

**5** Turkey and  
the Iran War

**7** We don't settle for scraps-  
we claim the country, we  
claim the world

**9** Solidarity with Cuba:  
An ideological marker in  
identifying anti-communism

April 2026

Voice of  
**TKP**   
Monthly international magazine

**2** TKP General Secretary  
Kemal Okuyan:  
All the "things" of the  
world, unite against  
Trump!



# Capitalism must be destroyed



The global dimension of the struggle against one-man rule

## All the “things” of the world, unite against Trump!

Kemal Okuyan - TKP General Secretary



Opposition to U.S. imperialism is once again at the top of the agenda. One could hardly ask for better. Just think: the man governing the country at the top of the imperialist system has become an object of hatred and ridicule. He has few admirers and virtually no respect left. He lashes out in every direction, kills, assassinates heads of state, orchestrates abductions, and threatens countries as if saying, “this is mine.” All of this is, of course, bad and extremely dangerous. Yet he is inconsistent; he wavers, and, as in the case of Iran, ends up humiliated, further weakening the already shaky hegemony of U.S. imperialism.

The other day, a friend of mine said, “Trump will do what communists could not. He will bring down the United States.”

The future of U.S. imperialism is another matter altogether. There are too many factors to consider. Setting aside for the moment the hope that it may collapse sooner rather than later, let us turn back to the global perception of Trump.

For nearly twenty years, “if only

he would go” has been the most widespread political sentiment in this country for Erdoğan, so we are used to it. Still, I could not help being surprised when I recently heard the same wish, this time directed at Trump, from one of this country’s discontented citizens. Clearly, they have stopped expecting anything from Turkey.

Still, a connection can be made. The AKP government, long practiced in hedging its bets, has steered toward the Trump administration both to ease the economic pressure it faces and because it fears Trump may deploy Washington’s leverage recklessly.

Perhaps Washington’s expectations regarding Iran were not met, which for Trump had already turned into NATO’s collective “betrayal,” but on Palestine, Ukraine, the Black Sea, and rearmament, an almost perfect alignment was established with the U.S. administration. As a result, a while ago, we witnessed Trump describing Erdoğan as a “great leader” and Turkey as a “fantastic country.”

Since an early end to the Trump era would weaken the AKP’s position, it is entirely possible to read this “if only he would go” sentiment as the outcome of a calculation meant to kill two birds with one stone.

The CHP (t.n. - main opposition party - social democratic) likewise seems to have written off the Trump era and pinned its hopes on a possible Democratic administration.

This, too, forms part of the background to why Özgür Özel, who has consistently avoided sharp criticism of the United States, has recently become rather “bold” in anti-U.S. rhetoric. For the moment, anti-Americanism is viewed as a tolerable posture by the global representatives of U.S. hegemony: so long as reactions remain centered on the “one-man ruler” Trump, they look on with concealed amusement.

### Let the one-man ruler stand alone!

Trump blusters, but the wind inside the United States is also blowing against him. The major sections of capital that brought Trump and his circle to power have

not yet turned away from him, though their earlier confidence has clearly diminished. Fanatical Trump supporters such as Elon Musk and Peter Thiel, along with the fossil fuel lobby, have not abandoned ship, but they are following developments with concern. Meanwhile, giant corporations such as Microsoft, Apple, Alphabet (Google), LinkedIn, Meta, and Soros have so far shown little eagerness to ingratiate themselves with the U.S. president. They may not openly adopt a political position, but they waste no opportunity to undermine the “one-man ruler.”

One can also gauge the strength of anti-Trump sections of capital by looking at the balance of power in the media: The New York Times, The Washington Post, CNN, MSNBC, The Atlantic, Politico, the BBC, The Guardian, Financial Times, The Independent and Sky News in the UK; Der Spiegel and Die Zeit in Germany; Le Monde and France 24 in France. This is no small force.

On the international front, Trump seems to have drawn Britain, France and Germany closer despite their internal contradictions. Some make light of the European imperialists, but the reality is more complex. Europe remains a vital market for both the United States and China, while the economic potential and political experience of these countries’ capitalist classes must be taken seriously in the sharp conflicts likely to unfold in the near future.

In one respect, these countries are also doing precisely what Trump has long wanted: they are rearming at a frantic pace. Anyone who underestimates Germany’s metal industry, with its vast experience in militarization and its visible turn toward the innovations demanded by a battlefield radically transformed since the Ukraine war, would be seriously mistaken.

The Democratic Party, long burdened by a serious leadership crisis, seems to be drawing encouragement from its anti-Trump allies across the Atlantic while also quietly urging them to hold firm. Among the economic and political reasons why no NATO country has

rushed headlong into aggression against Iran, we should also count the desire to isolate Trump.

It is now possible to say that an undeclared coalition has emerged against Trump, made up of forces no less willing than he is to launch wars, interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, and generate hostility toward everything progressive. Even Russia, one of the few countries that would be uneasy about Trump leaving the White House ahead of schedule, cannot decide how to position him. Lavrov, who has kept Russian diplomacy standing through difficult periods for years, produces a different inconsistency each day when speaking about Trump.

Last October, Lavrov called Trump’s Gaza proposal, aimed at the colonization of Palestine, “the best plan on the table,” while at the same time describing U.S. foreign policy as destabilizing. In December, he identified Trump as the leader who best understood the causes of the war in Ukraine, but by the new year he was calling him “reckless” and “unreliable.”

Despite everything, Putin, who has failed to fully achieve any of the political objectives declared at the start of the “special operation,” knows that in Ukraine a settlement can only be reached with a Trump administration. At the same time, Russians are fully aware, like everyone else, that anti-Trumpism weakens the United States overall. It is therefore entirely understandable that Moscow is no longer as willing as before to rescue an administration threatening its interests in Venezuela, Cuba, or Iran.

Yes, Trump is becoming isolated both domestically and internationally. The anti-imperialist movement is gaining momentum across the world. How much of this is shaped by the undeclared coalition mentioned earlier remains a matter of debate. Yet if one considers that all the networks which for years supported the European Union project from the “left” have suddenly become active, then clearly something is taking place. It is impossible to determine

exactly where funding ends, where an attached left begins, and where “independent” actors start occupying space.

More importantly still, beginning with Palestine, the recent aggression of Israel and the United States has created among many revolutionary formations across different political currents a sense that this is the moment. Even if it is still too early to speak of a full awakening, energy is rapidly building.

Under such conditions, ideological rigor becomes critically important. In Turkey, the obsession with the struggle against one-man rule has produced no result other than the paralysis of emerging social energy. There is no reason to expect a different outcome internationally. The parallels are clearly multiplying.

### **Rejecting the Sultan and the King**

The “No to the King” banners carried in anti-Trump demonstrations in the United States clearly evoke our own slogan, “we do not want a sultan,” both in historical and contemporary terms. Those who imply that Trump’s one-man rule amounts to kingship are also pointing to independence from the United Kingdom and to republican values.

Such labels may seem harmless, but as ideological confusion becomes more pronounced, they bring more harm than benefit. The world is increasingly moving toward an “after all, we are all anti-Trump” fraternity. It is worth thinking carefully about what a fraternity dominated by high-tech monopolies, financial centers, imperialist media outlets, NATO generals, Pentagon hawks, EU elites, and enemies of the people such as Ursula von der Leyen, Zelensky, Starmer, and Macron can offer humanity.

It should not be forgotten that Trump is not simply acting on personal whim, that aggression against Iran has been ongoing for decades, that war plans were prepared long before his arrival, and that countless alternative plans for military intervention in Venezuela were already in place during Democratic administrations.

Trump came to power twice as the representative of one of the diverging tendencies within American monopolies. Rather than trying to avoid alarming the sections of capital that dislike him, he also functioned as a transitional administration, taking the chestnuts out of the fire so long as he carried out the reckless style suddenly required by all of them.

Those who think U.S. imperialism will suddenly collapse as a result of Trump's stupidity and clumsiness understand nothing about the logic of capitalism.

Trump is harming the United States in certain respects, but there is no guarantee that U.S. imperialism will not mobilize the resources needed to compensate for that damage once this period ends. The U.S. economy was already struggling with enormous problems before Trump. He did not cure them, yet neither did the worsening one might expect from such an incompetent administration fully materialize. Moreover, because of interdependence within the imperialist system, it became clear that the problems of an economy as vast as that of the United States spread across the world, especially into economies that had been heavily promoted. Despite all his isolation, Trump also demonstrated that the United States has not lost its capacity to shape the game.

### **Getting rid of Trump**

Under these conditions, the Trump administration may come to an end in two ways, either at its scheduled time or earlier. The first possibility is that the coalition described above turns Trump into a scapegoat, gathers the social

support necessary to restore the United States, NATO, and the European Union despite its deep internal contradictions, and leads humanity toward new disasters that could one day make Trump look mild by comparison.

It is not difficult to foresee that the leading actors of this coalition have not abandoned the strategy of encircling and pressuring Russia, and that unlike Trump, whom they criticize for launching unauthorized wars, they will mobilize the full institutional machinery available to them for new wars and attempt to present them as legitimate. We can also be certain that certain left circles, already moving away from principle in the name of the struggle against one-man rule, will be used by this coalition as little more than a cleaning rag.

The second possibility is that the lawlessness of the Trump administration generates a class-based anti-imperialist accumulation both inside and outside the United States, that the socialist perspective finds suitable ground in many countries, and that revolutionary actors capable of acting on these conditions emerge and grow stronger. In that case, a change of administration in the United States would not coincide with the climate sought by the coalition, and the world imperialist system would be driven into a serious ideological and political crisis.

The "first get rid of Trump" approach should be seen as the executioner of this possibility. If ideological rigor is abandoned, it must be understood that even Iran's resistance, which today excites

many, will contribute nothing to revolutionary accumulation at the international level and may turn into deep disappointment.

In this dark age, holding on to even the smallest sign of beauty and saluting those who emerge as heroes is not only understandable, but in many cases necessary. Anyone who cannot draw hope from every missile that pierces Israel's defense systems and strikes Tel Aviv or Haifa cannot truly be called revolutionary. But being revolutionary also requires vigilance. We cannot allow imperialism to wash its hands through hostility to Trump, especially while such heavy prices are being paid.

Difficult tests await us. Cuba is a test. Our principles and our resilience will be tested. The major upheavals and conflicts in our region, together with the new peace process on the Kurdish issue, are a test. The strategy of "first get rid of Erdoğan," which is increasingly becoming a kind of mass litany, is also a test. The question of the class and ideological character of republicanism in Turkey, is a test as well.

Thanks to Trump, the issue of one-man rule, which has been our reality for more than twenty years, has now moved onto the international stage. We are experienced, and we have learned from it. Will working people become invited guests adding color to the masked ball staged amid the horror created by Trump and those like him, or will they throw their weight behind another world? This is the question that must be answered with courage.





# Turkey and the Iran War

**Cansu Oba,**

*Member of TKP Central Committee*

Turkey is at a crossroads.

On one side of this crossroads lies a reality in which the interests of the working majority are sacrificed for the profits of a small group of monopolies; where extreme wealth and extreme poverty coexist; where absolute exploitation and inequality prevail; where the expansionist ambitions of capital disregard the borders and internal affairs of other countries; where there is full-alignment with imperialism; and perhaps where the neo-Ottoman ambitions of Turkish capital could drive the country toward an existential abyss.

On the other side lies an egalitarian, sovereign, and secular Turkey that can only be built through a transformation of the current social system—in other words, a socialist Turkey.

The Communist Party of Turkey recently issued an important statement emphasizing that this crossroads is not only historical but also immediate and urgent. We begin here because the issue is closely related to the Iran War. To understand this connection, we must take a closer look at the first path above. Within this path, there are propositions

that belong to the same direction but differ slightly through secondary alternatives. While these differences become visible when examining Turkey's position in the Iran War, it is also necessary to question how meaningful they actually are.

Since the beginning of the war, statements made by Turkish officials have contained certain contradictions—or at least differences in tone. This reflects internal conflicts of interest within the government, as well as an ongoing struggle over the post-Erdoğan period, something that has long been observed across many political issues in Turkey. Of course, when it comes to the deepening of exploitation, the drive for profit, plunder, and destruction, these differences amount to little more than nuance. In the case of the Iran War, despite differing justifications, all positions ultimately converge at the same point: a more pro-US, pro-NATO alignment and greater integration into imperialist plans.

A very brief overview of Turkey's statement from the beginning of the Iran war: On the first day, relatively moderate statements were made,

calling for peace and diplomacy. Within hours, however, these were followed by statements condemning Iran's response and placing it on equal footing with US attacks. Thus, a position emerged that increasingly placed greater responsibility for escalating tensions on Iran. As mentioned, due to the dual nature of these statements, Turkey's stance has oscillated between assigning equal responsibility to the US and Iran and shifting the weight more heavily toward Iran.

In the incidents where three missiles were intercepted by NATO air defense systems on the grounds that they had entered Turkish airspace, Turkey adopted a rhetoric that at times escalated tensions—even though Iran denied firing any missiles targeting Turkey. NATO, for its part, did not refrain from making provocative statements aimed at drawing Turkey further into the conflict; even before it was clear where the missiles had originated or where they were headed, Iran was condemned for allegedly targeting a NATO member.

At this stage, Turkey does not appear ready to plunge headlong into

the war. This is, of course, a positive development. However, given that this “cautiousness” is neither principled nor the result of a consistent foreign policy, there is little reason for the working people of Turkey, Iran, or the wider region to feel reassured. Turkey is navigating an extremely chaotic landscape shaped by both internal and external dynamics—a heavily mined terrain. The potential consequences illustrate why it is necessary for ways to part as soon as possible, and why the fate of Turkey and its working people must be separated from that of the Turkish capital.

Let us briefly recall the recent past.

The Iran War began as part of a broader process at a time when what might be called “pax Americana” in the Middle East was gaining momentum and securing ground.

In the months leading up to this development, the global order shaped after the collapse of the Soviet Union—particularly the principle of the inviolability of borders—had already been shaken by the Ukraine War. Meanwhile, attacks in Palestine continued in full view of the world; the most uncompromising elements of the resistance, led by Hamas, were eliminated; the resistance was weakened; and the groundwork was laid for transforming Palestine and Gaza into a dystopian hub of capital, increasingly detached from poor Palestinians under the guise of a “peace framework.”

Even before reaching this point, in Syria, the US, the UK, and Israel—alongside Turkey—supported the rise of jihadist forces to power in order to remove an already weakened government that was seen as an obstacle to Israel’s security and to enable deeper intervention in Syria’s internal affairs. In doing so, even the interests of Kurdish nationalist movements and autonomous regions—long aligned with US imperialism—were disregarded. What Turkey may have conceded in return, particularly regarding the weakening of Kurdish autonomy in Syria (which it strongly opposes), is a subject in itself. Today, Syria is governed not only by forces acting as proxies of imperialism but also by actors whose legitimacy remains deeply contested, thereby

justifying further intervention. At the same time, significant efforts were made to weaken resistance in Lebanon. In addition to direct Israeli attacks, attempts were made to cut off support channels to Hezbollah and isolate it.

After all this, it was widely expected that Iran would be next. But why would this concern Turkey?

Within Turkey’s ruling circles and capitalist class, there is an ongoing debate between more “cautious” and more assertive factions. This debate revolves entirely around interests, profits, and access to new markets. Naturally, it also has implications for how Turkey’s security architecture should be shaped, as these actors seek to protect the positions they have gained. At present, both sides converge on the necessity of acting in full alignment with US imperialism. Even those who argue for a less aggressive foreign policy ultimately agree on the need for deeper integration into the US orbit.

While this situation may indeed give rise to debate, the answer to whether anything beneficial for working people of Turkey can emerge from it is clear: absolutely nothing.

It is not difficult to understand the reasons behind Turkey’s support for the steps that would weaken Iran. Iran is one of the strongest regional competitors Turkey faces. They compete over regional influence—from the Middle East to the Caucasus—and over shaping the positions of Islamist-based organizations such as Hamas. Some interpret the potential elimination of Iran as an opportunity for Turkey to dominate the region. However, this is an illusion.

There are concrete reasons for this. It is unlikely that the US would grant Turkey full regional leadership, especially to a country that occasionally pursued policies in conflict to US interests in the past. Given that the US often prefers to manage its allies through competition—as seen in the Greece–Turkey and Israel–Turkey dynamics—the guiding logic has long been: “who better represents US interests.” At the same time, Turkish bourgeois must be taken into account—an ambitious force with imperial aspirations,

seeking expansion and possessing one of the most advanced militaries, industrial capacities, and arms industries in the region. This makes it a country that the US would not want to fully empower.

For this reason, some argue that factions within Turkey advocating deeper involvement in Iran—similar to Syria—are falling into a trap. They believe that after Iran, Turkey itself could become the next tar get.

While anti-Iran narratives are continuously reinforced ideologically within Turkey—portraying Iran as weak—when US rhetoric escalates toward regime change and occupation, it is not surprising that the government tends to adopt a more restrained tone. This shift reflects concerns that imperialist conflicts could eventually turn against Turkish capital itself. Thus, the limits of the government’s opposition to the escalation of the Iran War are defined entirely by the interests of the Turkish capital, not the people.

There is a certain truth to this perspective. In a time when borders and governments across the region are increasingly blurred, some leading actors within the imperialist system clearly has no interest in seeing Turkey survive as a national entity inherited from the revolutionary era of the early 20th century. Turkish bourgeois is complicit in this, pursuing its own expansionist agenda. It is worth remembering that the faltering peace process in Turkey has often been framed—by both the government and the Kurdish nationalist movement—as a Turkish–Kurdish–Arab alliance aiming to resurrect the Ottoman legacy in the region. Yet if the expansion of a country’s borders can be debated, so too can its contraction. To question Turkey as a political entity is to risk the total fragmentation of the Turkish working class.

For the working people of Turkey the challenge is clear: either they find a way to change this system before things come to a head—or, if an existential crisis does arise, to turn that moment into an opportunity to resist both foreign interference and the so-called “national” actors who uphold this system.

# We don't settle for scraps—we claim the country, we claim the world



## **Savaş Sarı,**

*Member of TKP Central Committee*

Humanity is going through tough times. Exploitation, plunder, war, destruction, and decadence, which grow in intensity and severity with each passing day, have made the world an almost unbearable place, especially for the billions of people who struggle to make a living through their labor. A similar picture is unfolding in Turkey. The imperialist aggression engulfing our region and the destruction it causes are intensifying day by day. Multinational monopolies are ravaging nature with insatiable greed and plundering our country. The system dominated by large monopolies is stripping the working class of its rights one by one, while pushing the conditions of exploitation to an

increasingly extreme level. On one side of this picture lies the irrationality and ruthlessness of this social system. On the other side, however, lies the weakness and disorganization of the working-class movement... We are witnessing first-hand that in a world where socialism and the working-class movement cannot exert influence, barbarism is inevitable.

Of course, people do react to wars, massacres, destruction, the plundering of nature, looting, poverty and hunger, exploitation, and every form of inequality - and they do rise up in resistance from time to time. However, the pent-up anger, the cries of the people, and the scattered

struggles are insufficient to push back or dispel this dark picture. The overall situation in each country and in the world is once again calling the working class to the stage of history. Humanity needs the hope of tomorrow, rooted in the quantitative and qualitative strength of the working class. In order for this, the working class itself must come to recognize its own identity as a class first. It must feel like a class, see who its friends and enemies are, and realize what its interests are. Clearly, this cannot be achieved through workers' economic demands alone, nor through fragmented or isolated struggles. Efforts to resist the individual attacks that the exploitative system imposes on workers do little

to reinforce their recognition of themselves as a class. Confronted with the hardships they endure, workers need a concrete vision that allows them to hold on to life and hope for the future. They seek a compelling objective—one that can unite them as a class and inspire collective action.

Today, the only truly convincing reality for the working class—the only force capable of uniting them as a class—is the demand for systemic change. The understanding that liberation from today's unbearable conditions can be achieved only through a transformation of the system is not merely a truth; it is the sole force capable of bringing workers together as a class.

Aware of this reality, the Communist Party of Turkey (TKP) is striving to unite the working class and organize it around this demand. It took a significant step in this effort on March 15, 2026. At the founding meeting of the Workers' Representatives Council held in İstanbul, TKP brought together hundreds of workers' representatives

from various sectors - including metal, petrochemicals, textiles, food, logistics, warehousing, aviation, shipbuilding, construction, IT, communications, tourism, healthcare, education, office and services - both from the private sector and the public sector, and including retirees. The Workers' Representatives Council is composed of 322 representatives from unions and professional organizations across the aforementioned sectors, solidarity networks operating under the "Patronların Ensesindeyiz" (Breath Down the Bosses' Necks) initiative, ongoing worker resistance movements throughout Turkey, as well as TKP workplace units and committees.

At its founding meeting, the Workers' Representatives Council discussed various resolution proposals concerning the working class's current demands, as well as specific struggle agendas. Each proposal was adopted unanimously by the representatives. The Council also passed resolutions to strengthen solidarity with the people of Cuba and Iran in the face of imperialism's brutal aggression. It was also quite meaningful the presence of

Nikos Tzortzis, International Relations Officer of the All-Workers Militant Front of Greece (PAME), who attended the meeting and saluted the Council on its establishment.

The meeting was characterized by a strong determination and conviction centered on the working class' demand for systemic change, as reflected in both the ongoing discussions and the proposed resolutions. The role of the Workers' Representatives Council—which unites TKP's organized strength and representation within the working class around the demand for systemic change, as well as specific concrete goals—extends beyond deliberation: it aims to build a united, organized force capable of exerting influence within the working class around this demand.

Therefore, in every decision made and every initial step to be taken, expanding the organization of the working class has been defined as the primary task. The decisions adopted by the Workers' Representatives Assembly aim to realize this objective through both their political content and clearly defined, concrete tasks.





# Solidarity with Cuba: An ideological marker in identifying anti-communism

**Aslı Çakal,**

*Member of TKP Party Council*

In recent weeks, a video released by over 500 artists, journalists, scientists, trade unionists, and intellectuals in Turkey to support the “Hands Off Cuba!” petition campaign against the U.S.’s increasingly severe blockade of Cuba has brought a familiar debate to the forefront. Immediately after the video’s release, some liberals who identify as “libertarians” or “leftists” made arrogant remarks on social media, framing this honourable stance by Turkish intellectuals as if it were an issue external to the country.

This liberal reaction, which gives the impression of sensitivity through statements like “With so many problems in Turkey and neighbouring regions, why bring up Cuba?” or “Our people and the peoples of the region come first,” bears the traces of apoliticism at best, and

anti-communism in reality. It is no coincidence that these circles – who one would expect to be familiar with the idea of international solidarity, even within the context of funding from imperialist institutions and demands for a “democracy package” – opt for a self-centered political outlook when it comes to Cuba.

It would be naive to explain this discussion—opened through solidarity with Cuba,—solely by the intellectual shallowness or historical blindness of liberalism. Presenting Cuba—a vibrant example of an alternative to capitalism and an egalitarian society—as something foreign or disconnected from Turkey and its people constitutes, even if subtly, an ideological intervention with an anti-communist agenda.

In Turkey, this ideological intervention is, of course, not limited

to liberal circles alone. The Turkish right, which historically has placed anti-communism at the center of its political identity, periodically reproduces this line through current discourses. Indeed, the leader of a nationalist party, in a statement made within the context of debates regarding the alleged threat to secularism, asserted that Turkey would not “become like the Taliban,” but that it would also not be allowed to “become like Cuba.” This rhetoric serves as overt anti-communist propaganda, as the Turkish right – having lost its historical enemy, the Soviet Union – now frames Cuba as a “threat” and a “regime to be avoided.”

The communists’ response to such rhetoric is clear: For those who portray Cuba as something to be avoided, the real issue is not the reality of Cuba, but the possibility that

the ideas of equality, independence, and public ownership might gain strength in Turkey. Therefore, the discourse constructed around the “threat of Cubanization” is essentially an ideological reflex aimed at suppressing the working people’s quest for alternatives in Turkey.

The U.S. blockade represents an undeniable political, historical, and contemporary reality, regardless of Cuba’s geographical distance from Turkey. In mainstream media, discussions about Cuba often either ignore the blockade and its effects or treat it as a marginal issue. By contrast, liberal circles—although aware of the U.S. sanctions on Cuba—deliberately avoid considering this reality as a decisive factor.

The debate has emerged as an attempt to devalue the pro-Cuban, anti-imperialist, and working class patriotic stances of intellectuals and communists - based on the annoyance that such stances do not contribute to identity politics - which clearly reveals which side these circles take in the class struggle.

### **Ignoring the blockade**

For over sixty years, the Cuban Revolution has faced not only economic but also ideological attacks from imperialism. The anti-communist rhetoric, which shifted in form according to the political climate of the era and the needs of capitalism, defined Cuba during the Cold War not as an independent country, but as an “advanced Soviet outpost on the doorstep of the United States” and a direct “security threat.” The Cuban Missile Crisis (1962), which also closely concerned Turkey, was turned into one of the strongest pillars of this narrative; Cuba’s sovereignty was reduced to a military detail of the bipolar world.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, however, this narrative shifted. Cuba was no longer portrayed as a “threat,” but rather as an “anomaly” - a relic of the past, doomed to collapse. Thus, while the “end of history” thesis was used to declare the inevitability of capitalism, Cuba, with its “faltering” economy, was cited as evidence of this claim.

In recent years, however, the

anti-communist offensive has been centered primarily on poverty, economic crisis, and inefficiency, despite certain formal differences. Criticisms regarding “Cuba’s failure” - which liberal thought, viewing solidarity with Cuba as an external and irrelevant agenda for Turkey, feeds upon - deliberately exclude the U.S. blockade, one of history’s longest and most systematic economic sieges, from the equation. Yet this policy, whose framework was established as early as 1960 with the Mallory Memorandum, is a fundamental political strategy aimed at collapsing the revolution from within by driving the Cuban people into hunger, deprivation, and despair - a strategy that has maintained its continuity despite the succession of a number of U.S. presidents.

The fact that liberals present the crisis - deepened by this planned economic war - as if it were a natural consequence of socialist planning in Cuba has become one of the mechanisms through which anti-communism reproduces and reinforces itself. Social welfare is once again being defined by capitalist consumption standards; the historical achievements of the Cuban Revolution in areas such as healthcare, education, and biotechnology are being systematically obscured.

Under the intensifying conditions of the commercial, financial, and energy blockade, the Cuban state - which is striving to manage a multi-layered and complex crisis - is not backing down from prioritizing social needs and protecting the gains of the revolution. Conversely, the rise of digitalization and social media has provided anti-communism with a new ideological tool. Power outages, food lines, or piles of trash - when detached from their causes and their historical and political context - are circulated as “visual evidence” of the Cuban Revolution’s failure.

Turkish liberals, embellishing this process with arguments such as “the selfishness of human nature,” present the market economy and capitalism as an unalterable fate. This narrative, in which all social gains are portrayed as a temporary necessity, is in fact part of an ideological effort to keep alive

the claim that communism was tried and failed.

A different problematic tendency is also evident within Turkey’s non-revolutionary left. This approach, which embraces Cuba through an apolitical romanticism while passing judgment on ‘how much longer it can endure,’ creates a serious internal inconsistency: it critiques the Cuban state harshly, assigning grades to its international cooperation and trade relations, without understanding the constraints imposed by the U.S. blockade.

### **A foreign policy topic for those interested**

Cuba, as a socialist country standing alone in a capitalist world with limited resources, defies those who try to turn the crises imposed on it into ideological proof, those who render the achievements of socialism invisible, and those who enjoy the result of the blockade as the ground for criticizing the system in Cuba. It is a symbol of ethical values and resistance. Like its social gains, Cuba shares social hardships collectively; today, it is not just any Caribbean island, but a concrete expression that equality, freedom, and justice are possible under any circumstances.

The story of this proud people, which has resisted imperialist encirclement for decades, holds an emotional resonance and even a historical connection with our people’s own struggle for liberation. The Cuban Revolution has left a significant mark on the Turkish socialist movement not only through historical leaders like Fidel Castro and Che Guevara but also through its ways of struggle.

The noise made today by those who ask, “What relevance does Cuba have?” and by those trying to stoke fears of “Cubanization” is in vain. The anti-communism being waged through the prism of Cuba cannot find lasting resonance among either the intellectuals or the working people of Turkey. Because defending Cuba and standing in solidarity with Cuba is, at the same time, a demonstration of the will to uphold Turkey’s sovereignty and its socialist future.

# The Victory Party: Emerging as a nationalist element in Turkish politics



The origins of the fascist movement in Turkey, as in many other countries, can be found in the first half of the 20th century. Fascist ideas, which had emerged under the influence of international currents, gained strength during the Second World War. The impact of these ideas on the country's politics would manifest itself in the pro-German government policies implemented by Prime Minister Şükrü Saracoğlu, who took office in 1942.

The period in which the fascist movement contacted the masses was the 1960s. *The Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi* (MHP-Nationalist Movement Party), founded during this period, formed the main body of the fascist movement. Today, MHP continues this characteristic by supporting the AKP (the ruling party) from within a coalition in which it is not formally a part of the cabinet. The paramilitary organization that has existed within MHP since its inception, the *Ülkü*

*Ocakları* (Grey Wolves), also continues to exist. Since its founding, MHP has been at the center of deep and dark relationships both within the state and at the international level. The *Ülkü Ocakları* played a role as the Turkish branch of NATO's Gladio organization.

Over the years, various cadres split from the MHP and formed new parties. Some of these continued political activity without actually departing from the MHP line. One of the more noteworthy among them is the *Büyük Birlik Partisi* (Great Unity Party). Although it established its own paramilitary organization, and despite not being able to shake MHP's dominance, it maintained a certain weight in Turkish politics until the suspicious helicopter crash that killed its founding leader Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu.

A significant break from MHP occurred in 2017. Some important cadres left the party and organized under the name *İYİ Parti* (Good Party).

This party claimed to position itself at the center of the political spectrum. In reality, its aim was to become the leading force of the long-vacant center-right politics. However, this claim failed after its current chairman *Müşavir Dervişoğlu* was elected. *Dervişoğlu*, a classic MHP cadre, made no effort to conceal his fascist identity.

One of the figures who led the founding of the *İYİ Parti* together with *Meral Akşener*, was *Ümit Özdağ*. He left the party shortly thereafter, citing differences of opinion. *Özdağ*, who also comes from an MHP background, founded the *Zafer Partisi* (Victory Party) in 2021.

Although the Victory Party's origins are rooted in MHP, it has come forth as a distinct structure and, despite not being represented in parliament, has secured a certain place for itself in Turkish politics. Before going into the details of the party's politics, it



is useful to examine Ümit Özdağ's background.

Özdağ was born in Tokyo in 1961. The reason for this was that his father, Muzaffer Özdağ, was in exile in Japan. The elder Özdağ had been among the members of the military junta that seized power in 1960. However, fourteen members with differing views, among whom he defined himself as conservative, were purged by the others and sent into exile. Among these fourteen officers was also Alparslan Türkeş, who would become the "Başbuğ" (chief leader) of the fascist movement in Turkey.

Ümit Özdağ began his education in Turkey and joined the Ülkü Ocakları at a young age. He studied political science in Germany. In 1986, he began working as a research assistant at Gazi University in Ankara. He became a full professor in 2001 and left the university in 2005.

In 2006, he emerged in an oppositional position within the MHP leadership. He became a candidate for party leadership against Devlet Bahçeli, who had taken over the leadership after Türkeş. However, he was expelled from the party two days before the congress. Later, he returned to party membership by court decision. He reconciled with the leadership and was appointed deputy chairman in 2015. This did not last long, and in 2016 he again became a candidate for party leadership and was expelled from the party once more.

Özdağ was among the founders of the İYİ Party in 2017. However,

after a few years he clashed with its leadership and left that party, as well. In 2021, he founded the Victory Party.

From the moment he first appeared in public discourse, Özdağ projected a character with "deep" connections. Despite trying to present himself as a follower of Atatürk's principles, his nationalist reflexes have always remained dominant. His distance from political parties on both the center-right and center-left lines has remained roughly the same. In this way, he has successfully maintained a "key/kingmaker party" position, capable of speaking with everyone and forming alliances with anyone.

What distinguishes the Victory Party from other nationalist parties is its abuse of the migration issue. The traditional nationalist line, in alliance with AKP, has not treated as a problem the fact that migrants, whose number in Turkey is estimated to be around 10 million, serve as a bargaining chip in international politics and as a source of cheap labor and votes domestically. It has stood behind AKP's policy. The Victory Party, on the other hand, has adopted a policy centered on the return of migrants to their countries. This policy has provided the party with a certain social base. Combining it with a secular discourse, it has further strengthened this base.

Especially among younger generations, a greater interest in the Party has emerged. Segments of youth who define themselves as secular and pro-Atatürk's principles, but who lack a genuine political consciousness in

this regard, have gravitated toward the Victory Party. In polls conducted in 2026, the Victory Party's support across society fluctuates between 2.5% and 6%. In a poll conducted in February among first-time voters, it ranks as the third party with 11.5%. In the mass mobilization that began in March 2025 with the arrest of Ekrem İmamoğlu, the CHP mayor of İstanbul, young supporters of the Victory Party have also become increasingly prominent.

The youth drawn to the Victory Party have a highly amorphous ideological and political profile. They possess the potential to be mobilized and engaged toward different extremes of the political spectrum. They could become the street enforcers of fascism—or evolve into something entirely different. Most come from working-class families. These young people, who have a high level of secular sensitivity and therefore position themselves against AKP, meet the Victory Party through nationalism and migration policies. Some recent experiences show that, if proper communication is established, these youths may also be open to socialist ideas.

The Victory Party is taking shape as a party that may continue to exist as a certain force in the post-AKP period. Its avoidance of serious tensions with the current leading actors of the system and its ability to establish relations with US imperialism, constitute advantages for it in this regard.

# May Day in Turkey

## 1923 FIRST OFFICIAL CELEBRATION



In 1899, the Second International claimed May 1st as a day of celebration emphasizing working class unity, struggle and solidarity. First May Day celebrations in Turkey started in the Ottoman times. Although the first official celebration in Turkey took place in 1923, cities with organized working class masses like Thessaloniki, Skopje and İstanbul had witnessed earlier May Day celebrations. Following World War I, May Day celebrations took place in İstanbul under occupation of allied powers from 1919 to 1922. The demand for independence was at the forefront in those rallies, which were organised despite the bans.

## 1976

### FIRST MASS CELEBRATION AFTER 52 YEARS

Mass celebration of May Day was banned in 1924 with a total ban following next year with the "Law on the Maintenance of Order" (Takrir-i Sükûn Kanunu). The first mass celebration of May Day after decades of bans took place in 1976. The site of the May Day celebration organized at the call of the Confederation of Revolutionary Trade Unions of Turkey (DİSK) was the Taksim Square. It is estimated that around 400.000 people gathered in Taksim Square on May 1st 1976.



## 1977 BLOODY MAY DAY

May 1st 1977 went down in Turkey's political history as the "Bloody May Day." In Taksim Square, shots were fired at the working class crowd of hundreds of thousands, much larger than the year before. The May Day massacre, carried out by the NATO-backed paramilitary forces of the country, left 36 workers dead and 126 wounded.

## 1980 REINTRODUCTION OF THE BAN

In the following years, 1979 and 1980, a curfew was imposed in İstanbul to prevent May Day celebrations; however, celebrations were still organized in other provinces. With the fascist military coup of 12 September 1980, May Day was banned once again.

1988 saw the unions submit a request to the Governorate of İstanbul to legally celebrate May Day many years after the 1980 ban. Although the request was rejected, Taksim witnessed an attempt to celebrate May Day. This resulted in the police attacking the crowd with 81 detained and several arrested. The trend continued in the following years. Workers who took to the streets to celebrate May Day were attacked, shot at and many were arrested.

## 1996 and 2015 DEFYING THE TAKSIM BAN

May Day celebrations were held as indoor meetings in 1991 and 1992. Attempts were made to enable the working class to once again celebrate May Day on a mass scale in public squares. Given the historical significance of İstanbul's Taksim Square for May Day, and in order to demonstrate the unity of the working class, a political demand was put forward to hold May Day celebrations in Taksim.

The title of the magazine published by the Party for Socialist Power (SİP - the predecessor party of the TKP) in 1996 was "Taksim Belongs to the Workers on May Day." On May 1, 1996, approximately thousands of SİP militants marched to Taksim Square accompanied by marches and slogans, carrying red flags with hammers and sickles. May Day had reunited with Taksim with SİP as its vanguard.

Communists broke through the police blockade and defied the Taksim ban in 2015 as well.



## 2010 WORKERS TO TAKSIM SQUARE

After being banned to the working class and laborers for 32 years, Taksim Square was reopened to mass May Day celebrations through years of struggle and determination. The Communist Party of Turkey took its place in Taksim Square with full strength on May 1, the day of unity, struggle, and solidarity of the working class. Following the highly attended rally, a few years later Taksim Square once again became subject to bans due to the government's perception of it as a threat.



# Highlights from Turkish Foreign Policy



## Riyadh statement

When US threats against Iran wWith the third week of U.S. and Israeli attacks on Iran coming to a close, twelve countries, including Turkey, gathered in Riyadh for the Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Group of Arab and Islamic Countries. In the joint statement released after the meeting, no mention of the United States' aggression while Iran's bombing of U.S. bases and strategic locations in the region was condemned. Calls were made for Iran to respect the "principle of good neighborliness." Given the presence and actions of these bases, which facilitate the projection of imperialist aggression into the region, any expectation of good-neighborly relations, however, appears unrealistic.

This text, which fails to condemn the attacks by the U.S. and Israel, was initially not posted on the Ministry's website. The state news agency published the statement only on its English-language site. Later, the website of the Foreign Ministry only uploaded the English version. In addition to efforts to restrict access to the joint statement, two pieces of information were circulated to the public through pro-government media in an attempt to soften the backlash. The first of these indicated that the meeting was a single-issue meeting: to discuss Iran's attacks on regional countries. The second was the statement that the part of the text mentioning Israel was

added at Turkey's request. However, the content of the added clause criticizing Israel is not about Iran, but about the attacks on Lebanon. An attempt is made to brush aside the root causes of why Iran can't practice "good neighborliness," and why Lebanon is under attack yet again.

The AKP government once again tried to justify the situation in foreign policy by invoking concepts such as state wisdom, national interests, and strategic foresight. Just two months ago, following the backlash over the government's complete silence regarding the kidnapping of Venezuelan President Maduro, AKP spokesperson Ömer Çelik made similar remarks, warning against a short-sighted approach to politics. Since the justification of being pro-American is not something easily defended, they increasingly cling to the claim that there is a "bigger picture" beyond the grasp of the public.

## The existential crisis of a new NATO base

Claims that a new NATO base would be established in Turkey had been denied by the Ministry of National Defense. However, after a journalist came across posts on a Turkish NATO staff member's LinkedIn account—including the logo of the new headquarters—the Ministry of National Defense was forced to acknowledge the claims. Even though vague statements are made, saying they have "begun the work on the Multinational

Corps (MNC-TUR), which has been confirmed with great difficulty, but it has not yet been established, and it is not certain that it will be established—it may not be established at all..." one has to consider the eventful timing of the U.S. and Israeli attacks on Iran. It becomes clear that this is a project that has been meticulously planned and executed over the course of many years. The tensions between U.S. imperialism and Iran did not begin yesterday; in fact, a similar attack was launched just last year, right in the middle of diplomatic talks. Although this new command center is said to contribute to deterrence and national defense and is marketed as a "domestic" initiative within the NATO framework, the truth reveals itself at the example of the İncirlik Air Base in Adana city.

## Who does İncirlik Air Base belong to?

Following Iran's retaliation against U.S. and Israeli attacks by targeting U.S. bases in the region, the issue of control over the İncirlik Air Base has once again become a mainstream topic in Turkey. As discussions emerged regarding the presence of foreign bases in Turkey, the ministry found it necessary to release a statement. Both pro-government media and the Ministry of National Defense emphasized that the İncirlik Air Base would not be attacked, stating that the air base belongs to Turkey, control and command lie with Turkey, and it is a



NATO base – not a U.S. base—hosting military personnel of many countries. Although it is specifically emphasized that a Turkish brigadier general is in command of Incirlik Air Base, and although the base is indeed located on Turkey's soil, at the end of the day, control over the base is determined not by legal boundaries but by the rules of imperialism. Trump's remark that he will just "go and use" the NATO bases in Spain "if he wants to" is an example for the functioning of this system.

### Meetings and state visits

- The Council of Foreign Ministers of the Organization of Turkic States assembled in Istanbul in early March. At the meeting, which was also attended by Azerbaijan, a message of support and solidarity against Iran's attacks was conveyed. At the meeting aimed at "refreshing strategic perspectives in times when international law is being disregarded", Foreign Minister Hakan Fidan warned "both the West and the East" about the possibility of the war spreading along ethnic and religious "fault lines."

- Ankara saw the visit of German Foreign Minister Wadephul, where topics such as the EU accession process, increasing trade volume, the customs union, the purchase of Eurofighters, and the Middle East and Iran were discussed. In the joint statement issued after the meeting, however, the foreign ministers of Germany and Turkey were on completely different pages. While Fidan once again mentioned ethnic and religious fault lines, Wadephul declared Iran a threat to the region and to Israel, and defended Israel's right to fight Hezbollah.

- Bangladesh's new foreign minister Khalilur Rahman held his first bilateral meeting with Turkey. While the joint press statement touched on the diplomatic history of the two countries, the focus was primarily on Iran and Israel. While Foreign Minister Fidan's remarks highlighted criticism of Israel, questions have been raised as to whether this emphasis is connected to Bangladesh's stance not recognizing Israel.

- During the Canadian Foreign Minister's visit to Ankara, emphasis was placed on diplomatic and commercial relations. While it was noted that talks have intensified particularly on the question of the energy sector, this brought to mind the forests that were handed over to Canadian mining companies in recent years.

- Following his regional tour to Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Foreign Minister Hakan Fidan made public remarks. While he criticized Tel Aviv, he refrained from addressing Washington's role in its coordinated actions with Israel against Iran. This once again reaffirmed Turkey's backing of the position set forth in the Riyadh Declaration.

- Defense Minister Yaşar Güler visited London, where he met with his counterpart. An additional support agreement was signed during the visit related to Turkey's project for 20 Eurofighter Typhoon jets purchased from the United Kingdom.



## The call to withdraw from NATO is growing

TKP organized two separate anti-NATO protests in Ankara on April 5 and 9.

The April 5 march was held on the anniversary of NATO's founding. Following the mass march, TKP General Secretary Kemal Okuyan spoke at a rally, emphasizing that Turkey should withdraw from NATO.



On April 9, TKP members gathered in front of the luxury hotel where a NATO meeting organized by the Presidency's Directorate of Communications and SETA (a pro-government think tank) to protest. In statements made during the protest, it is declared, "We will expel NATO, the world's largest terrorist organization, from our country," adding that the action was a "warning" ahead of the NATO summit scheduled to take place in Ankara in July.



## Protest from TKP against the joint statement signed by the foreign minister



On March 18, foreign ministers from 12 countries, including Turkey, met in Riyadh and issued a joint statement signed by Foreign Minister Hakan Fidan. The statement was criticized for placing blame solely on Iran, omitting the United States, and offering only a very limited criticism of Israel, while also calling for disarmament in Lebanon. It is particularly noteworthy that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has not published a Turkish version of the statement on its official website.

TKP called to protest in front of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Ankara, the capital of Turkey, under the banner: **"We do not accept this disgraceful statement: That signature must be withdrawn."**

Ali Ufuk Arıkan, a member of the Central Committee of TKP, criticized remarks by Foreign Minister Hakan Fidan during a protest. Arıkan referred to Fidan's arguments during a tv programme saying that countries lacking sufficient military capacity should avoid engaging in polemics with Israel, and suggested that Iran should treat the killing of its leaders as an opportunity to pursue an agreement with the United States. He added that such statements do not represent the people of Turkey.

Just before the protest, TKP Central Committee issued a [statement](#) called **"This is how a country defends its interests."**

TKP has opened a debate on "national security" through this statement addressing the Iran war and Turkey's position, arguing that the country's foreign policy is driven by the needs of large monopolies. The text claims foreign policy determined by the monopolies sustain ties with Israel, seek Gulf financing, promote NATO alignment, and push militarization while relying on cheap labor and suppressing dissent at home. In this context, Turkey's stance amid escalating US-Israel pressure on Iran is presented as exposing the contradiction between official security rhetoric and the realities of threat to the people, with NATO membership portrayed not as protection but as a factor drawing the country into conflict and making it a potential target. The statement ultimately calls for a break from this framework—ending foreign military presence, withdrawing from overseas operations, nationalizing strategic sectors, and building an independent, people-centered security policy.

## Workers' Representatives Council established

On March 15, 2026, 322 workers from across Turkey, representing multiple sectors and joined by retiree representatives, convened at the call of the TKP to establish the [Workers' Representatives Council](#). The Council brings together union representatives, workplace committees, solidarity networks such as "Patronların Ensesindeyiz," and participants from ongoing labor struggles, aiming to unify and strengthen a fragmented working-class movement. TKP General Secretary Kemal Okuyan gave the opening speech of the meeting. The meeting was also attended by Nikos Tzortzis, Head of International Relations of the Secretariat of the All Workers Militant Front (PAME), who expressed international solidarity.



The Council announced plans to expand workplace organization, strengthen unions, build solidarity networks including for retirees, and play an active role in ongoing worker resistance movements to increase their coordination and impact.

## Continuous solidarity with Cuba

Upon the Ecuadorian Government expelled Cuba's ambassador and all diplomats, TKP General Secretary Kemal Okuyan sent a [letter](#) to the Ambassador of Ecuador in Ankara denouncing this move. The letter stated that: **"The decision taken by your government—at the request of the U.S. administration—to expel Cuba's diplomatic representatives is disgraceful. Our only consolation is knowing that the people of Ecuador do not share this cowardly and dishonorable stance."**

Okuyan also paid a short solidarity visit to Cuba, where he met with Dr. Roberto Morales Ojeda, a member of the Political Bureau and Secretary for Organization of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba.

Additionally, *Küba Gerçeği* (*The Cuban Reality*), a digital publication by TKP on the soL news portal, launched a new daily bulletin this month called ["Blockade Diaries."](#) Each daily edition reports on the impacts of the U.S. blockade on Cuba, the solutions developed by Cubans, the international solidarity built around these efforts, daily snapshots of the energy crisis, and key statements from the Cuban government. This initiative allows the readers to follow Cuba's situation day by day under the blockade and access reliable information, rather than relying on disinformation coming from the media organs manipulated by the imperialist actors.



## Working women flooded the streets on March 8

At the call of the Women's Solidarity Committees, many women took to the streets in numerous cities on International Working Women's Day, March 8. Women gathered in front of the TÜSİAD (Turkish Industry and Business Association) building in İstanbul and Ankara. Demonstrations were also held in several cities in the symbolic places, where women drew attention to femicides and exploitation.



In addition, on March 15 in the Netherlands, as part of the March 8 events, the establishment of Women's Solidarity Committees took place in Amsterdam with the aim of creating common areas of struggle. The meeting was also attended by the New Communist Party of the Netherlands (NCPN) and its youth organization.



## Solidarity with Jordanian Communist Party

The Communist Party of Turkey strongly condemned the abduction and arrest of members of the Political Bureau of the Jordanian Communist Party, comrades Omar Awad and Osama Zain Aldin. TKP demanded the safe release of the detained comrades and [declared solidarity](#).

## Iran and Beyond on the Communist Perspective

TKP General Secretary Kemal Okuyan assessed the attacks on Iran by the U.S. and Israel on Iran, on the Communist Perspective. The Communist Perspective is the weekly [YouTube program](#) where Okuyan evaluates current political, economic and social developments.



## TKP celebrates Newroz: The “new day” will be celebrated through the workers’ overthrow of oppression and darkness



The Communist Party of Turkey published a [statement](#) on Newroz. In the statement, TKP stressed that today, the Newroz festivals are stained with blood by the hands of genocidal Israel and U.S. imperialism. Moreover, the statement emphasized that the “new day” will be celebrated in our country through the workers’ overthrow of oppression and darkness.