

1  
11 February 1966  
5209 Westwood Drive, N.W.  
Washington 16, D.C.

Dear Mete Bey,

Your letter with comments on my draft was most helpful indeed. Before trying to answer your questions, however, I would like to explain a bit more about the nature of my manuscript. For as you rightly perceived it was written in more categorical fashion than was justifiable on the basis of the evidence available. The final draft will, I trust, reflect more of the uncertainties of the evidence -- though it still may contain more conjecture than would seem appropriate to you. Incidentally, the first draft was written in this fashion in order to crystalize reactions of my readers so that I could better judge the validity of my approach. In general, however, it represents my best judgement of the situation, and the final draft will follow along in somewhat the same vein. As to your disagreements with my interpretations, I am looking forward to the opportunity of discussing these in more detail with you.

Now for your questions: The May Appeal (p. 15) was described in Novichev's rather well researched "Zarozhdenie rabocheho i sotsialisticheskogo dvizhenia v Turtsii," Narody Azii i Afriki, 1964, no. 1, p. 16:

"On 1 May 1909 Vasil Glavinov and other socialists distributed handbills "The May Appeal to All Workers of Turkey" in which was contained the demand to give to all subjects of the Empire active and passive electoral rights, to issue laws on labor and social insurance, to change the law on strikes, etc."

Novichev's source is Dincho Zagrafski, "On the worker movement in Macedonia up to the Balkan War" (title translated from the Serbian) printed in Skopje in 1950. I have not been able to find a copy of Zagrafski's work.

You might also be interested in another passage from Novichev's article, his p. 27:

"The socialists of Macedonia participated in the elections to parliament in 1911, demanding general, equal, direct and secret election rights for all citizens who were 20 years old, without distinction of sex, nationality and religion, freedom of speech, of press, of assembly, of formation of societies, of worker legislation and dismissal from office of irresponsible elements. Analogous demands were advanced in the "May Appeal to All Workers and Employees of Turkey" in 1911. However, during the elections not only was there no unity but struggle took place between the separate socialist organizations which merely helped the enemies of the working class."

More about Manatov: According to the Russian edition of Nutuk, notes to volume 3, Manatov arrived in Ankara on 24 May 1920. I had not seen this before.

Regarding the Salonika socialists, Novichev said, p. 15:

"The disjointedness and particularism of socialist and worker groups were the main obstacles on the path of development of the worker and socialist movement in Turkey. It is enough to say that in Salonika alone there existed 4 independent socialist organizations.

"The two Social Democratic organizations in Salonika united first. A united session was arranged on 2 October 1908. The resolution adopted [here] said that "both groups have merged into one, which sets as its main task to unify the organizations of all the proletariat of the Ottoman Empire on the basis of class struggle into an independent political party and an independent union organization...The group will enter into relations with other socialist groups which exist in the Ottoman Empire for the formation of a unified socialist party."

Novichev's source is: The Bulgarian Workers Party (Communists) in Resolutions and Decisions of the Congresses, Conferences, and Plenums of the

(Published in Sofia, 1947)

Central Committee (title originally in Bulgarian), vol 1 (1891-1918), p. 224.

Novichev goes on to say, p.15:

"The remaining two socialist organizations of Salonika, in one of which were concentrated socialists of Bulgarian nationality and in the other of which were Jews, also merged and formed THE WORKER SOCIALIST FEDERATION. The Federation espoused the following basic principles: 1- Conversion of capitalist property in the means of production into collectives; 2-Conquest of political power by the proletariat; 3-united action of the exploited proletariat of all the world in a struggle against international capitalism; 4- the political and economic organization of the proletariat as the necessary condition for the carrying out of the foregoing principles.

"THE WORKERS SOCIALIST FEDERATION began to publish its organ, the Workers Gazete, in 4 languages -- Bulgarian, Turkish, Jewish (Spanish), and Greek."

Novichev's source for this is Dincho Zagrafski, p. 225.

He adds: "It [that is the WSF] enjoyed great influence among the workers. A great role in the formation of the federation was played by Vasil Glavinov."

"The WSF, fulfilling the decisions of the 15th Congress of the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Party [Congress held 1-3 August 1908] put forth the following minimal demands:

"Concession of the right of free autonomy to the nationalities which comprise the Ottoman Empire and the right to unite in a Balkan federation;

"Concession of the right to general, direct, equal, and secret elections for all elective bodies of the Empire -- parliament, popular national assemblies, district and community councils;

"Abolition of the Senate;

"Concession of autonomy to districts and communities;

"Passage of labor legislation providing broad defense of the interests of workers;

"Full resolution of the agrarian question."

Novichev's source for this is Dino K'osev, Struggle of the Macedonian People for Liberation (title originally in Bulgarian), (Sofia, 1952), p. 171.

I note you use the name "Benaroya." Most Soviet sources -- all those who mention it -- say Benaroy. What sources are you using about him?

Regarding Arif Oruç: You say that Arif Oruç claimed that Suleyman Nuri brought the 14 Temmuz declaration. Suleyman Sami we know left Baku in June 1920, but what do you know of Suleyman Nuri's activities at this time? What are your sources?

On Manatov and Salih Hacıoğlu: Yakin Tarihimiz, p. 281 tells of their contact. I am prepared to believe that Salih had a past leftist experience, but I know of no evidence for this.

About the Nizamname of Aydemir: This document needs to be checked. You may be right in saying it belonged to Manatov's party. If so, this would indicate that the Green Army and Manatov's group had much in common. Though the wording is not identical, many of the ideas are similar.

On the Call to Local Railroad Workers: I quoted directly from Frunze. There is no Turkish source for it that I know of. However, it seems to fit with Ataturk's statements in Nutuk that on December 20, 1920 Oruç's relative Nizameddin and other set out to bribe officers and men in the army not to oppose the partisans, and with Ataturk's statement in TBMM on 8 January 1921 that an appeal was made to Eskişehir workers. You will recall that in TBMM Ataturk did not tell about Nizameddin in 1921, but waited until 1927 to reveal this. He might have considered an appeal to railroad workers an unnecessary detail for a historical treatment.

I believe this merger took place about 1910-1911 as the minutes of the International Socialist Congress in Copenhagen in 1910 lists 4 socialist organizations in Salonika.

About Emek and the THIF: I must have read the date wrong in Novy Vostok. Unfortunately this issue is not easily accessible for me now. Could you tell me where to find the declaration of the THIF parliamentary representatives in early February 1921 announcing the closing of the party. Is this what Ataturk was referring to when he said in an interview in February that those who wanted to form a Communist party had recently seen the light and closed their organization?

About Şefik Husnu and Sadrettin Celal: I took Sokmensuer's word and Darendelioglu's on their activities -- though Antel was supposed to have gone to Moscow. What does Aydemir say about this?

The word "Seyyarei" is indeed in the microfilm just over the words "Yeni Dunya"

Soviet material (Novyi Vostok) in various places talks of Kurtuluş and Aydinlik as closed by Allied censors. This of course was a convenient allegation and perhaps can not be entirely accepted at face value. Other than this, I have no direct evidence.

You are certainly right that Aydinlik did not mention the Kurdish revolt. I should not have left that impression. I used the phrase "Aydinlik's editors" because I had not received Orak Çekiç at that time and merely assumed the editors of Aydinlik also put out Orak Çekiç. My information came from Soviet sources here.

I agree that the phrase "almost as revolutionary as anything the Communists had in mind" gives a false impression. What I meant to say was merely that Kemal's reforms dealt with many of the areas of social life that the Communists saw in need of reform. Naturally he could not satisfy the real Communists, but I see Ataturk's reform program as pushing the Communists further to the left to always insist on more and faster. It seems to me that at first the Communists themselves were demanding formal, legalistic actions. Do you agree?

Ustungel is a mystery to me. He was evidently a Turkish Communist who served some time in Turkish jails. He was a Stalinist one should judge. He talks of the murder of Communists in prison and the like. Unfortunately I do not have the Turkish text, nor do I know his first name. He seems to have fled to Bulgaria sometime before 1950.

Finally, about the passages from Ataturk in the beginning: I recognize your problem. I hope to include more quotations possibly at the start of each chapter. What I wanted to show was that Ataturk chose his words according to his audience -- this to counter Jaschke's claim in Orient that "never was there a country so closed to Communist propaganda as Turkey." For Jaschke bases his argument heavily on Kemal's statement to Harbord. But surely Ataturk was merely speaking for effect. With more quotes this should perhaps come clearer. In any event, if one reads my work, I think my aim comes clear.

Hoping to hear from you soon,

*George Harris*  
George Harris

TÜRKİYE GÖZETİMİ