own is not good enough, I also mentioned tactics. Tactics are indeed much more intelligent than the devil. (Öcalan, 1996b, p. 115).

A group of "patriotic youth-intellectuals *off* the material production" (*Manifesto*, pp. 160,161) agreed to playing "the motor-role of revolutionary intellectuals armed with a science of history" (Touraine, 1995, p. 105). The "bunch" of university students from mainly the social science faculties of Ankara-based universities, whose leader concluded from the science of history that "those peoples or classes – either progressive or reactionary – who are not able to configure a conscious and organised 'minority', they cannot reach their economic and political goals" (*Manifesto*, p. 160), decided to undertake the struggle "under the guidance of scientific socialism" (*op. cit.* p. 161).[5]

The specific story of the PKK under Öcalan is the issue from here onwards.

c. The Evolution of the Years of Armed Propaganda

The PKK had its initial experience of the armed struggle when it interfered in a tribal clash in the Kurdish towns of Siverek and Hilvan in 1979. The PKK saw this as part of the fight against the collaborator tribes (in this occasion, *Bucaks*), in the sense of not being a guerrilla war but "armed propaganda". This is immediately followed by the coup d'état of 1980 and the partial escape of leading figures, including Öcalan, to the Bekaa Valley (Lebanese territory under Syrian control) which was occasionally to be compared with Mohammed's "Hegira". The next programmatic publication appears subsequent to these experiences with the title of "The Problem of Kurdistan National Liberation and the Way of Solution; Kurdistan National Liberation Front – Draft Programme" (*Kürdistan Ulusal Kurtulus Problemi ve Cözum Yolu; Kürdistan Ulusal Kurtulus Cephesi – Program Taslagi*, 1982).

This initial document of the series appeared during the 1980s, reflects the circumstances and confrontations encountered following the settlement of the training guerrilla groups in the Lebanese Bekaa Valley and accordingly crucial usage of South Kurdistan (Northern Iraq) as a passageway and/or bases behind the lines. It is partly a promotion of the programme submitted in the *Manifesto* with an effort of corresponding the Movement's principals and objectives with a "front" organisation. But, on the other, we come across certain alterations to some basic points at first glance, which are not necessarily dependent on the "witty" concerns about the framework of a *front* programme. On the contrary, the emphasis on the proletariat and socialism has its extension along the lines – if not as strong and frequent – with the familiar idiom. However, the diligently constructed alterations focuses on three susceptibilities:

1- The interrelations, solidarity and the independent will of the national liberation movements of each part of Kurdistan.

2- The need to put more effort into finding the possible way of solving the Kurdish national question corresponding with the interests of revolutionary-democratic people's powers within the borders of sovereign states,

3- The Greater Kurdistan.

And the final point is put in more explicit words.

... To work towards handling the question of the independent, united and democratic Kurdistan State on a regional conjectural basis, for it is closely linked with the interests of the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the region. (*Kürdistan Ulusal Kurtulus Problemi ve Cözüm Yolu*, p. 198)

Yet in the *Manifesto* of 1978, the slogan of "Independent, United and Democratic Kurdistan" has its frequent emphasis in bold print. Also, "the other theses and forms of solution (referring to "regional autonomy" and "federal unity"), for they do not tend to disturb the existing State borders, are *reformist*, and consequently *reactionary* views (*Manifesto*, p. 204). So attempting to solve the Kurdish question within the borders of the colonialist states would mean they would become the *usak* (servant-collaborators) of the "bourgeoisie of the sovereign nation" (*PKK Kurulus Bildirisi*, 1978, p. 50).

Thus the change mentioned may be assessed as the first major alteration in the basics of the PKK's programme since the foundation of the party, constituting the seeds of the "Second Manifesto" which were to be declared in a cell of the Imralli Prison in Turkey by Abullah Öcalan in 1999. The change, in fact, does not bear a crucial significance relating to the Organisation's essential objectives because the PKK – of in particular the 1980s and 90s – avoided employing the term "independent-united Kurdistan" but rather has been obsessed with the idea of "Free Kurdistan" instead. Further, the terms "freedom" and "independence" were to be gradually employed with reference to the individual's spiritual structure (Öcalan, 1986a, pp. 107-112) as the organisation grew. [This is re-emphasised in the "Second Manifesto": "... I focused on the notion of independence far more in the sense of ideas and individual will" (Öcalan, 1999c, p. 90)]. Additional attention is paid to the concepts of "free personality" and/or "freed individual" in philosophical accounts of Öcalan which dealt with human lifestyle and the meaning of life (Öcalan, 1995b, 1996, 1999a *et al*). So, how then can the changes be defined or, what is "new" here and does it present a remarkable significance in the development of the theory of the PKK? It is the restatement of the party programme because of being faced with the harsh reality of sitting down at the "wolves' dining table". The early 1980s were the time when the PKK was beginning to walk with its feet on the ground. And accordingly, on the one hand, restate its policies for the struggle for Kurdish national emancipation appropriate to the regional and international "vitals" of the Middle East, and, on the other, cease

from the idiom and formulations moulded in reaction to Kurdish "reformist-collaborators" and Turkish "social chauvinists". Such slogan-like agitating phrases implying a "united-independent Kurdistan" almost withered away towards the late 1980s.

In the course of the preliminary years to the guerrilla war of 1984, another three major publications [*Kürdistan'da Zorun Rolü* (The Role of Coercion in Kurdistan), *Örgütlenme Üzerine* (About Organisation), *Kurdistan'da Kisilik Sorunu, Devrimci Militanin Özellikleri ve Parti Yasami* (The Question of Individual's Personality in Kurdistan, the Traits of a Revolutionary Militant and Party Life)] appeared and showed how the Party's theoretical efforts intensified. Even if the date of issue of the latter is 1985, it is, as others, substantially composed of unnamed editing of lectures delivered between 1981 and 1983 by Abdullah Öcalan, prior to launching the guerrilla offensive which was planned for 1983 but postponed to August 1984. Öcalan, in his teachings gathered in these books, continued to be strictly within the boundaries of orthodox Marxism to the extent that the bibliographical list of these three editions are additionally identical and limited to five to eight Marxist classics. The *eighty four* footnotes and quotations of "The Role of Coercion in Kurdistan" referred to only *eight* authors: K. Marx, F. Engels, V.I. Lenin, J. Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, G. Dimitrov, V. N. Giap and Le Duan. The *sixteen* sources of "About Organisation" are from Marx, Engels, Lenin, Giap and Che Guevera; and *eighty three* of "The Question of Individual's Personality in Kurdistan" are yet again from certain works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Dimitrov and Victor Serge.

Yet each of the theoretical works is put into three individual subjects. The first, *Kürdistan'da Zorun Rolü*, insists on the indispensability of the use of force against Turkish "colonialism" for the success of Kurdish national liberation policy. Öcalan kept on this line of the policy of *war*, "the intensified extension of politics executed by weaponry", by taking it as the fundamental form of struggle until a couple of weeks before his arrest, excluding several unsuccessful attempts at unilateral cease-fire between 1993 and 1998. "...The only way [to liberation] is to organise and enlarge the fire-power of guerrilla corps and orientate them towards almost all targets" (*Serxwebun*, June 1999). The second, *Örgütlenme Üzerine*, focuses on the organisational particularities of a party, which were to undertake leading the "atomised" Kurdish society. While advocating many points and principals of a Leninist party in common with the rest of the Kurdish and Turkish "radical left", the

143

substantial and distinctive part of the argument of the work is concerned with the *"reorganisation* of the whole society" (*Örgütlenme Üzerine*, 1983, p. 13). Rather than structuring a "Marxist-Leninist party of the working class" an overall reorganisation is proposed because Kurdish society has been the victim of a "deliberate disorganising programme from top to bottom implemented by the Turkish colonialists" (*op. cit.*, pp. 11-13). This is the initial distinguishing theoretical point of argument that separates the PKK from the other Kurdish political circles of Turkish ruled Anatolia. The third, *Kürdistan'da Kisilik Sorunu* (The Question of Individual's Personality), endeavours to initiate a "raw" matter of discussion. The roots and dimensions of the "degeneration" of the "Kurdish personality" are discussed with the aim of forming the personalities of the "Humanisation Movement". This is the unique aspect of the PKK's theoretical, philosophical – and practical – identity that determines both the successes and failures of the Party. I will examine this feature of the PKK further in the light of the findings of my field research.

Each theme in these editions of Öcalan's teachings actually constitutes the corners of the structural triangle of the PKK: armed struggle, an organisation that transcends the notion of class and moulding personalities appropriate to such an organisation. But the "question of personality" is important in the PKK's organisational development – as will be explored in the following two chapters.

d. The Years of Building the Guerrilla War

We discussed earlier how the theoretical development of the PKK's conceptual agenda is a reflection of its organisational confrontations. This is truer in the years of armed struggle from 1984 to 1999.

The reflections of practical problems confronting the organisation are consequently more apparent in these writings. Similarly, the evaluations concerning the nature of the socialism of the Soviet Union and "experienced socialism" (or "actually existing socialism") of the world developed – in fact metamorphosed – subsequent to the spectacular fall of the "iron curtain" and the demystification of the factual spectacle behind the curtain. On the other hand, the theoretical efforts of these years gradually become more and more composed of editions of verbal lectures given

by Öcalan to his pupils as his *"indispensability"* or charisma emboldens simultaneous with the accumulation of the social and political effects of the guerrilla activities.

At the outset of the guerrilla war, the accounts of world socialism and revolution continued for some time to be under the "heavy influence" (Öcalan, 1999b) of *cold-war socialism*. There were many symptoms of the Stalinist approach. He talks of "unique examples of world-wide creations of socialist labour-heroism" (Öcalan, 1986a, p. 126), great socialist construction of 1930s and 40s which "made the reversion back to capitalism almost impossible" (Öcalan, 1992, p. 75) and places emphasis on Trotsky's animosity towards socialism in the mid 1980s.

> Trotsky – who claims that the socialist establishment under the dictatorship of the proletariat would not be survived in one country in the long term, and that it would absolutely have to be expanded into Europe with fellow revolutions – as a result of disbelief in the revolution in Russia deteriorated his position against it, following a bitter quarrel he was driven out of the Party and the country, and, in consequence, he reconciled with imperialism to the extent of being the enemy of the revolution. (Öcalan, 1986a, p.125).

But he was to firmly state that he Trotsky is the voice of "anti-bureaucracy" and "further universalisation" (Öcalan, 1992, p. 27) in 1987 – while adding in the following paragraph that without a "revolutionary bureaucracy" it would have been impossible to shelter the revolution from imperialist offensives in the historical context of Soviet Russia.

On the eve of collapse of the Soviet Union, the estimations of its latest stage of socialist progress were still overwhelmingly optimistic or, in his words, "fairly pretentious and exaggerated" (Öcalan, 1992, p. 323). In his speech delivered on the seventieth anniversary of the October Revolution, the pretension was beyond exaggeration.

> Socialism, just at this point, entered into a new stage – from the institutionalisation stage to the maturation stage. If the ephemeral and indistinct Khrushchev era – also bearing the quality of a transitory period between the reigns of Stalin and Brezhnev – is not taken into account, the Brezhnev era is indeed a progression and maturation of institutionalised socialism. (Öcalan, 1992, p. 28).

Even though Öcalan wants to believe the Soviet establishment's loyalty to the socialist cause up until April 1989, the "Soviet Union does remain loyal to the socialist principals, but there is a *right-deviancy* today in the tactics nevertheless" (*op. cit.* p. 161). As other political standpoints who took part in the controversy surrounding the nature of the Soviet system as defenders of the "socialist castle", the PKK too was compelled to "some" self-critical reassessments by events in the Eastern Bloc.

In January 1990, he talks of the "emergence of a bureaucratic capitalist class in the socialist countries" (*op. cit.* p. 197) and of the "impasse of the October Revolution since Lenin was doomed to pragmatism" for he was deeply concern about the personalities of almost all members of the Politburo which was his creation (*op. cit.* p. 204). Yet in further months Öcalan began to sound off about the PKK's vulgar accounts of world socialism as they seemed fascinated by the geographical scope of the "socialist camp". They "should not have" evaluated the gains of socialism according to its percentage of territorial domination such as *one sixth* after the First World War and *one third* after the Second. "Today it is becoming much more obvious that instead of approaching socialism from such an angle, it needs to be reduced to an individual's personality and pursued to the extent that he/she becomes socialist; namely, the extent of living socialism within his/her spiritual structure should have been the point of attention" (Öcalan, 1992, p. 252). Then he confesses: "We too, for a long time, took up with such accounts of world socialism" (*op. cit.* p. 324). And Öcalan reaches the eventual conclusion on behalf of the PKK with a much sharper reverse from Brezhnev's "mature socialism" in his speeches of May Day and August of 1991.

But it appears that the Soviet experience is the realisation of a process which was inspired by socialism rather than being an experience of socialism, in which honourable socialists also struggled, and as a result, which emerged in the form of national socialism with the rise of sociality and class related entities that held capitalistic longings but did not have the opportunity of becoming bourgeois at the time. (Öcalan, 1992, p. 292).

In other words,

Today, the overwhelming majority of the men of the Soviet Union are in an eager search for capitalism. What then does this mean? We certainly do not intend to say that the complete Soviet Socialism is mere capitalism. ... The conclusion that shall be drawn from this is that the fact of the matter is a flourishing of capitalism obtained under the label of socialism by a greedy capitalism, in the conditions of an underdeveloped country of weak national growth and less-developed means of production. (*op. cit.*, p. 332).

In consequence, he stated that the collapse of "mature socialism" actually freed socialism from suffocation. So it was not socialism that collapsed but "a system which institutionalised many features of capitalist, even of feudal, society by extremely dangerous implementations" (*op. cit.* p. 337).

Apparently, these statements are not novel diagnoses for those who did not have the standpoint of the "socialist castle" defenders or, in particular, who were inspired by Trotsky's critiques of October Revolution. For instance, Furedi, while arguing how to "generate enough surplus and disposable labour-time, to move from the 'realm of necessity' to the ' realm of freedom' " for a *full development of the individual* as the central project of Marxism (Furedi, 1986, p. 9), arrives at a quite similar conclusion in his words, some years before the collapse.

The strength of the Soviet system under Stalin lay in the way it overcame constraints on the mobilisation of resources. To realise its objectives, Stalin's regime could draw on a vast reservoir of natural resources and labour. Through the use of terror the regime also eliminated much of the demand for consumer goods, thus diverting funds for accumulation. Stalin's regime was more successful in mobilising resources than it was in using them efficiently, but in the thirties and forties the consequences of the inefficient allocation of society's labour-time were not widely apparent. Indeed the exigencies of the Second World War revealed the strengths rather than the weaknesses of the Soviet system. (Furedi, 1986, p. 63).

Furedi was pointing to the extent of wielding socialism in terms of both material and spiritual means for the economic structure of Russia, drawing attention to the *strength* of the Soviet system. For Furedi, an economic development of society in the framework of *socialist* objectives must have been inextricably linked to the *full development of the individual*, "the central project of Marxism", instead of eliminating

147

the demand for consumer goods. What Öcalan was concluding was that "Russia wielded socialism in order to develop its own form of capitalism" substantially in the course of the "socialist construction" of the October Revolution because a socialism of the genuine liberation of mankind must "infiltrate into the spiritual structure of the individual" and mould the "individual who constructs the socialism in his/her little nucleus" (Öcalan, 1992, p. 360).

So the purpose of this part of the argument is to highlight the theoretical development of the PKK in relation to "actually existing socialism" which have been, "for a long time", almost the primary source of controversy for pro-Marxist political mainstreams of Turkey and Kurdistan, as it was in many parts of the world. On the other hand, it will draw attention to the little or nothing effect of such metamorphosis-like theoretical and programmatic transformations on the grassroots and mass base of the PKK.

As the war of the Kurdish guerrillas expands, Öcalan abandons both the rhetoric of classical Marxism and the agitation language of "national liberation". This is gradually replaced with an idiom peculiar to himself, rather engaged with more universal and philosophical concepts such as "humanisation", "socialisation", "human emancipation", "analysing the Self", "freed personality", "pure human being" etc.

The PKK movement, ... in brief, is a movement that is composed of individuals who became devoted, not only to the requirements of being human, but to the average life of the average living being; who are resolved to live as a progressive species, a species of humanity, in Kurdistan; who are determined that the nobility of such an aim may only be realisable through a resistance against this dreadful guilt; who believe that the advance on the path of humanisation is feasible only through every sign of life which is created in the course of the resistance against this barbarian, and aware that only on this basis can national and social identity be attained; who reorder and remould all aspects of their life in accordance with these exigencies. (Öcalan, 1986b, p. 17).

Even if the PKK had a sharp reverse within months about the Soviet experience subsequent to its end in failure, Öcalan stood contemplating the questions of socialism in terms of its establishment within the "individual nucleus" in the Party's third congress held in 1986. In the speech given on "Planning the Activities and Armed Struggle" he substantially argues the questions of socialism and the individual while

titling it the "Approach to the Revolution and the Question of Personality". Following some generalisations he made various critical remarks on the "revisionism" of real (existing) socialism and its "*stencilist*" extension – the Turkish Communist Party of the time – the explanation given for distinguishing their movement from the others is distant from an ethnic or national context.

We did not look at the fact from such an angle; our approach to the matter from the very beginning has appeared with a notable resemblance to the human species' feelings – from its inception to the present day – of a noble concern about a harsh natural obstacle, a social affair, exploitation, oppression or progress and a passionate desire for overcoming hindrances. Most of you [telling the delegates of congress– AKO] approached us with some slogans afterwards, but the approach of the entity which materialised in the form of PKK towards the question that it is obliged to solve is, in essence, within this framework. ... Of a similar kind of excitement which a primitive man feels when obtaining the first yield of cultivation or when taming a wild animal he/she has caught; of such a virtue of the earliest human being when they acquire it in the course of reaching the faculty of grappling with a very fierce tiger by using hardly developed self-made defence tools; of a spirit and wisdom which raised its struggle against nature to a degree of scientific solving creativity; of the noble will, desire and resolution of a man of religion who emerges in the context of very oppressive social circumstances; yes, a similar kind of way to all these, if we also perform in this way when approaching our very reality, and, if we do not deform and degenerate it afterwards, then we may be humanised and shall be able to advance gradually on this path. (Öcalan, 1993a, p. 183).

Throughout the talks about the "genuine nature" of the movement, Öcalan emphasises the spiritual reformation of personalities who take the initiative of the revolution, and every so often refers to the material and spiritual nature of early civilisation. The notion of man's self-reproduction thus constitutes the essential part of the texts. The theme of discussions increasingly abounds with references to the individual's will and ability of self-analysis, self-transformation and self-recreation. While stressing that they "must very deeply penetrate into the spiritual atmosphere – and live up to it – which may be felt in the course of the formation of every new religion, at the inception of every new mode of production, in sum, at the emergence of every new process which gives further strength to the human being", the central issue is rather concerned

about the "how" of getting there. "The item on which we contemplate is production of individual's personality. Namely, first of all, you will have to produce yourself". And, in an obvious materialist manner of saying, adds that they believe the realisibilty of the recreation of personality because "history is a considerable witness of this" and, for him, "who ever neglects this is simply a reactionary" (*op. cit.* p. 190). Then from such a point of departure, on many occasions, he universalises the definition and objectives of the organisation.

Essentially, the thing to be comprehended among all these is that our movement bears certain peculiarities in grappling with the epoch, in opposing the whole history of mankind and in analysing its very insight. Only the style of our movement's struggle is moulded in the context of the particularity of Kurdistan. Being a militant who was to execute this struggle or becoming the representative archetypes of the newness of this reality are intimately related to one another. Compare your personalities with this reality, resolve its complexity into its elements and make it reach a settlement. Certainly, we do not talk about orienting oneself towards some superficial changes. Let's give you another ten-fifteen years time, or can history give us this time? But then let's not miscalculate, let's not insist on antiquity, let's not be caught unawares. Wherever we go, since our creative unity is not developed in this mould, we shall not be welcomed either in the world or in the region or in the country. ... That means to say, materialisation of these traits of our movement in the form of a national liberation or a freedom movement will bring out the strength to overcome the problems of the humanity which both capitalism and socialism could not [overcome]. ... In our case, the nature of development is not a mere nationalisation of Kurdistan. The reality of Kurdishness in fact, to a considerable degree, represents the fusion of other nations. This precisely signifies, in its factual entity, the material basis for synthesising internationality or humanity in a most noble form. ... Because there is, in our case, to a certain extent, the presence of Arabisation, Persianisation and Turkification. ... In this sense, our existing national liberationism means – in its most broad sense – a movement of freedom for it is both, at the same time, in a battle with the total elements of capitalism and in an encounter with the narrowed and vulgarised forms of socialism. (Öcalan, 1993a, pp. 190, 191)

The philosophical construction of the idea here appears to be a sort of combination of Marx and Plato, or in the post-modern form of argument, a version of Touraine's notion of "subjectivation" or "reconstruction of the figure of the Subject" (Touraine,

1995, p. 204-215, 370,371) which he innovates in the arguments of New Social Movements, and asserts that it radically differs from the idea of class struggle for it appeals not to the logic of history but to the freedom of the Subject.

If we are to resist total oppression, we must mobilise the total subject, the religious heritage, childhood memories, ideas and courage. ... Having recently lived through the catastrophes brought about by the authoritarian modernisation forced upon us by totalitarian States, we now know that the production of the subject – the emblematic figure of modernity – is only possible when consciousness does not divorce the individual body from social roles, or the old figures of subject that was projected into the world in the form of God, from the modern will to construct oneself as a person. (Touraine, 1995, p. 211).

Sometimes in response to questions, Öcalan emphasisises his childhood background, childish longings and religious references. "If a child does not betray his/her longings and utopias, he/she will never be a bad adult" he says when replying to Küçük's question. "I am", he continues, "a forty four year old child. That means, I grew up without betraying the longings and utopias of my childhood" (Küçük, 1993, p. 37). On another occasion, he focuses on the "principal of conduct" which he claims supersedes the sense of class and the Leninist boundaries of Marxism (the "Marxism of the imperialist era".

– Now, in our case, we did not contemplate moulding our humanity or personalities according to such principles of civilisation, but according to natural principles. In other words, this was not according to the rules for the development of a class society, but according to very natural principles. What are these natural principles? In some cases, it was the principle of childhood or of the earliest days of mankind. We did not lose sight of this. It was part of my strategy for action. (Özcan, A. K., 1999, p. 65).

In the early stage of the interview I held, I aimed at his further exemplification on the response to Küçük's question relating "childhood memories".

– You say, "I grow up without betraying the longings and utopias of my childhood" or "If a child does not betray his/her longings and utopias, s/he will never be a bad adult" ...

– Yes, not betraying childhood, getting "back" to the principles of conduct from the earliest human societies, taking these principles as fundamental guidelines and within that framework, examining civilisation, class societies, politics and art, diligently and with focus. This approach is at the same time very easy and very difficult. It is difficult to become as pure as either the first human being or as a child, but it is more basic. It is very difficult for those who have been brought up according to the principles of civilisation but it is also very attractive and pleasant for those who are interested by the concept of human naturalness. And, in this sense, we do have a philosophical approach and effect. (Özcan, A. K., 1999, pp. 65, 66).

In the approaches to the conflicts and the grasp of the roots and settlements of the social questions, the point of view, throughout the Öcalan's talks of 1986 congress, corresponds with the definitions above focusing on the self-reconstruction of the individual – transformation of the Self into Actor. Within the framework of Marx's materialist conception of history, the fundamental question of humanity from the outset of civilisation to the present is taken as the field of departure and the "cause" of the "Freedom Movement" is defined accordingly.

... The process of humanity's progress is in this manner, and scientific socialism has actually elucidated this. As early mankind became capable of producing little more than his/her needs, the instinct of man's fierce greed was stimulated and mobilised, and the eagerness to accumulate appeared. One party in the society, namely exploiters or rulers, thus, came to being. Once they ascended to the throne, they did not desert it. Here is the source of all wars, violence and terror in social existence hitherto. The overall aim of freedom fighters is to emancipate humanity from this millennial chain. (Öcalan, 1993a, p. 193)

Because of his materialistic approach, "since it [Kurdistan] is an international colony; since it is a place in which humanity is ignored to the utmost and regarded as a hundred per cent its property, then the revolution of Kurdistan shall be international and the property of humanity in proportion to it" (Öcalan, in Küçük, 1993, p. 145).

152

As an extension of such an approach, the universality and historicity of the "burden" of the "Freedom Movement" is commented on further in the party congress of 1986.

> If attention is turned towards the point, humanity is faced here with deep-rooted losses, unjustness and deprivation of freedom. But if we are willing to live as human beings, we must then regain them [what we have lost]. This is an immense conflict. This conflict will determine the strength and the tactics of the war and the lifestyle of our movement. Since, as the fact that lies in the essence of the conflict is so significant, and if our movement does not want to lose, then it must passionately embrace the meritorious values bearing the vital sense of life. ... Our freedom movement will insightfully handle this question for the purpose of solving it in its entirety. And it will strive to solve the question by using a method which will need to go beyond the methods of violence experienced in the struggle of slaves against slave owners, of serfs against the lords of the manor, of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and retrieve all the losses in this way. This is the scientific elucidation of the fact that we have handled. (*op. cit.* p. 193,194).

The universalising aspect of the "Kurdistan Revolution" took up much discussion at the party congress, held in the second year of the guerrilla war. Then, the rhetoric of the classical Marxist ideology gradually transformed into more philosophical accounts of "personality" and "lifestyle" – the personalities moulded in the course of the war with its way of living peculiar to itself who were to be the seeds of a future freed society harmonised with its entire naturality. And evaluation of the "holy war" they have endeavoured to initiate is done accordingly.

> ... Notwithstanding that we call it the national liberation war, it is actually a great humanity war, a cultural and social development war; it is both a personal and economic development war, the war for gaining political emancipation and for flourishing in every respect. The war is a lifestyle for us. That is to say, it also has an economic content; and it is a fundamental form of production, a form of the reproduction of everything. (Öcalan, 1993. P. 202).

This quality of the war he defined is considered as the condition of the development of politicisation and a form of production in Kurdistan. "As profoundly as we transform this war into a lifestyle", Öcalan states in continuation of his talk, "we shall be able to

153

enhance the liberation and development of the form of production. As much as we develop the war we may do so in political life. The formation of the individuals' personalities, the development of the social and cultural sphere may only be possible through this war. Here is our party policy on war". The meaning of the "victory" of which they are in pursuit, in consequence, is sensed corresponding to the definition of the war above, in which its men were to be shaped.

There have hitherto been accounts of victories within the framework of an apparent front-line, of direct fighting with the enemy in a vulgar form, and of the dominance of weaponry. Whereas such an approach to victory is so insufficient. The greater and more detailed war, and the one which is not quite apparent is the "inner" war. Since the war is so great a phenomenon, since everything is mobilised and dedicated for it, then it has to be dealt with on the level of the human being who executes it. The only acceptable comment on the war executed in Kurdistan would thus be the one which is expressed in terms of the human species it has realised. (Öcalan, *Serxwebun*, 1993).

e. The Years of Massification and the Collapse of Existing Socialism

These efforts of Öcalan – not of the PKK – were accelerated and intensified in particular from 1990 onwards due to both the collapse of the Soviet system and the rapid rise of confrontations of massification occurring in the spring of this year. Yet in these years he continued emphasising the "indispensability" of socialism and socialist ideology while abandoning the classical Marxist-Leninist idiom. A sequence of books (Küçük, 1992, Öcalan, 1992, 1993, 1994a, 1994b, 1995a, 1995b, 1996a, 1997, 1998, 1999a *et al.*, Öcalan and Belli, 1999) focusing on today's questions of socialism, the individual's personality and the "renewed" or "re-humanised" man of the future of socialisation, appeared amongst the party publications. They were composed of party instructions, lectures, addresses, interviews and dialogues of no any leading figure of the PKK, but only of Öcalan on various occasions. (This will be argued further in chapter seven which is more engaged with the questions of the organisation). He puts additional emphasis on the inevitability of socialism and its inextricability with man's nature. "Being without socialism means leaving oneself without air" (*Serxwebun*, May 1993), says Öcalan, in a May day speech and, "the socialism that is receded from

human nature would no way have been doomed to collapse" later in the course of an interview with a Russian journalist (*Serxwebun*, October 1995). He subsequently talks about a new programme of international socialism transcending the classical perceptions of class structures and conflicts.

The approach of 19th century socialism is absolutely insufficient. It always solidly takes the notion of "*class against class, national liberation against colonialism*" as the premier standpoint. This is needed to some extent, but essentially the initial aspect should indeed be the flourishing of the socialist democracy. Struggling against the terrible destruction of the environment and consumption insanity is also essential. This may then be the new programme of socialism. Such a programme will obviously be both the merest expression of socialism and the liberation of humanity itself. (Öcalan, 1998, p. 30)

Anything other than socialism, for the Öcalan of the early 1990s, would not pervert human beings towards a "social bestialisation". According to this, "being dubious about socialism is equivalent to be dubious about the human being and its social existence" (Öcalan, 1992, p. 283)) While naming the overall era of class societies as "Civilisation Satan" (*Serwwebun*, December 1996), for it shaped mankind's spiritual structure on the basis of selfishness, greed and power, he sees socialism as the only way of escape from the bestialisation "flood" of the capitalist-imperialist era. "Socialism, in our day, is the name of the struggle against the insanity of consumption, the destruction of nature, and against capturing the society by the global media and similar kinds of epidemic social diseases" (Öcalan, 1998). In consequence, the main slogan of the 90s was invented accordingly: "*If imperialism is compelling humanity to bestialisation to its cells, we then must compel it to the humanisation to its atoms*".

In this sense, socialism is the only option for the future of humanity. It used to be called socialisation. Now we term it socialism. When socialisation stops bestialisation begins. And dangerous dragons breed in the social circumstances of capitalism. It is thus a socialist struggle, in this stage of the capitalist-imperialist era, that is the only pathway to emancipation. It is the single vital condition for a humane survival! If such a generalised and prevalent bestialisation is not hindered, humanity will come to an end. And in this sense, I say, insistence on socialism is insistence on becoming a human being. (*op. cit.*, 1998, p. 30).

155

From this perspective, the PKK leader began to globalise the theory of the revolution . On occasions, he defines the PKK as a "Humanisation Movement" (Öcalan, 1994a; White and Logan, 1997) and their aim as founding a "Republic of Humanity" (*Serxwebun*, October 1995, September 1996). And it is evaluated as the core entity of the "Peoples' Federation of Middle East" (*Serxwebun*, May 1992) because, for them, it is the "Gordian knot" (*Manifesto*, p. 208) of the surrounding geography. Towards the late 90's, the term "Great Anatolia Revolution" (*Serxwebun*, December 1997) was gradually employed instead of Kurdistan Revolution. For the PKK, the socialism of Kurdistan shall not be a "geography socialism" but the "human socialism". And the contemporary slogan of socialism was to be "everything is not for the Party and State but for Humanisation and the Humanity Republic" (*op. cit.* Oct. 1995). Öcalan's definition of the "movement of the PKK" of October 1991 was the first literal expression of the notion of the "Humanisation Movement" by which all these were followed.

The PKK movement, beyond being an entity of nationalisation and national emancipation, is a humanisation movement. For that reason, our struggle is not only for the liberation of the Kurdish people but it also, in a sense, means the liberation of the humanity of the world. The loftiness of the Kurdish people will in the final analysis mean the loftiness of the world's humanity too. If a people has so descended to the bottom in a part of this world, I think one cannot speak of the exaltation of humanity. Ignoring Kurdistan to such an extent is the measure of the world's foolishness, and we will arrive at humanity from this very contradiction. (Öcalan, 1994a, p. 517).

An ironic language, anyhow, is used following the paragraph above during the narration to the pupils. "I do not tend to make you feel sorry, but I have to state that the works are not so simple as you think". Yet, when replaying White's question asking the Party's "*class* politics" he gives fairly identical definition in a slightly different manner.

... You should call our movement a humanitarian movement – not a class movement but a movement for the freedom of the human being. So, you can't understand the movement, by looking at the PKK only through the spectacles of class struggle

156

(Abdullah Öcalan, pers. Comm., Lebanon, 2 July 1992). (White and Logan, 1997, p. 229).

Yet Öcalan makes comparisons of their work with the Islamic, French and Russian revolutions, and, in particular, proposes to accomplish the Bolshevik's "semi-revolution" – or "quasi-revolution" – (Öcalan, 1992, p. 98) of October. He defines the PKK in terms of being the remedial way out from the depression of experienced socialism.

> It is becoming clearer that the PKK is the peculiar name for being consistent in grasping and believing the essential theme of socialism, and of defending it insistently against all the forms of degeneration at a time when the depression has begun to deepen, but in conditions where the chance of escape is viewed as not being fairly possible. (*Serxwebun*, June 1991).

The main critique of the Soviet Revolution by the PKK is based on the view that it is the victim of a vulgar materialism for they exhausted all the energy of socialism for the growth of the economy, Party and State. The Soviet experience of socialism and its versions of the other parts of the world were a kind of "primitive" or "childish" socialism. Whereas "the socialism of Kurdistan is a great human revolution which by all means does not recognise the borders", and, according to them, the State should have been dissolved in the people. But in experienced socialism the process has occurred the other way round; people have been dissolved in the State and Party (*Serxwebun*, October 1995). Thus, for the PKK, shaping a socialist individual is more vital than establishing a state or a party (Öcalan, 1998, p. 180) because "if the question of socialist cadres is not overcome, either in case of the victory or of executing a quite ordinary political or military activity, everything may promptly reverse" (*op. cit.* p. 22). In the course of the interview with the Russian journalist, Öcalan asserts that the self-critique of the existing socialism is also presented by himself and, thus, rather focuses on the notion of moulding the man of socialism and his corresponding lifestyle.

> The fundamental objective of socialism is to create the personality of a new man. ...
> Consequently creating the personality of a new man is essential for our ideology. ....

Because socialism represents the novelty and nobility of humanity, socialism needs to be transformed into a lifestyle and needs to infiltrate society.

The new man, accurate man, good man is socialist man. Why then should it be imprisoned in borders? Why then should it hide itself? (Öcalan, 1998, p. 179)

In Öcalan's view, this universalistic approach to the objectives of socialism may well be the historical task of the inhabitants of upper Mesopotamia – the cradle of primitive humanisation. In addition, this very background of Kurdistan "may be quite a component of the material base" for the success of the PKK's re-humanisation attempt.

This country, just as it played the role of being the cradle of civilisation in its past, in our time, – through overcoming the immense conflict between down-trodden humanity to an extent that had never been seen before and that is compelled by capitalist-imperialism and nature and social life – may yet again initiate the role of rescuing humanity and of being the cradle of re-humanisation of the same weight and loftiness. Our party, if a concession is not made from its essence of taking great humanity as the fundamental source of action, if full awareness and sensitiveness are not weakened [in defence] against the vulgar policies of experienced socialism, all sorts of capitalistic traits and yet against the base illnesses of feudalism, will indeed be able to obtain the chance of being the vanguard orienting humanity from the most backward conditions towards a most developed stage of humanisation. (*Serxwebun*, March 1993).

Further, the leader of the PKK, in the course of talks and dialogues, frequently ventured onto defining himself or on explaining the realisation and development of his personal spiritual structure in terms of this very global conflict. For example, "...If such a form of combined conflict did not exist, I would by no means be able to survive myself" or "I am the product of such a logic of the current merciless intricate relation-conflict wholeness" (Öcalan, 1994a, and *et. al.*) he says at various occasions in his teachings. There are many similar expressions and explanations of himself throughout his talks of almost a quarter of a century to the extent that one may conclude that it is one of his basic methods of educating and/or motivating his militants. In this case, as regards contemplating the history of mankind, he again refers to himself: "One can say that I devote the largest share of my efforts to myself. I strive to see, to hear, to

perceive, to feel the sciences, the philosophies and the religions those which are as old as humanity, and whatever can be seen, heard and felt as far-reaching as my eyes, my ears and my spirit are able to see, to hear and to feel" (*Serxwebun*, October 1994a; Öcalan, 1995b, pp. 59-110).

Being aware of this gradual intensification of rather exalted universal objectives by tackling man's nature, made me to fomrulate question when I interviewed him in front of over a hundred of his militants and fighters in the Party Central School. I asked him the story of diversion from the "two words" (colony and Kurdistan) to this *re-humanisation* perspective.

- At its outset, your movement appeared to be an attempt to revitalise the Kurdish nation, which had been "buried in concrete" by the young Turkish Republic, an attempt to smash that "concrete" to pieces. Later, however, particularly now in the 1990s, it has acquired a more universal and humanistic dimension. Now you focus on human nature, human personality and the spiritual structure of human beings. What has caused this progression from national identity to the quest for humanisation? (Özcan, A. K., 1999, pp. 56,57).

He somehow tended to ignore the question, or probably aimed at provoking the questioner as a consequence of his leadership style.

- It would be very difficult for any ordinary social scientist to comprehend me. I think that, despite all your efforts, you are not going to be able to understand. In fact, my method does not fit into the imagination of ordinary human beings. Only I, so far, know how and who I am fighting. ... (*op. cit.*, p. 57).

I briefly reform and insisted on my question for it was not the answer.

-... I wanted to know how or why you have redirected your emphasis from rediscovering a buried national identity to the point of universal re-appropriation of the human essence.

- These were only *key words*. You have to place the key in the door and turn it in the relevant direction before you can open the door and see inside the room. These words

159

were not the whole edifice. The subsequent developments are well worth looking at. (*op. cit.* p. 57)

Literally, what one may infer from the narration above is that the national words are rather regarded as instrument of the genuine struggle. In fact, Öcalan was to put it into more "undressed" words in the monthly magazine Serxwebun, the central organ of the Party: "In this sense, national liberation is only a means of my struggle" (*Serxwebun*, December 1997)

Along with the insistence on socialism, and subsequently on humanisation, the weight given to the term "ideology" is remarkable enough to mention. One of the earliest publications of the Party, following the *Program*, *Manifesto* and *Foundation Bulletin*, is "*What is the Ideology and Politics, and How is it Emerged?*" was typed, photocopied and distributed among the early party cadres and printed subsequently. The cause of the functional stage at which they arrived so far is largely attributed to the ideological efforts. While, in 1987, Öcalan regards the main source of their success as diligently putting all the efforts of the Party into the implementation of the "Marxism of Imperialist era, Leninism" to the concrete circumstances of Kurdistan and "welding the Leninist theory of revolution into the material condition" of their country (Öcalan, 1992, p. 51); towards the late 90s, he points at the crucial importance of ideology in the process of furthering their activities (Öcalan, 1998, pp. 58-67). Moreover, he finds the cause of the historicity of his leadership and its effectiveness in filling the gap of "*ideologylessness*".

> Why then can I be so effective? I am currently considered to be a miracle, this is because I revealed the state of ideologylessness and absence of morale in the Kurdish existence within the framework of my personality, and the extent of my own self-realisation through this very unveiling corresponded quite easily with the concrete circumstances of this phenomenal social and political existence. In fact, the miraculous quality of every historical leap emanates from such a conjunction. (Öcalan, 1998, p. 59).

So he tells his pupils in confidence: "If you brake the link between yourself and ideology you will bestialise", and accused them of being "ideologyless": "I am afraid of you because you are ideologyless. In the past, people used to say '*you are*

irreligious, immoral'. ... Now ideology has replaced all these concepts". He firmly relates the "descended" state of the people of Kurdistan and the way of his action also with ideology.

> Instead of saying *"our people are ignorant, thoughtless"* which is repeated in abundance by everybody, we will in general say: Our people is ideologyless, without morale and have been descended to the level of bestiality because of being deprived of these basic concepts. ... If I could become a great voice, the most fundamental cause of this is improving myself ideologically. If the fact is looked at from a closer distance, one may see that I did not work vulgarly with weapons. I did not work with money either. My style of executing the work is through ideology. (op. it. p. 59)

Then he gives a definition of the Party, in this occasion, in terms of ideology. "Just in this point - what is the PKK?" asks and answers Öcalan, "The PKK is primarily the movement of inventing the ideology and morale of the reality of a people whose ideology and morale has totally collapsed" (*op. cit.*, p. 64).

And the ideology with which Öcalan works and "grows up" with is Marxism: "ideologically I am nourished by Marxism" (Öcalan, 1995a, p. 78) he conveys during the dialogue with a fellow Turkish prominent revolutionary activist of the early 70's; and tells his militants: "To what extent socialism may shed a light on your existing traits? It is important. Because it is our ideological guide. That is to say, it is the fuel, the consciousness, the soul which make you walk. What can your feet do without it?" (Öcalan, p. 151). I mean, throughout Öcalan's teachings, the explicit emphasis on the terms socialism, Marxism and also Leninism is bold in proportion with the refrain from the word communist or communism. (For the word "communist" has not just derogatory but also dangerous connotations in Turkey and Kurdistan. It is translated and penetrated into people's Turkish as *"dinsiz-Allahsiz"* [irreligious-Godless] and *"ana baci tanimaz"* [the man who do not recognise the limits of mother and sister in terms of sexual intercourse]).

To summarise, the ideology of the PKK at its inception generally squares with the framework of a commonplace version of classical Marxism in the Cold War era, with its hesitant and/or balanced critique of Soviet socialism. The ideological spirit of the Party's programme is fairly identical with an orthodox communist party in spite of the scarce usage of the term "communist". The programmatic objectives in terms of

the national emancipation cause, including the "unavoidable necessity" of the armed struggle method to attain its goals, are additionally identical to fellow Kurdish political initiatives, which existed at the outset, apart from the spirit of the PKK's language. Among the written materials of the early years of the organisation (the late 1970's) there are no remarkable peculiarities deserving elucidation, with respect to either its ideological framework or programmatic schedule or theoretical accounts of the state of affairs of the day, apart from the enthusiastic – and also aggressive to some extent – ingredients of the language which I considered to be the roots of its future organisational prominence. As the struggle furthers, transformations, alterations and modifications – and in some cases metamorphoses – occur due to the simultaneous rise of mass participation and confrontations. In certain stages of organisational expansion and progression, universal efforts at micro (reshaping the individual's personality) and macro (the re-humanisation attempt for an "unaccomplished" move into socialism) levels intensifies while classical Marxist-Leninist rhetoric withers away. Likewise, with regard to national ends, the change of circumstances is immediately reflected in programmatic targets to the point where the overall renewal of the Party programme occurs at the seventh extraordinary party congress, which was held following Öcalan's call from Imralli Prison for the withdrawal of guerrilla forces from inside Turkish State borders.

In addition, the phenomenon of the ideological and theoretical body of the PKK merely consisted of Öcalan's recorded-edited verbal "activity" of fairly two decades – from his escape of 1979 to his abduction of 1999 – except from some initial texts of late 70's. The scarce books of several prominent figures of the Party are the ones with memorial context, with the single exception of Mazlum Dogan's *Collected Writings* edited afterwards, someone who was killed in Diyarbakir Prison of Turkey at the age of 22 in 1982. This is why Öcalan does not avoid emphasising the fact from time to time by saying, "I execute the revolution with my tongue".

However; of the principal peculiarities of the PKK to itself, the one which needs further elaboration is the *consistency of insistence* on socialism within the framework of its perspective of perception, even if the use of language in this regard is substantially shifted depending on the Party's positional policies. For instance, in talking to a Russian journalist, Öcalan contemplates the subject to the extent of penetrating the lack of Stalin's education by Lenin, Lenin's warnings about the potential dangers of Stalin and the importance of his bequest in this case, and even

162

further into Stalin's marriage when arguing the questions of Soviet socialism (Öcalan, 1998, pp. 179-181). But when Öcalan responds to the "retired" American diplomat David A. Korn or to the professor of political science at Tennessee Technology University, Michael M. Gunter, he produces an *"extremely temperate"* language. Gunter reminds Öcalan of the removal of the hammer and sickle from the PKK's flag at the 1995 congress and its subsequent efforts to "de-emphasise its earlier Marxism". Gunter then asks him: "What do you say to those who say this was a cosmetic change and that you are still a Marxist, a communist?" Here is the complete response.

> *Öcalan*: This is just propaganda. It is not possible for us to be communists. Why did the Soviet Union collapse and the United States has not? It is because the communism made the government every thing, but human being nothing. The United States represents development. (Gunter, 1998, p. 82).

As it is shown from the quotations from him so far that Öcalan, in this brief response, employs the term *communism* in quotation marks implying actually the "experienced communism", but quotation marks are not visible in verbal statements! And the relating part of question and the "drizzled" lines of answer to Korn are as follows:

> – ... In addition, is Marxism-Leninism the ideology of the PKK?
> – ... As a people and party we are harmed by this socialism. ... I am not in the position to explain very briefly as to what sort of perception of socialism we have in every aspect. But I can confidently convey that our understanding of socialism is not
> ... a socialism in which the individual is shrunk to its bottom limit but the State is swollen to its top limit.
> ... Rights for the individual as much as the needs of society, social benefits and social order as much as the needs of the individual is what we are trying to be loyal to as a principle. I think this is enough of an explanation to introduce ourselves. (Öcalan, 1998, pp. 99-101)

The eventual paragraph does present some association with Marx's proposal of "from everyone according to his/her ability, to everyone according to his/her need" for a matured communist society. Or in other words, it is rather a super-structural version of it. That is to say, the leader of the PKK, as the only builder of the Party's theoretical and ideological body from the foundation of the Party to his arrest, kept on

insisting on the socialist ideology and its universal aspirations, and he somehow governed his language of this realm in "dressing" it according to the Party's standpoint of a *durational* position. Yet, one tends to conclude, at first glance, that he has not been in pursuit of such a language as such in his *Defences* and statements raised from the one-man prison of Imralli island, which are solidly backed as a whole and deemed to be the "Second Manifesto" by the PKK. Whereas the very governance of the "extreme-temperate" language has been extremised further to the extent that one can hardly notice the difference. For example, it does not seem to be easy to state whether he refuses the principle of "self-determination right of nations" or actually criticises the comment and application of the principle in the following sentence: "The right of nations for self-determination' which came into fashion in the 70's, which was interpreted only in terms of separate state in the course of its applications, was, indeed, an impasse in this specific context". (Öcalan, 1999c, p. 12). But the firm attitude towards socialism and its significance for the future of humanity have not been moderated as such.

Whatever the language is, the PKK's overall programme reconstructed with major alterations, even in certain aspects metamorphosed into a distinct party programme following these defences, and was approved with no considerable opposition at the extraordinary congress held afterwards.

II Following Öcalan's Arrest: The "Second Manifesto"

To develop the argument of the PKK's ideological and theoretical journey, the defences produced during the trials, and the statements released through his lawyers subsequent to the verdict of death sentence are more than worthy of being looked at. In distinguishing the consistent, flexible, inconsistent, firm and ignored aspects of the journey, these documents will, to a vital extent, be useful. For the changes that appeared here are not customarily relevant to a movement claiming to undertake national liberation.

a. The Legal Defences at Imralli Prison

One cannot miss the defendant's immediate concern (the point at which my argument is directed. In the early lines of introduction to the first defence, Öcalan, referring his earlier statements as regards the war, a separate state, violence and accusations for making tactical proposals, promptly comes to the ideology and programme of the PKK. He begins with the extract below from his statements made during the press conference of 15 March, 1993, at which the initial unilateral cease-fire declared.

> "We are not demanding an immediate separation from Turkey. We are realistic on this subject. Do not interpret this [cease-fire] as a simple tactic [serving a hidden agenda]. There are many reasons as to why [we are realists]. Those who understand the historic, political and economic situation of the two peoples [the Kurds and Turks], know well that separation could not take place. They [the Kurds and Turks] are intertwined like flesh and bone". (Öcalan, 1999d, p. 7).

This is followed by three other extracts from the statements made at the latest unilateral cease-fire declared on 1 September 1998, emphasising their genuine understanding of war and violence, and their "essential objective" for *democratisation of the Republic* rather than forcing its abolition. Then he comes to the point.

> I am quoting these for this particular reason: there may be some who tend to incorrectly claim that I have come to such a standpoint due to the harsh conditions of my solitary confinement. Even in the indictment, I have the impression that my earlier statements taken under interrogation will not be of considerable significance. But however, my statements have laid bare *the necessity of altering of both the PKK's programme and its political structure with its narrow, strict ideological approaches of the fiery 70s* in the light of the composition of the world and Turkey in the 1990s. There is an emphasis on the need for *revising* and *updating* the *principles and programme* [of the PKK] in the aftermath of an immense experience. [Italics added]. (Öcalan, 1999c, p. 10).

What would he then imply by "alteration of the programme and political structure" or revising and updating the principles of the Party with its "narrow, heavy" elements of ideological approaches descended from the fiery 70s? There are extensive texts of, not

implications, but of illuminating explanations indicating the deep-rooted alterations to the programme of the PKK, surrounding the concepts of "Democratic Solution", "Democratic Republic" and "Free Togetherness". From the national-programmatic point of argument, one may, without exaggeration, infer that the only thing that remained unaltered is the name of the Party (*Partiya Karkeren Kurdistan* – Kurdistan Workers Party) which actually contradicts the essential framework of the texts. But a similar assertion cannot be made with regard to the *revisions and updates of the principles of the party* as those are based on socialist ideology. On the contrary, the ideological aspects relating socialist purposes and aspirations of the Party are dealt with far less than the "inevitability" and/or "nobility" of democratisation. From the ideological point of argument, the "heavy" rhetoric of the "fiery 70s" and, rather more, the reflection of the principle of "the right of nations for self-determination" to the terminology of PKK's theory and programme in the form of separate state, is meant by the "necessity of alteration" which are indeed superseded by a diligent moderate language. On the other hand, even if it is briefed under certain subtitles of the main defence, the insistence on the belief in socialism as "the only future of humanity", is expressed in a "straight-forward" locution. But it is phrased simultaneously with an over-highlighted stipulation: *evolutionary* and *democratic* socialism.

Öcalan's "Second Manifesto" (*Kürt Sorununa Democratik Cözüm Manifestosu* – The Manifesto of Democratic Solution of the Kurdish Question) consists of three defences produced against the Turkish State institutions of jurisdiction. If one were to give the most broad outline of the defences, it may well be reduced to a word or a phrase: Solution or Democratic Solution. They are consequently a presentation of a bold picture of an attempt at persuasion of the Turkish Establishment for an "exterminated" settlement to the Kurdish question within the existing *Misak-i Milli* (the National Pact of 1920) borders of Turkey, which is believed to be the most feasible, most accurate and most dignified resolution [of the sanguinary conflict of centuries] for both parties. In respond to the allegations claiming Apo's surrender and conversion because of the fear of death, his justifications also gather around the notion of *solution*: "This is the celebrity of the Apo personality. The Apo personality is the solution personality. ... the temperament of my spirit, my attitude is keeping in the same style as my march shaped outside. It is conjectural. It is linked with being the strength of the solution" (*Özgür Politika*, 6 June 1999). In the statement released

through his solicitors while touching on the matter of his survival and death he points again at the solution.

> The case is not whether I stay alive or die. However, understanding me will lead everybody to win. Both the society and the state will benefit from this. I could take a position of another sort. I could easily strike a non-concessive attitude. But if I desired the solution, I should not have taken such a position. I myself survive for the solution, I urge myself forward for the solution. (*op. cit.*, 6 June 1999).

Yet in the introduction of the main defence, he repeatedly emphasises the cause of the standpoint he had to form. He states that he did not attempt to "revert to either a classical Kurdish nationalist line or the leftist interpretation of this very tendency" because, "a sterile repetition, no matter how heroic it is", would not "contribute much to the ideal of freedom".

> ... In general, the PKK's [ideological] defences have followed the two opposite extremes; either a stubborn defence of the classical line, or the abandonment of that line. This, in a sense, is the same as having no solution. I made it a point to go beyond this. (Öcalan, 1999d, pp. 9,10).

Öcalan contemplates further on the "why" of this "converted" aspect of himself by a philosophisation on the transition of his personality, for he regards this as the method of his *"analysations"* (referring his teachings). "Scrutinising a splendid search-for freedom in the framework of my personality has become my methodology." And, "making an attempt to try for it, here too, was an expected issue" (Öcalan, 1999c, p. 12). By the end of main defence, "although it might not be needed", he, however, puts down one more heading, "My Personal Status", before passing on to the Conclusion. In the paragraph of introduction tending to give an abstract of this heading, he talks of a "transitional" stage of his personality.

> ... At this point, my greatest fear is *the non-completion of a project of humanity left at the halfway point.* Therefore, my greatest expectation from life is the chance of transition from an overly-competent personality of a rebel-for-freedom to that of fighter-for-peace which contains freedom. Only for this reason I regarded the necessity of my survival as a fundamental point of departure in the course of the

overall process of my arrest, interrogation and of subsequent events. The personality of peace – and, likewise, that of the society of peace – is a theoretical endeavour which requires both political, social, and, in addition, detailed psychological analysis to a greater extent than is assumed. ... As I have emphasised, a war, or any kind of action of violence, which does not aim at a noble, sacred and very necessary peace is madness. In accordance with this rule [understanding], it was crucial that I should unveil the aspects of the personification of a man of a peace which is needed to a vital degree, not only theoretically but also morally, politically and practically [Italics added]. (*op. cit.*, pp. 12, 13).

The reflection of this *personal* transition, or "upgrading", to the cause of *national liberation* will be discussed in the course of comparison of the earliest and latest programmes of the PKK because the programme of "re-foundation" is, as I mentioned earlier, a kind of systematised edition of this reflection. Here, thus, I shall have to go through Öcalan's ideological temperament as regards the socialism along with the "why" of his positional state in Imralli Prison, for they relate my point of argument – the balance of national and ideological aspects of the PKK.

Even though it is quite limited in comparison with the "repeated" proposal of "uniquely solvent" capability of "free togetherness" under a democratic republic, Öcalan does not refrain from arguing the questions of socialism and his present position towards them. He continues to make every endeavour to govern his style, but it is more straight forward than the one employed in response to the American former diplomatic mission's question concerning this. Under certain headings of the "Second Manifesto", such as The Emergence of the PKK and a New Stage in the Kurdish Question, Transformation Problems within the PKK or My Personal Status, we find firm elements in defence of socialism and beliefs in its significance for the future of humanity. However, he begins with a gathered account of democracy-evolution-revolution under the first heading following the Introduction – Victorious Democracy at the End of 20th Century.

Democracies rather possess an evolutionary language, but they essentially rest on revolutions. The most crucial thing is the appropriate time for the democratisation of a revolution. Revolutions that fail to democratise, either engender dictatorships or are eventually run wild led by anarchism. ... To become stuck to the revolutionary stage

also means to be fixated on all kinds of conservative bureaucratism as much as on counter-revolution. ...

Today's democracies, ... then in the 20th century, resisted the unforgiving dictatorship of fascism and the totalitarian regimes of its adversaries, experienced socialism, and announced its final victory at the end of the century. ... It derives its actual power from being the answer to the needs of society's naturalness. ... Coercion produces rapid development, but also easy downfall. Whereas the democratic system might produce slow development but does not engender easy downfall. (Öcalan, 1999c. pp. 13,14).

He concludes that the crucial thing [for democratic systems] is transforming democratic values successfully into not only solutions of social problems but also into its power of governance. "The best politics or politician", for Öcalan, "will then seek its/his/her identity through the personalities of individuals, leaderships and the nature of parties who/which shall be capable of representing this very power" (*op. cit.* p. 15).

Once having given this a preliminary base for a relevant conversion of their well-known revolutionary language into a well-formed evolutionary one, Öcalan returns to the peculiar background of the Turkish-Kurdish relations of almost two centuries. Following a scrutinised picture of the Republican era in particular, he again comes to the point. Namely, he gives an assiduously structured definition of the PKK in ideological and non-national terms.

The PKK is indeed the latest extensive movement of Kurdish rebellion which has emerged and developed initially as an ideological rebel movement between 1970 and 1980, but later from 1980 to 1990 as a political and operational movement, of a utopian theoretical group which departed with a theoretical-practical exploration of the world's stormy revolutions and counter-revolutions of the time, on an objective base which had been shaped by the infrastructure and superstructure of the Republic's preceding fifty years. In spite of its formal Kurdishness, it is a unique territorial freedom movement which took progressive steps towards combining the arts of politics and war. (*op. cit.* p. 27).

When arguing the "Transformation Problems within the PKK", Öcalan gives another definition – but in terms of lifestyle: "The PKK is the free life of a new man as much as it is so of a people".

Yet it is believed that the Party should transform itself from a *revolutionary organisation* to a *democratic organisation*. The PKK leadership persuaded itself that the Party had accomplished its revolutionary task (Öcalan, 1999d, p. 31,32; *Program*, 1999, pp. 46-55) by now (even by the early 90s because the years followed became "rather self-repetitive years" (Öcalan, 1999d, p. 41). According to the Programme echoed from the *Defences*; the war did its part: They have come to believe that this war produced its effects through its extensive, deep-rooted influence of the years, and changed many things to the extent of a non-revertible state; that the "democratic revolution" eliminated the tribal-feudal social structure apart from "some remnants and traditional customs" (*Program*, 1999, pp. 47,48); that, even if the assimilation has not been completely stopped in the sense of language, it is considerably driven back by the democratic revolution in terms of feelings and culture; that the Kurdishness converted from an entity from which everyone ran away, to an identity of which everyone is proud because of its contribution to freedom, democracy and humanity; and that, while the first condition of being involved in politics used to be the *denial* of Kurds, now, there are many people who are active in the politics on behalf of the Kurds. And thus, "it became impossible to execute a colonialism of pre-1984 within the Kurdish people whose political and democratic consciousness flourished" (*op. cit.*, pp. 51,53-55). Namely, the Kurdish people no longer resemble the earlier Kurdish people; "Kurdistan is no more early Kurdistan" (Besikci, 1990, pp. 50-56). In consequence, the PKK should from now on continue its "genuine march" by the method of not violent-revolutionary but democratic-evolutionary means of action.

... Giving birth to itself by force does not mean that it [the PKK] will keep on growing up in the same way. The birth of a child, too, occurs as a result of a gigantic difficulty but then its natural development takes place without difficulty. This is a law of nature. Qualitative leaps both engender and are engendered by force, but it is quantitative development that is essential. (Öcalan, 1999c, p. 39).

In terms of national undertakings up until the arrest of Öcalan, the self-critiques of the movement's recent past gather around three highlighted points: a) The self-repetition

of the mid and late nineties and not being prepared enough mutually with the State for a democratic outlet, b) Exaggerated assessment of earlier Kurdish rebellions based, on the one hand, on misinterpretation of the establishment and authoritarian development of the Turkish Republic, and on the other, on the non-national nature of their leaderships[6] and c) not being sufficiently frank and confident on the only adequate solution of "free togetherness within the *Misakk-i Milli* (i.e. existing) borders of Turkey". Therefore, as a result, the overall programme of the Party has been rewritten appropriate to a re-foundation. Nevertheless, the prospect of the Party's socialist views and its reflection to the programmatic dimension are quite distinct. Even more, the undertakings put down in the very new programme of "democratic liberation" (Programme, 1999, p. 50) is proposed for a future leap towards socialism (*op. cit.* p. 70).

Under the heading "The Problems of Transformation within the PKK", the overall intellectual effort devoted to some dialectical accounts of the *questions and future of socialism*, which are substantially reedited in the renewed programme by the method of simply not using the quotation marks. The main concern here is not how to avoid the future hindrances or the potential preventatives on the way to gain the national cause those which are engendered by the PKK's hitherto insistence on socialist ideology and objectives – that is widely believed [by the major nationalistic circles] to be the obvious source of the high price already paid so far by the Kurdish nation.

On the contrary, Öcalan focuses on how to meet the historical exigencies of socialism within the actuality of the PKK's theoretical and practical existence with a deep concern of being the victim of a law of the societal nature formulated by himself as "if you do not solve, you will then be solved" or, in other words, "if you do not overcome [the obstacle at a historical conjunction] you will be overcome". Both the critique of "Sovietic" socialism, its manifestation in the Turkish Marxist left of 1970s and the self-critique of the stretch of the dogmatic aspect of the early PKK during the 90s was guided by this very concern. "For it [socialism] did not manage to open the adequate channels within its own system to freedom and equality which meant to be the part of its essential nature; for it did not actualise both economic and political progressions which have even been ventured by capitalism and partly reflected in the mundane life of the ordinary individual, socialism has simply died of the luck of breathing", he states, and continues:

Although the heavy global depressions stemming from capitalism were not only its [socialism's] fault, but because it was still held responsible for them, socialism would either solve the questions or be dissolved. Because they could not be solved, it was doomed to be dissolved and ultimately was dissolved. (Öcalan, 1999c, p. 33)

Even further disabilities of socialism spread around Turkey, for "the socialism introduced to the Turkey of the 1970s was far behind the adequate seriousness of ideologies", or the transfer of socialism to Turkey "was conducted in a more eclectic, imitative and schematic manner than that of capitalism". He then compares it with the emergence of the Islamic sects. "There existed", according to him, "not the ideology of socialism but its hypocritical sects, namely the fake factions". And in consequence, "once again, the rule of '*if you cannot offer the accurate solution, you will be dissolved*' produced its result, i.e. the Turkish socialist left promptly disappeared as the coup d'état of 1980 took over. This is the very concern that made him impose the PKK for a comprehensive change of strategy and for a new programme, before missing the opportunity.

Those who do respond in time to this law of the evolution of the social dialectic will enjoy development, but those who do not will not merely be able to escape from being left under the wreckage of massive sufferings and meaningless losses. In the context of the social transformations we are undergoing at an intense rate in our day, we see the application, virtually under laboratory conditions, of this very law in some corner of the world every day. Not to draw a conclusion from this is possible only if one is blind or extremely conservative. (Öcalan, 1999c, pp. 33, 34)

In other words, Öcalan believes that life would "not tolerate those who stand outside it for long". He warns his party by referring to the broadest law of the social dialectic formulated briefly by Marx as, "the relation of production which does not further the powers of production turns into a barrier to its progression and shall thus be superseded inevitably". Once again this is a kind of political version of Marxist socio-economic formulation: "A force that does not take life further turns into a hindrance; on such occasions, transcending [eliminating] the force itself becomes the most vital requirement of revolution". That is to say, in the final analysis, alteration has become

172

inescapable; but to what extent, or, what would be the limit of alteration? For the reason that, "an alteration brings [the entity subject to change] to an end, another creates historicity" (*op. cit.* p. 38).

However, no significant hesitation about the extent of change appears within the "Second Manifesto" in terms of either national objectives scheduled in the *Manifesto* and the modified Programme of 1995 or of the method of revolutionary violence (the strategy of "People's War") operated for almost two decades. (These were partly discussed in the foregoing and I shall briefly examine them again while making a sequential comparison below between the programmes). On the contrary, there is no hesitation about the "consistency of insistence" on the socialist objectives and the idea of utopias and romanticism is found throughout the whole text of the re-foundation proposal.

> Just as capitalism incorporated the gains of socialism into its own democracy by – even allowing the foundation of communist parties – paying more attention to the human rights at the roots of socialism than socialism itself, and thereby outstripped experienced socialism; the socialism of the new era will regain its great power for solutions through incorporating all the values of not only capitalism but of those of all human history and through facing the dangers before the new humanity. (Öcalan, 1999c p. 33).

Following the statement emphasising the death of socialism due to "a virtual lack of breathing" as "the most progressive, egalitarian and freethinking form of democratic development at the start of century" which "went on to exert a pressure on capitalism to the utmost", Öcalan constructs several comprehensive sentences containing a firm defence and prophecy of socialism with no noticeable tactical governance of his language as such. In other words, the loyalty to the future of socialism and belief in its potential political, social and philosophical strength are expressed rather in an "undressed" style. He defends in confidence:

> ... This of course does not mean that socialism left no positive legacy. The historical role it played in bringing about the social and national institutions that characterise our age, and in the emergence of the classes and nations enjoying a greater degree of equality cannot be disputed. What capitalism had achieved in only a limited way over several centuries, socialism exceeded in half a century. (Öcalan, 1999d, pp. 36, 37).

In continuation, he makes fairly broad and firm prophecies.

> ... There is no doubt that it will flower again on its roots. Again it is inevitable that, socialism, i.e. scientific socialism as the manifestation of a further scientific analysis of the social actuality, will re-flower in its mature age by overcoming the basic problems of humanity. It will form the antithesis to the thesis posed by contemporary capitalism with its extreme inequalities and especially its inability to cope with history, with nature and with social problems. The socialist experiment which has in fact left a great deal of experience behind; through a sense of obligation to synthesise what it has to gain for mankind with its hitherto gains, and through recovering its capacity of being the only solvent power to level the social imbalances by flourishing its theory and correct and rich practice amongst one another, particularly in the provinces of the nature-environment, women-children-population, history, culture, ethnic and religious minorities and national complications ... will prove its capability of replacing its raw democracy, which essentially led to its very dissolution and from which capitalism even benefited to a considerable extent, with its most developed democratic system in its matured stage. (Öcalan, 1999c, p.33).

But within the contemplation called "My Personal Status" towards the conclusion of the main defence document, Öcalan lays emphasis on his loyalty to socialism. He re-emphasises that he retains his belief in the ability of socialism to be the answer again to the problems of society and the epoch by presenting its genuine democratic perception and the frank application of it (Öcalan, 1999d, p. 106).

Alongside these broad generalisations, he outlines his view by suggesting democratic socialism for present day Turkey. "The role of non-development of democratic socialism, which is actually an indispensable need for society, is vital in aggravating the societal complications to the current level in Turkey" (Öcalan, 1999c, p. 91).

From such a point of departure he again draws a dialectical conclusion:

> From consolidation of thesis and antithesis a new synthesis is born. The antagonism of the State-PKK leads to the synthesis of the Democratic Republic, and of its victory (op. cit. p. 40).

There will be no need for citing the reflections of Öcalan's statements focusing on socialism to the new programme, for they are conveyed virtually in the form of the removal of quotation marks. However, a couple of points may be worth mentioning which in a sense transcended the Leader's perspective. Just before passing on to state the "Duties of the Democratic Transformation" in a sequential order, the seventh extraordinary congress of the PKK, while re-constructing the schedule of the Party's activity sphere, drops a note of pre-warning.

> The democratic transformation of which we have defined the features is actually proposed to be a preliminary stage in order to reach our actual aim at socialism, and will undertake the following tasks. (*Program*, 1999, p. 70).

Also, in the recent issues of *Serxwebun* subsequent to Öcalan's standpoint in the Imralli prison, there has been a striking intensification of articles and speeches concentrating on the "socialism of the PKK" held/signed by either the Presidency Council of the PKK or a named member of the Council. One may effortlessly notice the additional emphasis on the socialist aspect of the PKK in these editions. Many similar and distinct accounts and definitions of the Party's earlier and present nature in terms of socialist ideology may be selected (*Serxwebun*, 1999-2000). From January 1999 to July 2000 *thirteen* lengthy these articles and speeches of either prominent figures or Presidency Council members, published in the central organ of the Party, *Serxwebun*. Of these emphases, the most brief and bare one, I believe, is that expressed in the one signed with "Prescience Council" and published in the May 2000 issue entitled "Socialism is Not the Ideology of Class in its Narrowed Sense".

> From this angle, to know, to appreciate and to acknowledge socialism is crucial. If we refuse socialism, there will be no Party left. There will be no more PKK. (*Serxwebun*, May, 2000).

In summary, with respect to the social standpoint, the ideological perspective broadened along with the furtherance of aspirations and tenets of socialism, and, in addition, the "democratic transformation" that they "have determined" under the "Democratic Republic", which is featured by "free togetherness" within the existing State borders of Turkey, is regarded as a preliminary stage (Program, 1999, p.70) in

order to attain the eventual goal – socialism. This will then be referred to in the course of the arguments of the forthcoming chapters tackling the questions of the individual, the organisation and their peculiar interrelations.

We may now pass on to drawing a very basic skeleton of the latest programme (the "Second Manifesto") with comparison to the primary (*Manifesto*) and modified (1999) ones in terms of the aspect of national undertakings.

b. The Programme of "Re-foundation"

The national standpoint of Imralli Prison had its illustrated echo in the new programme of the PKK approved at the extraordinary congress. It is to a large extent a systematised edition of Öcalan's defences and does indeed contain substantial changes in the sense of the Party's national structure. Here are the first two sentences of its introduction:

> Our Party movement is entering in a process of deep-rooted changes and transformations. The currently ongoing changes and transformations are at a strategic level and are occurring in the form of re-foundation.

The programme of "re-foundation" has been rebuilt in accordance with not the target of "Independent, United and Democratic Kurdistan" (*Manifesto*, p. 202) or of "A Democratic People's Dictatorship in an Independent and United Kurdistan" (*PKK Foundation Declaration*, 1978, p. 55) but of a "Democratic Republic"; in accordance with not the violence of the "protracted people's war" but with the pressure of political escalation and mass mobilisation for a "Democratic Solution"; in accordance with the language of not a *frightening* "revolution" but of a *fondling* "evolution". Namely, the PKK will no more be in pursuit of a separate independent State of Kurdistan, a violent Kurdistan Revolution and of eliminating the Turkish army or its sovereignty in Northwest Kurdistan.

Glancing through the programmes, a conceptual variation is striking. In addition to an apparent moderation of the style, the concept of "Kurdistan Revolution" is converted into "Democratic Transformation" which associates with the notion of "Great Anatolian Revolution" formerly introduced by Öcalan (*Serxwebun*, December,

176

1997). The heading under which the political, social and cultural "duties" of the Party which was written down in a sequence has become "The Duties of Democratic Transformation", whereas in the former two programmes it was called "The Duties of the Kurdistan Revolution" (*Manifesto*, p. 190; *Programme*, 1995, p. 71; *Programme*, 1999, p. 70). Among the sequence of tasks of the Democratic Transformation, the following articles would be worth taking from the "national liberation" point of argument in comparison with the relating lines of the earlier two programmes.

In the *Manifesto* of the Movement's inception and the *Programme* of 1995:

1- The prime objective of the "Kurdistan Revolution" is stated in both as being "to create an Independent and Democratic Kurdistan", and consequently "the essential nature" of the revolution would be "A National Democratic Revolution". In order to accomplish the task; for the Manifesto, "the Turkish political and cultural colonialism and military invasion must be abolished", and in the words of 1995 programme, "to end every means of sovereignty of the Turkish colonialism and so of the imperialism behind it" (*Manifesto*, pp. 192, 193; *Programme*, 1995, pp. 67,68,72). Whereas in the Programme of 1999, the prime objective of the "Democratic Transformation" is to "end every means of sovereignty of an oligarchic structure and of its extension on the society" (*Programme*, 1999, p. 70). Here, the sovereign oligarchic structure and the society subjected to its sovereignty are not named. However, in the context, it is clear that what is meant is the "Turkish State", and the "whole population under its rule". Also, in the beginning of the attached Party Constitution, in front of the "Organisation's aim:" they are expressed by name: "To bring the sovereign power of Turkey's oligarchic structure and its extensions on the Turkish and Kurdish peoples to an end, ..." (From here onwards, comparison will have to be between the programmes of 1995 and 1999 because in the *Manifesto*, the tasks are not sequenced in articles. Also, comparison between the programmes of 1999 and 1995 with the most recent modifications approved at the fifth congress of the PKK will thus be more significant in the sense of clearer indications pointing at rapid metamorphoses as regards the national targets of the Party).

2- *Programme*, 1995: "To pillory the concessionist policies such as 'territorial autonomy' or 'autonomy' etc., those which do not aim at breaking the colonialist yoke and which in essence requires compromising with the colonialists, and keep on the continuing determined struggle against those approaches"[7] (p.72).

Program, 1999: "To develop a democratic political system on the base of Turkey's political wholeness and constitutional citizenship in which the free participation of Turkish and Kurdish peoples is realised" (p.71). "... To further the solution of the national question without disturbance of the boarders, within the framework of democratic transformation and free unity" (p.76.).

3- *Programme*, 1995: To create a national-independent and democratic society under the governance of people's democratic rule" (p. 73). *Programme*, 1999: "To create a free and democratic society under the rule of the Democratic Republic" (p. 71).

4- *Programme*, 1995: "Not to recognise any permission for setting up a military base and right of privilege for any foreign State on the land of the country" (p. 73) *Programme*, 1999: "To be in favour of reducing the army within the framework of protection of the borders and of its conversion from the state of being an entity of menace" (p. 72).

5- *Programme*, 1995: "To establish national institutions of education and culture instead of the colonialist's educational and cultural institutions. To provide the opportunities and arrangements for the development of all dialects of Kurdish, and to encourage one of them to be the national language" (pp. 75,76). *Programme*, 1999: "To work for obtaining the legal guarantee in order to be able to develop the Kurdish mother-tongue in every respect (p. 75).

From the selected articles above, it's obvious the programmatic transformation of the PKK goes beyond customary alteration or modification. It is not quite relevant to a party that was meant to be leading a national liberation struggle. Therefore, calling the seventh extraordinary congress a "re-foundation congress" or Öcalan's defence a "Second Manifesto" is not a mere exaggeration. The change is more than a transformation. It is rather a metamorphosis. According to the structure of the new programme, the Workers' Party of Kurdistan is literally no longer a party of Kurdistan, but of an official Turkey. The reconstructed programme resembles the programme of a legal socialist party of Turkey within the borders set out by the National Pact. For instance, the programme undertakes the abolishment not of Turkish sovereignty in Kurdistan, but of the sovereignty of an oligarchic structure over the people. Likewise, it does not target a national emancipation but aims at "furthering the solution of the national question within the framework of democratic transformation". What it

"jealously" retains among the duties listed in the constitution, as a manifestation of the PKK's peculiar internationalist socialism, is the assumption of unity among the peoples of the Middle East, which traces itself back to the foetal PKK. It is this assumption to which Graham E. Fuller, the former CIA high official expert on the region, also draws attention.

> ... For this reason many Kurdish intellectuals from different states see the PKK as the only modern Kurdish political movement, based on ideology rather than tribalism. But the PKK has also pursued an unabashed policy of violent guerrilla warfare in southern Turkey. It is led by an elusive and doctrinaire leader Abdullah Öcalan ("the Avenger") operating from exile, who aspires to social revolution across the entire Middle East. (Fuller, 1993, pp. 115, 116).

The phrase describing the unity of Middle Eastern peoples is "transformed" from the "Federation of the Middle East" to the "Democratic Union of the Middle East" (*Programme*, 1999, p. 77).

Concluding Remarks

The theoretical process of transformation, the programmatic metamorphosis and the development of a consistent insistence on socialism that the PKK has undergone are outlined above. Even if I had reduced them to the briefest detail, I would have had to refer to a great number of quotations, because this outline constitutes the crucial aspect to which the Organisation's cadre recruitment and build-up of mass mobilisation relates. The body of party publications, to which I have partly referred, are not composed of attacks or self-defences shaped in the course of debates with fellow political rivals, but are only composed of the *teachings* of the Party. These texts are, despite their repetitions, more voluminous than those of an average party. What is more, the overwhelming majority of them consist of Öcalan's verbal lectures, dialogues and interviews. In addition to the leadership's intensive theoretical and ideological performance, its unusual programmatic conversion is important in connection with one of the fundamental issues in the next two chapters – the build-up of mass support and mobilisation, and the activation of the grassroots.

Also, the metamorphosis of the Party's national standpoint does not of course mean that the Party has deserted the cause of Kurdish national entanglement. The first sentence of the Introduction to the main defence, from which the programmatic metamorphosis of the Party's national aspect sprouted, is devoted to dispelling such an inference.

> My defence is not so much based on detailed replies to the charges in the indictment prepared by the Chief Prosecutor [of the State Security Court], as it is about what I see as a more important topic: how to reach an historic reconciliation from a revolt under the leadership of the PKK, and increase the possibility of a solution to the Kurdish issue. (Öcalan, 1999d, p. 7)

Therefore, could this entire odyssey be a scrupulous "chapter" in the book of the PKK's "devilish" (Öcalan, 1996b, p. 115) tactics? Since Öcalan has placed an "overflowing" emphasis on tactical creativity in his teachings, which he believes to be absolutely necessitated by the very nature of the Kurdish struggle, this question si relevant. So in 1989, Öcalan gave this speech:

> One should not approach reconciliation in the form of selling every value that one possesses in order to save one's life, as is done by some opportunists. But it is exactly this way of acting which is performed by many, under the label of tactics. The form of reconciliation which incorporates the idea that everybody uses tactics in socialism and that many vital values can be abandoned in the case of difficult conditions is absolutely not right. We oppose all sorts of tactics which tend to mean the loss of the indispensable. (Öcalan, 1992, p. 137)

The question of whether the PKK's transformation is a real evolution or a scrupulous deployment of tactics will be incorporated into the arguments of the following chapters.

Note

---

[1] The phrase "the PKK's theory" is not employed in the sense of a sociological or political theory that explains social phenomena, but to refer to the Party's views on the specific and general questions of the region and the world.

[2] The group also called themselves, at that stage, as "Kurdistan Revolutionaries".

[3] *Pesmerge*: Special term for Kurdish soldier or fighter

[4] Capital lettering is as in the original text.

[5] Ugur Mumcu, the prominent Turkish author-journalist, devoted his latest uncompleted book, *Kurt Dosyasi* (The Kurdish File), to this tactical odyssey of Öcalan. An explosive placed under his car in 1991 killed him, while he was writing the aforementioned book. The murderer or murderers are still sought. In the book he focuses on the mutual "devilish" tactics launched by Öcalan and the MIT (Turkish Intelligent Service) in order to find out whether Öcalan or the MIT used their rivals for their aims. (Mumcu, 1993).

[6] The assessment of the nature of earlier Kurdish uprisings against Turkey as being non-national does actually trace back to the early PKK. It is stated in the Manifesto that in those [Kurdish rebellions] the Kurds were both "mutually wielded as a mere pawn by England and Turkey" and the "right resistance endeavours of Kurdish people were diverted to serve their own benefits by the prominent tribal-feudal leaders" of the time. (Manifesto, pp. 125,129). However, it is illuminated further here.

[7] While in the Manifesto, the proposals "such as in the form of 'territorial autonomy', 'cultural autonomy', 'federal unity' etc." are accused of being "reformist" and "therefore reactionary" theses "for the reason that they do not touch the State's borders; in the introduction to his main defence, Öcalan states that "even separate state, federation, autonomy and such similar approaches are backward, sometimes obstructive in comparison with the richness of the mode of democratic solution". (Öcalan, 1999d, p.11)

Chapter 5

THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE ORGANISATION IN THE PKK
SOURCES OF MOTIVATIONS

I The Socio-political "Heritage" of Kurdishness: *Ashiret* and *Ihanet*[1]

Unless we describe the unique socio-political background of Kurds, it is not feasible to explore the PKK's organisational decisiveness – the subjective share – in the development process of the most recent Kurdish "insurrection".

If the "insurrection" – which culminated in the high-profile abduction of Öcalan from Nairobi – led Fuller, the former vice chairman of the National Intelligence Council at the CIA, to reveal that "almost invariably, however, once the Kurds no longer served the immediate political goals of the external powers, they were abandoned" and to confess that "for the first time in modern history, control over the Kurdish problem has slipped out of the grasp of all regional parties as Kurdish politics has taken on a momentum of its own" (Fuller, 1993, p. 108), then it must have a legacy "appropriate" to itself.

Before the Movement gathered momentum, "to be sure, various Kurdish guerrilla forces regularly served the external powers as a handy tool with which to weaken local regimes" (*op. cit.*, p. 108). So the history of all this must be discussed.

a. The Constancy of Tribal Existence

The majority of those who have written on Kurdish ethnicity or nationality have paid a great deal of attention to the tribal structure of Kurdish society and, consequently, the endemic disunity among Kurds. The intellectual efforts devoted to the subject have

addressed not only its cultural and political dimensions, but also the economic aspects of Kurdish tribal existence.

The clearest theme in the literature is on *unchanged* tribal existence. The arguments of Wigram and Westermann are very similar. They point towards the "changeless character" of this endemic feature of the societal body and stretch it out to cover millennia.

> The only element of Kurdish culture which has changed much in the 4,300 years of known Kurdish life is the language. The Kurds took the Iranian basis of their language from the Medes and Persians about twelfth century BC They still resent any invasions of their lands and any other intrusion upon their independence just as sharply as they did when Xenophon, the Athenian, led his ten thousand Greeks northward out of Mesopotamia through the "Karduchian" villages in 400 B.C. In this respect, the only thing which has changed among the Kurds is the type of weapon used. Indeed, the only progress worth recording in Kurdish life is that where once the Kurds fought with bows and arrows, they now shoot guns. A predilection of the Kurds for shooting at moving objects, preferably at human beings, has not altered much since Xenophon time. ...
>
> The social and political organisation under which the Kurds have always lived is tribalism. Once, in the tenth century AD., they established a fairly extensive Kurdish kingdom – but only for the lifetime of the chieftain. (Westermann, 1946, p. 52).

With reference to their numerous "chronicle" uprisings,[2] Westermann finds no remarkable *national* ingredients in Kurdish struggles.

> During the years between the Treaty of Lausanne and 1942, two serious revolts of the Kurds had occurred in Turkey, three in Iran and three in Iraq. These revolts indicated a vital spirit of resistance to control on the part of the Kurds; but it is a mistake to interpret them as evidence of a conscious and active feeling of Kurdish unity and nationalism or even of an overwhelming desire for statehood. ... For the Kurds have never been a unified people. They have no national tradition, no background of unity and no experience of self-rule. (*op cit.*, p. 52, 54)

Westermann was writing just after the Second World War while the Kurdish Republic of Mehabad was experiencing its "independence" – which had been proclaimed some

months before with the backing of the Soviet Union. Wigram wrote in the wake of the First World War. But both reach similar conclusions.

"The characteristic feature of the Kurds seems to be that it has never changed during the historical segment between 1000 BC and 1900 AD. The Kurds are a type that have strong, skilful traits and they are attractive in many other respects. But, in fact; it is not clear, say, whether because of the eccentric complexion of the mountains in which they were born or the lack of some constituents in their formation process, the Kurds are *a type of community that has stayed at the halfway point*. In respect of social development, they have never come out of the "tribal stage", and are still experiencing this stage" (W.A. Wigram, *Suryaniler ve Komsulari*, s. 7). (Nikitin, 1986, p. 147).

"A type of community that has stayed at the halfway point" is my understanding of the term (*yarim kalmis bir tip*) from the interpretation of the Turkish edition of the excerpt above. However, my actual perception in this context would be that Wigram genuinely tends to call Kurdish society "a semi-humanised" or "semi-civilised" society. If we use philosophical literature's definition of the "human being" as "political animal", then Jwaideh's diagnosis of the Kurds' state of politicisation is pointing in a very similar direction. Wadie Jwaideh relies on "many valuable clues" from a wide range of references in related spheres, and thus confidently describes the most developed forms of the political conceptions and practices of the Kurds.

The autonomous Kurdish political system has never gone beyond the level of *ashiret* [Denotes the entire tribe (Bruinessen, 1992, p. 61) or "a federation of tribes over which a paramount chieftain may preside" (Kinnane, 1964, p. 10) – AKO]. Those Kurdish leaders who succeeded in founding states followed an Islamic rather than a Kurdish pattern of political organisations. The *ashiret* institutions have thus become the most perfected form of Kurdish institutions in consequence. (Jwaideh, 1999, pp. 59, 60).

Jwaideh also foresees the vital influence of tribal institutions on the future political orientations in Kurdistan, while highlighting the conscious interference in the affairs of tribal entities by the neighbouring rulers of the country (*op. cit.* p. 60) for the purpose of impeding the further politicisation of an ethnic nationality. Further, Jwaideh remarks

that "the peculiar tenacity of the Kurdish tribal sentiment ... has on numerous occasions proved even stronger than the religious sentiment" (*op. cit.* p. 63).

According to Wigramthe term *ashiret* strictly means tribe or clan (Wigram, 1922). The glossary of the book explains it with a single word: "Feudatory". He emphasises the extent to which this configuration extends to Christian dwellers in the region.

> All the Mussulman dwellers in the land were until lately "*ashiret*", and much in the same position as the Highlanders "beyond the line" in days previous to the "forty five". A fair proportion of the Christian dwellers there, happening to have arms, are "*ashiret*" as well. (Wigram, 1922, p. 167)

The verdict of Bois, in Encyclopaedia of Islam, leaves no space for discussion about the actual structure of Kurdish society: "A fundamental element of Kurdish society is without dispute the tribe". (Bois, Th., *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol. 5., p. 471)

Yet these shared views are not only found in foreign works. They also crop up in two native sources, *Serefname* and *Mem u Zin*, written in the late sixteenth century, as well as in the early writings of Z. Gökalp, a *Kurdish* ideologue of *Turkish nationalism*. Bedlisi, conveys that no accord or co-operation exists among the Kurds. He formed the epigram: "No common view recognised within the Kurdish ethnicity so far that links them to one another except the '*kelime-i sahadet*'[3] which expresses the singleness of the God" (Bedlisi, 1998, p. 22).

With respect to the "cause" of this peculiarity, he mentions a number of strange stories, and elects to tell the one which ends with the malediction of the Prophet Muhammed. "All being well, the Almighty God will never allow this community to achieve unity and concord; because if they unite, the world will be destroyed in their hands". The conclusion of Bedlisi, the oldest Kurdish historian, is not so far-removed from Muhammed's malediction.

> In accordance with Hazreti Muhammed's Sunnah[4], they consider marrying four non-concubine women as *mubah* (religiously tolerated or lawful – AKO); then, if they can cope, they add four concubines to them. So they procreate with the permission of the Almighty God, and multiply rapidly. If killings were not widespread among them, there would possibly be scarcity and famine not just in

Iran but it would also spread out all over the world because of the multiplication of their generation. ... (Bedlisi, 1998, p. 23).

He also claims that the Kurds may rebel because of the most worthless causes, and that they are keen to commit serious crimes due to unimportant blunders and trivial slights. Soane refers to some widely told stories in this regard.

> ... They are always ready to tell stories against themselves of this very characteristic.
>
> There was once a Khan of the Herki of Oramar (in the Hakkari), who bitten by a fly, scratched the place, five minutes afterwards irritated still, and again he scratched. Yet again it commenced, and he snatched a pistol from his belt, and cursing the father of flies, shot his finger off.
>
> Two Kurds were discussing the position in which the star Sirius (which marks the end of the warmest weather) might be expected in the firmament. Without any abusive language they disagree as to the position, stop upon the road, and fall upon one another. One remains there dead. (Soane, 1926, pp. 395, 396).

Nikitin refers to a French traveller's "contradictory" impression about the general quality of the Kurdish character.

> "Kurds, notwithstanding their wildness, bear a deep sense of honour nevertheless; they are known as men of their word. If a Kurd promised to take you somewhere safe and sound, you can trust him/her without fear or hesitation. But the day after, if you meet the same person again following the accomplishment of what is promised, he/she robs you and kills you like a dog" (Nikitin, 1986, p. 145).

Researchers have underlined the distinct features of each individual tribe. These differences do not allow broad generalisations on Kurds as a homogenous ethnic entity. Edmonds points towards the linguistic differences in a land with varying national characteristics. "Kurdistan is a land of high mountains", he states, "with difficult communications; for centuries it has not had any political unity which might have given it a common literature; it is therefore not surprising that local dialects vary almost from valley to valley" (Edmonds, 1957, p. 7). Soane emphasises the worries of scholars about summarising the prevailing national features. "Yet the character of the Kurds is

one on which the would-be writer is to experience enough difficulty, for the tribal character differs so much as to make one summary quite inadequate for the whole nation". However, like others, he advances a firm generalisation and, yet again, points towards the tribal loyalty as an unquestionable value of the "whole nation".

> The true feudal spirit is strong in the race. Devoted to the mountains, to his own clan intensely proud of being a Kurd, *the northerner will take the arms at the word of his chief, never asking to hear his reason.* ... A steady faithfulness, a recognition of the given word, a generous affection for the near relatives, a manlier treatment (among the southern and middle Kurds) of his women than is seen among any other Musulman race, a keen literary sense and love of poetry, *a ready willingness to sacrifice himself for his tribe*, and a fine pride of country and race. (Soane, 1926, pp. 393, 395; italics added)

The millennial handicap of the Kurdish ethnic nature based on "unfortunate" tribal consistency is also the main concern of the earliest *literary* work of Ahmede Xani, *Mem u Zin*, written in 1695. Laizer, while referring this "classical" concern, states that Xani is "probably the most accomplished Kurdish writer of classical time, renowned for this Kurdish epic *Mem u Zin* (a Romeo and Juliet style tragedy) [who] had recognised three hundred years ago the dilemma of Kurdish internal political division". Laizer translates an extract from Xani's epic poem titled *Our Dilemma*.

> As if the Kurds held the keys to the border
> every tribe as strong as wall
> whenever the seas of the Turks
> lash the oceans of the Persians
> rising and colliding
> it is the Kurds who are washed in blood
> and set one against the other
>
> generosity, benevolence and chivalry
> bravery, self possession and courage
> are attributed to every Kurdish tribe
> famed for their swords and their honour
> brave as they are proud
> in equal measure
> they despise submission

spurn domination

and for this remain isolated

fighting one another, ever divided

... (Laizer, 1996, p. 206, 207).

The suggestion of "feudalism" and of "tribalism" among Kurds in Gökalp's words is worth quoting:

Whoever looks at the wide-ranging escape from military service among the Kurds deems this nation to be without ideals. Or he/she thinks that they are cowards. Whereas loyalty to ideals is extremely strong. But because these ideals are not about the country, or patriotic ones, they are not inclined to enlist for military service. Their tribal ideals are so vehement. They, man and woman, find great pleasure in sacrificing their life, their wealth, their children for this ideal. ...

The tribal ideal is extraordinarily strong to the extent that it dominates man's sexual love, which is the most vehement passion of individual. (Gökalp, 1992, pp. 39, 40).

Gökalp supports his diagnosis by referring to the well known quatrain of a Kurdish folk song which expresses a girl's refusal to marry her lover due to the family's and the tribe's opposition to the boy: "*Nav mezine picuk nabe/ Esira min qail nabe*" (The name is grand, it cannot be passed down/ My tribe does not approve).

By quoting from sources dating back decades and centuries, it is not my intention to imply that tribal bonds are confined to Kurds' past history. In contrast with the PKK's latest programme to eliminate the tribal-feudal structure apart from the "remnants and traditional customs" (*Programme*, 1999, p. 48), this structure is a reality of Kurdish social, political, cultural and economic existence.

This societal phenomenon of the "Turkish Kurds" functions currently, even given the changes that have taken place in the past two decades and undeniably the extensive transformation towards transcending tribal structures and hence re-socialisation. The extensive changes and outstanding remains constitute two sides of a coin. While the PKK hardly managed to gather *twenty* thousand guerrillas in twenty years, the State – which hardly recognised Kurds as "Turks of Kurdish origin" – enjoyed rapid activation of over sixty thousand *official* "village guards" during several

months in 1986. These guards are still retained, in spite of the PKK's abandonment of armed struggle since 2nd August 1999 and the withdrawal of its guerrilla forces out of Turkey's national borders since the first day of the following month. There are also thousands of official and unofficial "voluntary village guards" reserved as eager to fight against the PKK guerrillas. Even the unofficial-unpaid "village guards" of the *Bucak* tribe[5] in the town of *Siverek*[6] are publicly numbered at "over ten thousand" by state officials and by the tribe's prominent figures. Tthe leader of the tribe, Sedat Edip Bucak – who was the only survivor of a car crash in November 1996 and who was found with the dead bodies of a high ranking police administrator and a man convicted of murder (who had been on the run for more than sixteen years) – is a current member of Turkish parliament for the DYP (True Path Party). Seydi Eyuboglu, the leader of *Sheyhanli* tribe of approximately 30 thousand members in Kurdish city of Urfa, is another current MP of the TBMM (Grand National Assembly of Turkey), along with many other scarcely literate chieftain-MPs from various parties. Eyuboglu's interesting and illustrative interview was broadcast on the Turkish television channel, Star TV, on January 28, 1999. The translation of a segment of the interview transcript is as follows:

Question: In tribes, do women have the right of words [i.e. the right to join the process of decision making], and in tribes, why does a man marry more than one woman?

Answer: In tribes, women do not have the right of words. The reason they do not have this right is our region's tradition. For example, if I intend to give my daughter to someone, I would question his family's previous 3-4-5 generations. That is to say, I take his structure [personality], his family, and his tribal status into consideration. That is to say, marriages take place absolutely according to the arrangement of equivalent persons found among the tribes. And this issue, this tradition is descended from our ancestry and still continues. Therefore, the issue of the right of words for women is as I said. In fact, such a demand does not exist on the side of women. And everybody is pleased with the situation.

Q.: How many children do you have?

A.: Mine? I have seventeen.

Q.: Are you thinking of more?

A.: I would guess that one more is on the way.

Q.: Are you thinking of another marriage in addition to your existing wives?

A.: Mr Saadettin [Interviewer], to tell the truth, I was thinking of it, before I involved in politics I was thinking of it.

Q.: *For example, how many would you go up to?*

A.: I would go up to four.

Q.: *Masallah!* [Wonderful! What God has willed].

A.: My elder brother is now at three. One of my father-in-laws is at four, the other at three. Only my deceased father stayed at one. Generally it goes up to two-three-four. So, such is the matter; politics bound our [my] hands and feet. I mean, I can say, it prevented our chance of marriage. And it [politics] has always bound us and blocked our way. If politics was not an obstacle, I would have resolved on going up to four.

Q.: *You had that intention?*

A.: Yes. From time to time, when I joke with my wives, they keep saying: "You have the right". That is to say, "You can go up to four".

Then the interviewer diverts the subject of the dialogue to politics, specifically elections, because it is widely known that members of the tribes do not vote for political parties but for what the chieftain imposes. Furthermore, there are a considerable number of "fixed" Members of the Turkish Parliament, based on the "guaranteed" tribal constituency, no matter which party nominates them.

Q.: *Suppose a chieftain said: "You will vote for the Party A or Party B". If, then, votes for parties other than what you [chieftains] said come out of the polling box, what happens in that case?*

A.: It does not occur.

Q.: *Say it occurred.*

A.: Nothing happens.

The programme continued with interviews with young boys and girls complaining about the high rate of *baslik*[7] in the region, which had climbed to 1,5 billion Turkish Lira. It also featured a lord of the manor who owned the Bilece village, Urfa, and who was desperately trying to sell his village with its 150 inhabitants for 3 billion. Even the author of *"A Modern History of the Kurds"*, rather prefers to put more emphasis on this "unchanged side" of the coin.

The agha was still intermediary between illiterate villagers and the outside world. It was irrelevant that the state had abolished the class distinction of 'agha', 'beg' or 'shaykh'. These families still operated the village guesthouse, the focus of rural life, and still mediated individual or collective village difficulties with local officials. No much had changed since Ziya Gökalp's description half a century earlier (page 95). (McDowall, 1996, p. 397).

My questionnaire was targeted at reaching an understanding of today's tribalness among Kurds. I aimed to bring out the extent of *tribal consciousness* in comparison with national consciousness. How far has the sense of national belonging superseded the tribal one in the Kurdish family following the remarkable supra-tribal changes within the ethnic body of "Turkish Kurds" during the last two decades? The questions numbered 28 and 29 were structured as follows.

■ *Do you remember when you first became aware of your nationality?*

■ *Do you remember when you first realised that you belong to a tribe?*

The finding was striking: While 84.4% of 184 respondents remembered when and/or how they became aware of their national identity, 26.6% of them remembered the time they realised they belonged to a tribe (Table 7 and Table 8). This means that 73.4% of the respondents were born into their family as a "natural" member of the family's tribe.

Whereas, 84.4% of them became aware of their Kurdishness due to somewhat of a coincidence. Namely, they somehow became a Kurd afterwards! And this was the phenomenal aspect of Kurdish society in terms of which the PKK premeditated and initiated its inception, and with which its organisational peculiarity has been considerably shaped.

b. Tribe and the "Kurdish Tribe"

Is the tribe peculiar to Kurds? If not, why has it continued so zealously, and what is its significance to social development in the rest of the world?

The tribe as a social institution and tribalism as a spiritual/cultural or ideological device are, of course, not entities peculiar to Kurds and Kurdistan. Tribe as a form of

sociality is a universal entity. "The history of the human race", Morgan states in the preface to his well-known *Ancient Society*, "is one in source, one in experience, one in progress".

> Since mankind were one in origin, their career has been essentially one, running in
> different but uniform channels upon all continents, and very similarly in all the tribes
> and nations of mankind down to the same status of advancement (Morgan, 1919, p.
> vii).

In all parts of the world, tribes appear to be the creation of pre-recorded history. The emergence of the tribal form can be traced back to primitive communal human sociality in which society has not yet been cleaved into classes and during which the "the idea of government in the human mind" (*op. cit.* p. 104) is fertilised.

The State, which became indispensable to class societies, emerged from this initial governmental form of sociality, which transcends the primitive family-clan groupings that did not exceed 20-30 people. So tribe, as a socio-political institution, is in fact a great leap forward in the history of human social development. It replaces the far smaller and primitive clan system[8]. "The tribe", Davis defines, "is a kinship group, including typically a number of clans or gents; it has as a rule a common language and a putative or magical common ancestor" (Davis, 1978, p. 202).

The Kurdish tribe is certainly no exception to the universal process of human social development. What is more, given the generally acknowledged view that the Kurds are the indigenous inhabitants of the "cradle of civilisation", the Kurdish tribe may well have been a prototype of the tribal entities of humankind. Therefore, van Bruinessen's assertion claiming that the term "of standard anthropological usage, 'tribe'" ... "appear[s] to be a straightjacket that ill fits the social reality of Kurdistan" (van Bruinessen, 1992, p. 59) is not a relevant concern. Here, the "uniqueness" of Kurds is rather exaggerated. The actual unique aspect is not the cultural or political quality of the Kurdish tribe but the *constancy* of tribal structures among the Kurds. In addition, given that the land and people form a "prototype" of tribal institutionalisation, this may well have been one of the effective factors of this constancy as a consequence of the dialectical logic of development.

While the tribe emerges as a premise of the primitive era of human sociality, it does not wither away simultaneously with primitivity. The acknowledged universal

pattern is that it emerges in primitivit, retains itself in slavery, matures in feudality and ends with the nation state of capitalism. So the seeds of nationalism are planted in mature tribalism. Morgan, while pointing at the fact that "the great body of the aborigines were found in independent tribes illustrates the slow and difficult growth of the idea of government under gentile institutions", dichotomises the concept of tribe with nation.

> *Tribe* and *nation*, however, are not strict equivalents. A nation does not arise, until gentile institutions, until the tribes united under the same government have coalesced into one people, as the four Athenian tribes coalesced in Attica, three Dorian tribes at Sparta, and three Latin and Sabine tribes at Rome (Morgan, 1919, p. 104).

A great deal of consensus appears among the scholars in their view that the nation is eventually the outcome of the coalescence, amalgamation, integration, dissolution and finally withering-away of tribes, by forming a "whole" people under "one" government. Accordingly Gellner too, just like Morgan, highlights the "contrast" between tribalism and nationalism.

> The contrast I am here drawing between culture-mediated nationalism and structure-mediated tribalism is, of course, meant to be a genuine analytical distinction between two objectively distinguishable kinds of organisations; it must not be confused with the relativistic or emotive opposition between *my* nationalism and *your* tribalism. ... In this sense nationalisms are simply those tribalism, or for that matter any other kind of group, which through luck, effort or circumstance succeed in becoming an effective force under modern circumstances (Gellner, 1983, pp. 86, 87).

Elie Kedourie also contrasts tribalism with nationalism. He criticises descriptions of nationalism as "new tribalism" by some scholars – those who make the analogy to indicate that, like the tribe, the nation excludes and is intolerant of outsiders. For Kedourie, "such characteristics ... are common to all human groups, and cannot serve to define either tribe or nation". He states that "the analogy is not only unable to shed light on the matter, it can also mislead". While the relation of the tribesman to his tribe is generally regulated, by unquestionable customs considered to be "part of the natural or divine order", Kedourie states that the citizen's ties are arranged, legitimised and

governed by General Will and/or the "edict of legislative Reason" (Kedourie, 1966, pp. 74, 75). And he comes to the firm conclusion.

Nationalism and tribalism, then, are not interchangeable terms, nor do they describe related phenomena (*op. cit.*, p. 75)

In Hobsbawm's view, tribalism falls into his concept of "popular proto-nationalism" or the "proto-national", which he relates to "certain variants of feelings of collective belonging which already existed" (Hobsbawm, 1990, p. 46) there – to be worked on by emerging national forces. So we may deduce that tribe is succeeded by a broader, more rational social formation – the nation.

What is peculiar to Kurds is that the Kurdish social structure has been *arrested* in tribality. For instance, in the classical pattern (Europe), tribalism is a kind of fertile ground for the nascent nationalism, but in the "Kurdish pattern" it is the basic sterilising factor for a would-be nationalist adventure. That is, while tribalism served to form nationalism in general, the Kurdish tribe has been an effective deforming entity in terms of an ordinarily viable nationalism in Kurdistan.

So the "fragmented politics" of Kurdish nationalism is not just an outcome of the fragmentation of land and population. It is rather the absolute lack of *national* desires and aspirations in the *fragmented minds* of the tribal structures that remain in Kurdish society. In short, the Kurdish tribe has never begun to evolve towards having market "sentiments" for its own commodity production in an envisaged broader ethnic *patrie*. This is the factor that renders Kurdish nationalism *without* nationalism[9]. The very same factor also causes "the absence of nationalism" in Scotland, which became "a form of Scottish self-determination" (Nairn, 1981, p. 126).

The peculiarity of the "arrested tribality" that haunts the Kurdish social structure is by no means related to the nature of tribal existence. The most general definitions of tribe and tribalism fit in with the tribal structures of Kurds just as "problematically" as those that fellow communities have experienced in the rest of the world. It is with the "following stage" that the Kurds have had trouble, ever since Kurdistan was introduced to modernity: the absence of a bourgeoisie inspired by a "home market" emoted by *rational* "market sentiments".[10]

Scholars acknowledge that "a bunch of intellectuals" always initiates national movements with bold romantic-maximalist aspirations (Chapter 1). This "initiating

stage" has been a *sine qua non* for all nationalisms. True, in almost all Kurdish uprisings too, there has been a modest group from the intelligentsia involved with similar "national" aspirations, including latest and most tribally-based uprising which occurred in Dersim under Turkey in 1937-38.[11] But the trouble with the Kurds, namely the Kurdish tribe, is that there has never been a "hope-giving" *base* for a "rational" bourgeoisie who would take over the job and *accomplish* the "following stage" –a nation-state with a "home market". Kurdish tribalism did not ever generate an "adolescent" bourgeoisie among itself who seriously aspired to a profitable "home market" in which the future ruling class would have been a self-leading superior entity, nor did Kurdish tribalism let it emerge from the surroundings.

The Kurdish tribe's most "profitable" option –or the only option for survival as a "mountain people" (Guttians)– has been the consolidation of tribal ties in order not to miss the "opportunity" for a position of *inferiority*. And the "tradition" has not been confined to the past at all. Tradition "jealously" extends its verdict to the very contemporary fate of Kurdishness. The most recent experience of resistance has manifested "tradition" in the unquestioned support of the Kurdish masses for Öcalan's proposal of a "Democratic Republic" of Turkey.[12]

In the initial chapter, I discussed the inevitable alienation between the departure and the arrival of nationalist "victories" by giving examples of some well-known experiences in modern history.

What ought not to be overlooked here is that the *departures* and *arrivals* of "national" movements are without exception doomed to be alien to one another. The primary "things" longed for in the *hearts* of the entrepreneurs of national emancipation, generally within the intelligentsia, and the "things" envisaged in the heads of the bureaucrats who accomplish the national construction are gravely distinct. In a general way, while the former departs from "national sentiments", the latter arrives at "home market" longings. The former is driven by the impetus stemming from aspirations to enjoy and experience their innate ethno-cultural elements in the face of others'. The latter are attracted by the gains of "control of the distributive system" (Hah and Martin, 1975) against respective others'. The former moves from the "heart", and is consequently emotional and maximalist, the latter moves from the "head" and so is by nature calm, rational and realistic, and also pitiless. An old Turkish saying expresses: "While the sheep concerns itself with its

life, the butcher concerns himself with its meat". In the case of *national* movements, however, the "butcher" is always the eventual winner (Chapter 1, p. 51).

When the Kurdish experience is the case, one cannot elide the fact that a "butcher" did not come into existence at all. The "sheep" (a kind of "poor" intelligentsia with considerable mass support) has always interfered with the myriad of tribal resistances against foreign invaders but the actual accomplishing entity, the "butcher" (a young bourgeoisie longing for the existing and/or potential profits of the "home market), did not emerge. It is thus: Kurdish nationalism has kept tackling the "pains" of departing. In fact, Kurdish tribalism has never prospered. The words of Gellner's dichotomy of tribalism and nationalism, in this sense, well define the so-called "Kurdish nationalism".

> Tribalism never prospers, for when it does, everyone will respect it as a true nationalism, and no-one will dare call it tribalism. (Gellner, 1983, p. 87).

The fact is that Kurdish tribalism did not prosper, so "no-one will dare call it" true nationalism. Moreover, Kurdish tribalism does not aspire to a national market, for which a nation-state may be the *sine qua non*. The most passionate aspirations of a marginal intelligentsia will not suffice for a movement to be defined as a "true nationalism".

This appears to be the most distinct feature of all the Kurdish ethnic resistance movements that have occurred throughout the last two centuries in all parts of Kurdistan. The PKK-led resistance against Turkey has not differ from the others in this respect.

c. The Appreciation of Treason amongst the Kurds

Travellers and observers have noticeably identical impressions regarding the "treacherous habits" among the Kurds (Soane, 1926), as they do about the unquestioned loyalty to tribal "values". Both Soane and Nikitin talk of Millingen's experiences in particular with regard to the Kurds' easy inclinations towards betrayal, scheming and counter-scheming. Nikitin cites Millingen, saying: "The Kurd is traitor, and he does

not hesitate to have the blood of a person on his hands who takes refuge under his own shelter" (Nikitin, 1986, p. 146). In order to emphasise the bravery of the Kurdish women in joining the fray, Soane refers to Millingen's "fantastic story".

> Millingen, a traveller among the Kurds, quotes a fantastic story of how the Kurdish women form themselves into bands for the decoy and robbery of the unfortunate traveller.[13] (Soane, 1926, p. 397).

Another continuing feudal – in fact pre-feudal – phenomenon in contemporary Kurdish society is *vendetta*, which became one of the main factors in the infiltration into "Kurdish personality". The frequent blood feuds and "peace dinners" organised to bring vendettas an end (generally arranged with the attendance of government ministers, mayors and the local "fixed" MPs) are customary "accessories" of the news agenda of Turkish media. The battles stretch across the Turkish metropolises. In fact, the bulk of "voluntary village guards" from the Bucak tribe reserved as "rapid reaction force" against the PKK guerrillas may well be explained by very *vendetta-like* sentiments, which can be traced to the clashes of 1979 between the party and the tribe. As far as Kurdish national-politics is concerned, Hasretyan has the most interesting document demonstrating the *cultural* dimension of vendetta's penetration into the society. He cites an oath excerpt signed by the tribe leaders who decided to join the Organisation, *Xoybun*[14] [Independence], which got involved to some extent in the Agiri (*Ararat*) Rebellion that took place against Turkey in 1930. This was the first rebellion that had an organisation partly involved in it. At the end of its foundation congress the party composed an oath text to be signed by the chieftain attendants, along with two declarations to the public and the Socialist International.

Brotherhood Oath

> Commencing from now onwards, the date of signing this oath, for two years; if a threat which endangers the security and existence of the Kurdish nation does not emerge, and, *if an attack on my life and honour and on others who are obligated to protect their family and Kurdishness ... is not made by another Kurd*, I swear on my religion, my honour and my sacrednesses that I shall make every effort to avoid using a gun against any other Kurd, to *postpone* the solutions of vendettas and

other disagreements, ... to a time after these two years [italics added]. (Hasretyan, 1995, p. 198, 199).

Because of the highly volatile nature of the issue, even making any endeavour to resolve the conflicts associated with vendettas is not allowed, but merely postponed for a fixed time, for the "Kurds are sometimes cruel against others, but always pitiless against themselves" (Nikitin, 1986, p. 13).

Turkish journalist R. Balli has a more interesting anecdote than Hasretyan's document. While Turkish-speaking Balli was interviewing a *peshmerge* commander from Southern (Iraq) Kurdistan, he had to use a "village guard" from the "Turkish Kurds", fighting against the PKK on the side of Turkey, as an interpreter. At one stage in the interview, the commander had come to say, "aggressors cannot stand against us because they are *jash*[15]". Balli's anecdote deserves to be quoted.

> When our interpreter came to the sentence he hesitated and stopped. Then he put all his effort into finding a relevant word for *"jash"*...In fact, I knew what the word meant from my years at university. The term *"jash"* which is translated as "donkey foal" in the dictionary, is, in Kurdish political terminology, employed for "traitor", "collaborator".
>
> The discomfort of interpreter did not seem to be coming to an end. He was still arduously searching for a Turkish word for *"jash"*. Even my interference, by saying, " OK, I understand", did not persuade him to give up. After he had exhausted all his efforts and language skills, he eventually found the way out! Here is his verdict. He declared, while ceasing to look me in the eye:

> *"Jash.* . Namely, people like myself."

> Despite rapidly reconnecting all the fuses in my nervous system, I could not prevent my whole body from shaking. My God, neither a Catholic nor a traditional Leninist would venture into such tyrannical self-criticism!
>
> Do not get me wrong. My intention is not to call some people "traitor" or "collaborator". I am dealing with how these human beings see or experience themselves.
>
> The only remaining alternative from my point of view was to be ashamed of myself. Because, at the end of the day, I am a journalist in that region, where human beings have such deformed and destroyed personalities.

...

> What do you think? Does the subject need to be elaborated on by psychologists?
> (Balli, 1991, pp. 15,16).

Treason is a cursed phenomenon in every society, no matter if it occurs within the framework of national or class or personal relations. It is, of course, cursed in Kurdistan too. However, what Balli's anecdote indicates is that it has infiltrated the "Kurdish personality" considerably and is to some extent appreciated in Kurdistan – at least within some components of the societal structure. Nevertheless, *tribal* treason has evidently not flourished as the *national* one has. On the contrary, tribal treason is by no means tolerated; that is to say, tribal loyalty has somehow been "jealously" and "stubbornly" preserved.

II The Nature and Resource Field of the Organisation

The arguments and observations above have been selected from a wide range of historical sources. The aim is to illuminate the *raw* and *well-matured* ground from which the PKK originated.

Obviously, the question of "how it has come there?" can not be neglected. But this question falls outside of the realms of this study. Rather, my study is tackling a question that revolves around "how it has come here from there?" I ask how and/or why Kurds have "for the first time in modern history ... slipped out of the grasp of" (Fuller, 1993) *treason* to a considerable extent, in their latest "adventure" undertaken with the PKK. For this reason, a study of the process of the "implantation" and functionalisation of the individual in the PKK's organisational structure is needed.

In his teachings, Öcalan often tells of his organisational efforts in the early days. One of the most repeated dialogues is the one he held with an old villager, which symbolised a "question" and a "diagnosis" bearing a chilling warning. The old man in his seventies, sitting against the wall in the village with a chip of wood in his hand picking the earthen ground in front of him, responds to the indoctrination of young Öcalan – who intends to stimulate his hopes about the Kurds' fate – by pointing at the chip of wood: *"Oglum sen su kuru agaci yesertebilir misin? Oglum, haklisiniz, ama devlete devlet lazim"* (My son, can you make this dry piece of wood sprout? ... My son

you are quite right, but [standing against] a State requires the State) (*Özgür Politika*, February 14, 2000). Since every single Kurdish attempt to win some freedom in Turkey invariably culminated in a "heavy handed" suppression followed by massacre, deportation and evacuation due to an apparent treason, there was a dead silence and a solid hopelessness before the PKK launched its war. Being well aware of this phenomenon and in spite of agitating about the inevitability of the armed struggle against "colonialist Turkish State" in bold-and-capital lettering, almost a dozen Kurdish political configurations never ventured to initiate this struggle, and they consequently withered away. Thus, Öcalan kept repeating in his defence: "One-third of the Kurdish [social] reality is ill, one-third is maddened and on-third is captive" (Öcalan, 1999c, p. 87).

a. A Dormant Resource

My knowledge of the historical sources above and my knowledge of recent affairs in relation to the Kurdish question led me to investigate the possibility that the power-source of organisational performance in the grassroots body and the mass base of the PKK is fundamentally *the firm grasp of and the reaction to* the "intrinsic" nature of Kurdishness. This seems to be the core resource that the leadership of the PKK targeted for mobilisation of the grassroots and masses. They mobilised by engaging with human nature within the framework of Marxist-socialist ideology, on the basis of the Kurds' deformed ethnic sentiments, which they call the "Kurdish personality".

A kind of "dormant resource" is an indispensable pre-requisite for all nationalisms, Nairn states.

> It [nationalism] always imagines an ideal "people" ... and it always searches urgently for vital inner, untapped springs of energy both in individual and the mass (Nairn, 1981, pp. 102, 103).

Öcalan starts from two primary interrelated diagnoses which he expresses on every occasion: "Kurds are a people of degenerated-debased (*Düsürülmüs*)[16] state"; and, "Other than the Kurds, no people exists in the world which has become the soldiers of others in such a disgraceful way"[17]. In keeping with these and similar statements

Öcalan quite frankly concludes in the third congress of the Party, 1986, that the Kurds have not "a base of ethnic nationalism" which will orient them "to a customary nationalisation as seen in many other countries" (Öcalan, 1993a, p. 191). The diagnosis of "degeneration" (*Düsürülmüslük*) is the prime and most distinctive theory of the PKK. It was this theory under which the latent Group ("Apoists") of the movement gathered and under which the Party attained unity and continuity. At the same time, it is as a result of this theory that Öcalan is constantly accused of treating the Kurdish people in a derogatory manner by the rest of the Kurdish political-intellectual circles. "Kurds are a dishonestised/scoundrelised (*namussuzlastirilmis*)", "nationally emasculated" people or "you were emasculated" (Özcan, A. K., 1999, p. 74) are the terms that Öcalan habitually employs in the course of his dialogues and teachings (*cözümlemeler*). According to Öcalan's diagnosis, the degeneration and/or "debasement" manifest themselves in the Kurdish lifestyle in two main forms:

1) There exists an extreme inclination among Kurds towards presenting themselves as resembling others. Namely they imitate the image and complexion of sovereign nations, for it is not "feasible" to live as a Kurd. This is additionally true of the Northwest population under Turkey, where Kurds are deprived of the basic elements of ethnic identity such as a name and a language, which varies incomparably from the other parts of the country ruled by Iran and Iraq.

2) Kurds are unlimitedly brave, resistant and pitiless against themselves and, in consequence, treason has "infiltrated the genes" of the people to the extent that treason is *appreciated* in Kurdistan.

In keeping with this diagnosis, the PKK's educational-organisational efforts – in fact, Öcalan's speeches – place intensive emphasis on the Kurdish man's "rich memories" of military service, through which he enjoys the rest of his life. According to Öcalan, the "endemic" decade-long vendettas caused by a goat or chicken or a fence or an argument between two children, are indeed the most acknowledged characteristics of Kurdishness by everyone bearing an average familiarity with the community. The memories' "richness value" appreciates in proportion to the worst beatings, swearing, insults and the difficulties experienced during the service, and the vendettas' "dignity" and "seriousness" is evaluated by the number of decades they lasted and the dead they produced. In daily agitation-aimed propaganda activities, Öcalan uses a sentence which

is associated with this Kurdish "national" legacy and which is not understood in terms of being a direct "collaborator" with the "foreign enemy", but of being one pitiless fighter pitted against another: *"There is no one in Kurdistan who has not become involved in some type of treason"*.

Thus, this Kurdish ethnic reality appears to be the fundamental raw resource —"untapped springs of energy" (Nairn, 1981, p. 1020– that is partly converted into and partly utilised as the *well refined* "sap" through which the PKK started and decisively extended its organisational functionality. Using this resource, the Party oriented itself towards questioning the meaning of men's lives and originating the argument of "how men ought to live" (Öcalan, 1995b, 1996a and 1999a) in an organisational existence. When one intends to study the PKK's individual-organisational interactions, it would be more plausible to examine the framework of the PKK's educational "inculcation" as part of the process of cadre and/or fighter recruitment and the organisation's functioning organic execution rather than its constitutional structure. Considering that the very same material and spiritual base existed in Turkey and Kurdistan as was present for a dozen other Kurdish political initiatives advocating a "holy national liberation struggle" against the "fascist-colonialist State of Turkish Republic", there naturally have to be some distinctive factors in the Organisation's nature which have enabled it to be the leading force in the outbreak of the most recent Kurdish resistance against Turkey. There is a fundamental underlying cause of the PKK's ascendancy above all the other initiatives claiming to be liberation movements, and this cause requires sociological identification. However, despite their quite peripheral significance to the Organisation's working order, we need to know about the basic constitutional structure and certain of the alterations made in the course of programmatic reformation and reconstruction before we can proceed to the actual "life" of the organisation's functioning.

b. The Basic Organisational Structure

There is no principle in the organisational structure of the PKK or in its constitution that distinguishes it from conventional socialist/communist parties or from other "Parties of Kurdistan". This is also true of the early PKK. The party's primary

organisational structure defined in the constitution resembles an ordinary Marxist-socialist party as much as its fellow organisations' initiatives do[18] (See Appendix 2).

The fifth party congress of 1995 made minor alterations to the constitution, and further ones were approved in the seventh extraordinary congress of 1999.

Under the influence of the collapse of the Soviet Union and its affiliated system, the classical terminology of 1970s was eliminated from the text and the term General Secretary was replaced by the "General President" in 1995. The "Council of General Presidency", which consisted of several prominent figures elected by the Central Committee from amongst themselves, was to be configured according to a new constitutional article approved in this congress[19]. The change of the party emblem and the removal of the sickle and hammer from the Party flag was also accomplished in this constitution.

In 1999, the Central Committee was replaced by the "Party Assembly". The emblem of the party – and the flag – was again changed. The yellow torch that had been placed in the red star in 1995 – which superseded the sickle-hammer – was now superseded by the full red star. This could be considered as a particular emphasis on the "*socialism*" of the party. The other minor changes were terminological modifications.

Nevertheless, the *definition* and the *traits* of the "individual" necessitated for the membership of the Party remain the same in both "updated" programmes and this definition goes back to the time of the PKK's formation – the mid-1970s (*Programme*, 1995, p. 80, 83, 84; *Programme*, 1999, p. 79, 81, 82). The framework for the personality of the membership, which originated at the inception of the organisation, extends into these modified constitutions.

The changes seem to be rather superficial and/or tactical changes, such as saying the party member "struggles [*mucadele eder*] for socialism" instead of "fights [*savasir*] for socialism". This has more to do with the basic lifestyle, beliefs and ambitions required of the person who decides to step into the Party than it has to do with the official constitution. Hence, this will be a matter for further discussion.

c. Party Membership

The procedures for becoming a member of and for dismissal from the PKK is simply put down in the constitutions. The issue is "cleared" in two paragraphs totalling 72

words in the constitution approved by the fifth congress, and totalling 53 words by the 1999 extraordinary congress (*Programme*, 1995, p. 81; *Programme*, 1999, p. 79, 80). The procedures are basically about the period of provisional membership in which the person is being tested for approval or disapproval and the party organ which decides upon the final approval. While the period had been "six months" and the organ was the "Central Committee" in the former constitutions, the period was reduced to three months and the approval institution stated as the "Party Assembly" in the most recent one. But this is by no means a matter at issue in organisational practice as it is actually experienced.

Even if the entire constitutional articles are of quite peripheral importance to the facts of party life, the definition of the "*party member*" has significance, for it presents clues to the nature of the PKK's "organisational life". The membership constitutes the most essential feature of the Party, and it also overwhelmingly determines the successes and failures of the movement.

A party member is one who acknowledges the programme of the party and is responsible for its implementation; who takes the will of the party as fundamental and gradually *attaches themself to the party's will*; who joins party life and tactical application [daily practical activities] *all day* in an organ of the party; who exuberantly works for the party's fundamental aims in the manner of not making concessions, of not following self-advantages and of unlimited self-sacrifice by embracing the party's demeanour, tempo, and style through *undoing* oneself [analysing-remoulding one's personality]; and who devotes his/her life to the cause of the party [italics added]. (*Programme*, 1995, p. 80).

In the 1999 constitution, it is passed exactly as above with elimination of the final component of the sentence, "who devotes his/her life to the cause of the party".

The PKK is a solid, "all-day" professional organisation. This aspect may be a peculiarity of the Party's organisation, but it is not the entity that defines the *quality* of the organisation. In other words, *full-timeness* or *professionality* is not a property that characterises the PKK's organisational nature, and nor do the extremely firm constitutional articles. Instead, it is the member's complete deprivation of "personal will" and of "private life" that is the most distinguishing feature of the PKK. The use of the term " all day" (or literally "whole day" [*tüm gün*]) instead of "full-time" is a

deliberate choice here. In fact, unlike the rest of the text of the constitution, the *definition* and the *duties* of the member, along with the *features*, is diligently structured as corollary of the particular approach to a point – the point that transcends the conventional boundaries of a Leninist party.

When an individual – either man or woman – decides to attach himself/herself to the party's activities as a *full-time* member, it ought unalterably to be *all day* "work". In other words, the incorporation of individuals into the PKK's organisational body does not encompass daytime working hours between sunrise and sunset, but the *whole day and night* of 24 hours. That is to say, the members of the PKK ought somehow not to have "*private time*" or a "*private life*" regardless of who/what they are: man or woman, single or married, a childless couple or parents, senior citizen or teenager. This is indisputable or non-negotiable in the PKK. As a matter of fact, it is the first condition for being able to be a component of a *party cell*. As a "corollary" to the nature of the Organisation, a member – not only a guerrilla – does not have a permanent address at which he/she practically lives, does not have a private home that he/she may keep for their own usage, does not have a family of which he/she is practically a part. If a *provisional* member merits, gains and is eventually approved as a *professional* (cadre), he/she then must withdraw themself from all social establishments (relations, institutions, belongings) that would usually be part of a person's life. For example, when the wife or the husband of a family – with or without children – becomes a member, he or she leaves the rest of family even if the member works for the party in the very same locality – as does a teenager.

Or, if both husband and wife join the party, then the home is either abolished or converted into one of the common places that a group of party members share, and the responsibility for any child/children is taken over by the party[20]. The same regulation applies to every "cadre" of the party who is based either in the Kurdistan part under Turkey or in Turkey or in other parts of Kurdistan or abroad, including Europe. This is what they call "party life". According to "party life", a member is essentially defined as one "who ... attaches himself/herself to the party's will; who joins the party life ... all day". Members are also defined by what the Party twice stated in its constitution about the nine sequential "duties of the party member" (in the 1999 constitution had a sequence of eight, but it combined the last two duties into one). The duties include: "To live in accordance with the party constitution and party's moral norms" and "To live within the framework of the requirements of the party membership". In

consequence, having been approved as a member of the Party is perceived as an introduction into a novel *way of living* rather than being a member of a political organisation. Hence the term "becoming PKK" [*PKK lilesmek*] is always employed throughout the party publications instead of "how to be a member of the PKK".

d. Organisational Procedure and the Search for Democratisation

The basic principle of the working order of the Party is clearly stated in the constitution to be Democratic Centralism (*Programme*, 1995, p. 95). In the 2000 Constitution, the first sentence of this section has been slightly changed: "The organisational procedure is regulated according to the principles of democratic participation and administration" (*Programme*, 2000, p.87). However, the rest of the section remains the same in this most recent constitution. That is to say, the principles of the organisational procedure have, in essence, been retained. The reason for restructuring the first sentence, in which the term "Democratic Centralism" is employed, is because it seems to associate the PKK with the conventional communist parties and the seventh congress of the PKK has made every endeavour to get rid of the jargon of the "real socialist" orthodoxy. In addition, Öcalan's recently intensified emphasis on democracy and socialist democracy is obviously reflected throughout the programme and constitution of the year 2000. Nevertheless, the realisation of actual organisational practices has always been in accordance with the "irrelevant" circumstances of Kurdish reality. In other words, the principles of Democratic Centralism or Socialist Democracy have not been substantially realistic and/or practicable so far. These principles have, to some degree, been implemented in the peripheral organisational configurations (such as youth organisations or religious communities or cultural activities), in the provincial or regional guerrilla units and probably in the party congresses, but not in the mainstream of the PKK's organisational execution. In particular, this has never been the case for Öcalan's position in the Party.

Also Öcalan does not refrain from expressing this. He even places additional emphasis on his undemocratic position. In response to Kürkcü's[21] questions, such as "have you, for example, ever been elected [in the organisation] in any form of procedure", the answer is fairly firm: "The election has never been required" for Öcalan works "with the person who has come to the point where he/she is ready to die in

206

defence of the opinion" (See the complete dialogue in Chapter 4), which he gave as his opinion (Öcalan, 1995, pp. 56,57). In brief, even if the general application of the organisational rules and regulations stated in the constitution are not totally invalid, the workability of the organisational performance is based on persuasion or – in more appropriate term – inculcation rather than constitutional principles.

The PKK did attempt to inaugurate some more democratised organisational practices in the early 1990s. This did not work because the cadre body of the Party was not ready for – or even familiar with – the practical significance of the notion. In November 1992, PKK's organisational entities in Europe led a free election among the Kurds over almost the entire continent[22] to establish a National Assembly. They were trying to transfer organisational initiatives from professional party activists to the people themselves in accordance with Öcalan's understanding of socialism. However, the new structure did not work, and somehow dissolved in its second year. Then they had another attempt at constituting the National Assembly in 1995. It, too, has encountered a fairly identical ending with the former attempt.

Whereas Öcalan and the management centre of the PKK were quite determined and optimistic about the enterprise, and put more effort towards appropriate outlets to enhance the participation of the people in the organisational decision-making processes to try and prevent a Soviet-like destiny of a "spectacular" collapse. Just a year before the elections, Öcalan, on the pretext of conveying his message on the thirteenth anniversary of the PKK's foundation through a live telephone linkage, conducted a "live" call to the "Patriotic People of Kurdistan" which devoted the opening of the Party to people and ended with the words "*I am saying with confidence in the PKK that this world cannot be without socialism, one cannot live in this world without socialism*". In the call, the emphasis on the "Kurdistan National Assembly" was striking.

Now, we have more work to do. What is this? To originate our genuine assembly. ... A national assembly, a national congress of Kurdistan has to be configured. We learned this lesson very well and our party, while entering its fourteenth year, will also undertake this as a primary task. It [the PKK] will obtain the workability and validity of the Kurdistan National Assembly. (Öcalan, 1995, p. 415).

In the beginning of the year of the initial elections, January 1992, Öcalan gave some "chilling" warnings such as "as seen more often than not, an armed movement which

does not fulfil basic duties in the interests of people is a movement that becomes the calamity of people" and "many people [cadres] may promptly emerge as immense careerists by relying upon the PKK's influence, and thereupon they may well be in the position of controlling huge privileges, if not now but in the coming times it will be possible", and thereafter he came to the actual "why" of the concern.

> In the light of lessons we have learned from the latest international experiences, not being a party force which stands completely above the people but which becomes the servant of the people, and not being a dysfunctional assembly but an innovation of an assembly which is functioning and *determining everything* [A.K.Ö.] is the most fundamental – and distinguishing – task that we will fulfil for socialism. The success that we achieve in this respect will at the same time be the success of socialism. (*op. cit.*, p. 315).

In another part of this "new year" talk, he specifies his concern – the "calamity" of the Bolsheviks' socialism.

> The course of affairs is grave; life has been converted into a very grave state. After seventy five years today, in view of what has been done to the October Revolution – to itself, to its essence, to its word – we clearly see that one cannot quite succeed with things as such, as it has been asserted and thought, by making literary rhetoric in the name of revolution, even further, by believing in its eternity. What I mean is that there have been great assertions and promises made for some time on behalf of these kinds of revolutions. But in the end, it has been obviously revealed that they could not oppose/resist offensives, even if these are at least in appearance or temporary. All these demonstrated that we need comprehensive and novel thoughts with regard to the matters of revolution. (*op. cit.* p. 307).

The main concern of the talk is the search for an outlet for his over-consolidated professional organisation after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The talk also contemplates new feasible or workable measures towards democratising the Party. The only outlet on which he concentrates is to open the organisation to the people – "the genuine fountain". In consequence, the search for elected "people representatives" as *new social leaders* becomes more apparent and is expressed in a more concrete manner. "If our people has known itself a little and has started to see its own interests to some

extent, then we will say to them 'so, such is the matter, here is the opportunity! Let the Party still to perform its vanguard duties, let it be the centre of say ideology, politics, tactics. But its power is limited, you are the millions ... so you select the best representatives for yourself!' Or, if there are some, we must find and bring out a handful of honest men/women in Kurdistan. If not, we have to create them" (*op. cit.* pp. 319, 320). Then, exemplifying himself as usual, he proceeds.

> ... Death is always there; in fact everyday people are dying like any creature in the streets, and what is more [they are dying] for the enemy. Wouldn't an honest person emerge and say "death is always there, I am here for lofty interests, national interests, and for humanity?" Wouldn't such men/women emerge from among over thirty million humans? I believe that they will definitely emerge. Even a man like me who is in a most difficult state, who is the most unable to say these words can talk this much. Let me say, I could talk both for the nation and every kind of class and stratum. And thus I started from myself. If I can do this, why not some others among the more than thirty million men and women. It will come about. It will occur more powerfully than expected,. We need to know how to make it happen. Every individual person of the people needs to be forced [encouraged] in this regard. (*op. cit.* p. 320).

In the months and years following the collapse of the Soviet Union, which was defined as a "re-birth of history – 1989 revolutions" (Kumar, 1995, p. 189) by some political theorists, increasingly "chilling" confrontations were engendered by the sudden massification of the movement in early 1990 and also by the effects of the very "1989 revolutions". Öcalan seemed desperate not to lose close organic contact with the Kurdish masses shouting his name and the Party's slogans. There was an increase in "strong analyses" (*çözümlemeler*) appearing in the pages of PKK's monthly central organ *Serxwebun*. These *çözümlemeler* asked for people's organic participation in Party activities. Öcalan's violent-transparent arguments followed one another "at the cost of divulging themselves" (Öcalan, 1994b, p. 13) in various party publications. Almost three quarters of the *Political Report* submitted to the Fourth Congress of the PKK (held between 25-31 December 1990) by Öcalan as [still] "General Secretary" of the party, was devoted to frank – and even offensive – arguments over the "inner questions" about "democracy" and the "close contact" of the Party with people. The main theme of these writings was various re-definitions of democracy, democratic

education, its essentiality and its indispensability, with an emphasis on democracy's linkage with the people's *direct will*. Such words as "Democracy is a phenomenon that absolutely needs to be taught and kept alive to the utmost both by education and by experience" or "Democracy is the very activity of the people's coming to itself" or "Democracy is the absolute backbone in the people's organisational entities" are the most striking ones along these lines. Thus, more concentration on "giving way to people" to enjoy direct participation in the organisational bodies has become the central theme of the educational efforts.

> ... We are in favour of giving way to people [to rule] and of protecting this. But
> there are many party cadres who make decisions on behalf of the people, who do
> not even give people the right to talk. ... The people will talk, the people will
> decide, the people will make its choice, the people will make changes. Our
> understanding of democracy is precisely this; it should not be distorted. (Öcalan,
> 1992, p. 187).

The frequent references to socialism's experience of a collapse have an additional place in these accounts of the democracy of the Party's socialism.

> ...Many democratic revolutions have been initiated, many so-called socialist
> democracies have been attempted to create. In the end, it has become evident that
> they all put the people aside, that the bureaucratic apparatus has become the
> calamity of the people, and then, that they [socialist democracies] have been
> overthrown by the very people who had become the followers of those whom the
> people did not know. ... You cannot put aside ties with the people even for a
> moment. If you do this, the demagogues interfere in affairs. And they steal the
> people from you and take them away, and furthermore, they position them against
> you and dethrone you. Here is the scene of all Eastern European countries, here is
> the tragic end of Ceaucescau, here is the wreckage of the chiefs who used to say
> "here I am the best". (*op. cit.* p. 187, 188, 189).

From this view, the boundaries of incorporation have been expanded to the extent that they encircle the "primitive" institutions (*agha*[23], sheikh, chieftain etc.) with the intention of *"dysfunctionalisation"*. The purpose of broadening the limits as the fundamental way of democratising the Party was to be twofold: The incorporation and

thereby dissolution of the preserving elements of the tribal structure in the Party's frontal or peripheral organisations and giving way to new social leaders or to new people's representatives – "historical personalities".

> ... *Ashiret* cannot be eliminated, chieftainship too cannot be eliminated, but they can be dissolved in national institutions. We shall tell them this: " Well, you be chieftain, but with few national features. You will not say only "my tribe, my family". Only if they say "My tribe too has a significance in the nation, my family too has a value among all the national values, it is loyal to it [the national cause] and I am from now on *its* [national significance's] chieftain, its representative" will we allow their existence. The actual work of dissolving them is not that difficult. If it is accurately handled, dissolving the existing traditional institutions and personalities in the national pot is not difficult. And the most important thing is that we will settle the [matter of] historical personalities.
>
> There are historical personalities in the hearts of our people. Now, they literally burst in on us. There does exist a new leader type, a people's new militant type in abundance for whoever looks for it. If the party cadres, guerrilla commanders look around themselves, they will come across countless people's representatives. (Öcalan, 1995c. P. 327).

Several months preceding the November 1992 elections were devoted to "genuine" democratisation. Fearing the implications of the collapse of Soviet socialism, Öcalan warned: *"If we do not take adequate measures, a novel sort of aghas will emerge amongst the very PKK cadres who will not be less tyrannical than those who existed in the past"*. This statement was published in three pro-PKK papers and magazines (The central organ of the party *Serxwebun*, the daily paper *Özgür Gündem*, the monthly youth magazine *Devrimci Yurtsever Genclik*)[24] in the months just before the elections for the National Assembly.

Open elections were held in Europe and some other parts of the world where an adequate Kurdish population reside – and illegal ones were held in Kurdistan and Turkey. But again the election did not work – so the arguments for democratisation continued.

Several months after the announcement of the National Assembly, a lengthy editorial article with the heading *"People Assemblies in Kurdistan and On the State-Party Relations"* was published in the Party's central organ *Serxwebun* "on the way to

becoming a State in Kurdistan". The main concern of the article was the relations between party cadres and elected representatives, or, in fact, the attitude of party cadres towards elected people's representatives.

> If we do not intend handing the people over to some persons who no one knows, to *agha* and gendarme-like personalities, to newly emerged despots, then, first and foremost the party cadres must assimilate themselves into democratic culture, be absorbed into democracy and convert democracy into a lifestyle for themselves. ... The Party ... will not govern the State by instructing people's assemblies. The governance of the State, uniting the masses around ourselves and motivating and directing them towards a common end will be through mass organisations. (*Serxwebun*, April 1993).

Despite everything, the initial National Assembly attempts failed. It withered away towards the end of 1994. Almost the same experience – but with less participation by voters – was repeated in 1995. It encountered an identical destiny to the former National Assembly. (Further discussion on this event – especially the causes of failures – is undertaken in the next chapter).

Recently, 1 August 2000, a new attempt containing more radical elements was introduced to the public. It was called "People's Assemblies" instead of a National Assembly. The new attempt is similar to the old because the overwhelming majority of the assemblies will be constituted by elected members voted for by the people. It is different from the old because the assemblies will have the authority to dismiss the professional party cadres. This authority is clearly expressed in an individual article of its constitution: "The People's Assemblies, ... have the right to dismiss the provincial, regional and local co-ordinators [of the Organisation] by two-thirds of the majority votes in a confidential ballot". But in fact, the latest attempt has been far more of a total fiasco than the previous ones in proportion to its radicalness. It was silently dropped from the Organisation's agenda. Whether or not any renewed form of such endeavours will function is an issue for the future, but what is known so far is that the constitutions of previous inaugurations have not been essential to the reality of the organisational life of the PKK.

e. Party Education

Education is one of the two vital components ("Education" and "Organisation") of the PKK's organisation. Rather than formulating the rules of constitutional procedure, the substantial share of Öcalan's leadership work lies in "producing" individuals appropriate to the "organisational life" of the PKK by an education of which he is the primary source. His speeches are called "*çözümlemeler*"[25]. On occasions, he says "We are an education movement" and asks "If there was not such an intensive education in the history of the PKK, would the PKK exist today?" (Öcalan, 1994a, p. 358). And he stretches "organisational life" to every aspect of life.

> ... Life in the organisation is a completely organisational life. From all your conducts and behaviours to the most official authoritarian attitude, from conversations at dining tables to a vigorous address, these are all organisational life. The enemy, today, is most irritated by this feature of us. "They all resemble each other as if they were manufactured by a single machine" says [the enemy] (*op. cit.* p. 130).

As a manifestation of the requirements for being attached to the organisational structure of the Party as a member, the philosophy of "lifestyle" questioning "how men ought to live" occupies a major space in the teachings. Accordingly, concepts such as "analysing oneself", "undoing oneself" and "reshaping oneself" are the fundamental themes in the Party's educational efforts. The Party uses these concepts in order to innovate a way of living and gradually develop the desired mode of life – which resonates with Raschke's "new" paradigm of the "way of life" or "mode of life" created for the New Social Movements of Western societies (Offe, 1985, p. 825) – within the organisation which is believed to be "in peace with genuine human nature".

The philosophy of education here, in a sense, is associated with Plato's notion of "three-fold division of soul" (reason, spirit, appetite) and the accurate equilibrium among those fundamental "parts" of man's soul. Plato calls this the "spiritual balance", by which, he asserts, the individual may always attain peace and justice *within the personality of oneself.* Because I was aware of the additional weight of his philosophical efforts which are devoted to the individual's personality and spiritual

structure throughout his teachings (talks), I constructed a lengthy question in this regard in the course of the dialogue we held when Öcalan was in the Middle East.

– There are two rival parties in the sphere of philosophy, which goes back through several thousand years of human history. One party, in essence, suggests that man is by nature self-regarding and can never be otherwise; s/he always puts him/herself first and organises all aspects of life according to instincts or motives. The other school of thought maintains that the human mind is originally a blank sheet and all knowledge is the product of subsequent experience. Consequently, a human being has a chance of changing his or her own nature. For example, Plato tends to say that the perfect man can be formed by the force of knowledge and education. Within this context there is a claim regarding the spiritual structure of human beings, which divides it into three centres (the threefold division of the soul): Reason, Appetite and Spirit. The first group assert here that man is a passionate being whose major motivations are beyond control and that reason is the slave of passion. Whereas, according to the second group, human beings are essentially rational and aware of this themselves; consequently they have the ability to restrain their instincts and passions. In view of such philosophical approaches to human nature, I think that there are some considerable points to be made in terms of the life of the PKK. What do you say?

– I feel sorry about this subject as well. I have striven hard not to be in conflict with human nature, not to let it take the wrong path...Whether it is my instincts or my conscious judgement, I leave them absolutely unrestrained. It could be said that they are in contention with one another. I think that the one which is more correct will not yield to domination over one another. If a good balance is kept between the two, you can make enormous strides forward, or you can become a genius; or a politician, a soldier, an artist. My particularity in this subject is, I think, on the one hand, constant deploying of *reason*, on the other hand never putting aside any religious, juridical, even philosophical moral values as much. I deploy a principle such as "let human beings be unrestrainedly natural", but at the same time I am an absolute obedient servant of some rules and regulations. I keep an extremely sensitive balance on the horns of the dilemma...One must not belittle instincts. They are vital and life is under a strict influence of instincts. But, of course, without the principle, if you say, "everything has to be according to instincts", your lifestyle will be bestial. Likewise if you say "everything according

to dogmas" you will become a hermit. I am trying to define an existing distorted state of human beings in which both *principle* and *instinct* have been led astray. I am still striving to analyse it. (Özcan, A.K., 1999, pp. 79, 80).

A definition of the ideal type of a "new mankind" is expressed , very simply, in terms of naturalness in a related part of an interview: "According to me, the natural human being is the greatest human being" (Öcalan, 1997, p. 81). By this, he means the one who keeps the self's "three" fundamental spiritual elements in the right balance, so "in peace and justice" as "not yield to domination over one another". As a corollary to this, Öcalan, the only "source" of party education, gives another definition of the movement he leads: "The movement of great human naturalness" (*Serxwebun*, December 1996).

The policy and application of "cadre education" in terms of both form and content is fundamental to the PKK's existence. Öcalan's two expressions on this are famous among the grassroots: "I execute the revolution with my tongue" and "Everybody thinks that we are a practical movement which promptly ventures into doing things; on the contrary, we are a theoretical movement, we say forty but do one". This particular aspect, the dimension of the "educational activities" in the organisation is, at the same time, the *source* of the PKK's "subjective share" in the "most recent Kurdish insurgency" against Turkey. That is to say, just as *the firm grasp of and reaction to* the "intrinsic" nature of the overall background of Kurdishness (tribe and treason) – the dormant resource – is the fundamental power-source of organisational performance among the grassroots and mass base of the PKK, the source of the *firm grasp of and reaction to* the "intrinsic" nature of Kurdish ethnic existence lies in the Party's *educational activities* with their particular form and content.

No doubt, the form of the education, the method and particular arrangements for it, is inferior to the actual content. However, it is diligently organised and planned in proportion to the "susceptibility" to the content. For the purpose of this study, I spent four weeks in the two (one for Turkish, the other for Kurdish speaking pupils) "Party Central Schools" based in Syria, where Öcalan himself was giving his teachings. And previously in 1992, I was included in the group for an "Intensive Party Education" programme held at a "Party Home" in Europe as a result of my voluntary contributions as an interpreter for the Kurdish community in London.

The form of the Central Schools fairly resembles a garrison with no military training, but they are secured by a sentry system in which militants on duty carried

rifles. The overall programme of the education in the school, with scarce exceptions such as interviews and/or dialogues with Öcalan or party meetings or perhaps party conferences, is composed of Öcalan's verbal – and edited texts of these talks – teachings which are called "Analyses of the Party Leadership" or, in brief, "Leadership[26] Analyses" [*Önderlik Cözümlemeleri*]. Öcalan was dividing his week between Turkish and Kurdish schools by spending approximately 3-4 days in the former and 2-3 days in the latter. The lingua franca was Turkish rather than Kurdish and consequently the number of learners in Turkish centre was visibly greater than the other – around two hundred. I was told by Cemil Bayik, one of the earliest comrades of Öcalan and senior figures in the Presidency Council, that the Öcalan's tempo has been constant since 1980. In fact, the total number (pages) of books containing published and unpublished "*çözümlemeler*" corroborates what Bayik said to me. Every single one of these talks and the instructions given to the heads of the guerrilla corps over the radio are recorded by a video camera, then edited, printed in the form of books and distributed to party organisations all over the world[27].

They are named by the months in which the "*cözümlemeler*" is delivered, such as "March Analyses – 1987" [*Mart Cözümlemeleri*], "September Analyses – 1993" etc. month by month for almost eighteen years from 1980 to Öcalan's arrest. Öcalan's published books contain material selected afterwards from these "monthly books" of the "party education". The live tele-talks on Kurdish satellite television (Med – later Medya – TV) during the period of his escape (from the date of his departure from Syria, September 9, 1998, to his abduction from Kenya, February 15, 1999) were also evaluated as "*Çözümlemeler*", and recorded, edited and distributed to all units of the Organisation. Further, since the defence lawyers began to visit Öcalan in the Imralli Prison, the notes of weekly visits by the group of lawyers have been regularly edited and distributed as the "Notes of Visits". The *Political Report* which has been submitted to the seventh extraordinary congress also consists of the relevant parts of the "Defences" and "Notes of Meeting" produced in the one-man prison of Imralli island of Turkey.

I was incorporated into the lessons (*Cözümlemeler*) during the time I spent there. On average, each talk took between three and four hours, and the classes were not classified by age or sex, or according to people's preceding educational level. Öcalan comes, talks and goes without sitting down. Occasionally, and no one knows when he will do this, he asks questions of persons he picks by sight among the all-militant audience and constructs Socratic dialogues. The one who is picked stands up and does

not sit back down until Öcalan quite noticeably orders them to do so (in practice at least twice), regardless of the person's sex, age, oldness or newness, including Cemil Bayik – the man who is generally regarded as the "Second Man" even if it is categorically denied that is not and or ever will be a Second Man in the PKK. Öcalan did almost the same thing with me and took the initiative in asking questions: "I ask you: What do I look like? What do you think that I resemble, as a person who reads those books a lot? What will happen to my [bad] situation? Where does my ending tend towards, according to you?". Yet an incident I witnessed there would, I believe, illuminate the atmosphere into which the *"Çözümlemeler"* are born.

In the course of a morning class, which was to be part of the "July *Çözümlemeler"*, a slight creaking sound was heard because the modest sound of a house-fly would have been obvious in the dead silence of the average sized hall. It was thought to be caused by a chair from the right side of the hall where women militants were sitting. Öcalan promptly interrupted his sentence: "Who was it?". He did not get a response. He repeated his question a bit more loudly. No response was forthcoming. He hesitated for some seconds as to what to do, then went back to his talk. A few minutes later the same sound was heard again. He stopped more abruptly: "Who was that?" There was absolutely no answer from anyone. He insisted: "Whoever has made that noise, take your chair and get out of here". There was no answer and no creaking. Öcalan waited for a few more seconds and continued. Exactly the same sound – but with a slightly more obvious intensity, giving its direction away a small extent – was heard once again. Öcalan stopped, looked around, then looked up to the ceiling: "Himm! [yes] It is coming from there". He nodded and re-concentrated on the talk. The creaky noise was merely caused by the sheet-metal roof of the hall due to the heat of the July sunrise in the Middle East. No one, among more than one hundred and fifty men and women, old and young, seasoned and new militants who were spiritually ready to die for their cause, ventured to say anything. Around one hundred people set fire to themselves in less than four months for the man talking there, more than a dozen of them burnt to death (See Appendix 3), and a considerable number of them experienced the very same atmosphere of this Party Centre School. There were, of course, no beatings or killings because of similar incidents. But the incident may be explained by the influence of Öcalan's leadership style.

My week's experience of "Party Education" arranged in a "Party Home" in Europe led me to conclude that the organisers of these educational activities make every

endeavour to imitate the atmosphere of the Party Central School. In fact, one of the main materials of education is selections from the video tapes of Öcalan's "Çözümlemeler" produced in the Central School in the atmosphere outlined above. I was taken to the "home" – it was a quite large house – on the night of 26 January and given a lift back on the night of 2nd February. There were about fifteen of us consisting of approximately one third female participants. I had absolutely no clues as to where (which town or even country) I had been taken. It was a two or two and a half hour drive from Brussels. We did not get out of the car, and did not even look out of the windows, for we had been warned not to do so in order to prevent drawing attention of any kind. A couple of shifts of boys and girls – probably militants – supplied us with food and drink during the week. The breakfasts and meals were prepared, cooked and served by a daily sentry system. The programme was intensive. The actual sessions lasted from 8 a.m. to 10.30 p.m. The sessions generally took one hour and fifteen minutes and the break time between the sessions was fifteen minutes. After the final session of the day, one and half hours was left for unnecessary free discussions based on the day's issues. This was followed by bedtime – at midnight. Men slept on the ground floor and first floor, and women on the second floor. The daily timetable was well ordered and strictly followed.

Waking up	7.00 a.m.	P.M. Sessions	2.00 – 3.15
Breakfast	7.30		3.30 – 4.45
Sessions	8.00 – 9.15		5.00 – 6.00
	9.30 – 10.45	Dinner	6.00 – 7.45
	11.00 – 12 00		7.45 – 9.00
Lunch	12.00 – 14.00		9.15 – 10.30
		Free discussions	10.30 – 12.00

The bulk of "party education" in the PKK rests on two columns: the personality and lifestyle of militant, and the "intrinsic" treason of Kurdishness that is believed to stem from *tribility* and *family*.

Yet these columns are treated as being mutually interrelated, and this understanding of Kurds led the Leadership's argument towards human nature and

thence to universality. Because the Leadership believes that degeneration, debasement, dysfunctionality and dehumanisation in the "Kurdish personality", based on *tribe* and *treason*, are so deep-rooted and have thereby devastated the humane elements of human nature in the country, they endeavour to re-humanise the community so as to challenge this spectacle.

> Kurdistan is the place where humanity itself fades away in its most solid form. It is humankind's oldest cradle. A magnificent victory for humanity may be gained in the place where it has been most "deformed". Such magnificence will be in proportion to the debasement. Namely, if in some place, humanity descends so sharply and deeply, then the concomitant rise of humanity will be as strong and splendid. (Kucuk, 1993, p. 125).

The framework of education features the influence of Marxist-socialist ideology – hence the dialectical materialism. However, a systematic education of classical Marxist principles and theory is by no means taught as part of the intensive educational efforts. The "theoretical" portion of socialism in the Party's systematic programmes is limited to Öcalan's emphasis and insistence on socialist tenets and aspirations, and his contemplation on remoulding the individual's personality for "genuine socialist relations", which I discussed in a former chapter. This is a phenomenon which was in fact a strength of the PKK at its inception but later – in particular, by late 1980s and throughout 90s – it became a handicap. (See Chapter 7).

The subject headings of the "education programme" in my notes of the weeklong experience were copied from the actual papers as follows:

A) *Introduction*
1- The Education Policy of the Party and its implementation
2- Educational Activities in Society
3- The Colonialist Education in Kurdistan and the Destruction Created by It
4- Pacification Activities of the Coup D'état of 12 September [1980]

B) *The Subject-Matters of the Week*
1- Education within the Party
2- What Is the Party Leadership, Who Is the Party Leadership and What is the Most Accurate Representation of Him?

3- Fundamental Features of the Party Leadership

4- How the Leadership Can Be Rightly Represented in the Life

5- Apo and Apoism: The Party Leadership is the History of a Historyless People

6- The Vitality of the Organiser Militant and Its Apparent Outcomes

7- Historical Development of the Party Organisation and the Relations of Comradeship

8- The Persistent Tradition and Militant Personality in the PKK: a) The Militant Past of the Party, b) The Traits of Party Militant In the Revolutionary Action

9- On the Questions of the Party and Guerrilla War

10- Becoming Party [*Partilesme*] and the Questions of Becoming Party

11- The History and Social Base of the Political Liquidation in Kurdistan: The Treason

12- The Lifestyle Within the Party and on the Right Relations

13- Critique and Self-critique

14- A Revolution Based on Men-Women Common Sovereignty

15- The Kurdistan Revolution is the Movement of Women's Emancipation

16- The Form and Content in the Party

17- The Six Stereotypes of Individuals

A list of subject headings of the "Political Education Programme of 20 Days" for a term of "fighter candidates", cited by Nihat A. Özcan, is consisted of ten items, and while no a Marxist-Leninist doctrine related one is found among them, three of those are (numbered 4, 9 and 10) concerning about personality and lifestyle: "1. History of Kurdistan, 2. Society of Kurdistan, 3. History of the Party, 4. The culture and Moral of the Party, 5. The Features of Turkish Bourgeoisie and Army, 6. The Nature of Special War [of Turkey] and Its Tactics, 7. Popular War, 8. Guerrilla War, 9. The traits of a Commander, 10. Style and Behaviour" (Özcan, N. A., 1999, p. 424).

It is clear that no heading relating socialist theory or the philosophy of socialism appears among the above subjects, but each of these headings is discussed under detailed subheadings. Two of the subjects have further details to be studied by sympathisers and provisional members: *The Fundamental Features of the Party Leadership* and *The Traits of the Party Militant In the Revolutionary Action*. The subheadings of the former are as follows:

a) He is the intensified expression [form] of science.

b) He is the merciless pursuer of truth.

c) He is independencist [*bagimsizlikci* – independence lover in the sense of individual's personality rather than of a State] under any conditions.

d) He takes the balance of powers into account but does not take it as fundamental and relies on the genuine power [of people].

e) He is the balanced combination of firmness in principle and flexibility in politics, and possesses a great talent for manoeuvring.

f) He does not fit into the existing moulds [patterns of leaderships].

g) He does not recognise the limits to progress; he always goes along at his peak.

h) He is *atilimci* [dashist or the person who does not hesitate to innovate].

i) He is an analyser [able to analyse things] and decisive [in having desired results].

j) He is always targeted at gaining and succeeds.

k) He is the highest representative of the loyalty to labour.

l) He has a talent for decisive persuading and educating.

m) He is an explorer and researcher, and has a deep knowledge of history.

n) He is the combination of sagacity, determination/stability and bravery.

Each of the features is explained and exemplified in details ranging from two to five pages. The latter, *The Traits of Party Militant In the Revolutionary Action*, which is sequenced in almost exactly the same way in all constitutions (1978, 1995, 2000) as "the traits (or personal conditions) of the party member" mentioned above. These traits are as follows:

He or She

a) bears a great love for the country and its humans,

b) is in favour of a democratic regime,

c) fights for socialism and is internationalist,

d) bears love and respect towards his/her comrades and people,

e) is the representative [model/example] of the new socialist ethic,

f) is not a coward or selfish but brave and self-sacrificing,

g) should keep a good balance between firmness and flexibility,

h) is careful, sensitive and measured,

i) is, in educating oneself, investigative and exploratory,

j) should not be dogmatic but creative,

k) does not work haphazardly but in a planned way.

Each trait which a militant needs to attain membership is broadly discussed.

Strikingly, there are no elements of socialist ideology within the education programme. Instead the spiritual aspects of man's personality are focused on. No elements of national sentiments, such as a focus on national dignity, are found among the subject or materials of the education. Whereas we find in the speeches of the 1986 congress (third congress of the PKK) that Öcalan places apparent emphasis on the study of socialist doctrine and is consequently well aware of the "vital importance" of the knowledge of socialism for their struggle: "We see socialism that it is the most scientific expression of our day's level of progression of humanity and social science. ... We must thus take scientific socialism, but the single-ply of its scientific essence, as the real basis" (Öcalan, 1993a, p. 214).

In another talk "On the Party Organisation" he becomes more specific in this respect: "We really strive to create a revolutionary party which is to be under the guidance of scientific socialism. ... I also said this earlier, if you had been knowledgeable about socialist doctrine, we could argue very well and the disparity between views would not have disturbed us too much" (op. cit. pp. 225, 254). The most probable/plausible cause of the contradiction is the educational state of the militant body of the Party. Recent research on the educational levels in a Kurdish province under Turkey, Sirnak[28] indicates a phenomenal state of affairs. 60% of the population of the province are illiterate. 75% of the rest of the population (who are able to read and write) are educated only up to primary school. The percentage of illiteracy rises up to 75% in agricultural (or rural) areas. Only 2% have graduated from universities among the non-illiterates (Mortan, 1998). In view of the considerable percentage of the party's grassroots who are somehow related to the peasantry, the educational grounds for a proposed "party education" guided by socialist doctrine become disadvantageous. However, while the noticeable implications of a systematic teaching of socialist doctrine are not found in the Party's educational activities, there is a bold emphasis on the identification of the party and its ideology with Marxist-Leninist socialism.

The findings generated by responses to a field research questionnaire reflect this aspect of the party education. I constructed two similar questions falling on separate pages of the questionnaire: "Is the PKK, in your opinion, a national liberation party for

the Kurds?" and "Is the PKK a nationalist party?" The answer of "No" to the former question is 94.5%. That is to say, 94.5% of respondents do not believe that the PKK is a nationalist party, for the term "nationalism" is deemed to be a derogatory notion and it is defined within the framework of bourgeois ideology by Marxist-socialists. The percentage of "No" responses climbs up to 96.5% among the more educated activists, from high school level education and above (Table 3). In response to the latter question, 70.1% of activists believe that the PKK is a national liberation party for the Kurds (Table 2). That implies that the PKK is not nationalist but "national liberationist". This of course does not define the precise ideological and political nature of the Party, but provides us with a mere example of "national liberationist" movement in its *communist* "ideological form" (Seton-Watson, 1965, p. 15), or, in Lester's words, the dazzling confusion of "national communism" (Lester, 1997, p. 42).

However, among the responses to two similar questions asking about the PKK's dominant quality and their main expectations from the Party, the percentage of the respondents who are interested in the Party's socialist aspect is quite low. While the main expectation of only 2.7% of the respondents is the "struggle for socialism" (Table 15), the socialism of the PKK comes first for 20% of them (Table 4).

Similarly, in response to an open-ended question asking for the briefest definition of the PKK, the second largest percentage of the respondents, 18%, defined the Party in national terms, following the unclassifiable total of "other" answers (Table 18).

In the overall content of the educational activities of the PKK, the usage of socialism, its materialism, its dialectics, even "its psychology" is obvious, but the actual theoretical elements of its doctrine have by no means been the issue of party education. "I felt the need to use the socialist method of psychology very deeply" because "if you do not contemplate and work daily on the [production of] socialist militants, the [existing] personalities can convert the party into a very solid feudal instrument at once" (Öcalan, 1998, p. 22). However, the very "production of socialist militants" is, in the experience of the PKK , attempted by a "single machine" – Öcalan's talks during 20 years, using an extremely centralised method.

Öcalan's talks over two decades (from the late 1979 to early 1999) are almost the only source material for the educational efforts of the PKK. Thus, the quality (or content) and quantity of these talks are of the utmost importance in respect of cadre recruitment and/or grassroots motivation. The talks' total quantity in pages or time was

impossible for me to find out, because many of them are unpublished and are kept as confidential documents by the party. However, I extrapolated an approximate figure from the regularity of unexceptionally recorded talks. First, the number of pages in all the published books is certain and provides a clue. Here is a list of these books, with the English translations of their titles and the number of pages they contain.

Title	Date	Page
A Militant Personality in a People's War	1994	552
About Organisation	1983	229
Collaboration, Treason and Revolutionary Resistance	1993	461
History Is Concealed in Our Time and We Are in the Commencement of History	1997	402
How Man Ought to Live? - I	1995	238
How Man Ought to Live? - II	1996	340
I Look For a Negotiator	1994	392
Insistence on Socialism is Insistence on Becoming a Human Being	1998	251
Letters	1998	320
Political Report to the 4th Congress	1992	250
Political Report to the 5th Congress	1995	340
Political Report to the 7th Congress of the PKK	2000	166
Questions of Socialism and Revolution	1992	365
Selected Interviews - I	1994	394
Selected Interviews - II	1995	288
Selected Interviews - III	1996	395
Selected Writings - I	1986	312
Selected Writings - II	1986	348
Selected Writings - III	1988	356
Selected Writings - IV	1989	342
Selected Writings - V	1992	439
Selected Writings - VI	1995	464
The "Special War" in Kurdistan	1987	284
The Cease-fire and its Reflections	1993	368
The Colonialist Republic Is Dirty and Guilty	1996	340
The Fascism of 12 September and the Resistance of the PKK	1991	523

The Guide of Life and the Army	1996	403
The Initial Talks	1999	258
The Kurdish Love; How Man Ought to Live? - III	1999	210
The Kurdish Patriotism and Our Duties	1992	628
The Language and Action of the Revolution	1996	336
The Liquidating of Liquidation	1993	525
The Manifesto of Democratic Solutions to Kurdish Question	1999	166
The Manifesto of Freedom: Zilan	1999	103
The People's Heroism in Kurdistan	1994	296
The People's War and Guerrillas in Kurdistan	1991	586
The Perspectives of Victory	1996	142
The Questions of Progression in the PKK and Our Duties	1994	308
The Reality of Leadership and the Experience of PKK - I	1992	381
The Reality of Leadership and the Experience of PKK - II	1992	362
The Role of Coercion in Kurdistan	1983	316
The Talks of 3rd Congress	1993	490
The Talks of PKK Prison Conference	1994	345
The Talks of Rome	1999	334
The Woman and Family in Kurdistan	1992	388
Transformation Process and Tasks	2000	204
Turkish State and the Reality of Leadership in the PKK	1992	194
We Will Change the Countenance of the Middle East	1994	367

Total pages   16,653

The talks of Öcalan (both the lectures and telephone-radio instructions or dialogues) have been quite regular since his flight from Turkey to Lebanon. It would then be plausible to calculate the approximate total in pages by the approximate lengths of the talks delivered in a week. Three or four lectures are given in a week and each takes three to four hours. (This is what I witnessed during my stay of four weeks in the Party Central School. I have also been told by Cemil Bayik, the "Second Man", that this is the "tempo" which started when the group decided to be a Kurdish Movement in 1976. But the talks were not recorded regularly as such until Öcalan's escape). In pages, each talk ranges from 30 to 50 A5 pages. This is more or less equivalent to 600 pages a month. The sum total of the pages over twenty years is

144,000. This, of course, is not a firmly reliable figure. But it is also by no means an exaggerated figure. Moreover, it excludes the tele-talks and interviews. And this very fact seems to be the fundamental cause of the "indispensability" of Öcalan's leadership[29] and consequently of the terrifying actions executed by individuals of both sexes and various ages who were shouting his name (Biji Serok Apo – Long Live Our Leader Apo) when they set fire to themselves.

Among those several hundred self-sacrificing (either through setting fire to themselves or blowing themselves to pieces with explosives) individual actions, two are particularly illustrative of the party education being overwhelmingly centralised on Öcalan's talks.

One was executed by a woman, Zeynep Kinaci, in Dersim on 29 June, 1996. It was a "suicide attack", where she penetrated a group of soldiers who were singing the Turkish national anthem, with a large amount of explosives tied around herself. She was blown to pieces with more than ten soldiers following the explosion. Zeynep Kinaci was a 24 year old married woman who graduated from Malatya[30] University with a degree in social sciences and used to work in a state (not private) hospital as an x-ray technician. She began to work professionally for the Party with her husband two years before (1994) the "action". She joined the guerrilla forces operating around Dersim in 1995. Prior to the "suicide attack", she recorded three messages in the form of letters: "To the Party Leadership" [Öcalan], "To the Kurdistan Women Freedom fighters" and "To the Patriotic People of Kurdistan and Revolutionary Public Opinion". In the first letter, she constructs a sentence containing a spiritual definition of the PKK in terms of a universalistic socialist aspiration and belief, following a very brief story of her background and attachment to the Party: "Our struggle; which has developed, has become the property of all humanity and gradually converted into the only hope of oppressed peoples on the way to lofty socialism in the vanguard of our Party, *has also* brought a people [Kurds] to an exalted state ... who were at the threshold of a complete degeneration ... for the first time in the history". She also sets out a diligent – but peculiar – framework for a comprehensive type of political leader.

The leader is a person who represents the most desired form of life at the highest level, namely with its innovations and progressions in accordance with a new man's new idea of society, who regulates his/her complete life according to the people's life, who literally lives with the pains, emotions and demands of the

people and consequently finds his/her destiny directly tied in with the people's destiny, and who shoulders practical duties to the highest extent for liberation.

She then expresses her feelings about the "Leadership", manifesting the fact that party education is over-centralised on Öcalan's teachings. In view of the fact that she is a cadre of only two years standing and has never met Öcalan, the manifestation of his influence is signified by some outstanding clues.

> My President,
>
> ... If we even sacrifice our life to you, it is not adequate in comparison to your unlimited labour and efforts. I wish we had things further than our life that we could sacrifice. You re-create a people through your own life. We are merely your work. You are the assurance of the whole people of Kurdistan and the future of humanity. Your life gives us honour, love, courage, confidence, trust and belief. The whole people of Kurdistan and the millions of humans are loyal to you in peril of their life. The attractiveness of your life also profoundly influences our life. In the most difficult circumstances, we think about your love for us and obtain a spiritual strength. You are the one who is most loyal to the martyrs. On this basis, *we will absolutely not hesitate* over the triumph of our demands [italics added].

In addition, the final sentence of the letter to the "Party Leadership" is interesting coming from a "suicide guerrilla" who has killed more than ten soldiers: "I carry out this action because I love life and humans". A similar expression regarding the love of life[31], human beings and nature is striking in the letter to the "People of Kurdistan and Revolutionary Public Opinion" which also emphasises her belief and trust in Öcalan. While blaming the "imperialist powers" behind Turkey for the "inevitable pitiless outcomes" of the war, she once again focuses on her love of life, peace and fraternity.

> ... I shout to the whole world: "Hear me, open your eyes!" We are the children of a people that has had their country taken away and has been scattered to the four corners of the world. We want to live in freedom in our own land like human beings. Blood, tears and tyranny must no longer be the destiny of our people. We long for peace, fraternity, love, humanity, nature and life more than anyone. We do not want to cause war, to die or to kill. But there is no other way of gaining our

freedom. It is the imperialist powers and their lackey, the Turkish State, which are responsible for the war.

She also discusses the woman question and points towards the main defect of "experienced socialism" about the question in her letter to the "Women Freedom Fighters". She states that the "scientific socialist theory proposes to provide women with the opportunity for a humanly life", and criticises the approach of real socialism which has not handled the woman question within the framework of "scientific socialist principles" or in accordance with its uniqueness, but rather within general questions of humanity. That is to say, the most remarkable point in the letters which highlights the limits of party education is that party activists are given the intensive aspirations and firm beliefs of socialism without the basic principles of dialectical materialist doctrine.

On the one hand, Kinaci, emphasises the socialist longing for universally humane content and the "principles of scientific socialism" to the extent of subordinating the Kurdish struggle by saying "our struggle; which ... has become the property of all humanity and has gradually been converted into the only hope of oppressed peoples on the way to lofty socialism ... *has also* brought a people to an exalted state". On the other hand, by saying "you [Öcalan] are the one who is most loyal to the martyrs ... [and thus] *we will* absolutely *not hesitate* over the triumph of our demands" she feels herself to be a "martyr" prior to the "suicide attack". Considering that she had graduated from a university where the majority of militants in the Party had not, the dimensions of the PKK's subjective share in the process of motivating its militants and grassroots support by an intensive and monopolised system of party education become clear.

The other outstanding "action" was performed in Germany by Eser Altinok, who informed on the PKK's activities to the German police for some time, and who then drank petrol before setting fire to himself "in order to burn up all the imperialist influences that had infiltrated his spirit". The letter he wrote to "Dear Mum" while he was preparing himself for this "action" is philosophical. 23 year old Eser attempts a dialectical account of the "wrestling" between the enemy and the PKK "with all their might" within his spiritual structure. The notion of the enemy in Eser's letter transcends the Turkish State or even imperialism. He repeatedly underlines the term "enemy" but does not specify it as being either Turkey or imperialism. He rather

associates the term with the one party of class struggle who have "govern[ed] the sufferings" of humankind since the "inception of world humanity" and expresses his confidence in the "harmonious" future of humanity through dialectical thinking.

> ... The source of every painful phenomenon is the enemy. The enemy does not only create pain but also governs it. ... The world's humanity was not born with pain. ... it [humanity] is passing through such a stage in our time. In the future, this darkness which we call pain will wither away because the world's humanity did not emerge with pain but at ease. This fight will consequently culminate in ease. It is so because ... every beginning contains the character of its end.

He deepens his concept of the "enemy" and puts more emphasis on the "internal class struggle" both in the PKK and in the spiritual wholeness of himself.

> The class struggle within the PKK is the struggle between the parties who want to end the pain and those who want to keep the pain alive. The ones who strove to deform the essence of the PKK at its inception are on the one side and the General President of the PKK Abdullah Öcalan on the other. The fight that is executed by these two parties against one another within the PKK is more intensive than the one against the enemy. I felt this intensity within myself, I lived with it everyday.

Eser Altinok joins the Party in late 1993, receives "intensive" party education in Europe in 1994 and becomes a professional party activist. He receives his earlier education, equivalent to pre-university college here in the UK, in Germany. Because the PKK is outlawed in Germany, he is arrested and imprisoned for almost eight months in 1997 due to his organisational activities. However, during his imprisonment, he experiences conflicts within himself and eventually agrees to inform on some fellow activists in the PKK and causes some of them to be arrested. Following occasional usage for operations by the German police, Eser repents of what he is doing. The interesting explanations he gives in his letter are about the period between this repentance and his appalling "suicide action". A paragraph in the letter concerning political action and the "renewal" process of the individual's personality tells us something about the PKK's "party education".

A new personality realises by *müdahale* [intervention/interference]. To achieve a new personality, to reshape one's emotional body, to adjust the brain in accordance to the new; all these can actualised by *müdahale*. To intervene in the formation of the personality, to generalise the positive aspects [of the personality] and regulate them according to the Party, to unite the power of the feelings and the intellect in aiming at this target and, in the final analysis, to defeat the enemy within one's spirit and on this basis to feel the Leadership, to keep alive the Leadership in your spiritual structure and to integrate the Leadership into one's surroundings entails politicisation. This is because politics means a practical entity, namely it falls in the field of *müdahale*. ... There is no other meaning of politics.

The above paragraph is a preliminary generalisation intended to describe the actual process of his attachment to the PKK. In continuation, he focuses on his "inescapable end" and exposes the essence of the process: "The way of my attachment to the Party determined the result because I did not grasp politics as intervening in one's existing personality. I wielded the Party for my personal interest ... I could not grasp even the 'P' of the PKK within its genuine framework. The thing existing in my personality is not the PKK's political *terbiye* [good manner acquired by education and experience] but the enemy's political *terbiyesizlik* [ill-manneredness, bad manners]". As a result, he sees himself as a traitor – "because", Eser repeats, "every beginning conceals the seeds of its end in itself" – and endeavours to illuminate the specific cause of the final effect by exposing his spiritual state in terms of Plato's notion of the "spiritual balance" between *reason* and *appetite*.

> ... I created emotionlessness in the name of emotion. I locked my brain for the sake of a *dirhem*[32] pleasure. A bucking [like a horse] pleasure means that the brain becomes locked.

Then he tries to describe for his mother how the "contention between the enemy and the PKK"... "with all their might" caused his particular spiritual imbalances. Even if he is aware that the "mum" is not in the position to perceive "what a non-PKK life and Leadership style" is, he still makes the attempt to describe his situation.

> Mum, you may never sharply feel the heat of the feeling of penitence in the depth of your spirit. It is not a feeling of which you are always conscious. It hides itself

in a corner of your spirit. When the other spiritual entities which prevent the sovereignty of this feeling in the spirit – which are indeed potent entities – begin to weaken, lose their omnipotence, it [the feeling of penitence] launches an offensive and conquers the spirit. If the material conditions which have a grasp on spirit and mind present an adequate atmosphere for bringing ease of mind and causing the feeling of penitence to cease, it [penitence] is replaced by gratuitousness. But if such an atmosphere does not sufficiently exist ... penitence leaves the sovereignty over the spirit to its opposite; penitence withdraws into its corner in order to erupt one day. During the period of this process, the feelings and inferences formed to justify the event, the circumstance (which caused the feeling of penitence) and its form and content all become the sovereign of the spirit.

The feeling of penitence is not something like a straw flame instantly blazing and going out but a volcano which becomes dormant and rekindles at times. It has occasionally shifted from being sovereign to being oppressed in my spirit. I am very happy for I [have decided to] set fire to myself. It is so because this time, on this occasion, I will by no means let this feeling be oppressed by anti-depressant pills! ... I thought that I would have entirely eliminated and destroyed this feeling ... and that it would have been non-existent as a feeling when I was completely consolidated into the enemy in theory and practice. Whereas I realised that it had hidden itself in a corner of my spirit. The corner in which it hid itself is the footprint of the PKK. This is what the PKK is like. Once it enters the spirit, it never leaves.

The 23 year old European-born militant of the PKK, Eser Altinok, reaches his eventual conclusion and expresses it in an ironic style: "The feeling of penitence tells me this: *The most beautiful sight of a traitor is his/her burnt-to-ash heart*". And in accordance with this conclusion, he constructs an interesting final paragraph.

I will also burn the enemy with myself. I will not burn an individual but a class. When I burn the imperialism inside myself, I want to convert my heart into ashes. If I swallow the petrol and also pour it into myself, I will be burning my heart from inside. I am conquering the castle from within its walls.

The excerpts I have quoted from the letter are selected to draw attention to the very main focuses of the PKK's organisational education. I have striven to demonstrate in the foregoing discussions and analyses that this education is first and foremost targeted

at rekindling the dormant anti-treason sentiments of the Kurds as "untapped springs of energy" (Nairn, 1981, p. 102), accumulated in their unique ethnic background. In addition, the party leadership proposes, through simultaneous endeavours, to reassess "human nature" in terms of Plato's belief in education and his method of "self re-creation", and in terms of Socrates' philosophy of "know yourself".

III Charismatic Messiah or Messianic Charisma

The indisputable charisma endowed to Öcalan's abbreviated name, *Apo*, is an effective source of motivation both within the party organisation and among the Kurdish masses, and deserves further study. We need to take a closer look to the concept of "charisma", not because it is one of the main themes of this research, but because the charismatic authority under Öcalan that operates in the party structure and the supporting masses has much to do with motivational effects in the movement. And because charisma has much to do with the messianic expectations of the helpless masses, we also need to make a brief reference to Messianism.

Charisma is one of the precarious or, so to speak, "slippery" concepts of the sociology of politics —and, of course, of the sociology of religion as politics. A similar intellectual challenge dominates the atmosphere surrounding messianism. The ideational coverage of theorisation on both concepts encompasses a wide segment of human history. Messianism, for instance, ranges from God's messenger (prophet) to Mazzini's "people", from Plato's "philosopher ruler" to Hegel's "World Historical Individuals", from Marx's "proletariat" to Gramsci's "*élite* of intellectuals". In a similar pattern, charisma ranges from God or gods itself/themselves to the most hardline anti-religious or so-called materialistic leaders of secular movements.

Thus, in order to avoid such a "slippery" path towards the multidimensional arguments of a wide-ranging literature, I shall have to condense —or even "solidify"— these two intricately interrelated concepts into a single path of cognisance. By doing this, of course, the individuality of each will not be denied. The susceptible "autonomy" of concepts is taken for granted. However, since this study relates to a movement that provides — and is propelled by— a secular foundation, a focus on "charisma" is apposite.

a) The Problem of the Concepts

The term "Messiah" derives from the Hebrew *mashiah* literally meaning "the anointed one". It denotes a "chosen" individual, or, in Christian theology, the Christ. The idea of "chosenness", afterwards, exceeds the individual and stretches to encompass either a group or a class or a people or a nation, and so on. Charisma comes from Greek word *kharisma* which means "gift of grace". And that is given by a divine power or, in secular cases, is an inborn quality of the individual. But both the messiah and the charismatic individual, according to believers or followers, are "chosen" and/or "sent" for redemption and/or salvation of a country or people – or, in case of "socialist messianism", for the "total redemption of humanity". In fact, both phenomena are "closer relatives" than is generally recognised in their respective literatures. The very *idea* –or the culture– that nurtures these "unbridled" and "awesome" powers (charisma or the messiah) with "ramifications of an individualised hegemony" (Lee, 1992, p. 44) relates the revolutionary yearnings of the helpless mob ("incapable of achieving order for themselves") –that is, Nietzsche's "herd".

Scholars are confident of three points regarding messianism: a) that it is attached to the human need for "revolution"[33] (the indispensable hope for total redemption from social evil) as a "comprehensive movement of thought" (Talmon, 1960, pp. 17-24; Duncan, 2000, pp. 48-61; Wegner, 2000,pp. 68,69[34]), b) that it originates from the "Messiah" of Christianity, and c) that its idea of "chosenness" can be traced back to Judaism's "chosen people". Duncan firmly states that the "concept of a 'chosen people' penetrated into Christian thought from Judaism" (Duncan, 2000, p. 141). Arguing for the "Jewish ingredient" in "political messianism", Talmon points at "the fact that Karl Marx was of Jewish ancestry" (Talmon, 1960, p. 77) and further states that "it was the Messianic urge that sent Marx upon his quest" (*op. cit.*, p. 505). On the other hand, the "elasticity" of the term "messianism" employed in the related literature cannot be overlooked. This is the "characteristic feature of all movements and ideas described as forms of 'messianism'" says Duncan, and he quotes R.J. Zwi Werblowsky.

> The term messianism...denoting the Jewish religious concept of a person with a special mission from God, is used in a broad and at times very loose sense to refer to beliefs or theories regarding an eschatological (concerning the last times) improvement of the state of man or the world and a final consumption of history.[35] (Duncan, 2000, p. 6)

The concept of charisma contains a similar problem. Although, as Conger puts it, "there is a little disagreement in the literature over the locus of charismatic leadership"[36] (Conger and Kanungo, 1988, p. 23), it is not clear whether it is a religious or non-religious phenomenon. It involves both supernatural and secular endowments. And its repositories are not only individual persons but may also be "groups" or "objects" such as "kinship groups", "blood lines", "status systems" or "an institutional structure regardless of the persons involved" (Spencer, 1973, p. 343)[37]. Also, it is not yet settled whether the "power of charisma" is deployed for "good" or "evil", or whether it is "neutral". There is a "problem" in the lack of consensus on the precise meaning of *charisma*, because the term has been applied to very diverse leaders,

> Despite the increased attention being focused on charismatic leadership in the academic literature, to date no scholarly consensus has emerged on the precise application of the concept of charisma. (House and Howell, 1992, p. 83),

Howell refers to Willner's "mediating" statement, which accords with a classical text – the concept of "charismatic authority" theorised by Max Weber.

> It should be underscored that, in accordance with Weber's example ([1924] 1947), charisma is used in a value-neutral manner. As Willner ...[38] points out, charismatic leadership is "inherently neither moral nor immoral, neither virtuous nor wicked ... such questions arise only when we wish to evaluate whether a particular charismatic leader has used the relationship in the service of good or evil." (Howell in Conger and Kanungo, 1988, pp. 214, 215)

Yet, "the problem" of the literature is found in the absence of "an explanation of the process by which charismatic leadership has its profound effects" (Shamir, House and Arthur, 1993, p. 579). Accordingly, to overcome the problem, research efforts are exhausted in analysing the "profound effects" that are generated on followers by

charismatic leaders (*op. cit.*, 1993 *and et al.*). And Jermier talks of confusion about the "vague concept" charisma that necessitates "additional imaginative new theories, critical reconceptualisations" (Jermier, 1993, p. 218).

Scholars have explored two main areas when analysing the phenomenon of charisma as a "process": the personal attributes of leaders as an inborn "seed" and the social tension of conflicts and contradictions as a nurturing "soil" accompanied with followers' perceptions/responses. While the scholars with psychoanalytic approaches are rather inclined to restrict themselves to the *person* of charisma (Popper, 2000, pp. 734, 735), inquiries in the social-psychological field investigate the *persona* of leaders (Gabriel, 1997, pp. 319, 330). Namely, some stress the sociological insights of the phenomenon by calling attention to the "soil" that yields charismatic leaders. Others focus on the leader's performance in terms of either "sacrifice/suffering/benefiting" or his/her personality as "a constellation of individual qualities", or on leaders' upbringing and backgrounds. On the other hand, when the central focus is charisma's relatively positive or negative consequences, intellectual efforts are devoted to the dichotomous "faces" of charisma: *personalised* and *socialised* or transactional and transformational types of leaderships (Burns, 1978; Howell, 1988; House and Howel, 1992; Lee, 1992; Popper, 2000; and *et. al.*). In fact, the mainstream of the literature overwhelmingly acknowledges the relational dialectic between leader and followers. It is the creation of a twofold process: the *person* of the leader with relevant inborn qualities and the *persona* of the leader influenced by the tension of social affairs.

> Thus, charisma is not a thing that can be possessed by an individual. Neither does it emerge automatically from certain circumstances regardless of individual qualities and initiative. Stated more precisely, charisma is a process that exists only in social relationships. It is a product of the qualities and actions of individuals and situational factors, but the nature of the situation is its most important determinant. (Jermier, 1993, p. 221).

And charisma is in any case recognised as a fateful social power that cannot be trivialised.

However, the *idea* that resides at the roots of the concepts, Messiah and Charisma, is the revolutionary expectations of the masses —the *mob* that is alien to ruling and rulers— no matter whether their usage is in the service of good or evil. The

helpless mob, which "does not 'distinguish' itself, does not become independent in its own right" without organisers (Gramsci, 1971, p. 334), has so far never dispensed with its radical expectations of total emancipation from social evil. This has always provided fertile "soil" to give rise to charismatic messiahs or messianic charismas. Here, the defining difference is associated with the timeline of human development. The progress of humanisation from the primitive/ancient to our days transformed supernatural messiahs towards relatively secular charismas. Accordingly, while explanations of messianism are worded in religious terms, charisma is conceptualised instead in secular or modern or in "materialistic/deterministic" terms.

b) The Reification and Ramifications of the Power of Charisma: How It Operates

In view of the problematic definitions of the concept charisma, as with many other concepts in the social sciences, the crux of the phenomenon —or Weber's "charismatic authority"– appears to pursue the questions of "how it faithfully operates among the followers" and "for whom it, in the final analysis, operates" –just as we discussed earlier in Chapter One on nationalism. The charisma of the *dead*, such as in Khumaini's Iran (Sanasarian, 1995; Saeidi, 2001), is rather grandiose and is easily considered, but contemplating the mechanisms of its "unbridled" power in the course of the "routinisation" of the charismatic leadership would be a more difficult sociological enterprise.

Charisma, as an "unbridled power", *demonstrates* itself through "legendary" successes in "battle" (Spencer, 1973, pp. 345-347) and salvages its followers from despair and disperses the tension of the existing "status quo", whose very tension legitimises and is "substituted" (Jones, 2001, pp. 759-761) by the *rationally* institutionalised new charismatic authority. This charisma becomes indispensable for the emerging "bureaucratic staff". Further, if its very power has recently salvaged the followers or has just dispersed their hopelessness, then charisma is "reborn" as a rapid *deus ex machina* for the "adolescent" ruling stratum that has come out of the process. This facet of the phenomenon reveals the genuine socio-political process vis-à-vis charisma and its charismatic ["transformational" (Burns, 1978)] leadership. This process of the "ramifications of an individualised hegemony" (Lee, 1992, pp. 43, 44) is

largely overlooked in the vast literature on the subject, in spite of Weber's articulation of the process under his major subtitle (The Routinisation of Charisma [1947, pp. 363-373]) to "Charismatic Authority" –the classical reference source. This may be why Spencer, while finding charisma as always involved with "a *relationship* between the group and the leader", has repeatedly "refused to consider the charisma as *either* a sociological or psychological phenomenon" (Spencer, 1973, p. 348).

In his article on the "two faces" of the process, in a scholarly analysis containing examples from Islam and Hinduism; Lee briefly pulls the crux of the sociological/political phenomenon into the mainstay of his argument and raises "the problem" of charisma.

> Generally, the problem of charisma is a problem of unbridled power that is psychologically awesome and socially threatening. This is the contemporary meaning of charisma, expressed in numerous studies of idiosyncratic power and its organisational consequences. ... For Weber, it was not the moral teachings that became routinized but the personal authority of the charismatic individual once he transferred his command to an impersonal, stratified order. By reallocating the source of routinization in the individual, rather than in the teachings, Weberian revisionists have been able to argue that the charismatic qualities of individuals once enshrined within institutions can assume a life of their own, in effect producing charismatic institutions which in a sense transcend individual idiosyncrasies but from which particular incumbents of corporate roles can enjoy tremendous power flowing from them (Shils, 1965[39]). (Lee, 1992, pp. 42, 43).

Lee, therefore, states that the central concern of contemporary researchers on charisma needs to be "the dialectical relationship between the personal and social or cultural sources of charismatic power" (1992, p. 44). In a similar mode, Spencer, though contradicting his refusal of charisma as a sociological or psychological phenomenon, draws attention to the "diffused form" of charismatic power "in the stratification system of society" (Spencer, 1973, p. 342). Whereas, in contrast with "Weberian revisionists", Weber begins his explication of the "routinisation of charisma" by situating his argument on the *base* of the "stronger ideal and also stronger material interests of the members of the administrative staff". He first underlines the inevitability of a *radical change* in the pure form of charismatic authority, which "exists only in the process of originating", towards taking "on the character of a permanent relationship forming a

stable of disciples or a band of followers or a party organisation or any sort of political or hierocratic organisation ...". Then he goes on to the causes of the inevitable transformation, in fact, the metamorphosis.

> The following are the principal motives underlying this transformation: (a) The ideal and also the material interests of the followers in the continuation and the continual reactivation of the community, (b) the still stronger ideal and also stronger material interests of the members of the administrative staff, the disciples or other followers of the charismatic leader in continuing their relationship. (Weber, 1947, p364).

The vitality of the strong "ideal and material" interests, Weber adds, "generally become conspicuously evident with the disappearance of the personal charismatic leader ... which inevitably arises" (*op. cit.*). Thinking of the charisma of the *dead* when "the problem of succession" arises, the reification of the power, allocated to the hierarchy of the newly arisen ruling apparatus, adds to the sense of the genuine significance of the "routinisation" of charisma, in other words, of the "radical change" in the charismatic authority[40].

Weber's "routinization of charisma" denotes *seizing* the power of charisma from the person of the charismatic leader to guard the "interests of the administrative staff, ... so that their own status is stable on a day-to-day basis" (Saeidi, 2001, p. 222). In fact, power is a non-individual phenomenon. Jermier advises thinking of charisma "as a pattern of interactions" which necessitates a cosmos-like (a well-ordered hierarchized whole) communal structure as *sine qua non* to be reified. He applies to Foucault's metaphoric words.

> ...Power must be analyzed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localised here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or a piece of wealth. Power is employed through a net-like organisation. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power.[41] (Jermier, 1993, p. 221).

In this very sense, charisma is a mere property of the "bureaucratic staff". Any charismatic authority temporarily operates through a body of staff. A body of corporate staff that steers political affairs defines a bureaucratic apparatus. Thus, the

"bureaucratic administrative staff" is not only a sub-property of "legal authority" but also of "charismatic authority" – both in the charisma of the living and the deceased.[42] The power of charisma, in all cases, undergoes two main stages: a) the emerging process, "the process of originating" in Weber's words, and b) the process of "routinisation" or, so to speak, of the institutionalisation of routinisation. In both processes the power is still based on the "attitude of awe" or "reverential posture", or "enthusiasm". But while in the former period the power is targeted at the tension, conflict and contradictions of the status quo, and consequently is deployed for the mobilisation of followers and masses, in the latter it is devoted to securing the status quo, and is consequently "sacrificed" for the reestablishment of the "loyal" followers and the demobilisation or stagnation of the masses. The former period, in general, squares with the duration of the struggle against the existing ruling order, and therefore charisma functions as "messianic power" for the followers and entrepreneurs "that can fan 'the spark of hope' in the dimmest political possibility" (Wegner, 2000, p. 72). The latter period squares with the time of ascending to the throne and afterwards, and in consequence, "radically" changes. Its *demonstrated* power is now in the service of guarding the new status order. And this is precisely why the ubiquitous "hallmark" of the process of rationalisation or institutionalisation or "routinisation" of charisma is the clear-cut elimination of dissenters –no matter what religious or secular or Marxist stamp the process bears[43].

Charisma, in the person of the leader, "emerges in a field of conflict and contradictions and is so sustained" (Perinbayanagam, 1971, p. 395) *as messianism*. It first operates as a pivotal revolutionary force to either end or transform the "rules and resources that maintain structural order" (Lee, 1992, p. 41). Then it rapidly reverses for the sake of the "ramifications of an individualised hegemony" (*op. cit.* p. 44) devoted to maintaining the *new* status order as a pivotal reactionary force. That is, it has "two faces": It both operates for individual or group or mass mobilisations and for the hegemony of the corporate body. It is an indispensable tool in the absence of institutionalised civic organisations which are *ruled by rules*.

To summarise, the "magic" power of the charismatic leadership of political parties –or of organised leading entities of non-local social movements exclusive of the field of business, etc.– emerges as a force sparking revolution. It has thus always been messianic. However, the "unbridled awesome power" arrives, in the final analysis, at

its mission: to operate on the part of newly emergent bureaucratic staff to institutionalise and to *class* so as to assure their "stronger ideal and also stronger material interests". And it continues to function since it succeeds regardless of the existence or absence of the person of charisma.

This recurrent "face" of human social development appears to reoccur until civil *political* organisations in every aspect of life have superseded –or obtained mastery of– the political parties that have been "instruments of the maintenance and the widening of power of some man over others" (Panebianco, 1988, p. viii). That is, the "sparking" power of both revolutions and "counter-revolutions", charisma, will be antiquated when the reification of what is called civil society is the case of total societal.

c) The Routinisation of "*Apo*" Charisma

The type of leadership that A. Öcalan and the PKK experience is evidently a bold charismatic one. No additional proof is needed in this respect. In particular, in terms of being "foreign to all rules" or at least "intellectually analysable rules" (Weber, 1947, p. 361), the organisational body of the PKK functions under a "pure form" of charismatic authority. A considerable proportion of the Kurdish masses and the whole structure of the organisation have recognised *Apo* as the "possessor of the quality" who has arisen "out of enthusiasm, or of despair and hope" (*op. cit.* p. 359) from the early 1990s onwards. This has been the case to such an extent that Öcalan himself has begun to complain loudly. In response to a related question from a Turkish journalist, he chastised his followers for not being critical of him: "My suffering is in their submission like slaves...They either do that [blind obeying] or run away. This is my problem too" (Balli, 1991, p. 282).

The nature of Öcalan's charisma does not provide us with an arguable distinctness in comparison with equivalent present or past experiences in the East, West and Middle East. What is unique to Kurdish societal praxis and its interaction with Turkey's Kurdish policy, is that the routinisation of Öcalan's charisma has been reified before the institutionalisation of the Party. Even, one may say, the routinisation firmly took place without the party having institutionalised.

The processes of institutionalisation and routinisation in charismatic organisations unavoidably follow a simultaneous path of development, for they mutually nurture one another. Both processes require, in a *de facto* flaw of organisational working, the elimination or dysfunctionalisation of the person of charisma, just as has been the recurrent face of history in examples such as those of Mao, Lenin, Ataturk, and even the prophets and so on, regardless of their secular/materialistic or religious character (elaborated in Chapter 1). Even if the person of charisma does not like it, the process of institutionalisation "shadows" the routinisation of charisma.

> Personal charisma is, besides, generally associated with strong resistance to institutionalisation. The leader, in fact, has no interest in organisational reinforcement which would inevitably set the stage for the party's "emancipation" from his control. (Panebianco 1988, pp. 66, 67).

That is, the resistance of the charismatic leader by no means has the power to prevent the routinisation and/or institutionalisation taking place. This is because charismatic power too "is employed through a net-like organisation", and the "material and ideal interests" of the administrative-bureaucratic staff is far "stronger" than the love for the person of charisma. This appears to be the plausible reason why Pedahzur and Brichta call to mind Maor's critique of Panebianco in "defining a charismatic party as un-institutionalised" (2002, p. 34) for Panebianco places the institutionalisation and routinisation against one another.

> In a charismatic party (before the routinsation of charisma), the absence of institutionalisation and the presence of a very strong centralisation of authority ... are associated. (Panebianco, 1988, p. 66).

Whereas the institutionalisation of charismatic parties takes place precisely along with the routinisation of charisma. And this is probably the fact that drove Rose and Mackie to develop the concept of "charismatic institutionalisation" (Pedahzur and Brichta, 2002, p. 35).

The institutionalisation of Öcalan's party began to be on the agenda of the organisation in the second half of the 1980s when the movement enjoyed evident mass support and major recruitment. The organisation established a popular army and front

flanks along with many sub-branches of various fields of activities (exemplified in Chapter 6, I b). The party even ventured into self-contained "general elections" twice (1992 and 1995). In fact, these were all fatal enterprises[44] just as is now the case for KADEK. (The preceding PKK is factually there with its routinised charismatic authority –with its "foreign-to-rules" working under the name of KADEK). However, while the institutionalisation attempts of the PKK have not produced noticeable results, the effective routinisation of *Apo* Charisma has held sway since the early 1990s despite everything. Also, the elimination of Öcalan by his arrest in 1998 has not so far effected considerable changes in either the decisive influence of his charisma or its routinised working.

The question of Öcalan's charisma in terms of organisational entanglements is further discussed in Chapter 6 (II e).

Conclusions

Both the form and content of "party education" and the dominance of Öcalan's talks in the overall educational activities of the PKK have constituted the fundamental base for the organisational motivation of cadres and the grassroots. In other words, the nature and intensity of the educational efforts, which are literally composed by Öcalan's "tongue", have had a decisive effect on the motivational extent of *national* sentiments of the *tribal* "Turkish Kurds". And the very form, content and intensity of the monolingual education reproduced the *"Apo"* charisma in the tension of Turkey's Kurdish question as a nurturing "field of conflict and contradictions" and his charisma has been thus "so sustained" (Perinbayanagam, 1971, p. 395). In turn, the "Apo" charisma as an "unbridled power that is psychologically awesome and socially threatening" (`Lee, 1992, p. 42) had profound effects on the organisation's mass activities. On the other hand, the same sources of motivation – "at a certain stage" of the PKK's quantitative growth within the framework of *de facto* organisational procedures shaped extensively by itself (Öcalan's "tongue") with the additional contextual effects imposed by the failure of Soviet Socialism – turned into the Organisation's fetters throughout the 1990s, just like the "destiny" of the "conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relation of production". The

most general rule of social progress discovered and formulated by Marx has just produced a typical result in the development process of the PKK.

> ... At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production ... with the property relations within the framework in which they have hitherto operated. From forms of development of the productive forces, these relations turn into their fetters. (Marx, 1971, p. 21).

This is the main theme of Öcalan's self-criticism, which he formulated in an epigrammatic style: "If you do not solve, you will then be solved" or "If you do not overcome [obstacles], you will then be overcome [by them]". But the resource of mobilisation under Öcalan's leadership with his "routinised" *Apo* charisma is still active and effective. The dominant slogans of the HADEP congress, which gathered about 100,000 Kurds in Ankara, were the ones containing Öcalan's abbreviated name "Apo" and the name of the island, "Imralli", where he is imprisoned.

Consequently, Turkish Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit has given a statement through the press: "The HADEP congress has to be a warning to everyone". Yet, several months ago, Ecevit was attacked by opposition parties in the Turkish assembly for he had received "only applause" (*Turkiye*, June 13, 2000) when he sounded his opposition to the death sentence in a limited public meeting held in a hall on his visit to Diyarbakir. Notwithstanding the fact that an over-centralised organisational nature moulded by Öcalan's theoretical and practical dominance has turned into the PKK's fetters since early 1990s, the organisation, as it stands, has succeeded in mobilising its cadres, the grassroots and the Kurdish masses. The findings of two related questions of my field research indicate the influence of Öcalan's leadership cult. I constructed two questions to find out the grassroots' perception of the most fundamental cause of the PKK's success and the reason for their sympathy towards the Party in the first place. In response to the latter question (Table 11), the two highest percentages of the answers of the activists pointed towards (one directly, the other indirectly) the leader of the Party: 24.4% of respondents ticked that they first became sympathetic to the PKK "through the leader" and 38.04% of them "through observations". I interpreted the 38.04% of who ticked the option of "through observation" as an indication of the effect of the leader because observations extensively encompass Öcalan's power, due to the

perpetual usage of the "Apo" icon by the State's propaganda machine – the instruments of mass media. In response to the former question, the answer and the percentage were more clear: 50.5% of grassroots believes that the most fundamental cause of the success of the Party is its leader (Table 10). The next highest percentage, 19.5%, is one which points towards ideology as the main cause of the party's success. This may be interpreted in terms of the effect of the party education composed by Öcalan's "tongue" and its consistent insistence on socialism. In view of the fact that I carried out field research after Öcalan's "metamorphosed" standpoint (with respect to the PKK's *national* undertakings at its inception) that he formed in the Imralli prison, my findings are significant in relation to the Party's educational efforts, and consequently in relation to Öcalan's leadership style, in the "built-up" (Turner and Killian, 1957) work of motivating cadres, grassroots and masses.

The findings reveal that the range of the PKK's organisational decisiveness – the subjective share – in the development of the most recent Kurdish insurgency against Turkey is substantially determined by the educational efforts of the Party, which are merely materialised by Öcalan's (recorded and unrecorded) speeches over almost twenty five years and the significance of these speeches to the organisation's procedures and performance. McCharty and Zald refer to Turner and Killian's (1972) conclusion which states that "...there is always enough discontent in any society to supply the grass-roots support for a movement if the movement is effectively organised and has at its disposal the power and resources of some established elite group". They then go further that "grievances and discontent may be defined, created and manipulated by issue entrepreneurs and organisations (McCharty and Zald, 1977, p. 1215). In 1957, Turner and Killian highlighted the very aspect of collective action and/or resource mobilisation in more firm words.

> ... But crowd behaviour does not consist of the mere release of repressed tendencies to action; it is built up. The social cohesion of the crowd does not emerge through a sudden synthesis of common, unconscious, psychological forces; it is developed. (Turner and Killian, 1957, p. 58).

This is more true of the phenomenon of the PKK in the specific context of "Turkish Kurdistan" and results from the unique policy of Turkey – and its strict application – towards Kurdish existence which has most recently manifested itself again through an

incident[45] that occurred at the HADEP congress held in November 2000. (The incident dominated Turkish media's news agenda on the following day, rather than the congress itself. The media was not interested in the State's policy but in the MEP's "conspiratorial" endeavours targeted at "propaganda and show").

The building-up of a "national" collective action among the *tribal* Kurds is a phenomenon of the PKK's philosophy and its experience of the structural individual-organisation linkage. But this very phenomenon is, as a corollary to the PKK's stage of development, a central property of the Organisation's failures, defects and impasses, and of its questions and confrontations. This will be dealt with in the next chapter.

Notes

[1] *Ashiret*: Tribe or, in some cases, a confederation of tribes. *Ihanet*: Treason.

[2] Including the most long-lasting one against Turkey in Dersim 1937-38 (prior to the PKK), the one against Iran which culminated in the Republic of Mehabad for eleven months in 1946, and the prolonged *peshmerge* war for decades under Molla Mustafa Barzani against Iraq.

[3] The sentence in the Koran (Qur'an) of Islam expressing the confession of faith which is believed to be one of the five conditions of Islam.

[4] The practices and rules not laid down in the Koran but derived from Mohammed's own habits and words.

[5] The tribe against which the PKK initiated its "anti-feudal, anti-collaborator" armed struggle in 1979 within the framework of "armed propaganda".

[6] The town that the proponents of the Party (HADEP) regarded as the legal extension of the PKK still cannot enter without being concealed.

[7] Money paid by the bridegroom to the bride's family.

[8] Martin van Bruinessen states, first, that the boundaries between tribe and clan "are rather vague", then he immediately adds the difference that tribes are "often much larger" in number (van Bruinessen,1992, p. 57).

[9] The phrase "nationalist without nationalism" is employed for Kurdish nationalism by Abbas Vali and is a use of words that solely fits the Kurdish "national" reality, which he also defines as "a historical anomaly which is nevertheless true". Vali also makes a footnote here and refers to the PKK's total abandonment of overall nationalist demands including even modest ones such as a federal system in official Turkey. He correctly states that the PKK "is the only significant modern Kurdish political organisation which started its campaign with a clear nationalist strategy demanding independence for Kurdistan". Vali points out the state of ambivalence in the spectacle of the latest PKK.

> However the radical change in the strategic objective of the PKK does not seem to have affected its nationalist discourse, which appears side by side with arguments for a political solution in the framework of Turkish sovereignty. This paradox testifies not only to an ambiguous political identity, but also to the curious case of nationalists without nationalism, which characterised the discourse and the practice of the Mahabad republic five decades earlier (Vali, 1998, p. 94).

In fact, the "nationalist discourse" too has been affected from the dramatically radical changes in the strategy of the movement since Vali's article was published. The "national" and "revolutionary" rhetoric has gradually "calmed down" and almost withered away since then. Eventually, in its eighth congress held in April 2002, the organisation converted itself from a "party" to a "congress" (KADEK – Kongreya Azadi u Demokrasiya Kurdistan [Kurdistan Freedom and Democracy Congress]) through which the PKK-led Kurdish movement abandoned a programme which was aspiring to and/or undertaking rule-

power. The overall strategic objective is to have a "Democratic Republic" of Turkey in which the culture-related and identity-related questions of Kurdish community are resolved.

[10] This "intrinsic" trouble may well be attributable to the overall socio-political history of the "keepers of the cradle of civilisation" in conjunction with the dynamics and contradictions of the course of civilisation's history since its inception. Naturally, this requires additional research and discussion, which falls outside the realm of this study.

[11] In the Dersim uprising, Dr. Nuri Dersimi –in his confined circle– attempted to convert the resistance into a "national" initiative, but either the leader of the uprising or the few backing tribes were not familiar with such aspirations as "Kurdistan" or the "nation-state".

[12] Öcalan justifies his proposal of a "Democratic Republic" by encouraging the PKK members to be consistent with their party's loyalty to socialist beliefs and aspirations held since its outset, but no one may assert that the masses have adopted such a novel approach to the struggle following a conscious consideration in the light of socialist principles.

[13] Millingen, *Wild Life among the Koords*, p. 244.

[14] Several Kurdish associations and societies with the support of various Armenian circles gathered in Lebanon in October 1927 and held a congress for the purpose of liberating the parts of Kurdistan and Armenia under Turkey. The congress ended with the announcement of the newly established United National Party, which came to be known as *Xoybun*.

[15] *Jash*, in a literal translation, means "donkey foal" but it is accepted in Kurdish political terminology as denoting *xain* [traitor].

[16] The Turkish word *"düşürülmüş"* literally means "debased". The leadership of the PKK, in fact Öcalan, employs this term to denote the "intrinsic" state of the Kurdish people which manifests itself in two main "unique" traits: imitating oppressors and being unlimitedly brave and cruel in fighting against one another. This appears to be the most distinct aspect of the Party's approach to its own people. When the case in point is an organisation which undertakes a "national liberation", the notion becomes more striking because the nationalism not only "always imagines an ideal" (Nairn, 1981, p. 102) nation but also emphasises and exaggerates its "greatness" among followers for whom subordination is not "deserved", and oppression is not "acceptable". This, on the other hand, points at the unusual aspect of "Kurdish nationalism" which in effect does not aspire to the "final goal" of every nationalism, a nation-state, but the emancipation of a denied ethno-cultural identity. This is more true of the Kurds under Turkey, where both the *denial* and *absorption* of the Kurdish population have been furthered far more boldly than in the respective parts of Kurdistan annexed by Iran, Iraq and Syria.

[17] Jwaideh penetrates the historical background in this aspect of his/her thesis, and describes several important personalities in the history of the Middle-East, such as Selahaddin Eyyubi and Han Zend, who established and ruled the states and empires on behalf of other peoples of the region (Jwaideh, 1999, pp. 7, 35).

[18] All the organisational configurations appearing during the 1970s in the part of Kurdistan under Turkey claimed to be Marxist-socialist with the exception of the early KDP in Turkey. But it too, later in 1973, changed its name first to T-KDP (Kurdistan Democratic Party - Turkey) then to KIP |*Kurdistan Isçi Partisi* (Kurdistan Workers' Party)], and stated its first article as "The Kurdistan Workers' Party is the political party of the working class of Kurdistan equipped with Marxism-Leninism." (Hasretyan, 1996, p. 128).

[19] Following Öcalan's arrest, it was publicised as the "Presidency Council" and its members increased from 9 to 11 including 2 women at the 7th Extraordinary congress.

[20] There are various arrangements for the "party children" appropriate to the conditions of the country, neighbouring states and Europe.

[21] Ertugrul Kurkcu was the chair of DEV-GENC (a Turkish revolutionary youth organisation which existed as a legal peripheral configuration of the illegal THKP |People's Liberation Party of Turkey| to which Öcalan was a loyal sympathiser) until 1972. In that year, he was the only survivor found after the Kizildere clash in which the rest of leading figures of the THKP were killed, including its charismatic leader Mahir Cayan who was regarded as Turkish Che Guevara.

[22] The actual "election" was held in four parts of Kurdistan and was obviously not as free as it was in Europe. It was held in a strictly clandestine and illegal way and had very limited participation.

[23] The lord of the manor.

[24] The latter two were being published legally in Turkey in the early 1990s.

[25] *Çözümlemeler* is Turkish word that literally means "analyses". However it has a particular meaning which denotes Ocalan's inculcation talks. On almost every occasion these talks are recorded, edited published and distributed to all party units, and used as almost the only material in the education programme of party cadres.

[26] The term "Leadership" (Önderlik) has actually become the official title of Öcalan within the Party. On questioning a member of the management committee of the School who had warned me about my use of the word "you" (siz) in the dialogue between myself and Öcalan, I was told that they perceive him as an "institution" rather than a personality. Öcalan also views himself as an "institution" : "Leadership is an Institution. I am not an individual but an institution. There are peculiarities in this institution. If it walks [works] then it will do the work, and the PKK has done some work." (Öcalan, 1994, p. 457).

[27] The "monthly books" and video-recorded forms of these "Çözümlemeler" are easily obtainable in London, and one Party activist in London who had experienced various Turkish prisons over three years due to his organisational linkage with the PKK told me that the monthly magazine Serxwebun (the PKK's central organ which is illegal in Turkey) and "Tapes of Çözümlemeler" were arriving at prisons regularly.

[28] Sirnak is the town in which HADEP (the pro-Kurdish legal party backed by the PKK) can not officially open its branch because of the severe oppression by the "village guards" of the State but it nevertheless polled the largest share of the votes in 1999 elections.

[29] I attended the 4th congress of HADEP (the pro-Kurdish legal party backed by the PKK) held in Ankara on 26 November 2000. The number of delegates at the congress was just over 800 but the police officials' estimate of the masses gathered around the congress hall was 100,000. The dominant slogan expressed sympathy for and loyalty to Öcalan: "Selam! Selam! Imralli'ya Bin Selam" [Salute! Salute! Thousand Salutes to Imralli (the island where Öcalan is imprisoned)]. The following day, the chief officer of MIT (Turkish Intelligence Service) declared that allowing TV broadcasts in the Kurdish language would be beneficial (Hurriyet, November 28, 2000). This was followed by an immediate statement from Bulent Ecevit, the Turkish Prime Minister, emphasising that the views of the chief of the MIT should be seriously considered because "the HADEP congress has to be a significant warning to everyone".

[30] A Kurdish populated town in Turkey towards the western border of Kurdistan.

[31]This dialectical expression of the "love of life" can be traced back to early militants in the PKK. The reply of Kemal Pir, one of the two Turkish founder-members of the PKK who died on the 56th day of a hunger strike in Diyarbakir Prison in 1982, to E. Oktay Yildiran, the head of the prison, has a similar philosophical flavour. In response to the military commander's question attempting to persuade him to abandon the hunger strike during his final days, "Don't you love life, Kemal?", Pir's answer is interesting: "We love life so much we are prepared to die for it".

[32] The smallest unit of weight used by ancient Ottomans

[33] The common reference point of the literature on charisma, Max Weber, is additionally firm about the "revolutionary force" of charisma and believes that it "is scarcely in need of further discussion". When comparing it with rational and traditional types of authority, Weber finds the "charismatic type" to be their antithesis in terms of being "foreign to all rules", and he consequently concludes that it is "a specifically revolutionary force" (Weber, 1947, pp. 361, 362).

[34] Wegner, in his penetrating article, "Messianic Historicity" in Rethinking Marxism, is more inflexible on the "revolutionary rupture" of messianism: "...the messianic is always revolutionary, it has to be" (Wegner, 2000, p. 68).

[35] Footnoted by Duncan: R.J. Zwi Werblowsky, "Messiah and Messianic Movements", in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th edn (Chicago, 1974), Macropaedia, XI, p. 1017.

[36] Conger points towards "a relational basis" as the "widely accepted" diagnosis of charismatic leadership in the related literature. "Charisma is believed not to reside solely in the leader and his or her personal attributes but rather in the interplay between the leader's attributes and the needs, beliefs and perceptions of followers" (Conger and Kanungo, 1988, p. 24).

[37] Martin E. Spencer cites from Weber's Economy and Society (1968) edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich.

[38] Cited by Howell from Willner, A. R. (1984, p. 12), The Spellbinders: Charismatic Political Leadership, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

[39] Shils, Edward (1965). Charisma, Order and Status. American Sociological Review 30, 199-213.

[40] With regard to the ramifications of the charismatic power, both E. Sanasarian (1995) and A. Saeidi (2001) present informative arguments on the Ayatollah Khumaini's (or Khomeini's) case. The former scholar delineates how the "routinisation" institutionalised through the governing apparatus of theocratic Iran during the lifetime of the person of charisma. He in particular exemplifies the institutionalisation of Khomeini's charisma within the military establishment, the "backbone" of the state, and its premier body Pasdaran (Revolutionary Guards). The latter scholar extends his argument to the penetration and solidification of "economic charisma" in the post-revolutionary and post Khumaini Iran, and figures the extent of charismatic power in terms of the redistribution of income and wealth.

[41] Jermier excerpts from Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Edited and Translated by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.

[42] "God" has been functioning for millennia as an effective *charisma* though it is solely a "persona" of a non-existent "person". God is a charisma, the messiah is the prophet and the prophet is the *resulullah* (representative) or messenger of God. This fact of history shows how the messiah is charismatic and how charisma is messianic.

[43] For empirical information about the example of unforgiving elimination of dissenters in Iran see Sanasarian, 1995, p. 195.

[44] This may be attributed to the Kurdish societal "heritage" of "arrested tribality" which we partly discussed at the beginning of this chapter. While "consistent" tribal structure did not give way to Kurdish sociality to be introduced with modern forms of institutionalisations that transcend "tribal institutions", the perpetual existence of profound tribal and religious leadership types provided a rich "experience" for routinisation of charismas. But this culturalised praxis of Kurds needs comprehensive elaboration which would provoke further inquiries into the persistent aspects of Kurdish "history frozen".

[45] The Kurdish born German MEP, Feleknas Uca, intended to convey her party's message to the congress in Kurdish because her Turkish was poor. As she began to speak in Kurdish, the police officer superintending the congress promptly interrupted her by pointing out the relevant legal article in a book in his hand, "any language other than Turkish" is forbidden. She, however, was "allowed" to continue conveying her message in German.

THE RISE AND FALL OF THE PKK

QUESTIONS, CONFRONTATIONS AND THE IMPASSE

This chapter will address the main theme of the study – the organisational function – by investigating the PKK's *difficulties*.

The inner dynamics of the PKK are examined from the point of view of the questions, confrontations and paradoxes within the Organisation. We will extend and broaden the examination of the PKK's "subjective share" in the process of Kurdish revitalisation during the period 1993 to 1999. So this chapter will concentrate on the deficiencies, contradictions and the problematic nature of the PKK's organisational structure.

But we must begin by clarifying the dynamics which gave rise to the PKK instead of giving rise to other Kurdish movements – in order to understand why the movement declined and shrunk. To that end, I shall explore the PKK's earlier years, during which the movement built its foundations of collective action among Kurds while ignored the world around them – from the aftermath of the 1980 *coup d'état* to the mass uprisings of the early 1990s.

I The Organisational Ascent

a. Clarifying the Cardinal Point

Theories of "collective action" or "collective behaviour" are sociological efforts to explain the processes of people's acting together. The different versions of these theories, with shifting emphases on *objective* and *subjective* factors, can help us analyse social movements within the framework of "cause and effect relations".

Scholars in the field devote their intellectual endeavours to providing adequate answers to the questions of *why* and *how,* vis-à-vis the realisation processes of collective social phenomena.

The shifting emphasis, either on contextual factors or on constructed internal dynamics of the collective phenomenon is a key argument among scholars. So the recurrent problem in this sociological field is caused by the entanglements caused by searching for the "right balance" between these two phenomena. While theories of "collective action" and "resource mobilisation" are seen as approaches paying greater attention to the *organisational factors*; while the perspective of the "political process" further contemplates the broader *multiple processes* "taking the existence of potential grievances for granted" (Diani, 1992), and while these theories have similarly dominant emphases on the "how" of phenomena, the "New Social Movement" approach is instead deemed to be tackling the "why" question. In view of Touraine's increasing attention towards the notions of "subject" and "actor", and of the *production of the Subject* by "modernity in crisis", and considering his definitions of the Subject as "the labour through which an individual transforms himself or herself into an actor" or as "a call to transform the Self into an actor" (Touraine, 1995, pp. 205-222, 368-375), one may say that the focus of the approach of NSM also tends towards the decisiveness of the *subjective share* in the collective action processes, and consequently towards the "how" of collective phenomena. Despite their valuable contributions to sociology in general and in particular to the sociology of social movements, the arguments remain unresolved. However, Melucci constructs three fundamental questions in order to facilitate the "understanding of collective phenomena in terms of *action*".

– Through which processes do actors construct collective action?

– How is the unity of the various elements of collective action produced?

– Through which processes and relationships do individuals become involved – or defect from – collective action? (Melucci, 1989, p. 20).

In "seek[ing] answers to these questions", one still has to elaborate the "how" of the processes, namely the inner dynamics of the subjective configurations of people's

acting together – the creativity, productivity, motivativity and transformativity of individual-organisation interrelations.

No doubt, the realisation of a process, which culminates in people's acting together, is a result of various sub-processes' it is the outcome of multiple processes and requires the combination of different components for it to happen. Tilly isolates "five big components" in the collective action process (interest, organisation, mobilisation, opportunity ad collective action itself) and asserts that

> *Collective action* consists of people's acting together in pursuit of common interests. Collective action results from changing combinations of interests, organisation, mobilisation and opportunity. (Tilly, 1978, p. 7).

These components are "vulnerable" to the processes that may either enhance or impede "the formation of cognitive frameworks and systems of relationships necessary for action" (Melucci, 1989). Even a process may well be, at the same time, impeding *and* enhancing the changing components. So in the situation confronted by this study, the uniqueness of Turkey's policy of denial about the Kurdish question, on the one hand, is an impeding constraint in terms of organisational *opportunities* – and on the other hand it could also serve as a means for mass *mobilisation* in terms of individual motivation[1].

Some Turkish experts on the Kurdish question draw attention to this. When explaining the oppressions of the Kurds by the Turkish state, Martin van Bruinessen immediately adds that "the same repression has also contributed much to strengthening the PKK" (van Bruinessen, 1988, p. 45). Similarly, Kutschera talks of "the extent and ferocity of the repression" by the regime which "thus cleared the way for the PKK" (Kutschera, 1994, p. 13).

In the preceding chapters, I have tried not to lose sight of this study's points regarding the most specific structural base of the emergence and formation of the PKK: a) the specifity of the Kurdish social-political background – constancy of *tribe* and *treason*, and b) the peculiarity of Turkey's Kurdish policy; namely, the particular nature of Turkey's Kurdish question – a categorical denial which is maintained by the

severe use of force. I have since hypothesised that the PKK is a phenomenon peculiar to Turkish politics resulting from these dual peculiarities.

These aspects are discussed as the basic twofold contextual factor in the PKK's early life – and as a common structural condition available to the actors in the fellow Kurdish political-cultural organisations that emerged before the later PKK and which drew considerably more public support than the PKK prior to the 1980 *coup d'état* – in chapters two and five. I defined the former ("tribe and treason") as the "intrinsic" tradition in the socio-political "heritage" of Kurdishness, which is targeted as a "dormant resource" by the leadership of the PKK. I discussed the latter ("policy of denial-repression") as being the "seeds of Turkey's Kurdish question". However, I share the view that the explanations "founded upon common structural condition[s]" ignore "the very processes that enable or inhibit actors to define the circumstances of common action" and are incomplete in "explain[ing] how certain individuals come to recognise themselves in a more or less sense of 'we'" (Melucci, 1989) insofar as these individuals sacrifice their "private life" to an "organisational life". In other words, such explanations omit the causality of how individuals transform their lifestyle from being "for oneself" to "for ourselves".

Further, the diagnoses regarding the two peculiarities are not the products of the novel efforts of this study. On the contrary, they are the primary themes of many authors in the field, to whom I have referred throughout. So I chose the central question of my study as focusing on *the determinative internal factor in the growth of the PKK* while constructing the research strategy in accordance with this, which necessitates understanding the inner dynamics of the "Revolutionary Modernizers" (White, 2000) of Kurdistan. That is to say, I have so far handled the organisational factor (what I call the "subjective share") in the realisation processes of the collective phenomenon of the most recent Kurdish attempt at a "national emancipation" as the focal point of my exploratory efforts. I have thus undertaken the discussions of these two interrelated and unique contextual entities to clarify the cardinal question of this study.

In the light of these sophisticated discussions developed by prominent scholars of social movements, I stated that the framework of this study would be to ascertain the most convincing answers to the "how" question of the process. Accordingly, this central issue is to some extent explored in the preceding two chapters. It has been partly discussed in relation to the programme and ideology of the Organisation, and it

is articulated further in the arguments about the organisation-individual linkage in the PKK. In this chapter, I shall extend the argument and the exploration of the "organisational share" in the processes of the Kurdish "national" collective action – but rather in the light of the questions and confrontations of the Party which will, I expect, contribute to the understanding of the "share".

It will be easier to identify the genuine questions and confrontations if we first clarify the period which resulted in the factual ascent of the PKK above its fellow movements.

b. The Rising Decade: From the 1980 Coup D'état to the 1990 Mass Eruptions

On the eve of the "official"[2] military intervention on 12 September 1980, Abdullah Öcalan managed to escape from Turkey, as did many other leading figures in various pro-Kurdish political groupings. A difference in the escape's significance and its outcomes began to be revealed after the guerrilla offensive – simultaneously launched against Turkey in the Kurdish towns of Eruh and Semdinli (McDowall, 1996, p.40; Imset, 1992, p. 40) by the PKK on 15 August 1984 – and the course of affairs which followed.

Certain forms of resistance organised by the PKK at Diyarbakir Prison in protest against "brutal torture practices" following the military take-over hinted at a remarkable separation from the rest of both Turkish and Kurdish legal/illegal opposing political configurations: the "tradition" of self-immolation in the history of the movement was initiated by a Central Committee member in the PKK, Mazlum Dogan, (known as the "theoretician" of the Party, and appointed as the person responsible for the publication of *Serxwebun* by the Party's foundation congress) on Newroz[3] day, 21 March 1982. On 17 May 1982, four members of the PKK (Ferhat Kutay, Esref Anyik, Mahmut Zengin, Necmi Oner) set fire to themselves and were burnt to death "hand-in-hand". They were later to become famous in the Party as the "Four". Some two months later, at the same prison and for the same reason, a group of prominent PKK members went on hunger strike on 14 July 1982, which culminated in four deaths (Kemal Pir, M. Hayri Durmus, Akif Yilmaz, Ali Çiçek). The first two were members of the central committee and had been among the seven participants of Öcalan's initial organisational meeting of 1974.

While these developments occurred among PKK prisoners, the Party was engaged with gathering its escaped militants in Bekaa Valley (a Syrian-controlled Lebanese territory) to be prepared for a long-term Vietcong-style guerrilla war. The PKK managed to gather "several hundred" (Öcalan, 1991, p. 21) members and sympathisers, and held two successive congresses in 1981 and 1982.

The 1981 meeting was a sub-congress, which differs from regular party congresses held every fourth year. In accordance with the resolutions adopted in these congresses, the leading cadres who had escaped focused on recovering from the impact of the 1980 coup, and utilised the years 1981 to 1984 as a "border reconnaissance and preparation period" (Imset, 1992, pp. 29-36) for the well-known guerrilla "Offensive of 15 August".

Following the organisational preparations in terms of both structure and material military requirements − along with the firm elimination of the "dissident voices" within the Party (op. cit., p. 37) − the historical offensive which marked the commencement of the "low-intensity war" of fifteen years between the PKK and Turkey reified on 15 August, 1984. The clashes in the first seven years led to more than five thousand deaths (Imset, 1992, p. 26), and after ten years, over twenty thousand deaths (Kirisci and Winrow, 1997, p. 126).

Of the initial preparations for the proposed guerrilla war in the organisational sense, the most remarkable was the foundation of a military wing called "the Kurdistan Liberation Forces" (Hezen Rizgariya Kurdistan–HRK). This was modelled on the Vietcong, and was composed of basic teams of three fighters, and a structural hierarchy formed from teams and units. A unit consisted of three companies, a company consisted of three teams. The initial body of the HRK was composed of three units (Imset, 1992, p. 129), namely, the total of the PKK's military force at the outset was less than a hundred guerrillas recruited mostly from the "Kurdish peasants (or recent ex-peasants)" (White, 2000, p. 211). Later, following the resolution adopted by the third congress of the PKK held in 1986 (Birand, 1992, p. 141) the HRK converted into the People's Liberation Army of Kurdistan, ARGK (Artesa Rizgariya Gele Kurdistan), due to increasing public support from and attachment to the armed struggle by the Kurds of Turkey.

The period 1984 to 1990 is the one in which the "unpreventable" rise of the PKK was established, creating the potential for mass uprisings (serihildans) of the early 1990s. There are three interrelated principal aspects of these years:

1) The initial aspect begins with a false dichotomy between both parties in grasping the actual extent of the "15 August Blow". While the state officials depreciated the "First Blow" with an *over-confidence*, the PKK leadership dared to carry it out, but with hesitation – namely with *under-confidence*. Ismet G. Imset, the former editor of the semi-official daily paper published in English, in his comprehensive work traces the "over-confidence" of the Turkish State's "ordinary officials" back to the early eighties by referring to the *quiet* aftermath of the 1980 coup d'état.

> Once those terrorists "on the streets" were rounded up and sent to prison, Ankara relaxed, believing as in the case of the Turkish armed left, this would be the end of another threat to the stability of the country. But was it?
>
> Facts have shown that the over-confidence of the government back in the early 1980s only served to help the PKK through its days abroad of intensive preparations for launching attacks on Turkey and upsetting the social balances of the south-east [implies Kurdistan under Turkey–AKÖ] by intimidating the local people. (Imset, 1992, p. 7)

Also, as stated earlier, the State's over-confidence continued until a while after the first offensive and it belittled the uprisings saying that, in the light of its "rich" experience of the earlier "twenty eight" attempts, which had been made by "primitive rebels". On the other hand, the protagonists of the first offensive themselves were in an under-confident spiritual state due to the very same "rich" and "pitiless" lessons of past experiences – the lessons which taught the vital role of "internal treason" in the crushing of all previous rebellions. Öcalan frequently underlines the anxiety and hesitation in his talks when he contemplates the atmosphere of the "inception years". In the beginning of the closing address to the Party's third congress (1986) he describes these years.

> If we try to look at the historical and present significance of our congress; our deep-rooted and historical questions have for the first time found the opportunity to discuss it in such an atmosphere. ... I am thinking about our state in the first congress... I remember my fears and anxieties at that time. We had given a party name to ourselves but would we continue? I was wondering whether the fiasco would knock on our door. Would the steps we had taken meet the target or not?

We acted amongst these anxieties and hesitations for years; we experienced many things such as organisational depressions, defections of persons [from the party] and refusals to shoulder the tasks etc. (Öcalan, 1993a, pp. 305, 306).

In the speech of the fifth anniversary year (1990) of the "Leap Forward of 15 August", Öcalan states that "not only friends, but also the very persons among the executors of the action believed that the step they were taking had no chance of success. The feeling of 'Yes, we will be quelled, this attempt will end in failure' was the dominant spiritual state in which they were expecting their demise" (Öcalan, 1992a, p. 116). He, occasionally evaluates their action as being a "miraculous leap forward" (Öcalan, 1998, p. 59). But both parties hurled themselves into a comprehensive and ceaseless struggle with all their might - and the very nature of the struggle in these years culminated in a remarkable extension, expansion and consolidation of the PKK's organisational structure. The Party configured its two main flanks of the popular front and the popular army: The National Liberation Front of Kurdistan, ERNK (Eniya Rizgariya Netewa Kurdistan) was established in 1985 and declared as such on Kurdish national day (Newroz), 21ˢᵗ March.

The HRK, which hitherto operated within the framework of "armed propaganda", was converted into the People's Liberation Army of Kurdistan, ARGK (1986) – the first "popular army" in the history of "Turkish Kurds". The Organisation built its overall body in the form of a "Party-Front-Army triangle": *the party* (as the ultimate political structure), *the popular front* and *the popular army*. The ERNK divided itself into four sub-flanks in 1987 so as to organise its various social strata individually: YKWK (Workers Branch), YRWK (Intellectuals [*aydin*] Branch), YXK (Youth Branch) and YJWK (Womens Branch) which was eventually to be converted into the Women's Party at the PKK's sixth congress held between 19 January and 16 February 1999 (Özdag, 1999, p. 225). The frontal flank of the PKK, ERNK, stretched its organisational network around almost the entire world (White, 2000, pp. 175,202) wherever an adequate Kurdish population could be found, such as Russia and other Soviet Republics, some Eastern European countries, Australia, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Britain and Canada etc., but in particular all the countries of Western Europe by the end of 1989. In brief, while the State, a short while after the "Leap Forward of 15 August", realised the extent of the danger and deepened its struggle by utilising every means at its disposal, the PKK leadership, under the pressure of fears, anxieties and

hesitations, put every endeavour into expanding and consolidating its organisational structure to secure the developing guerrilla war. This is the first aspect of the "build-up" period (1984-89) of the decade in which the PKK rose, and, at the same time, it seeded one of the prime elements of the ground from which the main difficulties of the Organisation arose during the declining period of the 1990s.

2) Secondly, the most "self-destructive" activities were carried out by the PKK in this period. In the name of fighting against the traitor "feudal elements" (van Bruinessen, 1988, p. 42) and village guards, a considerable number of villages and villagers were attacked and many civilians including women and children (Barkey and Fuller, 1998, p. 147; Aydin, 1992, p. 185) were killed in these clashes. Even if many of them were probably carried out by Turkish army "dirty tricks" squads (White, 1997, p. 249) in dubious circumstances, Öcalan admitted that such offensives were "indeed" conducted by "their own people" (*Ikibine Dogru*, October 22, 1989, p. 23) and "inevitably" women and children also lost their lives (Öcalan, 1999c, p. 114). Similarly, during these years the Organisation executed a number of PKK dissidents who were called either "traitors" or "divulgers" or "hostile elements", including some ex-CC members (Gunter, 1990, p. 74; Imset, 1992, p. 83; White, 2000, p. 145) and carried out executions even as far afield as Europe. At worst, the killings facilitated the disguise of further devious eliminations within the organisation, which were unveiled afterwards. In particular, some guerrilla commanders, such as Hogir (Cemil Isik), Halil Kaya (Kör Cemal), carried out many executions (*Serxwebun*, June, 1991) in their provinces due to similar accusations. Such incidents even continued through to the early 1990s. For instance, seventeen prominent guerrillas were executed in a week by a Central Committee member who was commanding Maras (Southwest) province, Ali Ömürcan (Terzi Cemal), on the accusations of "being recruited by the enemy as agents" (*Serxwebun*, August, September 1993). It is not yet quite clear whether Ali Ömürcan himself was a state-infiltrated figure or a mentally ill – but talented – personality who managed to reach membership of the CC of the Party. He was, however, executed by the PKK afterwards because of those "devious murders".

The Organisation took a turn towards corruption as a result of increasingly devious murders: the critique and self-critique mechanism began to turn into some basic repetitions and imitations, to the extent that Öcalan complained about the militants' "over-formalised" approach to himself, at the cost of jeopardising his

"charismatic authority". (The nature of Öcalan's leadership is partly handled but will be discussed further below). When responding to Balli's concerned questions, he seems to be literally rebelling against the Kurds' particular attitude towards criticism.

Question. ... It is widely said [by the other socialists] that the only remedy for a functional critique-self-critique process is the freedom of critique of the First Man. ... Is there freedom to criticise Apo in the PKK?

Answer. If they criticise me, it will be of great assistance to me. I said this to *2000 e Dogru[4].* It [Kurdish personality] has been debased so much so that he/she cannot free himself/herself from behaving as a slave. My suffering is not in being criticised but in not being criticised. My suffering is in their submission like slaves. The thing that I need the most is a heavily dosed [*dosaji yuksek*] critique.

Q. But I have not come across a different view in your publications. Always party leadership, party line...

A. They either do that or run away. This is my problem too. (Balli, 1991, p. 282)

Similar emphases on worries about this two-way "barren" attitude towards his leadership are found among several other interviews with Öcalan (Perincek, 1990; Birand, 1992; Serxwebun, April, 1991, January 1992, and *et al*). But the fact of these polarised attitudes has by no means changed nevertheless for it was necessitated in the course of "ruitinisation" of *Apo* Charisma on the part of "institutionalising" (Chapter 5, III) administrative staff of the Party.

3) The third aspect concerns what Tilly calls "opportunity" of collective action. These years also denote the duration in which the PKK effected the changes that allowed it to reach its apex of the early 1990s, with its absolute isolation in the sense of relations with the "whole range of Kurdish nationalists and Turkish leftist groups" (Gunter, 1990, pp, 62, 66). Further, these hostile relations resulted in occasional clashes between the PKK and various Kurdish or Turkish parties and circles (*Middle East Times*, 14-20 February, 1992; White, 1997, p. 226), such as the KDP (Kurdistan Democratic Party – Irak), the PSKT (Socialist Party of Kurdistan of Turkey), *Halkin Kurtulusu* (HK – People's Liberation), and *Dev Yol* (Revolutionary Path), etc. Notwithstanding the fact that an "accord document" was signed between the PKK and

the KDP in 1983, it did not last long and was invalidated due to the conflicts that arose after the 15 August Offensive (Öcalan, 1993b, pp. 447-449). Sheri Laizer attributes the "anti-amalgamation" to the other organisations' dependence on foreign powers, who have betrayed the Kurdish people "on every occasion".

> The PKK was opposed to amalgamation with other Kurdish parties, all of which it inevitably labelled 'reformist'. It has always taken its political decisions without consultations, being highly critical of the other Kurdish political parties and their leaders. The party claims to depend solely on the Kurdish people and on itself, refusing to rely on the dubious support of outside movements or nations where no good reason exists for doing so – history having illustrated that the Kurdish people have been betrayed by foreign powers on every occasion that a Kurdish leader relied on them. (Laizer, 1996, pp. 90, 91).

Probably because of a combination of the first and second aspects, namely, due to the Organisation's *under-confidence* based on the previously "inverted fate" (*makus talih*) of Kurdishness (and especially Turkey) and an *over-sensitivity* to the "intrinsic" prevalence of traitorous tendencies, or perhaps because the nature of Öcalan's leadership was not adept at enduring internal and/or external oppositions, the PKK élite did not tolerate critical approaches both from within and from people close to it. Or it was the object of hostile approaches and aggression. Whatever the reasons are, the fact is that these years were a period in which mutually extreme hostile relations were evident between the PKK and the "others", and the PKK managed to survive, to develop and eventually to reach a peak of organisational expansion and influence in the spring of 1990 with an absolute absence of a "component" – or an element of a component – of collective action.

> The test of real events has demonstrated that – whatever one thinks about it – the PKK now commands real support among Turkish Kurds. An uprising (*serîhildan*) in the Turkish section of Kurdistan that begin in mid-March 1990 had serious effects on many aspects of politics in Turkey as a whole, which require examination at this point, as these events illustrates the degree to which the Kurdish national movement has developed spontaneous militant forms 'from below' (*Middle East International*, 13 April 1990: 13-14; *Human Rights in Turkey*, April 1990; *Kurdistan Liberation*, April 1990: 5-5; *The Independent*, 7

April 1990; *Middle East Times*, 3-9 April 1990, 27 March 1990). (White, 1997, p. 232).

The founder of an illegal and daily operational paramilitary unit organised in the region (allegedly founded in late 1980s) also states the extent of the PKK's mass mobilisation capability when he sounded a "chilling warning" for the State forces in the introduction to his book about his direct experiences as part of the Organisation's activities.

> ... If, in the South East, shopkeepers shut or open their shops with a telephone call, if tens of thousands of humans can gather, march and shout slogans such as "DOWN WITH TURKEY", "LONG LIVE OUR LEADER APO", if clashes take place in towns over hours or even days, and if all these are approved with silence in the name of "HUMAN RIGHTS", then that means something has to be changed. [capital lettering cited as original] (Aydin[5], 1992, p. 6, 7).

As a result, the string of uprisings which erupted on the streets – and pathways of rural localities – of the relatively less assimilated Kurdish provinces in Turkey (East and Southeast) in March 1990, and which had substantially withered away by 1993, without dispute marked an entirely novel historical era for Kurdish politics and sociality. It introduced a newly detribalised mass participation in struggle to the history of the Kurds in their modern *national* sense. But the very same era simultaneously multiplied the entanglements upon which the "turning" of the Organisation's historical success "into [its] fetters" have rested.

c. The Apex Years: Settlement of the Impasse

The "March *Serihildans*" prompted an influx of new recruits into the Organisation. Thousands of men and women from the rural and urban populations, particularly from among the high school (Lycée) and university students of both Kurdish cities and Turkish metropolises joined the Party's frontal and military bodies.

While, in 1989, ARGK issued the "Compulsory Military Service Law" for guerrilla recruitment, "it has been forced temporarily to close off recruitment to its

guerrilla force at several points since 1991, due to an inability to properly train the large numbers of recruits coming forward" (White, 2000, p. 197). A videotape, recording a hunger strike of the group of more or less fifty boys and girls in Bekaa Valley whose admission to the ARGK was refused, was distributed to the PKK's sympathisers during those years. The "tactical leadership"[6] of the PKK, in consequence, was enjoying its organisational "peak". The front pages of the Party's two main magazines (*Serxwebun* and *Berxwedan*) from 1990 to 1993 became a mere celebration of the coming "pre-evident" victory. *Berxwedan* carried an Öcalan statement claiming "We are entering Newroz [1994] with 30 thousand guerrillas" (this was made at the press conference held on 28 September, 1993) on its front page in bold letters (*Berxwedan*, October 15, 1993). The next issue announced that the PKK had superseded "all colonialist institutions" in the Turkish-ruled part of Kurdistan with an "absolute authority" by splashing the headline "*OTORITE BIZDE*" (Authority Is Ours) right across its front page. The sub-heading was no less firm.

> The resolutions adopted by the PKK, which are formed in concrete proposals such as "political parties will shut [their offices in Kurdistan], all their administrators and members will resign, the newspapers serving the Turkish special war will not be distributed, TV's will not be watched, the schools serving as colonialist assimilation institutions will be shut down, teachers will resign, gambling will not be allowed, all the officers of the TC [Turkish Republic] will leave Kurdistan, no one will attend the courts of the TC, no one will join the Turkish military service, taxes will not be paid to the TC, journalists will be allowed to come to Kurdistan only with permission" are implemented in perfect order. Our people have been devoting all their efforts towards implementing these resolutions. (*Berxwedan*, November 15, 1993).

The headline of the subsequent issue of *Berxwedan* (December, 1993) was "The PKK Is Institutionalising the People's Rule Step By Step". *Serxwebun*'s earlier (September, 1991) front page headline was to predict a War Government: "We Are Advancing towards Botan-Behdinan War Government". Press statements issued by the Central Headquarters of the ARGK announcing the PKK's arrival "at a stage of preparing to proclaim a revolutionary government in those parts of Kurdistan where the political and military authority of the enemy has already been broken" were also released

through the *Kurdistan Report* (op cit., October 1991, February 1992) – the pro-PKK magazine which is distributed throughout the world and published in most of the European and some of the Eastern languages as well as in English. Further, the proposals for the "Revolutionary War Government" were to encompass some parts of non-Turkish ruled Kurdistan (Behdinan is a province which falls inside the Iraqi-ruled territory [now mainly dominated by the Barzani-led KDP]) for the growth of the PKK exceeded Anatolian Kurdistan, particularly following the Gulf War (*Middle East International*, 26 July, 1991). This enabled it "to establish bases deeper inside Iraqi Kurdistan than ever before, as well as benefiting from a fortuitous enhancement of its weaponry" (White, 1997, p. 234). Laizer, in her rather journalistic work based on direct observations and experiences, also points towards the PKK's growth "in both north and south" – but in terms of its non-military aspects.

In 1990 for the first time massive demonstrations in support of the PKK erupted in Botan province in the large Kurdish towns like Cizre and Sirnak. During Newroz ordinary Kurds hurled stones at the army and security forces, and marched openly in the streets waving PKK flags and holding up portraits of Abdullah Öcalan.

After 1992 and the war in south Kurdistan, the PKK emerged as the only Kurdish party in that particular conflict whose deeds matched its maxims. This brought the PKK even greater support in both north and south Kurdistan. (Laizer, 1996, p. 90).

All these facts were not the whole edifice, but a facet of the peak years. The "unimaginable" growth of the PKK had been proven by the string of *Serihildans* spread over 1990, 1991 and 1992. However, those achievements did not lead to a victory. Neither the enormous growth of the party nor the vast number of recruits to the militant and guerrilla body of the PKK made any difference to a modest settlement of Turkey's Kurdish question, not to mention the bold steps like the "liberated zones" and the "revolutionary Botan-Behdinan War Government", for they were exaggerations arising out of the state of "organisational climax".

The fundamental question was, from the organisation-movement point of view, the new recruits to the Organisation following the uprisings were ironically not pertinent to the Organisation's means by which it previously "developed the

spontaneous militant forms 'from below'" – "which require[s] examination at this point", as White puts it. In consequence, the extent of new and assorted recruits containing a large number of college-university students and graduates, instead of engendering a further "revolutionary leap forward", had mutated into the organisations "fetters".

Also, the mutation had not been acknowledged by the "tactical leadership" under the circumstances of the "organisational peak". And the repetition of "old customs" shaped by the fears, anxieties and hesitations – which seeded the main difficulties of the Organisation during the "condensation years" (the second half of 1980s) – accompanied by the *intensive one-way education system* of the Party (Chapter 5) inevitably "upgraded" the main organisational predicament from "fetters" to an *impasse* in subsequent years. From another angle, an organisation which had been enabled to "build up" its Kurdish "national" revitalisation from a "nuisance" to "a security threat" (*New York Times*, 20 October, 1991) or from a "rag-tag terrorist band" to "a viable guerrilla army" (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 October, 1991) by the "contribution" of kidnapped-abducted cadres gathered through the ARGK's "Compulsory Military Service Law", has actually been unable to achieve a modest "national" victory even with the *mobilised resource* of unanimously acknowledged massive popular support and the sheer number of new recruits. The *why* of this organisational phenomenon is examined further below.

d. Hints of the Fall

Hopes and slogans of the sort listed above were gradually abolished in the following years. The insistence on such proposals had already tended to weaken. The hopes of the "liberated areas" were being expressed with less emphasis – though they were still alive up until the end of 1994. An instruction of Öcalan to the "war headquarters" was published on the back page of *Serxwebun* (October, 1993) with the title "According to the existing course of the war, we may orientate ourselves towards the liberated territories" and "War Government" emphases were gradually superseded by the notion of "liberated territories". In the political report submitted to the 4th congress of the PKK (8-27 January, 1995), Öcalan repeated the PKK's proposals to orientate itself "towards" liberated territories. That target also faded in later years. Paul White traces

the hesitations about such hopes to as far back as 1992 and states that he had the impression that "Öcalan was noticeably vague on the question" when responding to his request for an explanation of the "organisation's conception of a Kurdish Parliament, for 'Botan-Behdinan'" and cites the following excerpt from the interview he held at the PKK's training camp in Lebanon's Bekaa Valley on 2 July, 1992.

AO: The people's power is stronger in these areas; it's also stronger for the national parliament, and for the government.

PW: Which government?

AO: The people's government.

PW: You can form a people's government in these areas

AO: It's being developed in that direction. (White, 2000. P. 168).

The fading of the string of *serihildans* had actually begun after the 1992 Newroz celebrations. At the PKK's call for celebrations, the response of the Kurds of Turkey had been widespread and there were simultaneous uprisings throughout Kurdistan as well as the Western metropolises of Turkey. But the reaction of the Turkish state was harsh and irreconcilable. Extensive violence and bloodshed erupted, involving the military, the police, the PKK guerrillas and civilians. The violence and clashes between PKK supporters and the Turkish armed forces did not end with the Newroz celebrations. The Turkish state was "determined to quell the PKK Rebellion" (Kohen, 1992) which was a full-scale Kurdish revolt. Well co-ordinated armed forces composed of military corps, police, militia and village guards continued their offensives over the following months. A city of approximately twenty five thousand people, Sirnak, was virtually destroyed in an assault by state forces commencing on 18 August 1992 (*Middle East International*, 11 September, 1992; *Middle East Times*, 8-14 September, 1992) and resulted in the death of thirty four civilians according to official reports. Further military operations carried out by the state on the towns of Çukurca and Dargecit etc. in this period led to a death toll of over five hundred in only thirty days – increasing the total in 1992 to almost two thousand (McDowall, 1996, p. 435; Hedges 1992).

Despite Turkey's polarising policies, the PKK did not harden its attitude. On the eve of Newroz 1993, 17 March, a unilateral cease-fire was declared by Öcalan (*Kurdistan Report*, April/May 1993) in the presence of the PUK leader Jalal Talabani.

Three elements of the cease-fire statement were highlighted: a) the cease-fire was "unconditional", b) the PKK "do not wish to separate from Turkey" and c) the "matter will be resolved within nationally agreed borders" (*op. cit.*). A couple of days later, on 19 March 1993, Abdullah Öcalan and Kemal Burkay (General Secretary of the Kurdistan Socialist Party – KSP), a "moderate leader", met in Syria and signed a protocol (*Serxwebun*, April 1993; *Nokta*, 4-10 April 1993) containing similar moderate demands for the cease-fire and promising joint peace efforts and future co-operation (Laizer, 1996, p. 95). No response was recorded from the Turkish state's side. By contrast, violence intensified while military operations against both guerrilla forces and the alleged "villages backing terrorists" continued, as did the "death squads" targeting the members and activists of the pro-Kurdish legal party (*op. cit* p. 75, 76) the HEP (People's Labour Party). But the unconditional-unilateral cease-fire was extended by Öcalan on 16 April 1993 at a press conference held in Bar Elias, Lebanon. The HEP leader Ahmet Turk and the "moderate-soft" (*ilimli*) KSP General Secretary Kemal Burkay participated as well as Jalal Talabani (*Serxwebun*, April, 1993; *Kurdistan Report*, April/May, 1993 back cover) to "promote the cease-fire and Kurdish nationalist unity".

Allegedly, the PKK took the "momentous" step of a unilateral-unconditional cease-fire following the meeting held between Öcalan and Talabani in late February (White, 2000, p. 167) – at which a message of the Turkish authorities was passed to Öcalan. This implies that the Turkish authorities had requested the ceasefire. Alternatively, Talabani passed Öcalan's "modest demands" on to Turkey – along with promises containing "PKK condemnation of terrorism", "abandonment of the armed struggle", "commitment to the unity of Turkey and the rejection of separatism" – which "were no more than had been mooted by leading Turkish politicians" to Özal (McDowall, pp. 436, 437; *Sabah*, 13 March, 1993). Or the leadership of the Party may have been compelled by the pressure of "repression fatigue among the Kurdish populace" (Muir, 1993) from which the PKK was suffering.

Whatever the immediate cause, the cease-fire proposals, which indeed contained a radical political departure for the PKK, were virtually made in vain. "By a cruel irony" (McDowall,1996, p. 437), President Turgut Özal[7], with whom the "moderator" Talabani was in direct contact and whose death "proved to be an untimely blow to hopes" (Laizer, 1996, p. 76) "died of a heart attack" on the day after Öcalan's declaration of the "indefinite extension" of the unilateral cease-fire. Turkey's attitude

towards the cease-fire and the PKK's diligently *softened* demands was summed up by the General Chief of Staff and Prime Minister – Dogan Güres and Tansu Çiller. The former warned: "The PKK will die like dogs in their own blood" (Dagli, 1994) and the latter was reported to have "cleared the way fully for military-backed policies to 'solve' the Kurdish problem" (Imset, 1993). The cease-fire thus remained unilateral. Its end was proven in practice on 24 May, with an abrupt operation by a guerrilla detachment commanded by Semdin Sakik[8] in which thirty-three unarmed Turkish soldiers were killed, and officially declared by Öcalan on 8 June 1993. So "the dirty war in Turkey" (Laizer, 1992, pp. 72-108) – which was to produce a death toll of over thirty thousand by the end of 1998 – started from the time when the PKK declared another unilateral cease-fire on "World Peace-Day", the 1st of September 1993, at the request of some other "mediators". By another "cruel irony", however, the PKK's final declaration of a unilateral cease-fire (World Peace Day, 1998) culminated in an international operation in which Öcalan "found himself bound, gagged, and drugged on a jet back to Turkey" (Howard, 1999, p. 38) from Kenya on 15 February, 1999.

The desperate search for a "modus vivendi" was doomed from the start to end in failure because the *decisive* cause on the part of Turkey was that it took "momentous steps" as an indication *strongly hinting* that the PKK "had undergone military defeat and now sought whatever he could gain politically" (McDowall, 1996, p. 437), and also because Turkey relied on the quantitative reports of its National Intelligence Organisation (MIT) which "was almost certainly in receipt of satellite intelligence from the United States" (*op. cit* p. 436): Turkey hit out at "a 'soft' side of the PKK" (White, 2000, 163). Namely, this study argues, the hints of the PKK's decline were getting more visible and becoming "handy" to the intelligence services whose conclusions were based on quantitative research and the reports they produced.

II The Organisational Vicious Circle and its Shrinkage

As has been discussed above, the central question in this study is *how* Kurdish collective action was organised by the PKK in the context of the Turkey's past and present policies regarding the existence of the Kurds. In extending this discussion, I am focusing on the hints about the decline of the PKK in this particular section. I am

going to endeavour to examine the fundamental factor underlying the Organisation's inability to further mobilise its massive resources acquired – made available and mobile – for collective action and the resulting organisational shrinkage. In other words, we shall see the *why* of this organisational "pollution" and "deconstruction" at issue below: the *why* of the *how*.

a. The Repetitive Cycle: Consolidation of the Impasse

In the course of mounting pressures on Italy pressuring the D'Alema Government to force him leave the country, Öcalan "told an Italian daily on 11 December 1998 that he was planning to resign as PKK president" (White, 2000, p. 184). He also expressed in the same interview that the cause of such a "party restructuring" proposal was the 95% of the PKK who he condemned at that time.

The resignation would "indeed be realised" if "they [the PKK] insist on not changing themselves", he said, adding: "If" they "continue what they have been doing for fifteen years, then I shall have nothing to do with them". However, the news of the resignation from Reuters (Rome, 11 December, 1998) was sensational, and Italian papers carried this with full-front-page headlines. The news became one of the headlines on MED TV[9] too, but the resignation was reported as "distorted news". In fact, Öcalan confirmed the news in a live interview for MED TV a few days later; and repeated it in the "Organisational and Political Report" submitted to the sixth congress held in January 1999 (*Serxwebun*, April, May, June 1999). We, almost two years later, learned from the "Notes of Meetings" (with lawyers) at Imralli prison that Öcalan still insisted on this course of action as a result of the PKK's inability to mutate itself – he was objecting to the vicious circle caused by the repetition of the "old" which has been sheltered and/or disguised by "naïveté and blind adulation".

> ... I did say this earlier. When I was in Italy, I said: "95% of the PKK is the PKK which I oppose; I do not want such a PKK, I am going to resign from it". Even the Italian newspapers made these words a front-page headline the following day. I now say it again; if the existing course [of events] continues, if you stay unchanged as you do now, I will leave you. (*Serxwebun*, August 2000).

It is one of the most striking facts that Öcalan frequently berates his followers for their habit of "obstinate-blind" repetition. The reality of repetition is another distinguishing facet of Öcalan's talks spanning more than one hundred and fifty thousand A5 pages – the basic material of the party's non-military education. Naturally, decades of an "educational inculcation" concentrating on certain matters would have been doomed to repetition to some extent. If the fountainhead of this inculcation is a "one-man Leadership", then more repetition will be inevitable. Further, if the object of the inculcation is a community dominated by a tribal[10] structure and the Subject of inculcation claims to be a socialist one accomplishing the "quasi-revolution of October" (Chapter 4) and even undoing the damage and degeneration which humankind has undergone during several millennia, then the extent of repetition will be broader. That is to say, the nature of the leadership-movement and the society in which it emerged necessitated a considerable amount of repetition in its "revolutionary tongue". However, the particular repetition of the vicious circle in the "PKK movement" in the 1990s is not a quantitative increase of such general repetition but an additional and qualitative one which decisively altered the movement's nature and development. Öcalan had "an inkling" of this of sort repetition towards late 1991. He begins his "analysis" (çözümleme), contemplating the "party education" under the heading of "The Grasp of the Seriousness of Education is Essential", by saying:

> Our analyses [çözümlemeler] are all composed of a repetition. Notwithstanding that I try to renew it, your state of incredible slow-motion progress compels us to repeat, and since it compels us we are driven into more and more difficulty. This, then, reduces our productivity. I have an inkling that you are gradually polluting the life [in the party] more than before at the present time. You are obstructing the way to a fluent and attractive life. You do not have the right to do this at all.
>
> The first prerequisite for education is to take serious comprehension as the fundamental concern. I doubt a person's humanness who does not lock himself/herself into an accurate grasp of the seriousness [of education]. (Öcalan, 1994a, p. 481).

The final sentence of the "çözümleme" (analysis) is filled with warnings – in fact with menaces and swearwords – "if" they continue to "insist" [on repetition]. He finishes the analysis with the following words:

... We are a movement that produced a revival from the deathbed. We can never admit adjectives such as non-progressing, non-reaching [the target/victory] and non-achieving as befitting you. I emphasise this again and again. I reject these adjectives with which you describe yourself. If you insist, we will make it cost you dear. The PKK is a greatness. We did not dedicate our life for nothing, did we? We did not have this many martyrs in vain. The person who does not take this as an essential [principle] and does not nourish himself/herself with this, he/she is an *alçak*[11] [debased-dishonest-disgraceful person] near us. And you know the place where these *alçaks* go. You will have to take this greatness as a foundation and make it live in yourself. This cannot be objected to; one only carry out its requirements. 15 October 1991 (*op. cit* p. 505).

By mid-1998, some months before he came to believe that he should talk about resignation, the level of critique had reached a "qualitatively" different degree.

Life is not feasible with *fahise* [prostitute] personalities in a political sense. Even in other senses, nothing can be gained with this personality! How does it – being the product and means of a mechanism whose only work is to produce *fahise* personalities for the regime – bore you? If you insist, I will absolutely qualify you as [fahise], absolutely! In fact, it reveals that you are one. What is repeating a fault, guilt forty times? In Arabic, this is termed "*fahis*". "*Fahis*" is constantly to repeat a fault, to continue an ugliness, to live with an advanced defect continuously. The term "*Fahise*" derives from here. If you retain these faulty personalities, [then I will say] all of you are "*fahise*". ... A prostitute in the street, in a brothel is much less guilty. She does not harm anyone other than herself. You harm the society, the party, the army. Military, political prostitution is far more dangerous. A person who repeats a fault in the same area ... is a dangerous prostitute. If a man who, above all, always repeats this, he is a street-walker [*sürtük*], and he is very dangerous. From now on, my greatest problem is to search for cures to stop this. (*Serxwebun*, June 1998).

Ahmet Aydin, devotes his "final (fourth) chapter" (1992, pp. 182-188) to a selection of Öcalan's similarly scathing sentences picked from the 1990 and 1991 talks, containing scolding expressions, swear-words and derogatory implications about both

the militants and the Kurdish people, to exhibit the "genuine nature of Apo and the PKK" in his own words.

The upward motion of the level of the "critique" continues from 1991 to 1998: from "having an inkling that" the PKK members "are polluting the life" to qualifying them as "prostitutes" or "street-walkers". It continues in some refined forms appropriate to the circumstances of the one-man-prison on Imralli.

What is the significance of this? To what extent does the increasing intensification of Öcalan's scolding of his militants from the early to late 1990s explain the PKK's organisational entanglements, which engendered a remarkable decrease in its military and political capability? No doubt, my aim here is not to prove the most decisive factors in the decline of the PKK by following the chronology of Öcalan's talks, but the ceaseless talks in fact provide a mirror-like reflection of the process of decline in the PKK. Also, the upward motion of the strong language of the "person of charisma" is "associated with strong resistance to the institutionalisation" of the "routinisation" of his charisma (Chapter 5, III, b, c) for he was witnessing "the party's 'emancipation' from his control" (Panebianco, 1988).

As has been explored earlier in preceding two chapters, the two interrelated and distinguishing aspects of the PKK are that its textual body consists merely of these ceaseless "inculcation talks" and that the talks concentrate substantially on the notion of the "self-shaping spiritual re-formation of personalities" within the structure of the Party's operating cadres. That is to say, the organisational capability or incapability of the PKK was very much related to Öcalan's "inculcation talks". This is not only true for the pre-arrest leadership of Öcalan, but also for his leadership during imprisonment. In the period following arrest, even if there has been a noticeable increase in articles signed by the "Council of Presidency" or by one of its members, Öcalan's accounts of general and particular issues noted down by lawyers have been regularly published in the central pages of the monthly central organ, Serxwebun, as "analyses of the new stage". What is becoming more apparent under the circumstances of Öcalan's imprisonment is that the inculcation talks, the "Leadership's analyses", have been functioning for institutionalising the "bureaucratic staff" of the Organisation. Thus, the talks that refer to particular circumstances are additionally illustrative of the Party's organisational questions and confrontations, which, in the final analysis, have determined the outcome of the Kurdish movement against Turkey. Considering the individual and group self-immolations of dozens of Kurds within two

months (Chapter 1), and the mass mobilisations of hundreds of thousands after Öcalan's arrest – in spite of abandoning almost all classical *national* undertakings (Chapter 4) – in a pre-feudal society in which the deadlock of "primordial" ties has dominated most aspects of social, political and cultural life (Chapter 5), a sociological understanding and explanation of the PKK is not possible without examining both the philosophical and spiritual inwardness of Öcalan's talks. In fact, building a collective action primarily embraces intellectual intercommunication (talks, writings etc.) and inspires attraction, stimulation and the eventual persuasion of individuals to act together, to construct "networks of informal interactions between plurality of" (Diani, 1992) themselves for believed common interests within the framework of rules and procedures. Thus, proceeding with the discussion of the "organisational shrinkage" period of the PKK in the light of Öcalan's increasingly tense talks during the 1990s – in particular, from 1993 onwards – will facilitate the identification of the principal causes of the collective process.

Despite the intensifying and thorough "analyses" containing open threats and swear-words, and the use of these "analyses" in both legal and illegal party publications, the *repetition of wrong*, or in Öcalan's term the "political prostitution" was not extricated from its habitual circle. On the contrary, the main predicament which originated in the PKK's "self-contained" years, during which the *over-consolidation* of the organisational structure took place in the shadow of *under-confidence* and *fear of treason*, settled down and penetrated the whole being of the Organisation. It has circled repetitively and been routinised because "to change the traditional Kurdish ways" was "more difficult than to split the atom" (Gunter, 1998, p. 82).

The central theme of the philosophy of the PKK's "education war", which is repeated throughout Öcalan's inculcation talks, has been the extrication of human naturalness from the "plague" of civilisation's property mechanisms (discussed in Chapters 4 and 5). This has been implemented, according to the "Party Leadership", on the "degenerated" Kurdish personalities of "Turkish Kurdistan" –where "humanity faded away in its most solid form". However, the 1990s revealed that "extrication" accomplished little or nothing when both the "education war" and guerrilla war themselves had metamorphosed into "degenerated wars" due to corruption among the "bureaucratic staff" of the "routinised" charismatic authority under Öcalan. "Power

271

tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely" said Lord Acton. The "absolute power" with which Öcalan's charisma was endowed had its reflection among the "trunk cadres" as countless "mini Öcalans" whose power began to exceed Öcalan's power in the most harsh and absolute terms. That is, the reification of the power of charisma, at its inevitable "routinised" stage, denotes the "ramification of an individual hegemony" (Lee, 1992) –the power that may only functions "through a net-like organisation" (Foucault, cited in Jermier, 1993). And thereby, Öcalan has "confidently" come to confess that "ninety percent of the party adherents who were able to be, and appropriate to be, real party cadres and members have been" eliminated "through a deliberate coercion" (Öcalan, 2001b, p. 97).

b. The Source of Repetition

Three principal questions caused by the sudden increase in recruitment do in fact indicate the source of the repetition of certain wrongs. The extent of the "raw" recruits prompted by the mass uprisings was, first of all, too vast to educate and inculcate through the one-way and one-man educational system of the Party. Secondly, the "raw" recruits, on the one hand, were viewed by the experienced cadres as potential spoilers who would release many pollutants into the "party line" or "party life". These recruits were thus either subject to biased treatment and kept distant from the important ranks of the organisation, or the victims of prejudged expulsions and murders. In particular, the elimination of the "deviant" recruits who joined from "poisoned bourgeoisie universities and schools" was effected "without delay" owing to "quick-witted" diagnoses. In his recently published tedious "defence" against the European Court of Human Rights, Öcalan's confession about the "calamity" years of the 1990s is horrifying.

> Although it has not yet been precisely unveiled, it may confidently be suggested that ninety percent of the party adherents who were able and appropriate to be real party cadres and members have been victims[12] of this approach through a deliberate coercion making them commit wrongs. Detailed investigations will unearth the actual truth (op. cit., p. 97).

On the other hand, among the new recruits, the ascent to the commanding ranks of the guerrilla forces was heavily determined by physical features rather than political, educational and leadership capacities[13]. The *old members* were not capable of educating and "absorbing" the *new members* according to the Organisation's "initiating spirit", which was defined as a self-rehumanisation initiative. Thirdly, and most destructively, the corruption of the *measure of qualifications* pertinent to the individual's ascent and descent in terms of organisational power and status in the Party, which had its origins in the late 1980s, has deepened with the multi-faceted effects of the new abundance of recruits. While there were amongst the new members "many *eager pursuers of power, privilege and esteem*" (Polat, 1999, p. 48) in the "emerging State" along with the *believers* in – but those who were alien to – the movement, among the old members there were many *disguised and/or "insoluble"[14] power holders* obsessed with the fear of losing their positions as well as the mass of *devotees* – who were substantially distant from organisational power. The premature search for the enjoyment of the "prestige-feeling that power gives" has been a pervasive and intense feeling among the *trunk-cadre* layer of the PKK.

> The state is considered the sole source of the 'right' to use violence. Hence, 'politics' for us means striving to share power or striving to influence the distribution of power, either among states or among groups within a state.
>
> ... He who is active in politics strives for power either as a means in serving other aims, ideal or egoistic, or as 'power for power's sake', that is, in order to enjoy the prestige-feeling that power gives. (Weber, 1948, p. 78).

Moreover, the corruption of the qualification mechanisms nourished the success and dominance of the former categories of "old members" and "new members" by presenting an easy basis for a pervasive and decisive mutual *tacit agreement* between these categories to "share power", and to enjoy the prestigious feelings it offers. The tacit togetherness of "power hunters" and "disguised/insoluble power holders" which was *catalysed* and *secured* by "naïve and self-deceptive loyal-cadres"[15] strengthened the vicious circle of the "repetition of the same wrongs" – the "prostitution" – and this, in turn, consolidated the degradation and distortion of the *measures* of factual organisational procedure. As a corollary to the nature of the vicious circle into which the "trinity" (made of disguised/"insoluble" power holders, power hunters and a naïve

and self-deceptive constituency) fell, the wave of *new* recruits in the early nineties resulted in an *impasse* for the PKK instead of a *further leap-forward*. And the *war* [which was believed to be producing a "new human species" (Chapter 4), shaping "even the philosophers" (*Serxwebun*, April 1998, p. 14) for a PKK-ruled society] itself became corrupted during the era 1993-96, in which conflict escalated pitilessly, and was "dirtied" (Laizer, 1996, 72-108) by all available means. This is precisely how the reification of the power takes place through "ramification of individual hegemony" (Lee, 1992) among the emerging ruling strata of revolutions. In the case of the movements with charismatic leaderships, the very process signifies the actual "face" of the routinisation of charisma. And this is precisely why Weber (1947, p. 364) repeatedly puts emphasis on the "stronger ideal and also stronger material interests of the members of the administrative staff" when articulating the "routinisation" process. In this sense, the change in Öcalan's opinion about the war within the space of months is worth looking at.

The war unveils feelings which have to die and those which have to be revived. The war brings out the greatest power of thinking. The war, in our reality, is a mere intellectual education movement. The person who becomes involved in the war may well be a philosopher, or may aesthetically realise or beautify himself/herself in the best way. The war is precisely an action of self-recreation. ... Identification and explanation of these notions are so extensive. But you, as an illiterate ignorant, do not draw the conclusion from our war reality. You are still saying: *"Wherever the war is, there will not be thinking, politics, organisation but the dominance of an individual's wild feelings and instincts"*. (*Serxwebun*, April 1999)

This excerpt is from the speech delivered at the opening of the 5th Middle East *Konferans* (sub-congress) of the Party held between 15-25 March 1998. But in the letter sent to the VII. extraordinary congress of the PKK from Turkey's Imralli prison, December 1999, which was later published as a *"Political Report"* submitted to the congress, Öcalan had come to believe that the *war* had actually shaped a "fraudulent personality".

> The fact of extreme repetition and the *corruption of war* gave rise to an enormous
> 'rant' [16] and the framework for a *fraudulent personality* [italics added].
> (*Serxwebun*, January 2000).

This change, in the first instance, may well be attributed to Öcalan's state of imprisonment under the fear of death or to his "devilish" tactics. However, when one examines earlier statements prior to the "unexpected" arrest, a "preliminary" motion towards such a change is noticeable. For example, in the "Political and Organisational Report" submitted to the VI. congress (12-25, January 1999) which he contemplated during his presence in Rome and put into words just after his departure (16, January 1999), it is striking that Öcalan has already come to believe that the war is not functioning in the direction of his "recreation" expectations any longer. When "scattered" lines are put together, the tendency becomes more apparent.

> Let me emphasise once more: the plot which was arranged by imperialism and its most aggressive fascist forces in order to conclude the critical process in the Middle East with a war around my personality is very important and still continues. Why was such an offensive planned against me? There was indeed an accurate revolutionary activity taking place in the region [the Middle East, namely Syria and Lebanon]. In the recent reports you have sent, you say "*Following the closure of the Mahsum Korkmaz Academy, the resources were not utilised sufficiently in spite of quite suitable educational conditions existing in the country*". The fact is not only the insufficient utilisation of resources, but you caused the educational quality we achieved [in the Middle East] to change into an unrecognisable state, ...
>
> I was executing a merciless war of education up until the day of my departure from there, and I was well aware of its historical meaning. But you did not understand even this ... Such a selfish approach to the work by, in particular, almost all of our central [committee] and the overwhelming majority of our prominent figures in the commanding body ... [who] suffocate the outcomes of our activities in their personal beings, and further, carry out all these under the name of "*loyalty to the Leadership*", ... stems from the nature of your personalities. ...
>
> You may say, what link is there with the activities of the Middle East? Yes, the link with the education activities [we undertook] there is very concrete [obvious]. If these educational activities had been carried out in a country where enormous

possibilities existed, in all headquarters and all localities, then the tasks which, I said, "could score several victories" would have been effected, and, first and foremost, splendid successes and solutions to our war and army questions would have been realised. Here is the historical task whose requirements you did not meet and the opportunities which you missed. ... A friend of ours says "There is a wrong at the base of this work". This is not the case. Didn't we provide you with a guerrilla force which was able to wreck an army altogether? What percentage of commanders, which you insisted on making me approve, are with you now?... Where are those who you authorised them to command? Who gave the commandership to these base creatures? I used to have gold-like cadres, they are all rotting in the soil now. Thousands of humans who resisted death are rotting in the soil. ... You evade rendering an account of what you did and bring the question to an insoluble position, and leave it. ... The thing with which I am infuriated is this situation. With these self-sacrificing forces, even the world could have been beaten into submission, and the world still is afraid of them [the forces]. And because I am the President of these forces, they [superpowers] are mercilessly pursuing me. ...

There must have been a so-called error in our war-style. Insolubility must have been a destiny. The tongues of those who say these things should be cut off. I say it openly; the reality of the PKK is not this. The reality of the PKK is the reality of victory and work, enough for ten victories, has been accomplished. The ones who have dropped it to the ground should be ashamed! (*Serxwebun*, April, 1999, pp. 13, 14).

Two main points dominate the excerpts above:

a) the vitality and decisiveness of Öcalan's education/inculcation "war" in the processes of the PKK's rise and fall, and

b) the determinative factor of "almost all" central [committee] members and the "overwhelming majority" of the prominent figures of the commanding body (Weber's bureaucratic staff") in the process of the *corruption of education* and, in consequence, of the *corruption of war*. In his daily journal of 19 July 1996, Enver Polat[17] quotes Öcalan's firmer words from the *"çözümleme"* of the day concerning the corruption of the war.

Talking about the enemy, we may defeat it a thousand times, but alas, I cannot bring you to the [desired] point. You are more obstinate than camels. The thing

that takes me to back to square one is neither the enemy nor the people; I am now
gradually realising better than before that it is the trunk-cadre structure with the
central [committee] as its head. It is an extremely dangerous situation.

The friends we interrogated are the most loyal and honest humans, but their
factual practices are virtually taking revenge on the leadership [italics as
original]. (Polat, 1999, p. 79, 80).

In further parts of the "Report", Öcalan becomes more explicit. In this part, his first
objective is to break one of the three legs of the "trinity" (the naïve and self-deceptive
constituency, or the *catalyst-shelter* body), namely the ordinary delegates of the
congress because he has already concluded that "self-deception is the greatest art"
among the "middle stratum" cadres (*Serxwebun*, February 1997).

> You dear participants!
> I think you are discussing [the matters] and certainly you have to discuss them. I
> say it again; as I emphasised in my earlier speech, if you say *"our elders say and
> we do"* then I say that there is no greater *şerefsis*[18] than you. No such elders exist
> and nor have you the right to listen like that even if there are such elders. You
> must absolutely know that you have harmed [the struggle] immensely.
> Approaching us [me] by such an understanding of seniority is the worst offence to
> us. (*Serxwebun*, May 1999, p. 13).

Then, the "main head or mind" (Gunter, 1998) comes back again to the first and most
permanent leg of the "tripod" (*the disguised/insoluble power holders*, namely the
"trunk-cadres") whom he feels has led him into a cul-de-sac. Öcalan actually proposes
to treat the sixth congress as a "re-foundation congress" before the seventh
"extraordinary" one (Chapter 4). "If not what may happen, you could say", he warns,
"[is that] there may be confusions, the discussions may tend towards an intricate state.
Wherever it goes or not, our congress is a renewal of the party foundation, we re-
establish the party if needed" (*Serxwebun*, May 1999. p. 14).

> ... But it seems to me that your existing conduct is the most devilish, the most
> foolish and the most porter-like, and, at the same time, is the most insidious one.
> This, on the one hand, is a most innocent *mümin*-like[19] style, on the other hand is a

most simple peasant cunning style, which both develop within each other. ... The most painful aspect is that I cannot see it in the individual's personality or as being a clique and I cannot get out of it. It is a situation peculiar to itself. ... My feelings, at least, tell me, "you cannot march with them". Whatever excuses you provide, my feelings say to me "don't draw nearer". (*op. cit.*).

The conclusion at which Öcalan arrives is that he "unfortunately cannot go further with the existing PKK" as it stands. He lays down the condition that if an "extensive and deep-rooted revision and renewal" does not take place to the extent of a re-foundation, the Party "cannot walk [work] after the VI. congress" and asks himself for the "answer" below: "If it walks [as hitherto] what happens then?"

It will be ordinary, the repetition of the past, as we have been accustomed to. Well, can we endure this anymore? For example, I can no longer endure it. Let such a PKK be dissolved. I cannot endure this pain. ... It may be emancipation for me to be divorced from those who bear these [accustomed] perceptions. ... You cannot seduce me [into continuing as we have up to now] by playing along with me which you have been doing through your tricks and performances. Either you alter this personality of yours or I must go my own way. (*op. cit.*).

Namely, if the PKK continues to repeat its habits, Öcalan will somehow "resign". In addition, following the "heated" and "condensed" experience of the 66 day "Rome March" (Ucar, 2000, 3-4-5), his hopes of being physically near to the Party organisation (in direct or tele-contact with the commanding body) have become extremely faint – if they have not been exhausted.

If you still say *"our tribe agha, our father will continue to send us something from far off"*, then I am telling you openly, there exists no such possibility anymore. The self-sacrificing devotees you wanted, the money, the warm interest, the people's support, have been sent to you for years. Now they are at risk, I say. Our [my] existence still presents you with significant advantages, but this is no longer a reliable entity. (op. cit.).

Thus, while he lays down a firm condition by saying either "you re-establish the Party" to extricate it from the vicious circle of "political prostitution" or "I will leave

you", on the other hand, he strives to prepare for (at least to give way to) the "centre and trunk-cadres" to achieve the "new walk" without him.

These words in Öcalan's "report" from which I have quoted large excerpts were shaped when the network of international intelligence agencies were breathing down his neck in Dusanbe, Tacikistan (Ucar, 2000, 6). This was both the last "*çözümleme*" (analysis) which the "main head and mind" conveyed to the "trunk-cadre" body and the last *connection* between the "Leadership" and the Party in an organisational sense. Since 2nd February 1999 when the plane took off from Greece, organisational contact ended in practice.[20] The crucial importance and specificity of this tele-talk from Dusanbe to the proceeding congress (the sixth) in the eastern mountains of Kurdistan stem from the fact that these were such historically important days for the organisation. The tele-talk is, therefore, composed as a kind of "testamentary bequest". Throughout the talk, Öcalan was additionally "transparent" and certain in his diagnoses and conclusions, while realising in horror that being the only "head and mind" of the organisation's whole existence has actually led to the PKK becoming vulnerable and "soft". And so, he formulates the final condition for the "inheritors" to consider.

> If an organisation which has absolute determination for the revolution does not revise and re-establish its real existence in a straightforward and responsible manner, it will not be able to escape from being a group of liars and deceivers. (*Serxwebun*, May 1999, p. 15).

The talk's illustration of questions, confrontations and the impasse in the organisation also emanates from the sensitive circumstances in which the "report" was constructed. All preceding reports submitted to the congress were called "Political Reports" and published afterwards as a book, including the one for the VII. extraordinary congress held a year after the VI. congress. This talk was called the "Organisational and Political Report" but has not been published as a book.

c. The Wrongs of Repetition

We have illustrated how the "repetition of wrongs" engendered the PKK's organisational shrinkage. The source − or why − of the repetition has also been

articulated. The remaining item is to clarify what has actually been the object of the repetition. Namely, what has in fact been repeated, or what were the fundamental wrongs that led to the organisational descent?

I have argued, in Chapter 2 and the first section of Chapter 5, that a dual peculiarity in the framework of contextual factors has been the basis of Turkey's Kurdish question and has consequently given rise to the PKK's organisational *particularities*. This double-faceted peculiarity was, I suggested, the millennial *tribal-traitorous* (*ashiret* and *ihanet*) nature of Kurdishness and Turkey's unique policy about "*her*" Kurds based on denial and repression (*inkar, tenkil*). In the second part of Chapter 5, I endeavoured to explain the particular build-up of a *national* reaction against internal treason which was – and is – utilised in turn as a "dormant resource" by the leading élite of the PKK for the motivation of party activists and the mobilisation of the Kurdish masses. Correspondingly, *tribe* and *treason* – and *family* – have been a vital concern of the Party's educational "war". This has led to a further two factors as being fundamental focal points of the PKK's organisational structure: individual-organisation and personality-lifestyle. The repetition of wrongs, which Öcalan phrased as "political prostitution", have materialised as manifestations related to those vital concerns of the Kurdish movement in one way or another. Certainly, the wrongs took place in various forms and in an incalculable quantity within the totality of the organisational activities. However, the "regularised" wrongs have mainly been, in the case of the PKK of 1990s, around three kinds of recurrent "deprivations" in the sense of the inward processes of the organisation. These were

– officialisation of sterile education,

– misuse of the "loyalty to Leadership" and

– routinisation of the metamorphosed critique and self-critique mechanisms.

Cadre education (examined in Chapter 5) has always been more than vital for the PKK's organisational existence. It has been deprived of its philosophical and moral ingredients, and considerably reduced to incentive or incitement-making teachings so as to recruit "determined fighters" against the "cruel enemy" from the early 1990s onwards. This reduction has been furthered in the education of recruits directly attached to the guerrilla corps (Özcan, N.A., 1999, p. 423) in the mountains. Whereas, just weeks before the "Spring Uprisings" in 1990, Öcalan taught[21],

"... Those who come to join our party, who come to our primary education school, are in an unrecognisable state. Even we can bring out to what extent they represent the enemy – many of them express it through their own words – and to what extent they are from the people's side following an arduous effort over months". (Quoted in Aydin, 1992, p. 183)

The intensive philosophical, moral and spiritual education, aimed at engendering the *self-recreation* process inside the personalities of those who come to the organisation in the "debased" state, therefore became converted into parrot-like imitations of certain terms and phrases. The sterilisation of educational activities repeated itself throughout the 1990s.

Loyalty to Leadership has been an additionally decisive "institution" in the organisational structure, as a result of Öcalan's "indisputable" charisma (White, 2000, pp. 209-216). It is defined as denoting loyalty to the people, to the cause and to the future of humanity. In fact, the sterilisation of education provided grounds for stating "loyalty to the Leadership" rather than as a "magic key" to open every door and obtain desired positions and the power of command in the organisation. The repetition and "institutionalisation" of the wielding of this "magic key" during the 1990s gave rise to a caricature of Soviet-like bureaucracy in the PKK that was "most loyal to the leadership". In other words, the "magic key" has been well utilised by the administrative staff of the Organisation for their self-contained "institutionalisation" in the course of "routinisation" of Apo charisma. This seems to be what led Öcalan to say, "this party is not my party" (*Serxwebun*, December 1999, p. 16) anymore and all "selfish approaches to the work" are being "carried out in the name of loyalty to the Leadership" following the horrifying "Rome March" (*op. cit* April, p. 12).

The critique and self-critique mechanism occupies additionally crucial space in the inward organisational processes of the PKK for its ideology and educational activities. As shown in the preceding two chapters, this mechanism is dominated by the notion of the "production of the new man" for the "Humanisation Movement" which was to rise from the "cradle of civilisation". In the PKK's "official view", the critique and self-critique mechanism is the primary means of initiating and developing the process of "self-dissolution" towards the invention of the *re-humanised man*. Generally, no questions arise about finding the faults and defects of "others", and consequently no discernible difficulties are met while engaging in critique. However,

the "instrument" of self-critique has been metamorphosed into the "self-veiling" or "self-disguising" instrument of "bureaucratic authority" in the organisational structure due to the organisational "complications" set out above. So self-critique has been routinised with an imitative rhetoric and has become one of the three basic items of "obstinate repetition" in the years of decline. Two educated cadres in the PKK (Zeynep Kinaci, whose pre-self-immolation letter was explored in Chapter 5, and Enver Polat, whose daily journal was published as a book among the party publications following his death) point towards this particular aspect. Kinaci, in her letter (1996) "To Party Leadership" states: "It has been evidenced that the often repeated kinds of self-criticism which are excused by the influences of the petty bourgeoisie, peasantry, feudal culture, enemy and special war orientations etc. do not make any progress". Polat, notes a "very important" and "seriously distinct" facet he witnessed at a "critique-self-critique platform" chaired by Cemil Bayik in the guerrilla camp. He highlights Bayik's words which underlined the "freedom to oppose the critiques" for the persons who did not agree with a critique of himself/herself, and adds: "In fact, the number of persons who wield the self-critique as camouflage are not in a small quantity" (Polat, 1999, p. 163).

The *corruption of the measures* of "loyalty to values" and the distortion of norms for the individual's qualifications to partake in organisational rule have reified as a result of the totality of the repetition of wrongs manifested in the Party's basic "institutions" outlined above. This was in many ways to result in the organisational shrinkage – meaning the deconstruction of collective action.

d. The Deconstruction[22] of Collective Action

From the evidence given so far in this study, it follows that the PKK is a heavily ideological-educational-organisational entity. It is an organisation which is networked and operated by absolutely professional cadres who are deprived of their "private life". That means the ethnic "social movement", which emerges from the "quiet" – even "buried" (Kendal in Chaliand, 1980 pp. 54-63)– Kurds of Anatolia, has been constructed, or in words of Turner and Killian (1957) "built up", through the network of the ideology-dominated educational-organisational works interwoven by the "off-

material-production" actors in the political entity of the PKK. The phenomenon has come into being "brick by brick".

So my research provides support for the "constructivist" theories developed by a remarkable portion of social movement scholars who brought forth the idea that collective action is, in the final analysis, a product of the individual's organisational endeavours because "there is always enough discontent in any society to supply the grass-roots support for a movement if the movement is effectively organised and has at its disposal the power and resources of some established élite group" (Turner and Killian, 1972, p. 251) and "even further: grievances and discontent may be defined, created and manipulated by issue entrepreneurs and organisations" (McCharty and Zald, 1977, p. 1215). When I examined the process of the 1990s in which the Party fell into decline, the argument I developed in conjunction with explicating the questions and confrontations in the PKK's organisational discourse and practice supports this idea. The resulting conclusion would then be that the deconstruction of a collective phenomenon shall have to fundamentally be the sequel of a somehow *disorganisational construction* – that is, the deconstruction of the organisational "building". But, of course, with an evident contrast: the deconstruction is as easy as the construction is difficult, just as it is in brickwork! This is what has been explored in the latter section of this chapter.

A distinct point stood out vis-à-vis this conclusion among the findings of the field survey. While the "imperialists' venture to capture" Öcalan is attributed to a decline in the organisation's power of mobilisation by *Serxwebun* and articulated in a lengthy editorial article, the grassroots body seems reluctant to acknowledge the fact. *Serxwebun* states,

> America, England, Turkey, Germany sat down, investigated, explored: *'these humans* [PKK activists] *are like this. ... a person [Öcalan] does everything, lets catch him, then they grapple with one another. No sense of executing party, politics, struggle, anything amongst them'* they said. Namely, they diagnosed all these features of us, and dared to launch such an offensive against us, and by the strength, self-confidence acquired from this [our state] they effected this fearless aggression against the Leadership. (*Serxwebun*, December 1999, p. 17).

The editorial article of *Serxwebun* puts the acknowledgement of the "organisational shrinkage" in further explicit words: "This war served the party less, but more the non-party [objectives]. That is why we did not succeed in the war, [then] such wear and tear, loss of strength have materialised". The grassroots do not agree with this nevertheless. I asked the respondents: "Do you think that the PKK fell into decline in the last few years?" Despite the considerable number of "No" answers in all the other optional questions, only "one" did not answer, but 89% of the 184 respondents said "No" decline has taken place in recent years. The percentage rises to 95% among the less educated respondents (Table 9). Likewise, while 80.4 percent of respondents found "The *growth* of the PKK" as the actual cause which urged the USA to hand Öcalan over to Turkey, only 0.5 percent of them ticked "The decline of the PKK". In perspective, these striking findings refute my suggestion of them taking the organisational descent of the PKK for granted, which has even been acknowledged by its "Leadership" and his successors. However, if we continue to rely on the facts and figures that corroborate the decline of the PKK in the 1990s, how shall we then interpret nine tenths of the "No" answers that oppose the indisputable "such a wear and tear, loss of strength"? The fair interpretation would be that the human's spiritual propensity towards self-deception is a yet undefined "faculty" in human nature to the extent that it challenges Freud's "most potent" instinct of sexual desire. The conspicuous findings also support my suggestion that the "naïve and self-deceptive loyal-cadres" of the PKK served the tacit togetherness of "power hunters" and "disguised/insoluble power holders" as a *catalyst* and *preservative* in the Party. And the deconstruction process, in its complexity, has actually been a result of such an organisational "decay".

However, the very organisational decay handled above at a micro-level is by no means a unique device of the PKK that caused its inevitable descent. It is, in effect, a typical heir to the fate of the "national communism" of national liberationist movements during the second half of the last century. And, in general, it is another example in the sequence of the inevitable end of the "Iron Curtain socialism" of the belated adolescent bourgeoisie forming the "socialist camp" (Chapter 1). Even further, this is what happened to Caesar, to Mazzini, to Napoleon, to Lenin[23], to Mao and so forth as the recurrent destiny of revolutionary endeavours. What is new to this "tradition" of history is that the process is well articulated and evidenced by Öcalan's recorded and "uncensored" talks of the last two decades.

e. Öcalan's Charisma: The "Party Leadership"

Corresponding with Weber's general conceptualisation of *authority* and *charisma*, the "charismatic authority" operating in the persona of Abdullah Öcalan in the PKK is an easily-acknowledgeable phenomenon. Its extent and existence "was strikingly (if not chillingly) illustrated by the self-immolations of PKK supporters and members which began across Europe and in Turkish prisons ... in response to perceived threats to Öcalan's person" (White, 2000, pp. 210, 211) following his abduction on 15 February 1999. I also observed symptoms of its continuity during the HADEP congress (Ankara – 26. 11. 2000) at which tens of thousands of Kurdish masses chanted his name and the name of the island (Imralli) where he is imprisoned, even though he had abandoned the most basic *national* undertakings of twenty (1978-1998) years in his *Defences*. Yet the related findings of the field research of this study, which I carried out following his new stance on the Kurdish "national question", point the way towards the "routinisation" of Öcalan's charisma in that 50.5 percent of respondents see the "Leader Apo" as the most fundamental cause of the PKK's success (Table 10). Whereas the lowest percentage of the grassroots (9.2 % and 12.5 %) came up in the findings as activists who became sympathetic to the PKK through non-Öcalan effects – that is, a friend or a fellow activist (Table 11). Three out of five of the options in response to the question regarding the initial approach-means to the Party appeared as higher percentages (15.7 %, 24.4 % and 38. 04 %) which somehow (one directly, the others indirectly[24]) relate to Öcalan's leadership. Thus, his charisma seems insurmountable or irreplaceable – at least in the near future. Even embodiment and/or incarnation of this "indispensable" charisma seem to be unrealisable.

The point with which this study is concerned is neither the nature or the extent, or the future of Öcalan's charisma, but the *nourishing base* of its growth and, in particular, how it later in the 1990s became a paradox of the PKK's organisational structure. In the preceding three chapters, the specific causes of such an unusual charisma were actually shown when I examined the emergence of the party, its theory and ideology, and its organisational education and "modus operandi". In the present chapter, I partly elucidated the nurturing base of the "routinisation" of the Apo

charisma when I discussed the "wise" wielding of "loyalty to the Leadership" under "The Wrongs of Repetition".

What I am going to add here is, firstly, that the development of such an impressive and pervading charisma in the persona of Öcalan was inevitable and is quite understandable. This inevitability initially lies in the fact that the "Apo" charisma has been nurtured by the highly tensional Kurdish question of Turkey (discussed in Chapter 2) as a fertile "soil" for the charisma "emerges in a field of conflict and contradictions, and so sustained" (Perinbayanagam, 1971, p. 395). On the other hand, the completely Öcalan-led PKK has opened up an historical "gap" in the millennial "inverse fate" (*makus talih*) of Kurdishness and this opening is deemed to be a miraculous and phenomenal development among the Kurds of Turkey, to the extent that it is acknowledged even by its enemy. The "first man" of the National Intelligence Organisation (MIT) of Turkey, Senkal Atasagun, confessed: "If we say that Apo did not have any effect there in 20 years, we would be lying" (Ergin, 2000). And the "second man" of MIT, Mikdat Alpay, says that the "PKK destroyed the feudality" (*op. cit.*) in the region. Also, the "interpretation" of the findings of a survey[25] that carried out among 1267 respondents – gathered in the "Special Research Report"– articulates the "gap" opened "this time" in the tradition of Kurdish history.

> When we look at the fact in the light of our recent history, it is evident that the preceding Kurdish revolts have always been the revolts of noble leaders. As soon as the leaders were arrested or exiled or executed, the "movement" ended. For the first time a Kurdish movement has come from below. And the difficulty of its repression stems from this. Ordinary people are joining a "cause" which transcends themselves. They discover that their lives are becoming significant. For the first time they believe in their ability to determine their future. (Ergil, 1995, p. 89).

That is, in the case of Ocalan's charisma, once again, the "charisma of the general is, quite simply, success in battle" (Spencer, 1973, p. 347).

Secondly, any "charisma" – even any "authority" apart from the "*impermanent*" or "*transitory*" proletariat dictatorship which "itself" was bound to wither away *all classes* and *class societies* (Marx, 1962, p. 452), namely, *all authorities* of (*herrschaft*) "imperative control" (Weber, 1947, p. 152) – contradicts

socialist ideology, and therein lies the potential bacteria of self-decay as is proven by the spectacle of its Soviet experiences. In the case of the PKK and Öcalan, this self-decaying contradiction is deeper and tends towards deepening further because the ideology of the PKK is claimed to be Marxist-socialism of a *post-Soviet* version. Moreover, because the philosophy of socialism in Öcalan's talks (as elucidated in chapters 4 and 5) is dominated by the notion of *re-humanisation* versus the "socialism in which the individual is shrunk to its bottom limit but the State is swollen to its top limit" (Öcalan, 1998), any tone of charisma contradicts the *articulated* ideology of the PKK. Any *charisma* denotes authority. In fact, Weber (1947) elaborates the phenomenon under "The Types of Authority and Imperative Co-ordination [or imperative control]", and specifies the "charismatic authority" as one of the "*three pure types of* legitimate *authority*" along with "legal authority with a bureaucratic administrative staff" and "traditional authority" [italics added] (*op. cit. pp.* 328-363). If an ideology proposes and idealises the "swelling individual" and the "shrinking State", then even a modest charisma, or any other of the "three types" of authority, will in no way be a "bacterial" resource for the coming "decay". In addition, if a version of the socialist ideology of post-Soviet aspirations, namely in the case of the PKK, set forth the "individual's emancipation" (*ozgürleşme*) from all "sins" of the "Civilisation Satan" [of class societies] in search of initiating the "*movement of great human naturalness*" as the cardinal focal-point, then a "swollen" charismatic authority "to its top limit" would lead the organisation holding such an ideology into a vicious circle, then into an impasse. Then, the impasse will "guide" the organisation into overall collapse – if the chance for diversion or reversal is missed[26].

The contradiction between what has been said and what has been done causes "depression" in organisations too, just as is true of an individual's personality. The contradiction between *person* and *persona* generated by the unnatural and/or inhuman values of the institutions of class-society superstructures is the main source of non-physically inspired spiritual imbalances and depressions in the personalities of individuals. As I have argued in previous chapters, Öcalan himself was becoming aware of the fact, and consequently has been focusing on the growing question of his charisma since the early nineties. He, in particular, has concentrated on the "democratisation of the organisation" through "people's assemblies" of elected members (Chapter 5) to loosen, if not break, the *structure* of charismatic authority. But it did not work because it was quite late – in fact, too late. He therefore came to

say: "This party is not my party" (*Serxwebun*, December, 1999, p. 16; Öcalan, 2001b, p. 97). More importantly, Öcalan himself either did not want or was not aware of his decisive part in the process. In 1996, I asked him about any viable contemporary way out of the inevitable elimination of the "naïve intelligentsia" (Chapter 1) in all previous revolutions while reminding him of the recurrent fate of overall revolutionary odysseys. He did not answer my question, but rather preferred to choose a humiliating response.

> – It would be very difficult for any ordinary social scientist to comprehend me. I think that, despite all your efforts, you are not going to be able to understand. In fact, my method does not fit into the imagination of ordinary human beings. Only I, so far, know how and who I am fighting. I have said, therefore, that if any researcher or scientist from where you have come from [implying the West] has sufficient self-confidence, they may attempt to learn and understand. You have tried but I fear that you will return with empty hands (A. Öcalan, personal communication, 15 July, 1996, Party Central School, Syria).

Further in our dialogue, Öcalan became more aggressive and more exaggeratedly self-confident. When I pointed out the contrast between what he says and what is done in the organisation's activities to the extent that the things he wants have in practice been rendered "forbidden" in the party though they are "officially" accepted and intensively parroted, he instead targeted my "nonsense" question.

> In these respects, if you mean what happened to prophets, what happened to Lenin will happen to me too, that is a nonsense story because I have organised myself in these aspects insofar as it is out of the reach of your perception, or I am extremely pitiless against all [those who do] these things. No one can use [me] as they think. ... There is no significant defect in my way of succeeding in things. This is so clear. Aren't your eyes capable of seeing this? (*op. cit*).

But in the latest "defence", Öcalan ventures into a harsh self-critique. He, so to speak, is additionally confessional about what he himself could not do, and what was in fact beyond his power of understanding.

> ... I have been defeated by the Organisation. The marauder tendency created a state of insensitivity in the [party] structure to the extent that there was nothing that could

be done; and hence the very defeat [his helplessness] was melting me inside. I had come to the point of impulsively saying to an Italian paper, "I am going to resign from the Organisation [PKK]. (Öcalan, 2001b, p. 97).

After all, Öcalan concludes that he had fallen into the "cursed" tradition of dogmatism believing the very general "banal truths" which he kept warning his pupils against.

Falling into this cursed tradition while warning my comrades to have the best self-protection against it, not counting on the power of this tradition is my real self-critique that will be left there [for history]. (Öcalan, 2001b, p. 275).

However, the confessional self-critique of Öcalan, though he hopes to undo the "institutionalised" wrongs in the Party, has also come too late to revive the existing organisational body, because the organisation has overwhelmingly come to be dominated and consolidated by a "new ruling stratum" whose members are well aware of the danger to themselves. And Öcalan's routinised charisma continues to be the prime assurance of their future as a privileged stratum. In fact, Öcalan's charisma was already in the service of the party bureaucracy (trunk cadres). The power of charisma relates to the bureaucratic apparatus rather than to the person of charisma because the power "only functions in the form of a chain" and it "is employed through a net-like organisation" (Foucault, quoted in Jermier, 1993). In addition, charisma in its routinised form no more relates to some traits of the charismatic personality but to the very *persona* that is endowed to this personality *by* the bureaucratic staff.

From everything said so far, it follows that there are historically "frozen" socio-psychological causes for giving birth to such a charisma in the form of Öcalan's "supernatural" or "superhuman" persona. So, his charisma was inescapable – or probably, vitally needed – and thus understandable. However, it was doomed to be converted into a cul-de-sac for the organisation because since the *charisma* does relate to a "certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men" (Weber, 1947, 358), its *authority* does not function through the charismatic person. The charismatic authority too, in contrast with Weber's separation of "pure types of" authorities, is networked and operated by "a bureaucratic and administrative staff" (*op. cit. 329*) just as in the "legal authority". Further, both the charisma and its authority may well "be defined, created and manipulated" by the very

"bureaucratic and administrative staff" "for all practical purposes" in securing the material and spiritual privileges "that power gives" to the bureaucratic staff. It is so, no matter if the person of charisma is alive or dead. This is the case in Iraq with the very much alive Saddam Hussein, just as it is in Turkey and Iran in the cases of the deceased Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Ayatollah Khumaini. There is a crucial distinction which relates to the argument here: while charismatic authorities of capitalist purposes perpetuate themselves and their bureaucratic staff as long as the system exists for it is appropriate to the ideology and philosophy of capitalism, the charismatic authorities of *articulated* socialist utopias and longings does not function as such because it contradicts the ideology and philosophy of socialism. This has already been demonstrated by the avalanche of historical mutations that took place in the Soviet style and in its fellow "communist" authorities. That is, charisma and the "institution" of charismatic leadership in Öcalan's personality and his party appear solely to be replications of "Marxist idealism" (Nairn, 1981, pp. 329-331).

It is thus that the routinised "charismatic authority" of Öcalan has been one of the paradoxical entanglements of the PKK's organisational structure, which contributed greatly to its shrinking in the 1990s. And Öcalan's belated attempts at a "personalisation" (*bireysellesme*) in the current party structure – a reorientation in harmony with socialism or collectivism and against capitalist individualism– have tended to be totally ineffective among the "remaining" (Öcalan, 2001b, p.97) ranks of the Party on whom he himself is doomed to rely. In brief, the charisma of Öcalan –the "routinisation" of "Apo" charisma, so-called the "Party Leadership" (*Party Önderligi*)– has proven to be a fatal paradox for the Leader and the party bureaucracy from which the organisation can not appear to escape. Routinisation of charisma is a simultaneous process with institutionalisation and bureaucratisation of party. And because "charisma and bureaucratisation are antithetical organisational phenomena" (Panebianco, 1988, p. 66), the paradoxical process has for now culminated in Öcalan's serious defeat by his abduction and imprisonment in solitary confinement at the one-man prison of Imralli island, Turkey.

f. The Nationalism of the PKK or the "Weakest Link" of Kurdishness

I have striven to select the most revealing excerpts from Öcalan's talks to show how he defines the nature of the struggle under his leadership. I took these talks as being crucial for this study because the ideas, the philosophy, the form and content of these talks have not been shaped as claims or defences in the course of quarrels and arguments against enemies or adversaries. But the overall talks are actually materialised as efforts to inculcate his pupils in the course of – what he calls – the "war of education". And it is evident that Öcalan identifies the nature of the struggle organised in the form of the PKK substantially in non-Kurdish and non-national terms. In addition, no exalting expressions are found in the total sum of Öcalan's talks that bear any indication of a national narcissism. On the contrary, he repeatedly employs derogatory – occasionally humiliating – expressions for Kurds, such as "debased", "degenerated", "dishonest", etc. Yet he does not refrain from saying "*national liberation is only the means of my struggle*" and lets it be published in the central organ of the Party. It was also proven by the stance he took in his *Defences*, in which he dispensed with all classical national targets without any opposition in the PKK. The words "Kurds" and "Kurdistan" are the ones which a would-be researcher will come across most rarely in his language. Interestingly, in my personal interview which took around two hours, Öcalan did not mention the words Kurd, Kurdish or Kurdistan at all (*Serxwebun*, 1996, pp. 19, 20, 23). White, the author of the only sociological study written in English about the PKK-led Kurdish movement, talks of "the Real Kurdish Personality" and the "New Kurdish Person" (White, 2000, pp. 139, 210). These must either be comment or wrong translations. Such terms literally cannot be found throughout Öcalan's talks including interviews. What may extensively be found about the Kurds is the "debased Kurdish personality", and regarding the socialist future, there is the "new human", "renewed" or "naturalised personality" of "a new lifestyle" or of "a new way of life". The former is not narcissistic at all, and the latter is by no means a novel notion. The sought-for "new man" is not only the concern of the socialist literature of the twentieth century but it can be traced back to Plato's "philosopher kings" or "philosopher rulers". Above all, the non-Kurdish aspect of Öcalan's inculcation talks is not the "greatness" of his leadership demonstrating its

socialistness in not being nationalistic, but rather a manifestation of being aware of the "absence of a base of ethnic nationalist" (Öcalan, 1993a, p. 191) sentiments among ordinary Kurds – especially among the Kurds of Turkey. Further, the eventual conclusion at which Öcalan arrived in one of the recent "Notes of Meeting" is clear enough in terms of a national narcissism: *"Sinirlar ve siniflar adina savas dönemi bitti"* (Serxwebun, February 2000, p. 13). Which translates: "The era of war on behalf of borders and classes has come to its end". However, his charisma still functions in motivating not only the PKK militants but also the ordinary Kurds of Kurdistan and of the Diaspora.

Collective narcissism is a national sentiment *par excellence* – which was "defined, created and manipulated by issue entrepreneurs" of modern era capitalism and entails the ultimate aim of sovereignty in a geographic territory. In fact Koenigsberg himself elaborates on the social psychology of nationalism within the "process of *urbanisation*" (Koenigsberg, 1997, p. 36-52) which genuinely denotes the modern era dominated by the young bourgeoisie of competitive capitalism. Nationalism is consequently defined as the ideology of the bourgeoisie by Marxist tradition. Hastings (1997) selects the corresponding conclusions of both Gellner (1964) and Hobsbawm (1990) which square with one another: "Nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist"; "Nations do not make states and nationalisms, but the other way round". Nevertheless, this does not mean that Öcalan has nothing to do with nation and nationalism. After all, Öcalan and his PKK do lead an ethnic-related opposition. In fact, he admits: "We cannot regard national socialism as treason" (Öcalan, 2000, p. 25). But, is there a "nationalism" in the PKK which actually aims to accomplish a nation-state?

Any national struggle in its actual sense is, in the final analysis, a struggle for borders in which the "suffering mother" – the "country" – lies down (Koenigsberg, 1997, p. 2) and for which a "holy" State is the only remedy! Nation state is "an essential goal of every nationalism" for which "possession of territory is, after all, a *sine qua non*" (Smith, 1983, p. xiii). Either Öcalan's teachings or the collective consciousness of the Kurds, as it stands, do not fit into these general or classical definitions of both nation and nationalism. The striking realities of the sub-division of a *piece* of Kurdistan (which is sheltered by the world coalition of the superpowers as a

"Safe Haven") between Barzani's KDP and Talabani's PUK in the very minor interests of tribal leaderships, and their regular attacks on the PKK "to please Turkey" (Lawrence, 2000, p. 24) may also be interpreted as a weakness in – if not the absence of – an ordinary national consciousness in the Kurdish ethnic spirit.

The nature of the struggle conducted by the PKK embodies all the "raw material" of nationalism but not nationalism itself. That is, the movement's spirit relates very much to the innate sentiments of ethnic-cultural, primordial and patriotic sorts. This "raw material", however, has never been "refined" to become a real nationalism of a nation-state with a national market. In other words, the PKK's "nationalism" has remained a "mass nationalism" which is not *yet* nationalism (argued in Chapter 1 in "The Two Faces of the Modern Janus"). And this, of course, is not because the leading bureaucracy of the party is so committed to socialist utopias and values but because they are well aware of the fact that there exists no "adolescent" or nascent bourgeoisie class aspiring to a Kurdish national market. More importantly, there exists no viably exploitable –or potentially exploitable– national market to which the party bureaucracy itself is/would be attracted. The economic "network" of the region (the Kurdish populated territories of Turkey) is dependent on and incorporated into Turkey's economy, which is itself already in crisis. In this sense, "market sentiments" among the Kurds have always been weak –if not totally absent. In consequence, there have never been real "dreams" of a nation-state (Kutschera, 1994) in Kurdish ethnic resistance movements. And thus, voices speaking of an "Independent Kurdistan" in each revolt have remained marginal and have always been subordinated to the collaboration with the Kurds' "others".

The PKK is the first *national* organisation in Kurdish history in terms of transcending pre-feudal (not feudal) institutions as organisational entities in Kurdish social and political existence. But this "nationalisation" was by no means engendered by a nationalism of the bourgeoisie for which it "is the vehicle *par excellence*" (White, 2000, p. 4). That is, the process of "nationalisation" of the Kurds of Anatolia does not resemble the transformation from Hobsbawm's peasant "primitive rebels" to a "modern Kurdish nationalism" (*op. cit* p. 3) of nation-state building. The findings of my limited field research and of Ergil's "Special Research" bring out this aspect of the phenomenon. Ergil asks 1267 respondents two questions relating to the "goals of the Organisation" (Ergil, 995, pp. 33, 34): "What are the goals of the Organisation?" and

"Which of its goals can the Organisation attain?" In response to the former question, while 15.3 % of respondents ticked the option of "the Independent Kurdish State", 30.6 % ticked the "the cultural and political rights". The contrast between the options is more apparent in the answers to the latter question: 3.6 % said "Separate Kurdish State" but 15.9 % said "cultural and political rights". The diagonal comparison of these percentages indicates that the state-building national aspirations among the Kurds of Turkey represent a marginal tendency. Yet, the general picture of the findings, which emerged in the answers to my questionnaire, is additionally illustrative of this aspect. I constructed two open-ended questions seeking the "ultimate end " and "most innovative feature" of the PKK: "How would you briefly define the ultimate end of the PKK?" (Table 16) and "What is the most innovative feature of the PKK?" The highest percentage, 29.3 %, stated the "ultimate end" as being "national liberation". The second highest portion of respondents (16.3 %) defined the "ultimate end" as being "equality and fraternity of peoples". The third (11.9 %) and the lowest (4.3 %) classifiable groups envisaged a "united-independent" or "independent-socialist" Kurdistan. In defining the "most innovating feature", interestingly, anything that implied "fighting for independent Kurdistan" did not exist at all among the answers (Table 17). Even if 36 percent of the answers were unclassifiable, the expressions of "the most innovative feature of the PKK" gathered around the "renewal and continuity of the struggle" (26.6 %) with a remarkable distance between the next classifiable group which pointed to the "freedom, democracy and peace" (11.4 %) qualities of the Party.

So, it would be the most plausible interpretation of these findings in association with the "state-building nationalism" of the *mobilised* Kurds, if one were to state that the "continuity of struggle" for either "political rights" or "national liberation" or "freedom" do not substantially imply an "independent state" of Kurdistan in the backs of their heads. In this very sense, a customary state-building nationalism is *still* the "weakest link" of Kurdishness. And consequently, the leadership of the PKK did not in fact base their struggle on state-building nationalism, in spite of the programmatic discourse of 1970s that aspired to do so. The "national" ingredients of the PKK's verbal and textual discourse strike one as the mere eloquence of the romantic revolutionary intelligentsia in its adolescent or infantile phase. For this precise reason, Abbas Vali evaluates Kurdish nationalism as a kind of "nationalismless nationalism" (Vali, 1998, p. 84); that is, so to speak, a glass of water with no water in it.

It has been so, not only because the Party claims to be Marxist-socialist but also because they were/are aware that there was/is no reliable resource to be a "vehicle" for their struggle. Further, the PKK did not *wield* a nationalist agitation as a "vehicle *par excellence*" in its overall struggle. While the sense of "nationalism" (*milliyetcilik*) in the Turkish-speaking nationalist mainstream of East and West Anatolia is a cause for pride and patriotism insofar as not being *milliyetci* denotes that one is a traitor, the overwhelming majority of the PKK's grassroots members do not view their party as nationalist. Fully 94.5 percent of 184 respondents, which I selected among the PKK activists, rejected the idea that the PKK is a nationalist party (Table 3). Instead, the PKK wielded socialism in order to develop its own form of "nationalisation" on behalf of the Kurds. This was because the Kurdish socio-political structure in which the organisation emerged was not pre-national or feudal but *pre-feudal* and *primitive*, and because Turkey's policy about "her" Kurds was not actually a *national* or *colonial* oppression (Besikci, 1990, pp. 13-15) but an "indefinable" one based on denying the existence of both geography and the population. And therefore, the lack –if not total absence– of market "sentiments" among the Kurds of "above" has been a factual hindrance in the PKK's "anti-colonialist" struggle. Only an "irrepressible" desire and a corresponding perspective for a "home" market suffice for a "tribalism" to prosper which "everyone will respect it as a true nationalism" (Gellner, 1983, p. 87).

A fateful deep-rooted factor caused the Kurds to be arrested in tribality, and in consequence, Kurdish tribalism neither gave birth nor gave way to a bourgeoisie who would develop a true nationalism aspiring to a "national" (home) market and achieving a nation-state for it. This extreme facet of Kurdish history has built a solely consistent "tradition" that stretches from the Gilgamesh of the Sumerians to our very time. The "historical tradition" refers to the Kurds' *way of survival* as the indigenous "mountain people" of the "cradle of civilisation" which left no way open to Kurdish tribes other than deadly competition against one another for an "inferior position" –as the *safest* option– to the habitually changing foreign master powers. In conjunction with this "tradition" dating very far back, the uncompromising policies of denial of the latest "master" of the largest portion of the Kurds have necessitated a further strikingly "nationalismless nationalism" among the Kurdish population under Turkey. Accordingly, the main –if not the only– aspiration of the "Turkish Kurds" has

appeared to be the emancipation of their ethno-cultural identity, which may well be realised in a "Democratic Republic" of Turkey. And for this precise reason, the mass-support behind the HADEP or KADEK (in fact, the PKK) continue to remain –in some cases it has tended to rise, in spite of the "U-turn" by Öcalan and the PKK from overall ordinary nationalist objectives.

Concluding Remarks

Just as the construction of dynamics gave rise to the ascent of the PKK above its fellow Kurdish organisational configurations, the deconstruction of the very same dynamics engendered the descent in its military and civilian capabilities. The deconstruction process has been materialised through the repetition and proliferation of certain wrongs. The most "irresistible" phenomenon was/is that; all these "cursed" wrongs have somehow been justified and appreciated because the deep belief in the need for an *indivisible-extraordinary organisation*, in reaction to the disorganised-deformed state of the Kurdish ethnic existence moulded in the shadow of the "intrinsic" traitorous background of millennia, leached into the personalities of the "middle-class" executing cadres of the PKK as the *sacred-immutable organisation*. That is, the fresh realisation of a vital need for an organisation among the "greenhorn" party militants and fighters – which constituted an overwhelming majority of the cadre body of the PKK following the rise in new recruits in the early 1990s – provided a handy basis for the "bureaucratic staff" to work on Öcalan's charismatic authority. Thereby, both the charisma and the concept of organisation were endowed with further sacredness by the "infantile" bureaucracy of the PKK. Sacredness is the correlative of immunity. The handiest means of being out of the reach of critique and questioning is to become a sacred organisation – which is usually materialised in the individual members of the "bureaucratic staff". This appears to be the most pervasive question of the organisational nature of the PKK.

The intensive "education war" of the party did produce an undeniable result in revitalising the "buried" Kurdish ethnic existence by introducing a "new culture" of organisation that transcended millennial Kurdish tribal structures. However, the education war did little or nothing in the Organisation in terms of such a universal

"undoing" of civilisation's property mechanisms. And, in effect, the contrast between the parroted philosophy and the factual functioning of the trunk-cadre body within the very "property mechanisms" of the "Civilisation Satan" has remained as the greatest contradiction in the Party's organisational dynamics.

Öcalan's abduction was without doubt not only an outcome of the inescapable strength of the international conspiracy organised by "unchallengeable" global powers, but rather also of the Party's *undisguisable* decline in recent years, which dates back to 1992-93. It was not the strength or danger of the PKK's latest performance for the West's New World Order that urged the USA to arrange the international conspiracy against Öcalan but, on the contrary, its calculable decline of organisational (and consequently military) capability that inevitably culminated in the "catastrophic" abduction. The USA does not act on instinct or from sentiment but in accordance with reports and surveys based on quantitative information. From the USA's point of view, it was the right time to act because, for example, the party, which was capable of gathering almost a hundred and fifty thousand people in Germany for an annual festival in 1994, this time (December 1998) gathered a crowd of not more than fifty thousand for a vital reason – Öcalan's critical future.

The nature and source of Öcalan's charisma may be covered by other research. In this study, I only touched on causality of the specific charisma's efficacy, but rather focused on its problematic aspect within the framework of the Organisation's entanglements. What I may suggest, by relying on my overall Turkish reading of Öcalan's *Turkish* talks (termed *Cözümlemeler* – Analyses) is that his very charisma is by no means a product of the combination – or mutual satisfaction – of Öcalan's personal narcissism and Kurds' collective narcissism (White, 2000, p. 211) which would otherwise have nourished Kurdish nationalism. The *Apo* charisma is a resultant of the convergence of Ocalan's personal attributes and the highly "flammable" tension of Turkey's Kurdish question.

"Kurdish nationalism" does not concur with the ordinary or classical nationalism of a "home" market for which a nation-state is the *sine qua non*. Insofar as the remaining discourse of the PKK relates only to the masses' innate ethno-cultural sentiments by which they continue to be effectively mobilised in the face of Organisation's total abandonment of all national liberationist objectives, the ethnic resistance of Kurds under Turkey shall remain confined within a struggle for a "Democratic Republic" of Turkey. And hence, their resistance shall have to be

defined as an *"identity* liberation movement" – rather than a *national* liberation movement.

Notes

[1] An incident (Chapter 5) occurred during the most recent HADEP congress held in Ankara (November 26, 2000) in which the peculiarity of Turkey's undiminished "ostrich" policy on its Kurdish question manifested itself in a coarse form. This incident has since become "handy" material in the PKK's propaganda and educational activities. The reaction of over five thousand people in the hall, who protested against the interruption of the MEP's Kurdish speech by the superintendent police officer, was phenomenal.

[2] Critiques on the nature of Turkish State generally converge on its "Bonapartist" or "praetorian" character "that is, one in which military, para-military or semi-military forces operate independently of the civilian political apparatus" (White and Logan, 1997, p. 247). Up until the experience of 12 Sept. 1980, this was almost the most accurate definition of the fact. However, since then, the military apparatus has updated the "interventions" because of the difficulties encountered both in internal affairs and in the state's developing relations with the West. Consequently, the *occasional-explicit interventions* have been converted into a *constant-implicit grasp* of the rule through the National Security Council (*Milli Guvenlik Kurulu*) in which the Military apparatus passed its resolutions to the "civilian" governmental officers (Prime Minister, other ministers etc.) for execution in the Council's regular meetings.

[3] Kurdish national festival day.

[4] Referring to the interview by *2000 e Dogru* (Turkish weekly magazine) published in three issues dated 14, 21 and 28 April 1991.

[5] Ahmet Aydin is the pen-name used by Ahmet Cem Ersever, who founded a semi-autonomous organisation (White, 2000, p. 144) composed of military (gendarmes) and paramilitary elements (JITEM) which operated effectively against alleged PKK supporters and civilian activists, including several attempts to assassinate Öcalan. Ersever was later killed in Ankara and his death still remains mysterious (Bozarslan in Olson, 1996, p. 148).

[6] The phrase (*taktik önderlik*) is employed in the terminology of the PKK to mean the regional and local representatives who hold the direct management of party activities or, in other words, who implement the party's strategic policies in daily practice.

[7] The death of Turgut Özal has been seen as suspicious in many circles including some Turkish MPs from various parties and his son Ahmet Özal who is currently an "independent" MP in the TBMM (Turkish Grand National Assembly). They believe that Özal "was in fact poisoned by Turkish forces opposed to his Kurdish initiative" (White, 2000, pp. 163, 200). No attempt has since been made to investigate the claims. Allegations have even been made that his hair, which had been kept hidden, disappeared after the raising of suspicions.

[8] Semdin Sakik was a prominent commander and CC member of the PKK. He later, in 1998, deserted from the guerrilla forces and surrendered to the Turkish state through the KDP. (McDowall, 1996, p. 437; White, 2000, p. 169)

[9] The first international Kurdish-language satellite television station known as pro-PKK. It was opened in 1995 under licence of ITC (Independent Television Commission) of Britain, and reopened later in the name of "Medya TV" due to its licence termination by ITC.

[10] Tribal structure in Kurdistan is not what we generally find in feudal societies, which may be defined in terms of "Eric Hobsbawm's 'primitive rebels'... in the throes of ... capitalist modernisation" (White, 2000) or as "proto-nation". Rather, tribal structure is pre-feudal –in fact, a somewhat higher stage of a primitive communal society.

[11] The term *alçak* has no English equivalent. It literally means "low" but is actually a vulgar swear-word in Turkish

[12] Some of these party members and cadres were killed, some were expelled from the party and some ran away.

[13] Öcalan was to caricature this fact in the late nineties by saying, "a good guerrilla is not a person who has strong leg muscles".

[14] I refer to the concept "self-dissolution" – which in a way is relevant to Touraine's notion of "self analysis" (1981, p. 27) – widely used in the PKK's educational texts in the sense of orienting oneself to the "self-recreation" process.

[15] This category is frequently defined as the "objective agents of the enemy" in PKK publications and it is believed to be more dangerous than the "subjective" agents of the enemy.

[16] *Rant*: easily exploitable material and moral/spiritual values.

[17] Enver Polat is an activist of the PKK who joined the guerrilla forces in 1996 following several years work for the party's central organ, *Serxwebuin*, and was killed in a clash with state forces in 1997. He left basic education in his third year of primary school and became attached to the Party in Europe in his late teenage years following his family's migration from Kurdistan to Germany for work. The book he published, which is composed of 350 pages of his notes from his daily journal, is the most philosophical text among the non-Öcalan authored books.

[18] The turkish swearword "*serefsiz*" denotes an unesteemed, dishonourable, debased person.

[19] Mümin: Believer of Islam who never fails to follow his/her worship requirements.

[20] Öcalan himself was only informed of where he was going in the aircraft – destined for Nairobi, Kenya (Ucar, 2000,11).

[21] The quotation was picked from an Öcalan teaching dated 21. 02. 1990 by Ahmet Aydin (1992) for the chapter "Selected Words from Öcalan", so as to exhibit how badly Öcalan treats his pupils.

[22] Here, the term "deconstruction" does not refer to the post-structuralist theory developed by Jacques Derrida. It is employed to mean the steady decay of the organisational structure.

[23] In his work, *The Soviet Union Demystified*, Frank Furedi explores how an identical process occurred in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and how the "reactionary bureaucracy" consolidated its position as a "new ruling stratum" whose members "enjoyed widely varying access to privileges and wealth" (Furedi, 1986, pp. 42-45).

[24] The options of "through observations" and "through publications" are the ones which considerably embrace the sympathy to Öcalan because the PKK publications are largely dominated by his talks and pictures, and "observations" embodies various pro-Öcalan elements as such.

[25] The survey was sponsored by a leading businessmen's association in Turkey, TOBB (*Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birligi*), whose former chairperson (Yalim Erez) was a minister of government at the time. In the report's introduction, it emphasised that the research aimed to contribute to the "elimination of the terrorist organisation".

[26] It has gradually been revealed that such a chance has actually been missed, and therefore the party has officially annulled itself and converted into a "congress" which does not aspire to power, in accordance with Öcalan's instructions from Imralli prison.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

a. Summary of Conclusions

The introduction gives a general picture of the PKK's organisational contribution to the mobilisation of the Kurdish masses. In bringing forth the principal issues of the study, the substance of the subject matter was presented along with the facts and figures on which the opposing parties more or less converge.

Chapter one reviews the theorisation on nation and nationalism to provide an analytical framework for understanding the distinguishing aspects of the phenomenon under study.

In chapter two, we discussed the historical tensions between Turkey and the Kurds, which gave rise to the emergence of the PKK. We saw how the "rebirth" of the "new" Turkish nation-state as the "Republic of Turkey" was not *invented* by the "nationalism" of "national liberation movement" by a young native bourgeoisie. Rather, Turkish nationalism was "repressed" by the founders of the Republic until after the Republic's consolidation. Only then did nationalism erupt in Anatolia, with an exaggerated emphasis on "Turkishness".

In chapter three, we discussed the emergence of the PKK out of the radical Turkish Left in chronological order, along with the impact of particular events on Öcalan's leadership style and on the structural mould of his organisation.

We shall now have go through the preliminary conclusions vis-à-vis particular points tackled in the later chapters, to highlight both the specific and the general conclusions.

The Social Base and Class Politics

It is fairly obvious that the social base of the movement is not working class - even though its name is the "Kurdistan Workers Party". Indeed, there seem to be similarities

between the PKK-led "national" movement and the "New Social Movements" of advanced Western societies – certainly in respect of their social bases. Despite the claims about socialism and the "accomplishment of the October *Quasi-revolution*" after the Soviet Union's decline, the party's identification with socioeconomic codes (such as working class and/or middle class) faded away in the early 1990s and they are hardly mentioned now. The mass demonstrations and celebrations in the 1990s revealed that much of the movement's base is composed the middle-class (rural/urban or "old"/"new"), "decommodified" population, students and educated professionals; and wealthy families who make up a considerable percentage. Furthermore, the working class of the region (the "East" and "Southeast" of Turkey) remains distant from most mass activities.

However, such a comparison between the New Social Movements of "post-industrial" Western societies and the "New Movement" of the nationally destroyed Kurdish "tribal" (or primitive) society can be based on a minor aspect of both phenomena - namely common rhetoric and activities that orientate towards the human race as a whole. Nevertheless, such similarities, particularly with regard to a re-acquisition of the integrity of a genuine human essence, embrace generalisable features: they offer cures for the destructive, vulgar-pitiless rationalism of capitalism and the ills of post-Soviet socialism.

Both White and Ergil point to similar boundaries of the class base of the PKK. While the latter states that "for the first time a Kurdish movement comes from below" (Ergil, 1995, p. 103), the former draws attention to the PKK's prohibition against the "upper" social strata: "Despite occasionally aligning itself with so-called 'patriotic' tribal chieftains, the PKK never permits élite layers entry into its leadership" (White, 2000, p. 155). Further, White seeks Öcalan's view on the PKK's specific "*class* politics" in the course of personal communication in 1992, in which he found Öcalan "more explicit".

> AÖ: The role of poor peasants, the workers, the intellectuals, *everybody who has got the will to develop*, could shape our policy. We are not only a class movement. You should call our movement a humanitarian movement – not a class movement, but a movement for the freedom of the human being. So, you can't understand the movement by looking at the PKK only through the spectacles of class struggle [italics added]. (White, 2000, p. 153).

Even if a similar social base was proposed for the PKK in its *Manifesto* (1978, pp. 152-161), as being composed of "urban petty bourgeoisie, peasantry, proletariat, intellectuals and youth", Öcalan was to declare that "The war on behalf of borders and classes has come to an end" (*Serxwebun*, February, 2000, p. 13). The questionnaire in my "illegal" field work was not designed to survey the social base of the Party, but still the answers (Table 1) give a considerable clue about the composition of the grassroots activists, with its unusually high proportion of university and high school graduates.

A total of 184 respondents consisted of 44 persons who had only primary school education or less, 25 secondary school, 50 high school and 65 university. The percentage of activists who had graduated from either high schools or universities went up to 65.5 %. And these activists were active to the degree that they dared to fill in the "illegal" questionnaire. It may be concluded that while the social components of the "PKK movement" are rather "middle" and "low" segments in the Kurdish social structure (that is, the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie, and the "category of the population consisting of people outside the labour market or in a peripheral position to it (such as unemployed workers, students, housewives, retired persons, etc.)" (Offe, 1985, p. 832)], the actors of the movement are "patriotic intellectuals" – those who have got "the will to develop". In fact, the movement originated in a group of university students – mostly from the Faculty of Political Science at the University of Ankara (Chapter 3) – whose members still dominate the leadership structure. The same is true of the "Congress" (KADEK) that was declared following the annulment of the PKK in its eighth ordinary congress. This does not refute the fact that the "trunk cadre" body of the Organisation consolidated itself in the 1990s as the "bureaucratic staff" relying upon Ocalan's charisma.

One of the most peculiar outcomes of the specific mode of incorporation of Kurdistan by the young Turkish Republic has been the "unique" condition of the working class. Rather than the colonisation of a *named* country and a *named* nation as an ordinary colony, the situation of the "Turkish Kurds" has involved the incorporation of a "land" (the East and Southeast) and a "population" ("mountain Turks" or the recently invented "Turks of Kurdish origin") into Turkey. Accordingly, while a *Kurdish* collaborator "sovereign class" (Besikci, 1990, pp. 83, 84) does not exist at all in

Anatolian Kurdistan, the working class of the Kurdish region is a relatively *privileged class* given the economic circumstances and standards of welfare in the territory. It is a privilege to obtain employment in the state monopolies and the other state institutions – the actual structure of the so-called capitalist economy of the region (Tas, 1985) – that are protected and controlled by military measures in strict collaboration with the secret intelligence services, considering the massive unemployed population. The executive political authority of Turkey has given rise to this unique phenomenon, while insuring that pre-feudal institutions remain alive and active.

Institutionalisation of "Bureaucratic Staff"

A striking aspect of the movement is the contradiction between the charismatic and indisputable "national leader"[1] and the trunk-cadre structure. As the party grew, the leader increased his emphasis on *individual extrication* from the damage to the human being's spiritual structure throughout class societies – the millennial "muddy footprints" of the "Civilisation Satan" – while subordinating the party to individuals' spiritual reconstruction within the party. However, the militants in the peripheral bodies of the party persisted in operating the conventional structure of a socialist organisation by providing and maintaining the basis for the party to be *sanctified* (Chapter 6). As a result, the party's regional and local executors institutionalised themselves as the "bureaucratic staff" of Öcalan's "charismatic authority" following the prompt organisational massification of the early 1990s. That is, the "roitinised" charisma of *Apo* has now been *indisputable* for the "institutionalised" bureaucratic-administrative staff of the Organisation.

More strikingly, Ocalan has, in the final analysis, gotten along with this bureaucratic apparatus despite his menacing and abusive critique of it.

Endeavours towards the Re-acquisition of Great Human Naturalness

In response to a related question during an interview with the Turkish Professor of History Yalcin Küçük, Abdullah Öcalan gave a prompt reply: "If I thought that I would be leaving the PKK as a calamity to the people, I would prefer to take it to the grave with me" (Küçük, 1993, p. 296). In addition, he diagnoses vulgar materialism (if it is to be translated to NSM' language: vulgar-pitiless Rationalism) as the most general cause of the collapse of Eastern Block Socialism and convincingly asserts that Russia wielded *socialism* in order to develop its own form of *capitalism* (Öcalan, 1992, pp. 292-355)

and that socialism was a tactical means to achieve Russian capitalism and nationalism (Küçük, 1993, p. 290). In the course of the interview undertaken by the current author for the purpose of this study, Öcalan gives interesting clues regarding the genuine nature of his initiative when he explicitly says that the words Kurds and Kurdistan "*were only key words*" to "open the door" (Chapter 4). In one of his most recent speeches (December 1997) he is pointing in the same direction, but in simpler language.

I focus intensely on pure and distinguished human types. It may even be said that the summary of my life is in nourishing the tendency from *pure* towards *distinguished*, and from *distinguished* towards *distinguished human beings*. From my point of view, a pure human being is the most distinguished human being. I search for the distinguished in order to find pure human beings. But not the pure human of earliest civilisation. That would be too utopian. I keep asking: How will a human type of our era be formed? There are humanist ideologies; what is human and what is the thing that is humane? In this sense, *national liberation is only a means of my struggle.* ... [italics added] (*Serxwebun*, December, 1997, p. 20).

In another interview, he tells the Turkish politician Dogu Perinçek: "In point of fact, the most important reason for intensifying this war is to create humans who may love and deserve to be loved" (Perinçek, 1996, p. 33) while defining the movement as a "*purification movement*" or "*the movement of great human naturalness*" (Özcan, A.K., 1999).

All definitions of the Party by its "Leadership" are conceptualised in non-national terms – as discussed in Chapter 4. In relation to the source of the pandemic and perpetual ills of politics, Öcalan seems to respond to Graham Wallas' conclusion, in which Wallas finds the cause of the "unsatisfactory position" of the theory of politics to be in the division between its theory and practice, which are held in *separate hands*. While Leslie Stevenson suggests that Plato skirts around the question of "how men ought to live" (Stevenson, 1974, pp. 29, 30), a great deal of the philosophy in Öcalan's talks, some of which are gathered in three books (Öcalan, 1995b; 1996; 1999a), is concerned with the very same question. Öcalan claims: "Our revolution and the history of the PKK is an arduous attempt to respond to the question of *"how men ought to live"*.[2] He explains why he had to perform as philosopher, politician and military man at the same time.

The school of philosophy is an extremely difficult school. In various eras, these schools could hardly emerge over centuries, and their pupils at the outset were only taught philosophy. They did not have the chance to be involved in politics or war. ... Alexander the Great was influenced by Aristotle. This is an indirect influence nevertheless. He implemented this philosophy in the military sphere. But Aristotle is on one side, Alexander on another. The philosopher in one sphere, and the executors [of politics] are far distant. But in our case, it has to be all in one; I must be both philosopher and politician, and also military genius. Why? It is because, the special war [*özel savas*[3]] does not allow you to have any opportunity to do otherwise. (*Serxwebun*, February 1997, p. 12).

By and large, all this contemplation and philosophising have been reduced to the mere parroting of the concepts of the "new man" and the "new way of life" by the "trunk cadre" of the Party at the end of the 1990s. This was probably the main point of departure for Ocalan's instruction from Imralli prison to convert the Organisation from a "party" (PKK) to a "congress" (KADEK), which was adopted with no opposition[4] at the recent (April 2002) ordinary party congress. Whether or not this will deconstruct the consolidated bureaucratic structure is a question for the future.

Coexisting Mutation and Insistent Consistency

The most recent stance of the PKK on the Kurdish "cause" – as articulated by Öcalan from the Imralli prison in Turkey – has not been articulated in universal terms. In fact, the mutation that the PKK underwent within half a year (examined in chapter four) is phenomenal. The "strategic target" of the Party has been altered from the "*Turkish colonialism*" of Turkey as a whole to the "*oligarchic structure*" of the dominant "clique" in the Republic (Öcalan, 2000, pp. 13, 14). Rather than eliminating Turkish rule in Kurdistan, the incorporation of the PKK into the *common State* of a "Democratic Republic" in the "common fatherland" has become the principal objective of the party programme. The "national liberation" of Kurds undertaken at the inception has been converted into the "democratic solution of the Kurdish question" in loyalty to the territorial integrity of Turkey. The phrase "*democratic liberation*" superseded "national liberation" throughout the programme which was adopted by the seventh congress, concluded in mid-January 2000.

The Party dispensed with all customary *national* objectives to the extent that the Presidency Council member Nizamettin Tas was to emphasise that the PKK's programme was less radical than the "Democratisation Programme" of TÜSIAD[5] (live tele-interview by Medya TV on 10. 12. 2000). The leadership of the party justifies the abandonment of the objectives associated with "national liberation", arguing that the "national task" has been accomplished. The phenomenal diversion of the programme from its aims and the justification of this diversion denote that the "national task" or "national liberation" situated in the back of the PKK leadership's minds was actually an affirmation of Kurdish ethno-cultural identity.

Unlike the attitude towards national goals, the party has maintained its socialist ideology and aspirations. The metamorphosed programme of the Party has continued to envisage, not an autonomous State of Kurdistan, but a greater federation of the peoples of the region – the "Democratic Union of the Middle East".

b. General Conclusion

When contemplating the social history of mankind, despite many violent, magnificent, influential and historically diverting revolutions, it seems impossible to evade the fact of a persistent and prevalent *"consistency"*.

From the early stages of civilisation onwards, I am convinced that books have never been sufficient in following evolutionary and revolutionary *changes*, which have structured both the technological and societal body of humanity. Despite these changes, "Three Worlds" have coexisted as an inevitable outcome of class societies:

the world of rulers,
the world of sustenance pursuers and
the world of science.

The world of rulers is a world where well-organised, institutionalised bodies control the weaponry, economy and wealth, and where there are no restrictions on the inhabitants' consumption of the material, moral and scientific values produced by others. The world of sustenance pursuers is the *second* wherein the masses, the workers in commodity and

service production, have the *"chance of achieving freedom of survival"* and have some "privileged" constituents who become capable of *observing* what has been done to them. In Nietzsche's terms this is the world of the *herd*. The world of science, the *third*, is the one in which all the producers of scientific values of both natural and social studies live in a way unique to them – but essentially in a way of life which resembles that of the "inhabitants" of the world of the rulers. These second and third worlds may, in a sense, be assessed as *one* because both they themselves and their products are ruled and controlled by the *first* world.

However, despite the sameness in their subservient position, it is more accurate to classify the world of scientists as a "grey" world in between the other two, as they bear a close resemblance to the population of the ruling world.

Now, what would be the most general and most accurate interpretation of the PKK as it stands in the light of this study's overall explorations?

It has been concluded that, *firstly*, the Kurdish question is not a national and/or colonial question in the same way experienced in the rest of the world. The combined phenomena of Kurdish ethnic existence and the way in which Anatolian Kurdistan was re-appropriated by Turkey did not constitute an adequate base for the colonisation of a "proto-nation" and thus of an anti-colonialist national liberation struggle. That is, the "new" Turkish State had not "matured" enough to be an imperial-colonialist power and colonise "her" Kurdistan, nor had the Kurds of Anatolia reached the stage of proto-nation in order to form an effective anti-colonial nationalism. *Secondly*, the destruction of the most basic elements of the human spiritual structure in the "person" of Kurdishness – as the result of the fusion of Turkey's unique policy about "her" Kurdish dominions and population based on denial-repression (*inkar-tenkil*) and the millennial "intrinsic" property of the pre-feudal Kurds (tribe and treason) – have provided an ideational resource which has featured in the local and universal specificities of the PKK.

Thirdly, the PKK organised the first "semi-*national*" Kurdish opposition, which embodied the de-tribalisation of the "nationalisation" process. But the PKK itself is not a national organisation in the modern sense of nation and nationalism even if its initial programme was a replication of the national liberationist form. The emergence, development and evolution of the PKK's ideological and programmatic nature (Chapter 4), and the reality of the demographic map of Turkey's Kurdish population has by no means given rise to a state-building nationalism. It would therefore not be a coherent

explanation to define the PKK-led "rebellion" as a "Kurdish nationalist movement" in its literal sociological sense. *Finally*, the successes which engendered the factual ascent of the PKK among other organisations lie in the end-results of the philosophy and intensity of the cadre education in conjunction with a vitalised sense of organisation-individual linkage. Further, the organisational shrinkage of the PKK began to occur when the spirit of the re-humanisation initiative began to be transformed into the *premature appetite* of the bureaucratic staff under Öcalan's charismatic authority to partake in the joy of the prestigious feelings that power gives.

The conduct of the study required that I be cautious about the extent to which the Party has carried out the Leadership's *re-humanisation* initiative within the party structure, for the initiative related to my hypothesis, which pointed at the non-national inner dynamics of the movement. While concentrating on the most decisive internal dynamic of Kurdish collective action under the PKK, I simultaneously endeavoured to raise the question of whether the movement presents any concrete clues towards structuring a pattern of *emancipatory power*, not just for Kurds and neighbouring societies of the Middle-East, but for the whole of humanity. I aimed to assess whether the PKK's initiative presents a step towards breaking a ring in the chain of the Ruling World and closing the gap between the other two *ruled* Worlds. This was because I found that the "Leadership" of the party, Öcalan, arduously tries to undo the damage and degeneration which humankind has undergone throughout class societies in the person of the "debased" Kurdish personality in Anatolian Kurdistan "where humanity itself faded away in its most solid form". Accordingly, Öcalan has kept defining the "PKK Movement" in his inculcation talks over twenty years within the framework of universalistic and/or humanistic aspirations, to the extent that he names his party the "Humanisation Movement". Nevertheless, these claims might have been – either totally or partly – a vehicle of Kurdish "nationalism" peculiar to its manner of "nationalisation". Further, this philosophical approach might be treated or perceived as mere rhetoric, at least by the considerable number of "*party officials*" who may be the embryo of a future "novel" local branch of the omnipotent Ruling World. I have striven to devote my diligence to retaining a fair balance of scepticism during the study as an inalienable principle of scientific thinking, in order not to disturb the integrity of science, the complete academic integrity.

Deluding others and, more potently, self-delusion have almost been an instinctual part of human nature in this world of "three worlds". Therefore, I have been

in pursuit of practical and quantitative measures in order to reach more objective deductions, rather than intuitive conclusions of "intellectual taste", as Weber stresses.

Within this frame of reference, I have concluded that the manner of the PKK's organisational performance lies behind the revitalisation of Anatolian Kurds. And the *newness* in this organisational performance is associated with the Party's philosophy of cadre education devoted to the re-acquisition of *human naturalness as a social being*, which has itself determined the Organisation's success and failure in operating Kurdish collective action. However, the question of whether this "newness" contributes towards structuring a pattern of *emancipatory power* for the "two worlds" of the *ruled* (the workers of commodity and service production and the producers of scientific values in both social and natural disciplines) – whose inhabitants are *equally* alien to their products – remains unanswered. This study did not set out to answer that question, but merely to raise it.

Notes

[1] Abdullah Öcalan is generally named "National leader" (*Ulusal Önder*) by his non-party supporters instead of "Party Leadership" (*Party Oonderligi*).

[2] In a way, Raschke introduces a similar conception of the agenda of New Social Movements. C. Offe conveys that "way of life" or "mode of life" is a substantive concept which was invented for *the new paradigm* of West European politics by Raschke (Offe, 1985, p. 825).

[3] The term "special war" in the terminology of the PKK denotes Turkey's particular way of executing its war against the Kurdish struggle, which rests on manipulation and "psychological warfare".

[4] This, in a sense, reminds one of Mao's "unchallenged" re-election as "Chairman" of the Communist Party of China at the Ninth Party Congress in 1969, following which the elimination of entrepreneur intelligentsia, including Mao Zedong himself, was finalised in his presence.

[5] TÜSIAD is the largest businessmen's association of Turkey and is known as *Patronlar Kulubu* (The Club of Bosses)

Tables

Total Respondents 184	Age Groups				Education Level				Marital Status				Sex	
	-20	20-29	30-40	+40	Pri.	Sec.	Hi.sc.	Uni.	Mar	Sing	Wid..	Sep.	M	F
Metropolitan (Ank.+Icel+Izm)	04	29	32	28	27	15	16	35	56	31	03	03	78	15
Native region (Diyarbakir)	13	28	32	18	17	10	34	30	56	32	01	02	68	23
Total	17	57	64	46	44	25	50	65	112	63	04	05	146	38

Table 1: Enumeration of the respondents

The Question No: 16	Education level	Administrator			Member + Sympathiser			Sub Total	Total	
		Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.		Yes %	No %
Is the PKK, a national liberation party for the Kurds?	Univ. & High Sc.	07	08	-	69	28	03	115	76 % 66	36 % 31.3
	Secondary Primary & less	14	06	02	39	07	01	69	53 % 76.8	13 % 18.8
Total		21	14	02	108	35	04	184	129 % 70.1	49 %26.6

Table 2:

The Question No: 31	Education level	Administrator			Member + Sympathiser			Sub Total	Total	
		Yes	No	No Ans.	Yes	No	No Ans.		Yes %	No %
Is the PKK a nationalist party?	Univ. & High Sc.	-	15	-	03	96	01	115	03 % 2.6	111 % 96.5
	Secondary Primary & less	02	18	02	01	45	01	69	03 % 4.3	63 % 91.3
Total		02	33	02	04	141	02	184	06 %3.2	174 % 94.5

Table 3:

The Question No:17	Education level	Administrator			Member + Sympathiser			Other	Sub Total		
		Nationalist	Socialist	social&national emancipationist	Nationalist	Socialist	social&national emancipationist		N %	S %	NS %
What quality of the PKK comes first for you?	Univ. & High Sc.	-	05	10	02	17	80	01	02 % 1.7	22 % 19	90 % 78
	Secondary Primary & less	01	05	16	01	10	34	02	02 % 3	15 % 21	50 % 72.4
Total		01	10	26	03	27	114	03	04 % 2.1	37 % 20	140 % 76

Table 4:

The question No: 19	Education level	Kurds	Peoples of Anatolia	Peoples of Middle-east	Other	Sub total
Who does the PKK, you believe, struggle for?	Univ. & High Sc.	18 % 15.6	18 % 16.6	65 % 56.5	14 % 12.1	115
	Secondary Primary & less	16 % 23.1	12 % 17.3	35 % 50.7	06 % 8.6	69
Total		34 % 18.4	30 % 16.3	100 % 54.3	20 % 10.8	184

Table: 5

Question No: 20	Education level	Turkey	Turkey & USA	Turkey & Europe	Turkey, USA & Europe	Conquerors of Kurdistan	Against all	Sub total
Which power /powers of these do you think that the PKK fights against?	Univ. & High Sc.	12 % 10.4	06 % 5.2	-	47 % 40.8	08 % 6.9	42 % 36.5	115
	Secondary Primary & less	12 % 17.3	09 % 13.0	-	24 % 34.7	08 % 11.5	16 %23.1	69
Total		24 %13.0	15 % 8.1	-	71 % 38.5	16 % 8.6	58 %31.5	184

Table: 6

Table 7:

The Question No: 28	Education level	Diyarbakir			Metropolitan towns			Sub Total (yes) %	Sub total
		Yes	No	Sub total no answer	Yes	No	Average age of awareness (Yes)		
Dou you remember when you first became aware of your nationality?	Univ. & High Sc.	53	9	06	38	09	15.47	91 %79	115
	Secondary Primary & less	26	01	02	31	09	18.58	57 %82.6	69
Total		79	10	08	69			148 % 80.4	184
Average age of awareness		15.6			16.86				

Table 8:

The Question No: 29	Education level	Diyarbakir			Metropolitan towns				Sub total	Total (yes) %
		Yes	No	Not belong	Yes	No	Not belong	No ans		
Do you remember when you first realised that you belong to a tribe	Univ. & High Sc.	14	32	18	14	26	07	04	115	28 %24.3
	Secondary Primary & less	06	18	03	11	21	08	02	69	21 %30.4
Total		20	50	21	25		15	06	184	49 %26.6
Average age of awareness		10.8			13.4					

The question No: 26	Education level	Administrator		Member + Sympathiser			Total Yes %	Total No %	(Yes)
		Yes	No	Yes	No	N. ans			The dominant cause given among the many various answers: **The lack of cadre education**
Do you think that the PKK fell into decline in last few years	Univ. & High Sc	2	13	14	85	01	16	98 %85	
	Secondary Primary & less	2	20	01	46	-	03	66 %95	
Total %		04 % 2.1	33 %18	15 % 8	131 % 71	01	19 % 10	164 %89	

Table 9:

Question No 24	Education level	Leader %	Ideology %	Lifestyle %	Discipline %	Armed struggle	Other %	Sub total
What is the most fundamental cause of	Univ. & High Sc.	35+21 56 % 48.6	21 % 18.2	05 % 4.3	12 % 10.4	09 % 7.8	12 % 10.4	115 & 62.5
the PKK's success	Secondary Primary & less	19+18 37 % 53.6	15 % 21.7	03 % 4.3	07 % 10.1	05 % 7.2	02 % 2.8	69 % 37.5
Total %		93 %50.5	36 %19.5	08 %4.3	19 %10.3	14 %7.6	14 %7.6	184 % 100

Table: 10

The Question No: 11	Through a friend %	Through an activist %	Through the leader %	Through observations %	Through Publications %	Total
How did you first become sympathetic to the PKK	17 % 9.2	23 % 12.5	45 % 24.4	70 % 38. 04	29 % 15.7	184 %100

Table: 11

The question No: 33	The growth of the PKK	The decline of the PKK	The faults of the Europe branch	Other	No answer	Total
What was the actual cause which urged USA to hand Ocalan over to Turkey	148 % 80.4	01 % 0.5	16 % 8.6	16 % 8.6	03 % 1.6	184 %100

Table: 12

The question No: 34	Continue to grow	Continue to decline	Survive	Revive	Other	No answer	Total
How do you see the future of the PKK after deprivation of its leader, Ocalan	146 % 79.3	01 & 0.5	17 % 9.2	14 % 7.6	04 % 2.1	02	184 %100

Table: 13

313

The question No: 32	Education level	Yes	No	No ans.	If yes; in respect of — National demands	Organisational structure	Leadership	Fighting for freedom	Other	Sub total
Are there similarities between the PKK and	Univ. & High Sc.	46 % 40	67 % 58	02	21 % 45.6	-	04 %8.6	18 % 39.1	04	115
carriers of preceding Kurdish insurgencies	Secondary Primary & less	30 % 43	32 % 46	07	10 % 33.3	01	02 % 6.6	17 % 56.6	-	69
Total %		76 %41	99 %53	09	31 %40	01	06 %7.8	36 % 47.3	04	184

Table: 14

The question No: 15	Solving Kurdish question	Preserving humane values	Success in reaching the goal	Continuity of the struggle (Determination)	Struggle for socialism	Free man & society	Other	Total
What is your main expectation of the PKK	63 % 34.2	11 % 6.0	46 % 25	25 %13.5	05 % 2.7	03 % 1.6	31 % 16.8	184

Table: 15

The question No: 21	National liberation	In socialist terms	In Humane terms	Democratic Republic	United & independent Kurdistan	Independent & socialist Kurdistan	Equality & fraternity of peoples	Other / Total
How would you briefly define the ultimate end of the PKK ?	54 % 29.3	15 % 8.1	21 % 11.4	11 % 6.0	22 % 11.9	08 % 4.3	30 % 16.3	23 % 12.5 / 184

Table: 16

The question No: 22	Freedom, democracy, peace	Democratic republic	Renewal, continuity of struggle	Contemporary socialism	Approach to woman	Collective presidency	Life-style	Other / Total
What is the most innovative feature of the PKK ?	21 % 11.4	16 % 8.7	49 % 26.6	06 % 3.2	08 % 4.3	04 % 2.1	14 % 7.6	66 % 36 / 184

Table: 17

The question No:27	In national terms	In humane terms	In socialist terms	In socialist-nationalist terms	In terms of lifestyle	Freedom lovers movement	Other / Total
In as few words as possible, how would you define the PKK	33 % 18	29 % 15.7	24 % 13.0	24 % 13.0	04 % 2.1	07 % 3.8	63 % 34.2 / 184

Table: 18

Apendix 1

<center>

Please do not answer the questions before reading the following instructions

</center>

1– The questions I constructed below are for proposed field research of my doctorate study in political sociology (in the University of Kent at Canterbury, UK) on the subject of "Democratisation and Ethnicity in Turkey"

2– These questions that you are going to attempt to answer **are not** for the purpose of examining your intellectual ability but of reaching the most accurate empirical data in the research. Consequently, the answer that express yourself most is the answer that the research look for. For example, an answer such as "I don't know" or "I don't understand" will also be a valuable data for the research.

3– The questions or your answers are not for a survey aiming propaganda or political activity but a scientific inquiry into the phenomenon in order to explore, analyse and identify as it occurs or exists. The matter, here, is not writing something either against or for the Party but discovering the most reliable reality of the phenomenon. In addition, the most accurate answers will eventually, I think, be beneficial to the Party.

4– When I constructed the questionnaire, I strove to refrain from asking confidential information.. You may consider some questions as attempt at invasion of privacy. However, it is not necessary to answer such questions.

5– The information in your answers **will not be used against** either an individual or an institution. I will use it **for reaching some scientific conclusions** which may contribute to resolution of a social problem.

Consequently, the most accurate answers and information you will give without "damaging your childish innocence" will be the most significant empirical contribution to the research.

Many thanks with regards.

<div align="right">

Ali Kemal Özcan
Canterbury – 1999

</div>

Questionnaire

The Province/District ....

1– Age: ....
2– Place of Birth: ....
3– Sex: M [ ] F [ ]
4– Marital status: Single[ ] Married[ ] Widow[ ] Divorced [ ] Separated[ ]
5– Education: None[ ] Primary[ ] Secondary[ ] High[ ] University[ ] Post-grad[ ]
6– Occupation: ....
7– Monthly net income: ....
8– Nationality: ....
9– Live here since: ....

***

10– What was it first that drew your attention and made you interested in the PKK?
....
....

11– How did you first become sympathetic to the Party? (you may tick two) Through:
a friend[ ] an activist of the Party[ ] sympathy for its leader Apo[ ] observations[ ] reading its
publications[ ] an experience(write below)[ ] Other[ ] specify: ....
....
....

12– What year did you begin to work for the Party? ....
13– As briefly as possible, how would you express the reason – or principally significant
reasons (material or spiritual) – that keep you working for the PKK?
....
....
....

14– What is – or how do you define – your relationship to the Party?
Administrator [ ] Member [ ] fighter[ ] activist[ ] sympathiser[ ] None [ ]
....
....
....

15– What is your main expectation of the PKK?
....
....
....
....

16– Is the PKK, in your opinion, a national liberation party for the Kurds? Yes[ ] No[ ]
Other[ ] specify: ....
....

17– What quality of the PKK comes first for you? Nationalist[ ] Socialist[ ] Fighting
for both national and social emancipation[ ] Other[ ] specify: ....
....
....

18– In the organisation, is there a goal or value that you would sacrifice yourself for?
Yes[ ] No[ ]   If *yes*; what? ....
....
....

19– Who does the party, you believe, struggle for? (**tick the most relevant one**)
Kurds[ ] Peoples of Anatolia[ ] Peoples of Middle-East[ ] Other [ ] specify: ....
....

20– Which power/powers of the followings that you think the Party fights against?
Turkey[ ] USA[ ] Turkey and USA[ ] Turkey and Europe[ ] Turkey, USA and Europe[ ]
Conquerors of Kurdistan (Turkey, Iran, Iraq)[ ] Other[ ] specify: ....
....

21– How would you briefly define the ultimate end that the PKK struggles for?
....
....

22– What is the most innovative feature of the Party for you?
....
....
....

23– How do you consider the woman participation in the PKK?   Less than expected[ ]
Normal[ ]   More than expected[ ] If your answer is positive or negative,   please specify:
....
....

24 – What is the most functional cause of the PKK's success? (**Tick *one only* please**)   Lider [
]   Ideology [ ]   A new spiritual formation of the activists [ ]   The lifestyle of the activists[ ]
Organisational discipline[ ]   Other [ ]   Specify: ....
....
....

25– What has the Party changed so far in the Kurdish society?
....
....
– Or, it could not changed?
....
....

26– Do you think that the PKK fell into a decline in terms of its either guerrilla activity or
capability of mass mobilisation in recent years?   Yes [ ] since ...199   No [ ]
If yes, what is the salient cause? ....
....
....

27– In as few words as possible, how would you define the PKK?
....
....
....

***

28– Do you remember when you first became aware of your nationality? No[ ]   Yes[ ] in year 19..... How? ....
....

29– Do you remember when you first realised that you belong to a tribe?* No[ ] Yes[ ] in year 19...... How? ....
....

30– How effective do tribal relations have influence in the organisational structure of the PKK?   Very[ ] Little[ ] Very little[ ] None[ ].
– If not *very*; what is the main source of internal problems of the Party? ....
....

31– Is the PKK a nationalist party? Yes[ ]   No[ ]   If *yes* or *no*; Why? ....
....

32– Are there similarities between the Party and the carriers of preceding Kurdish insurgencies?   Yes [ ] No [ ]   If *yes*; is it in respect of:
national demands[ ] organisational structure[ ] leadership[ ] cadre or guerrilla recruitment[ ]
fighting for freedom[ ] Other[ ] specify: ....
....
....

33– What was the actual cause which urged USA to hand Ocalan over to Turkey?
The growth of the Party to the extent that USA cannot connive at any more[ ]
The calculable decline of the Party to the extent that it prompt USA to act[ ]
Faults and the weakness of the Europe branch of the Party[ ]   Other [ ] specify: ....
....
....

34– How do you see the future of the Party after deprivation of its leader, Öcalan? It will:
continue to be on the decline[ ] continue to grow[ ] survive[ ] revive[ ] Other[ ] Specify:
....
....

35– Any thing else you expected me to ask you and wish to answer?
....
....
....
....
....
....

Thank you for your valuable contribution to the research.

Ali Kemal Özcan
Canterbury, 1999

----

* I assume that every Kurd belong to a tribe.

Apendix 2

The Basic Constitutional Schema of the PKK:

```
                    ┌─────────────────────┐
                    │   Party Congress    │
                    └─────────────────────┘
                         ┌──────────┐
                         │ General  │
                         │Secretary │
                         └──────────┘
   ┌──────────────────────┐        ┌──────────────────────┐
   │  Central Committee   │        │ Central Disciplinary │
   │                      │        │      Committee       │
   └──────────────────────┘        └──────────────────────┘

        ┌──────────────────────────────────────┐
        │   Party Provincial Organisations     │
        └──────────────────────────────────────┘
              ┌──────────────────────┐
              │   Province Congress  │
              └──────────────────────┘
           ┌──────────────────────────┐
           │   Province Co-ordinator  │
           └──────────────────────────┘
   ┌──────────────────────┐    ┌──────────────────────────────┐
   │  Province Committee  │    │ Province Disciplinary Committee│
   └──────────────────────┘    └──────────────────────────────┘

        ┌──────────────────────────────────────┐
        │    Party Regional Organisations      │
        └──────────────────────────────────────┘
              ┌──────────────────────┐
              │   Region Congress    │
              └──────────────────────┘
           ┌──────────────────────────┐
           │   Region Co-ordinator    │
           └──────────────────────────┘
           ┌──────────────────────────┐
           │    Region Committee      │
           └──────────────────────────┘
        ┌──────────────────────────────────────┐
        │     Party Local Organisations        │
        └──────────────────────────────────────┘
              ┌──────────────────────┐
              │    Local Congress    │
              └──────────────────────┘
           ┌──────────────────────────┐
           │    Local Co-ordinator    │
           └──────────────────────────┘
           ┌──────────────────────────┐
           │     Local Committee      │
           └──────────────────────────┘
  ┌────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
  │ Party Cells (Consisting of least three party members)│
  └────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Apendix 3

The List of Self-immolations[1]

	Date	Name	Sex	Place	Outcome
1-	09. 10. 1998	M. Halit Oral	M	Maras	Died
2-	18. 10. 1998	Murat Kaya	M	Bartin	Seriously injured
3-	19. 10. 1998	Mehmet Gül	M	Amasya	Seriously injured
4-	20. 10. 1998	Ali Aydin	M	Bartin	Died
5-	20. 10. 1998	Ismet Inanc	M	Yozgat	Injured
6-	20. 10. 1998.	Meral Kasoturacak	F	Canakkale	Seriously injured
7-	22. 10. 1998	Aynur Artan	F	Midyat	Died
8-	22. 10. 1998.	Bülent Bayram	M	Midyat	Died
9-	22. 10. 1998	Ferhat Karatas	M	Diyarbakir	Seriously injured
10-	22. 10. 1998	Mehmet Bagriyanik	M	Elbistan	Seriously injured
11-	22. 10. 1998	Selamet Mentes	F	Midyat	Died
12-	22. 10. 1998	Seyri Ipek	M	Sakarya	Seriously injured
13-	23. 10. 1998	Cennet Günes	F	Antep	Seriously injured
14-	24. 10. 1998	Aysel Ceylan	F	Usak	Injured
15-	24. 10. 1998	Müslüm Muhammed	M	Antep	Seriously injured
16-	24. 10. 1998	Samet Okay	M	Konya	Injured
17-	27. 10. 1998	Hüsnü Cobanoglu	M	Erzurum	Seriously injured
18-	27. 10. 1998	Kenan Karahasanoglu	M	Erzurum	Seriously injured
19-	27. 10. 1998	Mirza Sevimli	M	Erzurum	Died
20-	01. 11. 1998	Berzan Öztürk	M	Stuttgart-Stammheim	Died
21-	13. 11. 1998	Mehmet Aydin	M	Canakkale	Died
22-	14. 11. 1998	Erdal Ceken	M	Midyat	Seriously injured
23-	14. 11. 1998	Hanifi Kuzu	M	Siirt	Seriously injured
24-	14. 11. 1998	Idris Basaran	M	Ceyhan	Seriously injured
25-	14. 11. 1998	Ismail Berkay	M	Adiyaman	Seriously injured
26-	14. 11. 1998	Ismet Akay	M	Adiyaman	Seriously injured
27-	15. 11. 1998	Abbas Sertkaya	M	Ümraniye	Seriously injured

28-	15. 11. 1998	Azime Inan	F	Batman	Seriously injured
29-	15. 11. 1998	Mehmet Karahan	M	Batman	Seriously injured
30-	15. 11. 1998	Muhiyettin Sevici	M	Diyarbakir	Seriously injured
31-	15. 11. 1998	Reyhan Lezgin	F	Batman	Seriously injured
32-	16. 11. 1998	Ahmet Yildirim	M	*Moscow-Kremlin*	Died
33-	16. 11. 1998	Remzi Akkus	M	*Moscow-Kremlin*	Died
34-	16. 11. 1998	Zeyni Arat	M	Antep	Seriously injured
35-	17. 11. 1998	Adnan Karatas	M	Mardin	Seriously injured
36-	17. 11. 1998	Hatice Falay (56)	F	*Istanbul*	Died
37-	17. 11. 1998	Kadri Ilhan	M	Siirt	Died
38-	17. 11. 1998	Mustafa Sahin	M	Stuttgart-Stammheim	Seriously injured
39-	18. 11. 1998	Cengiz Kaya	M	Agri	Seriously injured
40-	18. 11. 1998	Zülküf Yilmaz	M	*Rome*	Injured
41-	19. 11. 1998	Fethi Abdullah	M	Malatya	Seriously injured
42-	19. 11. 1998	Mehmet Turgay	M	Konya	Seriously injured
43-	19. 11. 1998	Murat Dursun	M	*Diyarbakir*	Injured
44-	19. 11. 1998	Osman Tint	M	Malatya	Seriously injured
45-	19. 11. 1998	Ramazan Adibelli	M	Konya	Seriously injured
46-	19. 11. 1998	Zeynettin Atar	M	Diyarbakir	Injured
47-	20. 11. 1998	Sahap Dogan	M	Sakarya	Seriously injured
48-	25. 11. 1998	Süleyman Gültekin	M	Trabzon	Seriously injured
49-	26. 11. 1998	Nuri Acar	M	Ordu	Seriously injured
50-	27. 11. 1998	Zehra (11 year old)	F	*Iran*	Seriously injured
51-	28. 11. 1998	Cemil Özalap	M	*Diyarbakir-Dagkapi*	Died
52-	05. 12. 1998	Hasan Taskin	M	*Düsseldorf*	Seriously injured
53-	24. 12. 1998	Mihittin Isik	M	*Antep-Demokrasi*	Seriously injured
54-	05. 01. 1999	Ramazan Atabas	M	Siirt	Seriously injured
55-	15. 02. 1999	Nurhak Polat	M	Ümraniye	Seriously injured
56-	15. 02. 1999	Serhat ...	M	*Athens*	Seriously injured
57-	15. 02. 1999	Yahya Figen	M	Ümraniye	Seriously injured
58-	16. 02. 1999	Arzu Demirat	F	Batman	Seriously injured
59-	16. 02. 1999	Bayram Koymaz	M	Nazilli	Seriously injured
60-	16. 02. 1999	Bülent Akcan	M	Erzurum	Seriously injured
61-	16. 02. 1999	Bülent Akcan	M	Erzurum	Injured

62-	16. 02. 1999	Fatma Saka	F	Stuttgart-Hecrenhiem	Seriously injured
63-	16. 02. 1999	Kahraman Denli	M	*Diyarbakir-Dagkapi*	Died
64-	16. 02. 1999	Mazlum Öncel	M	Diyarbakir	Died
65-	16. 02. 1999	Necla Coskun	F	*London*	Seriously injured
66-	17. 02. 1999	Ahmet ...	M	Diyarbakir	Injured
67-	17. 02. 1999	Cigdem Duman	F	Elbistan	Injured
68-	17. 02. 1999	Serpil Polat	F	Sakarya	Died
69-	18. 02. 1999	Ahmet Tepe	M	Adiyaman	Seriously injured
70-	18. 02. 1999	Hüseyin Cig	M	Maras	Seriously injured
71-	18. 02. 1999	Murat Cosar	M	Elbistan	Seriously injured
72-	18. 02. 1999	Veysel Cinar	M	Ümraniye	Injured
73-	19. 02. 1999	Bengin Kurt	F	Ceyhan	Injured
74-	23. 02. 1999	Piro Ecer	M	*Mersin-Cay Mahallesi*	Injured
75-	26. 02. 1999	Pakize Karadeniz	F	Usak	Seriously injured

---

[i] The places where the incidents of self-immolation occurred were overwhelmingly prisons, and the names written under the "Place" column are the names of prisons in Turkey – except the three self-immolations in Stuttgart, Germany. The non-prison locations are italicized.

Bibliography

Akzin, B., (1964), *State and Nation*, Hutchinson University Library, London.

Alavi, H., (1973), Peasant Classes and Primordial Loyalties, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, I/1, 23-62.

Anderson, B., (1983), *Imagined Communities; Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, London.

Arfa, H., (1969), *The Kurds, an Historical and Political Study*, New York-Toronto.

Asan, A., (1991), *Seyh Sait Ayaklanmasi*, Istanbul.

Atatürk, M.K., (1938), *Nutuk* (Speech), Devlet Basimevi, Istanbul.

Atatürk, M.K., (1952), *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, Vol.1, Ankara.

Atiyas, B. N., (1997), The Kurdish Conflict in Turkey: Issues, Parties and Prospects; *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 28(4), pp. 439-452.

Avcioglu, D., (1977a), *Milli Kurtulis Tarihi*, Birinci Kitap (1), Tekin, Istanbul.

Avcioglu, D., (1977b), *Milli Kurtulis Tarihi*, Ikinci Kitap (2), Tekin, Istanbul.

Aydin, A., (1992), *Kürtler, PKK ve A. Öcalan*, (Kurds, PKK and A. Öcalan), Kiyap, Ankara.

Aydogmus, S., (1990), Kuzey Kürdistan'da Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapinin Niteligi Üzerine, (On the Quality of Socio-economic Structure in Northern Kurdistan), Stockholm.

Balli, R., (1991), *Kürt Dosyasi*, (The Kurdish File), Cem, Istanbul.

Barkey, J. H., (1993), Turkey's Kurdish Dilemma, *Survival*, Vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 51-70.

Barkey, J. H., (1996), Turkey, Islamic Politics and the Kurdish Question, *World Policy Journal*, Vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 43-52.

Barkey, H. and G.E. Fuller, (1997), Turkey's Kurdish Question and Missed Opportunities, *Middle East Journal*, vol. 51, no. 1.

Barkey, H.J. and G.E. Fuller, (1998), *Turkey's Kurdish Question*, Lowman & Littlefield, Lanham-Boulder-New York-Oxford.

Baskaya, F., (1991), *Paradigmanin Iflasi; Resmi Ideolojinin Elestirisine Giris*, Doz, Istanbul.

Bedr Khan, E. S., (1927), *The Case of Kurdistan Against Turkey*, Philadelphia

Berkant, I., (1998), Medyanin Apo Sinavi, *Radikal*, April 7.

Besikci, I., (1969a), *Dogu'da Degisim ve Yapisal Sorunlar; Göçebe Alikan Asireti*, Dogan, Ankara.

Besikçi, I., (1969b, reprinted in 1992), 2nd Vol.., *Dogu Anadolu'nun Düzeni: Sosyo-ekonomik ve etnik temeller*, Yurt, Ankara.

Besikçi, I., (1990), *Devletlerarasi Sömürge Kürdistan*, (Kurdistan; An Interstate Colony), Rewsen, Bonn.

Besikçi, I., (1991), *Selected Writings: Kurdistan and Turkish Colonialism*, KIC, London.

Besikçi, I., (1992), *PKK Üzerine Düsünceler: Özgürlügün Bedeli*, Melsa, Istanbul.

Bedlisi, Seref Han, (1998 [Initial Edition in Persian in 1597]), *Serefname; Kürd Tarihi*, Deng, Istanbul.

Bilgiseven, A. K., (1991), *Türkiye'ye Yönelik Etnik Iddialara Dayali Bölücü Faaliyetler*, Istanbul.

Birand, M.A., (1992), *Apo ve PKK*, Milliyet, Istanbul.

Bois, Th., Kurds, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol. VI, pp. 470-477.

Bottomore, T., (1978), *Austro-Marxism*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Brown, J., (1995), The Turkish Imbroglio: Its Kurds, *The Anals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 541, pp. 116-129.

Buchanan, A. E. (1982), *Marx and Justice*, London.

Burkay, K., (1989), *TKSP Yurt Disi Konferans Tezleri*, TKSP Yayinlari.

Burns, J.M., (1978), *Leadership*, Harper & Row, New York.

Chaliand, G. (1980-revised and updated ed. 1993), ed. *A People Without A Country; The Kurds and Kurdistan.* Zed Books, London

Chaliand, G., (1994), *The Kurdish Tragedy*, Zed Books, London

Conger A.J., and R.N. Kanungo, (1988), *Charismatic Leadership*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Fransisco-London.

Coskun, B., (2002), Kuvai Milliye, *Hurriyet*, Turkish Daily Newspaper, March 6.

Criss, NB., The nature of PKK terrorism, *Studies in conflict and terrorism*, 1995, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 17-38

Dagli F., (1994), *Birakuji; Kürtlerin Ic Savasi* (Fratricide; The Kurds' Internal War), Belge, Istanbul.

Dawis, H. B., (1978), Towrds A Marxist Theory of Nationalism, Monthly Review Press, New York and London.

Dersimi, N., (1997), *Kürdistan Tarihinde Dersim*, Doz, Istanbul.

Descartes, R., (1988), *Selected Philosophical Writings*, Cambridge University Press.

Destroying Ethnic Identity, The Kurds of Turkey, *A Helsinki Watch Report*, (1998), New York.

Deutsch, K. W., (1962), *Nationalism and Social Communication*, Cambridge, Mass.

Diani, M., (1992), The Concept of Social Movement, *Sociological Review*, Vol. 40, pp. 1-25.

Dodd, C. H., (1980), *Nations in the Ottoman Empire: A Case Study in Devolution*, University of Hull, Hull.

Dönmezer, S., (1989), *Türkiye'de Vatandas Esitligi*, Istanbul.

Driver, G. R., (1923), The name Kurd and Its Philological Connexions, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, X (July, 1923), 393-403.

Duncan, P.J.S., (2000), *Russian Messianism; Third Rome, Revolution, Communism and After*, Routledge, London and Newyork.

Duran, R., (1995), Freedom of Expression and the Press: Turkish National Press Coverage of Kurdish Issue, ed. by Medico International and Kurdistan Human Rights Project, *A Democratic Future for the Kurds of Turkey*, Frankfurt-London.

Durkheim, E., (1964), *The Rules of Sociological Method*, The Free Press-Macmillan, New York.

Durkheim, E., (1974), *Sociology and Philosophy*, The Free Press-Macmillan, New York.

Edmonds, C. J., (1957), *Kurds, Turks and Arabs; Travel and Research in North-eastern Iraq, 1919-1925*, Oxford University Press, London

Ergil, D., (1995), *Dogu Sorunu; Teshisler ve Tespitler; Özel Arastirma Raporu*, (The Question of East; Diagnoses and Interpretations; Special Research Report), Stratejik Arastirmalar Dizisi: 1, TOBB.

Ergin, S. (2000), Kürtçe TV'ye Vize, *Hürriyet*, 28 November.

Frey, F.W., (1965), *The Turkish Political Elite*, The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge-Massachusetss.

Fuller, G. E. (1993), The Fate of the Kurds, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 108-121.

Füredi, F., (1986), *The Soviet Union Demystified*, Junius, London.

Gabriel, Y., (1997), Meeting God: When Organisational Members Come Face to Face with the Supreme Leader, *Human Relations*, April, Vol. 50, No. 4, pp. 315-342.

Gellner, E., (1964), *Thought and Change*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.

Gellner, E., (1983), *Nations and Nationalism*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford

Giritli, I., (1989), *Kürt Türklerinin Gerçegi*, (The Truth of Kurdish Turks), Yeni Forum Yayinlari.

Goldhorpe, J. H., (2000), *On Sociology; Numbers, Narratives, and the Integration of Research and Theory*, Oxford University Press.

Gökalp, Z., (1992 [originally published in 1909]), *Kürt Asiretleri Üzerine Sosyolojik Tetkikler*, (Sociological Studies of Kurdish Tribes), Sosyal Yayinlari, Istanbul.

Göktas, H., (1991), *Kürtler: Isyan-Tenkil*, Alan, Istanbul.

Göktas, H., (1991), *Kürtler-II: Mehabad'dan 12 Eylül'e*, Alan, Istanbul.

Gramsci, A., (1971), *Selections from the prison notebooks*, Trans. and ed. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith, International Publishers, New York.

Gramsci, A., (1977), *Selections from Political Writings*, Lawrence and Wishart, London.

Gunter, M. M., (1990), *The Kurds in Turkey*, Westview Press, Boulder-San Francisco-Oxford

Gunter, M.M., (1998), Interview; Abdullah Öcalan: "We Are Fighting Turks Everywhere", *Middle East Quarterly*, pp. 79-85, June.

Habermas, J., (1991), In R. Blackburn ed., *After the Fall: The Failure of Communism and the Future of Socialism*, London.

Hah, C., Jeffery Martin, Towards a Synthesis of Conflict and Integration Theories of Nationalism, *World Politics*, Vol. XXVII, No. 3, (April 1975), pp. 361-386.

Hansen, H. H., (1961), *The Kurdish Woman's Life*, Copenhagen.

Hasretyan, M.A., (1995), *Türkiye'de Kürt Sorunu* (The Kurdish Question in Turkey); *(1918-1940)*, Vol. I, Berlin.

Hasretyan, M. A., (1996), *Türkiye'de Kürt Sorunu* (The Kurdish Question in Turkey); *(1945-1990)*, Vol. II, Berlin.

Hastings, A., (1997), *The Construction of Nationhood*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York.

Hedges, C. (1992), Kurds in Turkey Seem to Be Nearing Full-Scale Revolt, *New York Times*, 30 March.

Hobsbawm, E.J., (1959), *Primitive Rebels; Studies in Arabic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Hobsbawm, E.J., (1990). *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780; Program, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

House, R.J. and J.M. Howell, (1992), Personality and Charismatic Leadership, *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 81-108.

Howard, M., (1999), A Kurdish Adventure, *Odyssey*, March/April, pp. 37-40.

Howell, J.M., (1988), Two Faces of Charisma: Socialised or personalised Leadership in Organisations, in Conger A.J., and R.N. Kanungo, Ed. *Charismatic Leadership*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Fansisco-London.

Hroch, M., (1985), Social *Precondition of the National Revival in Europe* -Cambridge

Izady, M. R., (1992), *A Concise Handbook: The Kurds*, Washington.

Ikibine Dogru, (1989) Turkish weekly magazine, issues 42,43.

Imset, G. I., (1992), *The PKK: A Report on Separatist Violence in Turkey*, Turkish Daily News Publications, Ankara.

Imset, G. I., (1993), There will be Hundreds of PKK Attacks, *Turkish Daily News*, 12 June.

Jermier, J.M., (1993), Introduction–Charismatic Leadership: Neo-Weberian Perspectives, *Leadership Quarterly*, 4, pp. 217-223.

Jones, H.B., (2001), Magic, meaning and leadership: Weber's model and the empirical literature, *Human Relations*, Jun 2001, Vol. 54, No. 6, pp. 753-772.

Jwaideh, W., (1999 [1960, *The Kurdish Nationalist Movement: Its Origins and Development*, as Unpublished PhD Thesis, Syracuse University]), *Kürt Milliyetciliginin Taruhi*, Iletisim, Istanbul.

Kadioglu, A., (1996), The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of Official Identity, *Middle Eastern Studies*, no. 32, 177-93.

Kartal, R., (1995), Democracy Party, ed. by Medico International and Kurdistan Human Rights Project, *A Democratic Future for the Kurds of Turkey*, Frankfurt-London.

Kedourie, E., (1966), Nationalism, Hutchinson of London, London.

Keyder, C., (1989), *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Siniflar*, Iletisim, Istanbul.

Kinnane, D., (1964), *The Kurds and Kurdistan*, Oxford University Press, London-New York.

Kinross, L., (1964), *Atatürk; The Rebirth of a Nation*, Wiedenfeld and Nicolson, London

Kirisçi, K. and G. M. Winrow, (1997), *The Kurdish Question and Turkey; An Example of Trans-state Ethnic Conflict*, Frank Cass, London.

Kirzioglu, M.F., (1995), *Kürtler'in Türklügü*, Hamle, Ankara.

Kirzioglu, M.F., (1984), *Dagistan, Aras, Dicle, Altay Ve Türkistan Türk Boylarindan Kürtler*, Ankara.

Koenigsberg, R. A., (1997), *The Psychoanalysis of Racism, Revolution and Nationalism*, The library of Social science, New York.

Kohen, S, (1992), Turkey is Determined to Quell PKK Rebellion, *Middle East Times*, September, pp. 4-14.

Komal, (1975, reprinted in 1992), 4th ed., *Koçgiri Halk Hareketi*, Komal, Ankara.

Kumar, K., (1995), *From Post-industrial to Post-modern Society*.

Kutlay, N., (1990), *Ittihat-Teraki ve Kürtler* (Union-Progress and Kurds), Vejin, Stockholm.

Kutschera, C., (1994), Mad Dreams of Independence; The Kurds of Turkey and the PKK, *Middle East Report*, July-August, pp. 12-15.

Küçük. Y., (1993), *Dirilisin Öyküsü*, (The Story of Revival), Wesanên Serxwenûn, Köln.

Kürdistan Kurtulus Partisi (Rizgari), (1988), *Siyasi Program*, KKP Basin/Yayin Merkezi Yayinlari.

Kürdistan Öncü Isçi Partisi (PPKK) Programi, (1984), PPKK Yayinlari.

Kürdistan Ulusal Kurtulus Problemi ve Cözüm Yolu; Kürdistan Ulusal Kurtulus Cephesi Program Taslagi [Draft Programme of the Kurdistan National Liberation Front], (1982) Wesanen Serxwebun.

Lawrence, D. A. (2000), A Shaky De Facto Kurdistan, *Middle East Report*, 215. Summer.

Lee, R.L.M., (19920, Two Faces of Charisma: Structure, System, Praxix in Islam and Hinduism, Journal for the Theiry of Social Behaviour, March, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 41-62.

Lenin, V. I., (1968), *Selected Works*, Progress Publisher, Moscow

Lewis, B., (1968), *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, London-Oxford-New York.

Luke, S.H. (1936), *The Making of Modern Turkey; From Byzantium to Angora*, Macmillan, London.

Luxemburg, R., (1976), *The National Question; Selected Writings*, Ed. H.B Davis, Monthly Review Press, New York and London.

Majeed, K. Y., (1976), *Under Underdevelopment; A regional Case Study of the Kurdish Area in Turkey*, Helsinki.

Marcus, A., (1994), With the Kurdish Guerrillas, *Dissent*, Vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 178-181.

Marx, K., (1971), *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Lawrence & Wishart, London

Marx and Engels, (1962), *Selected Works*, Vol. II., Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow.

Marx and Engels, (1975), *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking.

Marx and Engels, (1976), *On Colonialism*, Lawrence & Wishart, London

Marx and Engels, (1983), Correspondence 1852-55, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Moscow.

McCarthy, J.D. and Zald, M.N., (1977), Resource Mobilisation and Social Movements: A Partial Theory, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 82, pp. 1212-41.

McCharty, J., (1997), *The Ottoman Turks, An Introductory History to 1923*, Longman, London and New York.

McCrone, D., (1998), *The sociology of Nationalism*, Routledge , London

McDowall, D., (1996), *A Modern History of the Kurds*, I.B. Tauris, London-New York.

Millingen, F., (1870), *Wild Life among the Koords*, London.

Minorsky, V., Kurds, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol. VI, pp. 447-464.

Melucci, A., (1989), *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Societies*, Hutchinson Radius, London.

Morgan, L. H., (1919), *Ancient Society*, Charles H. Kerr & Company, Chicago.

Mortan, K., (1998), *Sirnak Ili Gelistirme Stratejisi* (Development Strategy of Sirnak Province), TOOB, Ankara.

Mumcu, U., (1993) *Kürt Dosyasi* (The Kurdish File), Tekin Yayinevi, Istanbul.

Muir, J., (1993), A Truce that Could Bring Peace, *Middle East International*, 447, 2 April, pp. 10,11.

Nairn, T., (1981), The *Break-up of Britain; Crisis and Neo-nationalism*, 2nd Ed., Verso, London

Nikitin, B., (1986), [Original Ed. in French 1956], *Kürtler*, (The Kurds; Sociological and Historical Study), Özgürlük Yolu Yayinlari.

Nimni, E., (1991), *Marxism and National Question*, Pluto Press, London

Nokta (1993), Sayisiz Batili ile Görustüm, 4-10 April, pp. 40-42.

Offe, C., (1985), New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics, *Social Research*, Vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 817-868.

O'Ballance, E., (1996), *The Kurdish Struggle 1920-94*.

Olson, R., (1989), *The Emergence of Kurdish Nationalism and the Sheikh Said Rebellion, 1880,1925*, University of Texas Press, Austin,

Olson, R., (1996), Editor. *The Kurdish Nationalist Movements in the 1990s: Its Impact on Turkey and the Middle East*, Kentucky.

Olson, R., (1998), *The Kurdish Question and Turkish-Iranian Relations From World War I to 1998*, Mazda Publisher, California.

Öcalan, A., (1978 – 4th Ed. 1992), *Kürdistan Devriminin Yolu* (The Path of the Revolution of Kurdistan) *(Manifesto)*, Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1986a – 2nd Ed. 1991), *Seçme Yazilar*, (Selected Writings) Vol. I, Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1986b), *Seçme Yazilar*, (Selected Writings) Vol. II, Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln

Öcalan, A., (1991), *Kürdistan'da Halk Savasi ve Gerilla*, Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A. (1992), *Politik Rapor* (Political Report Submitted to IV. National Congress of the PKK), Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1992a), *Sosyalizm ve Devrim Sorunlari*, (Questions of Socialism and Revolution), Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1992b), *Secme Yazilar* (Selected Writings), Vol. V., Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1993a), *3. Kongre Konusmalari* (The Speeches of Third Congress), Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1993b), *Kürdistan'da Isbirlkcilik-Ihanet ve Devrimci Direnis* (Collaboration-Treason and Revolutionary Resistance in Kudistan), Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, (1994a), *Halk Savasinda Militan Kisilik* (Militant Personality in People's War), Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A.,(1994b), *PKK de Gelisme Sorunlari ve Görevlerimiz* (The Questions of Progression in the PKK and Our Duties), Wesanen Serxwebun.

Öcalan, A., (1995a), *Dirilis Tamamlandi Sira Kurtulusta*, (Selected Interviews), Vol. II, Wesanen Serxwebun.

Öcalan, A., (1995b), *Nasil Yaiamali?*, (How Man Ought to Live?), Vol. I, Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1995c), *Secme Yazilar*, (Selected Writings) Vol. VI, Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1996a), *Nasil Yasamali?*, (How Man Ought to Live?) Vol. II, Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1996b), *Devrimin Dili ve Eylemi* (The Language and Action of the Revolution), Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1997), *Tarih Günümüzde Gizli ve Biz Tarihin Baslangicinda Gizliyiz* (The History Is Concealed in Our Time and We Are in the Commencement of History), Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Öcalan, A., (1998), *Sosyalizmde Israr Insan Olmakta Isrardir* (Insistence on Socialism is Insistence on Becoming Human Being), Wesanen Serxwebun.

Öcalan, A. (1999a), *Kürt Aski; Nasil Yasamali?*, (Kurdish Love; How Man Ought to Live?), Vol. III.

Öcalan, A. (1999b), *Savunmalarim* (My Defences); Wesanen Serxwebun.

Öcalan, A. (1999c), *Kürt Sorununa Demokratik Cözüm Manifestosu* (The Manifesto of Democratic Solution to Kurdish Question); Savunmalar I-II-III, Wesanen Serxwebun.

Öcalan, A., (1999d), *Declaration on the Democratic Solution of the Kurdish Question*, Mesopotamian Publishers, London.

Öcalan, A., (2000), *Dönüşüm Süreci Üzerine Perspektifler; Politik Rapor* (Perspectives on the Transformation Process; Political Report), Wesanen Serxwebun.

Öcalan, A., (2001a), *Sumer Rahip Devletinden Halk Cumhuruyetine Dogru*, Vol. I, Mem Yayinlari, Istanbul.

Öcalan, A., (2001b), *Sumer Rahip Devletinden Halk Cumhuruyetine Dogru*, Vol. II, Mem Yayinlari, Istanbul.

Örgütlenme Üzerine (About Organisation), (1983), Wesanên Serxwebûn, Köln.

Özcan, A. K., (1999), *Humanisation Movement*, Instituya Kurdi, Berlin.

Özcan, N. A., (1999), *PKK (Kürdistan Isçi Partisi); Tarihi, Ideolojisi ve Yöntemi*, ASAM, Ankara.

Özdag, U., (1999), *Türkiye Kuzey Irak ve PKK; Bir Gayri Nizami Savasin Anatomisi*, ASAM, Ankara.

Özkan, T., (2000), *Operasyon*, DK, Istanbul.

Pakulski, J., (1991), *Social Movements*, Longman Cheshire.

Panebianco, A., (1988), *Political Parties: Organisation and Power*, Cambridge University Press.

Pedahzur, A. and A. Brichta, (2002), The Institutionalisation of *Extreme Right-wing* Charismatic Parties: A Paradox?, *Party Politics*, January, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 31-50.

Perinbayanagam, (1971), The Dialectics of Charisma, *The Sociological Quarterly*, Summer, Vol. 12, pp. 387-402.

Perincek, D., (1990), *Abdullah Öcalan ile Görüsme* (Interview with Abdullah Öcalan), Kaynak, Istanbul

PKK Kurulus Bildirisi (Foundation Declaration of the PKK), (1978, 3rd Ed. 1984), Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Plato, *Letter VII*, 325d-326b; L. A. Post's trans.

Plato, (1871- reedited in 1992), *The Republic*, 473d, p. 203, B. Jowett's trans., Quality Paper Back Club, New York

Polat, E., (1999), *Mavidir Avasinin Sulari*, Wesanen Serxwebun.

Politik Rapor, (1982), Wesanen Serxwebun, Köln.

Popper, M., (2000), The Development of Charismatic Leaders, *Political psychology*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 726-744.

Programme, (1995), (*PKK; Program ve Tüzügü*), Wesanen Serxwebun.

Programme, (1999), (*PKK; Program ve Tüzügü*), Wesanen Serxwebun.

Radu, M., (2001), The rise and fall of the PKK, *Orbis*, winter, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 47-63

Ramsaur, E.E., (1957), *The Young Turks; Prelude to the Revolution of 1908*, Russell & Russell, New York.

Rich, J. C., (1836), *Narrative of a Residence in Koordistan*, 2 Volumes, London.

Riya Azadi, Monthly periodical of Central Committee of the PSKT (Socialist Party of Turkish Kurdistan)

Rodinson, (1968), *Israel and the Arabs*,

Robins, P., (1993) The Overlord State: Turkish Policy and the Kurdish Issue, *International Affairs*, Vol.. 69, no. 4, pp. 657-676.

Rugman, J. (1998), World's Most Wanted, *The Guardian*, November 25.

Runciman, W. G. (1969), *Social Science and Political Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Second Ed.

Rustow, A. D., (1959), The Army and the Founding of the Turkish Republic, *World Politics*, 11:4 (July), pp. 513-52

Saeidi, A., (2001), Charismatic Political authority and populist economics in post-revolutionary Iran, *The World Quarterly*, April, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 219-236.

Sanasarian, E., (1995), Ayatollah Khomeini and the Institutionalisation of Charismatic Rule in Iran, 1979-1989, *Journal of Developing Societies*, December, Vol. XI, No. 2, pp. 189-205.

Selek, S., (1987), *Anadolu Ihtilali*, Kastas Istanbul

Serxwebun, (1997), Monthly periodical of the Central Committee of the PKK.

Seton-Watson, H., (1977), *Nations and States*, Methuen-London

Shamir, B., R.J. House and M.B. Arthur, (1993), The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-concept Based Theory, *Organization Science*, Vol. 4, pp. 577-594.

Shaw, J.S. and E.K. Shaw, (1977), *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Vol. II, Cambridge University Press.

Spencer, M.E., (1973), What is Charisma?, *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 24, pp. 341-354.

Soane, E. B., (1926), *To Mesopotamia and Kurdistan in Disguise*, Sec. Ed., London.

Simsir, B., (1991), *Ingiliz belgeleriyle Türkiye'de "Kürt Sorunu" (1924-1938)*, TTK Basimevi, Ankara.

Smith, A. D., (1983), 2nd ed., *Theories of Nationalism*, London

Smith, A. D, (1991), *National Identity*, University of Nevada Press, London

Stalin, J., (1936), *Marxism and National an Colonial Question*, Lawrence & Wishart, London.

Stevenson, L., (1974), *Seven Theories of Human Nature*.

Szyliowicz, J. A., (1969), The Mulkiye and Elite Recruitment in Turkey, Middle East Studies Associating meeting paper.

Talmon, J.L., (1960), *Political Messianism; The Romantic Phase*, Secker & Warburg, London.

Tilly, C., (1978), *From Mobilisation to Revolution*, Random House - New York.

Touraine, A., (1981), *The Voice and the Eye - An Analysis of Social Movements*.

Touraine, A., (1988), *Return of the Actor*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Touraine, A., (1995), *Critique of Modernity*, Blackwell, Cambridge, USA-Oxford, UK.

Traynor, I. and M. Walker, (1998), Bonn Urged to Seek Trial of Kurd Rebel, *The Guardian*, 25 November.

Turner, H. R. and L. M., Killian, (1957- 2nd Ed. 1972), *Collective Behavior*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Tuncay, M., (1990), *Türkiye Tarihi 4; Cagdas Türkiye 1908-1980*, Cem, Istanbul.

Türkdogan, O., (1998), *Güneydogu Kimligi*, Alfa, stanbul.

Uçar, C., (2000), Carmihin Civileri, *Özgür Politika* [Free Politics – daily paper], 15 February - 03 March.

Vali, A., (1996), Nationalism and Kurdish Historical Writing, *New Perspectives on Turkey*, Spring 1996, No. 14.

Vali, A., (1998), The Kurds and Their "Others": Fragmented Identity and Fragmented Politics, *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, Vol. XVIII, No. 2.

van Bruinessen, M., (1988), Between Guerrilla War and Political Murder: The Workers' Party of Kurdistan, *Middle East Report*, 153, July-August, pp. 40-46.

van Bruinessen, M., (1992), *Agha, Shaikh and State: The Social and Political Structure of Kurdistan*, Zed Books, London.

Vanly, I. Ch., (1971), *Survey of the National Question of Turkish Kurdistan with Historical Background*, Rome.

Wallas, G. (1910), *Human Nature in Politics*.

Weber, M., (1947), *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation*, The Free Press New York-London.

Weber, (1948), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, Ed. By H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills.

Wegner, P.E., (2000), "A Nightmare on the Brain of Living": Messianic historicity, Alienations, and *Independence Day*, *Rethinking Marxism*, Spring, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 65-86.

Westermann, W. L. (1946), reprinted in 1991, Kurdish Independence and Russian Expansion, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 7o, no. 3, pp. 5o-54.

White, J. P. and Logan, W. S., (1997), *Remaking the Middle East*, Berg, Oxford-New York..

White, J. P., (2000), *Primitive Rebels or Revolutionary Modernizers? The Kurdish National Movement in Turkey*, Zed Books, London-New York.

Wilkinson, P., (1971), *Social Movement*, Pall Mall -London.

Wigram, W. A. and Edgar T. A., (1922), *The Cradle of Mankind*, London.

Woolf, S., (1996), Nationalism in Europe, 1815 to the Present, Ed., Routledge, London and New York.

Yapp, M. (1989), and The Mice Will Play: Kurds Turks and the Golf War, in Hanns Maul and Otto Pick, eds. *The Gulf War*, London.

Yegen, M., (1998), The Turkish State Discourse and the Exclusion of Kurdish Identity, *Turkey: Identity, Democracy, Politics*,(Ed), Frank Cass, London.

Yekitiya Sosyalist, Monthly periodical of YSK (*Yekitiya Sosyalista Kurdistan –* Socialist Unity of Kurdistan)

Yildiz, H., (1989), *Asiretten Ulusalliga Dogru Kürtler* ; *Politik-Felsefe Açisindan Kürt Toplumunun Kritigi*, (The Kurds from Tribe towards Nationality; The Critique of Kurdish Society from the Angle of Political Philosophy), Stockholm.

Yildiz, H., (1992), *Fransiz Belgeleriyle Sevr-Lozan-Musul Üçgeninde Kürdistan*, (Kurdistan in the Triangle of Sevres-Lausanne-Musul, in French Documents), Istanbul.

Yorges, S.L., H.M. Weiss and O.J. Srrickland, (1999), The Effects of Leader Outcomes on Influence, Attributions, and Perceptions of Charisma, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Jun, Vol. 84, No. 3, pp. 428-436.

Yüce, C., (1997), *Dogu'da Yükselen Günes*, Vol. I, Wesanen Serxwebun.