

15 *The 5 July protest
is an act of honor*

21 *The International Anti-NATO
Summit and the necessity of
expanding the common struggle*

36 *NATO 3.0 and the Turkish
defence industry*

August 2026


Voice of
TKP
Monthly international magazine



2 TKP General Secretary
Kemal Okuyan:
*The CHP split and the
communists
But we're at odds with
the "new"...*



Communists defied NATO



The CHP split and the communists **But we're at odds with the "new"...**

Kemal Okuyan - *TKP General Secretary*



One of the most important publications of the Russian revolutionary movement was Novaya Zhizn. It first appeared during the Revolution of 1905. Lenin devoted a great deal of time and energy to the newspaper, contributing both financially and as one of its regular writers. Novaya Zhizn means New Life. The old world was rotten. Humanity urgently needed a new one.

Shortly after the October Revolution, Mustafa Suphi, the founding leader of the Communist Party of Turkey, launched a publication called Yeni Dünya (New World) to spread communist ideas across the Turkish-speaking world.

New Life. New World. New Times. New Masses. New Order. New Youth.

The pattern is unmistakable. Wherever revolutionaries and communists confronted the capitalist system that was visibly falling apart, they spoke in the language of the new. They promised the “new”.

Then came 1991.

For a time, the “new life” was defeated by the old order. Whatever anyone may say, the Soviet Union represented the most advanced attempt humanity had yet made to build a new social order, a new kind of human being and a new way of life. Its defeat dealt a heavy blow not only to socialism but to the very idea of the new. The vultures descended immediately.

“New thinking”, “New politics”, “New liberalism”. Together they launched their assault, giving the old order a fresh coat of paint.

Those were years of severe testing for us. The old, rebranded as the new, threw everything it had into capturing people’s minds, shaping society’s direction and stripping the left of its legitimacy.

“New Left”, of course, had a history of its own. It began life as the title of a journal before establishing itself as a major current within Western Marxism in the 1960s. It would not be unfair to say that it provided much of the intellectual inspiration for the assault that followed. But after the turning point of 1991, that whole milieu abandoned even the theoretical exercises of the old journal. There was no longer any need to dress up criticism of the Soviet Union in revolutionary language. It proved far more useful simply to revive the very arguments once deployed in defense of the old order, and present them as the authentic voice of the left.

The story was no different in Turkey.

The TBKP (United Communist Party of Turkey), founded by those determined to turn the TKP into a social democratic party, was in truth the first “New Party”. That’s when we came to loathe the word “new”. That’s when we declared war on it.

Their magazine was called Yeni Açılım (New Initiative). They translated the latest absurdities coming out of Gorbachev’s camp and churned out ponderous pieces under titles like Can We Renew Ourselves? The cult of the “new” was born of the old world’s

inferiority complex. Left and right alike embraced the language of the “new”, dressing up a decaying capitalism as something fresh and desirable.

The struggle to rescue the TKP from that betrayal was long and hard fought. The organized movement that restored the party in 2002 also prevented the various peddlers of the “new”, who had emerged after 1986, from dominating the left. More importantly, it kept a generation of young revolutionaries searching for answers from being swept away by the seductive appeal of the “new”.

But the assault of the “new” never ceased.

Every form of social, ideological and political resistance to the AKP’s counter-revolutionary Project (which has nothing whatsoever to do with the “new”), was dismissed as “old”. Imagine it: an Ottomanist movement was settling scores with the Republic, while certain Turkish intellectuals, along with figures still counted as part of the left, were urging the left to side with the counter-revolution. We were told that to be progressive meant embracing the “new” and freeing ourselves from the old ways of thinking.

The logic of AKP's Turkey seeped into every corner of political life. A certain part of the left-wing was poisoned and never recovered. The CHP¹ still enjoyed the support of people who, however directionless, refused to accept AKP's Turkey. It became essential that this CHP, too, be adapted to the "New Turkey". As the capitalist class, the imperialist centres and the Gülenists² set about "renewing" the CHP, they made full use of those eager "leftists".

But was the CHP really a threat? Was it really an "awkward" or "problematic" party for the capitalist system?

Not at all. The CHP had always been a party of the established order. Whatever revolutionary character it possessed belonged to the periods of the War of Independence and the founding of the Republic. From the very beginning, it had also harbored the forces of counter-revolution and, in that sense, of the established order itself. By the 2000s, there was not the slightest reason for the capitalist class to deem CHP as a source of concern.

So why did they intervene in the party's leadership? Why did the calls for "renewal" never cease?

Because it was not the CHP that had to change. It was the CHP's base. Part of that base remained attached to the party through the values of the 1920s. What stood in the way of AKP's Turkey was not the CHP per se, but the CHP as it existed in the public imagination. If that base was to embrace the "New Turkey", the CHP leadership would have to lead the way. Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu took on that task, and to a large extent, he succeeded.

After an operation that removed the sitting CHP leader, Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu became party chairman in 2010. At a press conference in Germany, he declared: "I cannot say that secularism is under threat in Turkey today. We do not see such a threat." That statement could well have been read by the CHP's supporters as an instruction to let their guard down.

How many of the millions of CHP voters who believed secularism was under threat in 2010 took comfort from those words and thought, "Perhaps we've been exaggerating"? There's no way of knowing. But as more interventions followed in the same vein, the CHP base gradually swallowed its anger and retreated into itself.

That was exactly what the AKP, and the forces behind it, needed.

The republican tradition remained deeply rooted. It was fragmented, directionless and often reduced to little more than the defense of a way of life. Yet even with almost no organized political expression, it continued to generate a resistance that could not simply be swept aside.

Yet whatever the CHP leadership did, it was never enough to bring these sections of society into line with the “New Turkey”. They had to be subjected to constant political intervention.

Almost everyone now leading the New Party³ played a part in Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu’s attempt to reconcile the republican tradition to AKP’s Turkey.

So, what has changed?

How did Kılıçdaroğlu and the Özgür Özel–Ekrem İmamoğlu leadership end up on opposite sides of a political divide?

Because the effort to break down that social resistance produced new political consequences. As the years passed, the AKP government wore down and provoked growing

discontent among its own supporters. The more the CHP presented itself not as a force of resistance but as the representative of the “New Turkey”, the more serious a rival the AKP found itself confronting.

That, in fact, was exactly what those determined to remake the CHP had wanted all along: to free AKP’s Turkey from the AKP’s monopoly over it!

İmamoğlu’s rise played directly into that strategy. But Erdoğan has never been one to give up. He reached for the methods we know all too well. On the one hand, he took increasingly lawless steps to sideline İmamoğlu, at least for the time being. On the other, he moved to reassure both international and domestic capital that no one was better placed than he was to carry the “New Turkey” project forward.

At the same time, he decided to bring Kılıçdaroğlu into his camp in the hope that he could generate the additional social consent to float the “New Turkey” project, a project Erdoğan had never managed to bring to completion.

The widespread hostility towards Kılıçdaroğlu among CHP supporters today should fool

no one. The AKP needs every force capable of crippling the republican resistance. Whatever vote share Kılıçdaroğlu's CHP may receive is beside the point. If it aligns itself with the AKP's "national and home-grown" rhetoric, or lends open or tacit support to the new constitution and the renewed "peace process", the consequences will extend far beyond electoral arithmetic.

Yet, ironically, the New Party is heading down exactly the same road. Does anyone still take seriously the old liberal refrain that "the nationalists are holding the CHP back"? We have said time and again that nationalism cannot be invested with any progressive meaning. But that is not the question. When it comes to the CHP's political cadres, it is absurd even to suggest that they contain any nationalist current which holds that party back. Neither the Kılıçdaroğlu camp nor the Özel camp is defined in any meaningful way by "nationalism".

Enough of that.

Nor is there any reason to take seriously the "New Party's" claims that it represents a return to the principles of social democracy. Those claims are invariably accompanied by

pledges of alliance to the founding principles of the Republic. Yet, social democracy and the principles of the Republic are not the same thing. They never have been.

It is not possible to make much sense of the programme we have had to suffer through reading. Designed to appeal to everyone, the New Party Programme points in no clear direction for precisely that reason. But even if it did, it would make little difference. Little more than an abridged version of the CHP's previous programme, it would not change the fact that establishment politics in Turkey is no longer conducted on the basis of party programmes. They don't even pay much attention to the core texts of politics anymore.

In the end, the New Party has once again laid claim to the role of principal opposition in AKP's Turkey. It is clear that some organizations on the "left", along with a number of intellectuals, imagine they can pull the party to the left. After all, if this party is broad enough to accommodate every political shade, then surely now is the time to seize the initiative. Some are eager to dispense advice, others to proclaim new alliances/fronts, still others busy with behind-the-scenes maneuvering...

The problem is that, at this point, there is no longer a left capable of pulling the CHP, or rather the New Party, to the left. There is no organization, no conviction, no energy. Worse still, on questions such as the Republic, much of today's "left" is no further to the left than Özel and his circle!

In short, the "new" will do exactly what it did in the 1990s. First it set out to rob the left of its reason. Now it will try to vaporize what remains of society's capacity to resist.

This is an unending struggle. Like it or not, we will not jump on this latest "new" bandwagon in the name of fighting the AKP.

It is, of course, entirely possible that Erdoğan will once again turn his fire on the New Party, forcing Özgür Özel and his allies into a fight for political survival. But we have the experience and the strength to recognize the difference between resisting such a move and lining up behind the New Party.

Recognizing that, under these conditions, as the Erdoğan phase of the "New Turkey" enters its final chapter and the AKP has fallen far behind in preparing for the next phase and cultivating a new leader, the system is

increasingly turning to the İmamoğlu option, we will act with the awareness that working people will have an even greater need in the years ahead for an alternative political current that stands against the tide.

Nor are we concerned by the growing number of people who see the government's attacks on İmamoğlu and Özel as a conspiracy by the system to manufacture new "heroes". It is, after all, a system: a complex web of mechanisms serving the rule of exploitation. Beyond a certain point, it ceases to matter who believes what, who merely pretends to, who feints left while striking right, or who, while acting as the hired gun, ends up firing on the very hand that employs them.

First, this system does not operate according to reason. Second, it is unsustainable. Third, AKP's Turkey has no prospect of becoming permanent. Fourth, there is no escaping AKP's Turkey while remaining within the bounds of capitalism. Fifth, getting rid of the AKP no longer means getting rid of AKP's Turkey. Sixth, it is clear that the republican tradition will never surrender completely to AKP's Turkey. Seventh, socialism is the only channel through which that tradition can flow and gather strength.

These are the facts upon which a strategic breakthrough must be built.

Beyond that, there is nothing “new”.

1- CHP is a social democratic party and the founding party of the Republic of Turkey. The main opposition party. Following the establishment of the New Party, a number of CHP members of parliament defected to it, signaling that the role of the main opposition party was expected to shift from the CHP to the New Party.

2- “Gülenist” here refers to an anti-communist Islamist network led by the late Fethullah Gülen that collaborated closely with U.S. imperialism and the Turkish ruling class, in reshaping Turkey especially during the 2000s and early 2010s; the movement was pushed out of the ruling coalition after its failed military coup attempt in 2016.

3- In May 2026, a court decision invalidated the CHP’s most recent party congress, citing allegations of corruption in the internal leadership election. As a result, Özgür Özel, who had been elected party leader at that congress, was removed from office, and the party leadership reverted to his predecessor, Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu. The move was widely viewed as an attempt by the ruling AKP to interfere in the CHP’s internal affairs. Kılıçdaroğlu’s decision to assume the leadership—and his reluctance to promptly convene a new congress that could restore Özgür Özel to the party leadership—reinforced a widespread and well-founded public perception that, regardless of his personal intentions, the situation was objectively serving the AKP’s political interests. New Party is the political party founded by Özgür Özel and his allies after it became clear that continuing their political activity within the CHP was no longer institutionally feasible.



The 5 July protest is an act of honor

Berkay Kemal Önoğlu,

Member of TKP Central Committee

Ahead of the NATO Summit held in Ankara on July 7–8, the government's stance was to lock down streets across the capital and several major cities under a massive police blockade, silence every dissenting voice, and project an image of "complete domestic control" to the rulers of the imperialist organization. The counter-revolutionary AKP government—whose bargaining stance toward the West we have previously observed on various fronts—found its room for maneuver restricted both domestically and internationally this time around, having surrendered in recent years to an increasingly overt and unrestrained pro-US line. At the NATO

summit table, the government intended to sell weapons, offer up the resources and youth of Turkey for bloody new ventures, have its rule legitimized, and secure a place in advantageous imperialist projects where the capitalist class could “invest one and reap three”. To this end, it sent an unmistakable signal to Washington and Brussels: “In Turkey, we stand united as a solid NATO block. NATO is not up for debate here; rest assured, even the opposition agrees on this”, going to desperate lengths to keep this façade intact.

As early as 7 May, the TKP announced that the week of 4–12 July would be designated as an “Anti-NATO Summit,” featuring rallies, conferences, exhibitions, and public events designed to steadily rally the anti-NATO resistance of our people day by day. As part of this programme, it was also announced that a rally in Tandoğan will be held in Ankara, on 5 July. About a month later, just as the location and time of the rally had been finalized and public campaigning via posters had begun, the government—in a panic—issued a ban that effectively placed Ankara under siege for ten days starting in early July. While the governorate’s official decree omitted the exact date of the rally, the state-run Anadolu Agency reported two-week prohibitions, stretching the bans to cover the event.

Under any circumstances, it was necessary to reignite the anti-imperialist and working class patriotic momentum in Turkey that they were trying to stifle. This required organizing a broad process open to wide sections of the population—one that didn't overlook the political stakes of the NATO summit and elevated resistance against it. On the other hand, an effective response had to be given to the government's anti-people obstinacy at all costs. Otherwise, it would go unnoticed that the government could abandon its "anti-Western" rhetoric—which it hypocritically exploited in domestic politics—overnight whenever convenient, reinforcing the perception that a public which harbors strong anti-US and anti-NATO sentiments could be instantly coerced into silence and brought back into the traditional pro-NATO fold. That would have meant depriving politics of its substance and seriousness, and the public being openly treated as fools. Absolute silence was a prerequisite for Turkey's standing in full alignment with NATO, and to that end, it was of critical importance that no resistance surfaced, that the bans were accepted, and that the public normalized this situation.

One week before 5 July, TKP called on the public to join anti-NATO marches across



major provinces, starting with İstanbul and İzmir. Concurrently, as part of the “Anti-NATO Summit,” indoor events, exhibitions, and panel discussions were held alongside an intensive propaganda campaign, informing working people about the content and dangers of the upcoming NATO Summit. Following the government’s criminalization of the streets and the suspension of constitutional rights on a massive scale, anti-NATO sentiment in the country was struggling to find an outlet, and street protests were becoming increasingly intimidating for broader segments of the population. The activities within the framework of the Anti-NATO Summit were being organized on a scale that allowed every citizen with anti-imperialist sentiments to voice their objections. These actions formed the primary hub of the anti-NATO movement across the country.

Communists responded to the NATO summit with a political campaign designed to expose

the regime's unbridled NATOism, highlight the existential dangers of NATO membership, and put the demand for Turkey's withdrawal from NATO at the center. Yet in the face of the regime's stubbornness and bullying, all activity was being squeezed into narrow spaces where the imperialists gathering in Ankara would not even notice. Being able to respond to the bans directly from Ankara was of immense significance.

By 5 July, no protest of any significant size or determination had taken place anywhere in the country. In the days leading up to the summit and until that moment, just as the government had hoped, there had been, so to speak, barely a peep. At that very hour in Istanbul, TKP members launched a massive demonstration in Taksim Square joined by thousands, while in İzmir, a vibrant crowd marched toward NATO headquarters chanting slogans. Despite the bans imposed in other provinces, people were gathering, marching, and holding rallies in various forms. These were politically mature actions carried out by large, striking crowds.

At a moment when the government's sweeping restrictions had erased any remaining expectation that a genuine protest could still take place in Ankara, hundreds of TKP militants

succeeded in gathering in Kızılay, the city's central square, and marched.

In a city placed under lockdown by at least 60,000 police officers—with all major access roads closed, checkpoints at every turn, and daily life effectively brought to a halt—the communists entered the square chanting: “Seize the bases, NATO out!”; “Imperialists and collaborators, beware—TKP is on duty!”; and “No passage for NATO!

They proved that there is resistance against NATO in Turkey. They shattered the suffocating gloom and disillusionment that had had ample opportunity to spread up to that point. For this, they won the sympathy of the broadest sections of the working people who had the anti-imperialist sentiments; they received the support of journalists, intellectuals, and artists with working class patriotic sentiments. They staged the single action nationally and internationally that could not be ignored, raising a voice loud enough for the deafest ears to hear. The world acknowledged: “It turns out there are those in Turkey who are against NATO.” The government received the message. Most importantly, the protest gave hope, energy, and confidence to broad sections of the public opposed to both the government and NATO.



The International Anti-NATO Summit and the necessity of expanding the common struggle

Gözde Kök,

Member of TKP Party Council

Three days before the Ankara Summit, which brought together NATO heads of state and government, the International Anti-NATO Summit held in İstanbul on 4 July provided an important platform for discussing the current needs of the struggle against imperialist aggression. Convened at the call of the Communist Party of Turkey, the meeting was attended by representatives of the Party of Labor of Austria, the German Communist Party, the Communist Party of Greece, the Hungarian Workers' Party, the New Communist Party of the Netherlands, the Portuguese Communist

Party, the Communist Party of the Workers of Spain, the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY), the World Peace Council (WPC), and the Greek Committee for International Détente and Peace. A written contribution from the Portuguese Council for Peace and Cooperation, whose representatives were unable to attend, was also presented. Many other communist and workers' parties that were unable to attend the meeting sent messages of support. Held under the slogans "Humanity does not deserve humiliation and death" and "NATO and imperialism will be defeated," the summit expressed the determination of forces struggling against NATO to mount an international response at a time when new steps in war preparations are on the way.

The timing of the meeting carried political significance in itself. As NATO leaders prepared to discuss in Ankara the future of armament, military production, war economy, and new lines of confrontation, communists, youth organizations, and peace organizations from different countries gathered in Istanbul to discuss the struggle against the aggressive alliance. On one side stood the highly developed international coordination of capitalist states, armies, and arms monopolies; on the other, the search for a common struggle by the peoples forced to bear the costs of militarization.

Although the speeches delivered at the summit drew on the specific conditions of different countries, they converged around a common political framework. It was emphasized that NATO is not a defensive organization, that it has never represented the security of the peoples, and that since its foundation it has stood at the center of the military, political, and ideological organization of the imperialist system. Participants recalled that NATO's historical mission has been to encircle the Soviet Union, weaken the influence of socialism, safeguard the capitalist system in its member states, and suppress revolutionary movements. The fact that the alliance did not disappear following the dissolution of the USSR but instead expanded eastward and created new fields of intervention such as Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and Libya, is among the clearest demonstrations of its class character as an organization that violently serves to spread and strengthen imperialist domination against the peoples of the world.

TKP: NATO has historically been an internal problem of Turkey

The experience of Turkey provides particularly striking examples of this reality. In his opening speech, Kemal Okuyan stressed that NATO's presence in Turkey cannot be reduced to



military bases, headquarters, or foreign policy choices. Rather, he argued, it has become a mechanism embedded in the country's political system, economy, culture, and state apparatus. Attention was drawn to NATO's imprint on Turkey's recent history—from military coups and political assassinations to psychological warfare operations and networks of disinformation. It was emphasized that the Turkish bourgeoisie embraced NATO membership not as a means of protecting the country against an external threat, but as a way of securing its own rule and safeguarding the capitalist system.

The contributions from other countries reflected a similar political perspective. Participants discussed the expansion of military bases across Europe, the restructuring of armed forces, the reintroduction of compulsory military service, and the broader effort to prepare societies

for war. It was pointed out that even countries officially regarded as neutral, have become increasingly integrated into NATO's war planning through European Union mechanisms, NATO partnership programs, missile defense projects, and overseas military operations.

Costs of militarization, enlarging scope of NATO aggression and the role of military bases

Particular emphasis was placed on the costs of militarization for the working class. While healthcare, education, pensions, and social security are subjected to cuts, enormous resources are being channeled into military spending, demonstrating that the war economy constitutes an attack on working people. Armament is not simply a matter of foreign policy. Wage suppression, dismantling of public services, deteriorating working conditions, and growing unemployment among young people are all direct consequences of expanding military budgets. The costs of war preparations are intended to be paid first through the labor of the working class, and, when necessary, through their lives.

The growing military build-up in the scope of the war in Ukraine, the aggression unfolding in the Middle East, the genocidal war against the Palestinian people, and the policy of

encirclement directed at China were likewise discussed not as separate or isolated developments. Rather, they were presented as different fronts in the effort of US imperialism to preserve its hegemony and in the broader rivalry within the imperialist system. It was stressed that NATO's ambitions are no longer confined to the Euro-Atlantic area; while intensifying military pressure against Russia, the alliance is also becoming increasingly involved in tensions across the Indo-Pacific.

Another major focus of the summit was the role played by military bases. Participants described how countries ranging from Greece and Spain to Germany and Hungary have been transformed into logistical and military platforms for NATO operations. Rather than making these countries more secure, the presence of such bases turns them into accomplices in imperialist interventions and potential targets in future conflicts. For this reason, the call of "No passage for imperialists on land, at sea, or in the air" was presented not merely as opposition to the presence of foreign troops, but as a demand to break these countries away from the machinery of imperialist war.

The position of young people also received particular attention. As access to education

and decent employment is increasingly denied, young people are being channeled into serving the armed forces and the interests of imperialism. The meeting made clear that youth reject being treated as the “human resources” of war or as expendable instruments to be sacrificed on the battlefields of imperialism.

Taken together, these contributions demonstrated that the struggle against NATO cannot be reduced to a simple call for peace. The fight against NATO cannot be separated from the struggle against capitalism, imperialism, the domination of monopolies. Peace cannot be entrusted to the maneuvers of imperialist states or to diplomatic balances. One of the central ideas shared across the different contributions was that lasting peace cannot be achieved without abolishing the system of exploitation that gives rise to wars.

The growing importance of common struggle in the new period of NATO militarization

At no point in its history has NATO been merely an organization for military cooperation, let alone a defensive alliance. It was established after the Second World War to contain the growing influence of the Soviet Union and communism, organize capitalist Europe under US hegemony, and preserve the existing

social system within its member states. From clandestine networks and military coups to counter-revolutionary operations and direct military interventions, NATO has pursued this historical function through different means. What has changed today is not the class character of the alliance, but the scale, pace, and geographical reach of its war preparations.

Today, the alliance demands much more than increased military spending from its members. It calls for economies, industrial policies, energy infrastructure, transport systems, technological research, and social life itself to be reorganized according to the requirements of war. Expanding arms production, increasing joint military projects, enlarging ammunition stockpiles, and preparing armed forces for prolonged conflicts have all become integral components of the agenda imposed by NATO on its member states.

The direction taken by the Ankara Summit demonstrates why the need for international struggle expressed at the İstanbul meeting can no longer be postponed. Despite conflicts of interest within NATO, tensions between the United States and the European powers, and rivalries among the member states themselves, militarization and preparations for war remain the alliance's principal unifying factors. For the capital and the

arms monopolies, military expenditure is not only a geopolitical instrument but also an expanding field of investment and profit.

An international response to an international war machine

Today, a military decision taken in one country immediately activates bases, ports, factories, and transport networks in others. Weapons manufactured in one country are stored in another and transported to the front through a third. Military exercises are organized with the participation of numerous states. War propaganda is disseminated internationally through the same narratives and the same rhetoric of threat. Under these conditions, it is becoming increasingly difficult for those resisting this integrated machinery to succeed without learning from one another, exchanging information on a regular basis, and developing coordinated forms of intervention.

Every communist party for sure has the primary responsibility of confronting the bourgeoisie, the government, the military bases, the war budget, and the NATO ties of its own country. An internationalism that fails to expose the role of its “own” state in imperialist policies or challenge the domestic class foundations of war preparations remains abstract. At the same time, national

struggles can become more effective if they are strengthened through the sharing of information, common objectives, and coordinated political initiatives.

For this reason, it is essential to establish regular monitoring of military expenditures, bases, arms production centers, and joint military projects across NATO member states; to share the information gathered; and to prepare common statements and reports exposing the costs of the war economy for working people. There is also a need for a common counter-propaganda effort capable of demonstrating that the policies justified by different arguments in each country are, in reality, components of the same overall strategy. Regular exchanges of information and open discussion make it possible to develop a more accurate understanding of the rapidly changing dynamics of the imperialist system.

NATO strengthens itself by setting peoples against one another, fostering fear, and presenting war as inevitable. The task of communists, therefore, is to demonstrate that working people are not opposed to one another but to the classes that exploit them and drive them into war; to uphold the brotherhood of peoples against nationalism, independence against submission, and the rights of the workers against the war economy.

The International Anti-NATO Summit held in Istanbul once again highlighted both the possibilities and the responsibilities of this struggle. At a time when NATO's aggression is intensifying and war preparations are penetrating every sphere of life, the international communist movement must deepen its contacts, establish more systematic channels of information-sharing, define common objectives, and generate real political pressure through coordinated action.

TKP's Anti-NATO protest and international solidarity

As part of the international solidarity that emerged following the Communist Party of Turkey's (TKP) 5 July protest in Ankara, the following joint statement was issued by communist and workers' parties from different countries, calling for an end to the repression against TKP and the immediate release of all those detained.

We, the undersigned Communist and Workers' Parties, strongly condemn the repression carried out by the Turkish authorities against the demonstration organized by the Communist Party of Turkey (TKP) in Ankara in protest of the NATO Summit.

The violent police intervention, the injuries inflicted on demonstrators, and the detention of 145 communists including one member of the Central Committee of TKP and 8 members of the Party Council, constitute an unacceptable attack on the right to organize and protest. The sweeping bans imposed on demonstrations and public gatherings, which effectively turned the Turkish capital into a closed city ahead of the NATO Summit, reveal once again that NATO's war agenda goes hand in hand with the restriction of political rights and freedoms.

The attempt to silence the communists cannot conceal the truth: NATO is an aggressive imperialist alliance that has brought war, occupation, destruction and suffering to peoples across the world. Those who raise their voices against militarization, imperialist interventions and wars cannot be intimidated by repression.

We express our full solidarity with the Communist Party of Turkey, with all detained TKP members, and with everyone who stood up against the NATO Summit. We demand the immediate release of all communists in custody, the dropping of all charges, and an end to every measure restricting all anti-NATO political activity.

Hands off TKP! Hands off all communist and anti-imperialist militants!

Undersigned communist and workers' parties:

Parties of the SolidNet list:

Communist Party of Albania

Algerian Party for Democracy and Socialism

Party of Labour of Austria

Brazilian Communist Party

Communist Party of Brazil

Communist Party of Britain

Communist Party of Bohemia & Moravia

Communist Party of Canada

German Communist Party

Communist Party of Greece

Hungarian Workers' Party

Tudeh Party of Iran

Iraqi Communist Party

Workers' Party of Ireland

Jordanian Communist Party

Socialist Movement of Kazakhstan

Communist Party of Luxembourg

Communist Party of Mexico

New Communist Party of Netherlands

Communist Party of Norway

Palestinian Communist Party

Communist Party of Pakistan

Portuguese Communist Party

Communist Party of Russian Federation

Communists of Serbia

Communists of Catalonia

Communist Party of the Workers of Spain

Communist Party of Sweden

Swiss Communist Party

Syrian Communist Party

Communist Party of Ukraine

Union of Communists of Ukraine

Communist Party USA

Other parties:

New Communist Party of Australia

Revolutionary Brazilian Communist Party

The Revolutionary Communist Party of France

Communist Party (Germany)

Communist Front (Italy)

Galizan People's Union-UPG

Communist Workers' Platform USA

Party for Socialism and Liberation – USA



The Defense Industry Forum, held as part of the summit, served as a showcase for the arms industry.

NATO 3.0 and the Turkish defence industry

Ogün Eratalay,
Member of TKP Party Council

The repercussions of the NATO Summit, held in Ankara on 7–8 July 2026, continue to resonate across a wide range of fields. One of these concerns the Turkish defence companies that were repeatedly highlighted throughout the meetings.

The history of the Turkish defence industry

Before assessing the impact of the NATO Summit, it is useful to examine the historical development of Turkey's defence industry.

Examples of the Turkish capitalist class establishing a significant presence in the defence sector were extremely limited in the 1970s. Following World War II, Turkey became a member of NATO and developed a defence industry that was directly dependent on the United States. The industrialization initiatives launched during the early Republican period through state-led development plans were largely abandoned. In the post-war era, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and, subsequently, the influx of surplus military equipment supplied free of charge under the NATO framework rendered domestic arms production economically and strategically unsustainable.

This situation began to change in 1974. Following the Turkish military intervention in Cyprus, the United States imposed a three-year embargo on Turkey, arguing that American-supplied weapons had been used without authorization. This embargo may be regarded as a watershed in the development of Turkey's defence industry, as it exposed the vulnerabilities of a sector that had until then been almost entirely dependent on foreign suppliers. After the 12 September 1980 fascist military coup, and particularly during the governments led by Turgut Özal, Turkey pursued a new industrial strategy. The private sector, which was encouraged to integrate into global markets, received substantial state financial support while

technology transfer, production, and assembly agreements were signed with global actors.

The first examples were FNSS, established in partnership with the British company BAE Systems; TAI (TUSAŞ Air Industries), established in partnership with the US company Lockheed Martin; and Roketsan, established in partnership with Raytheon for the production of Stinger missiles. This period may be described as a process during which the Turkish bourgeoisie transferred capital into this sector with state support and accumulated knowledge and experience related to the defence industry.

During the subsequent period of the 1990s, serial production was carried out under licence, without making any contribution to the design process. Some of the significant orders of this period were the sale of armoured personnel carriers to Malaysia and the sale of F-16 aircraft to Egypt.

Current situation

The relationship of “dependency” in the defence industry is similar to that in other sectors. In the initial period, Turkey entered the international division of labour as a country producing intermediate goods with no added value and was able to receive only limited technology transfer. The assembly production initiated following the

offset agreements of the 1990s left behind a military industrial culture. At this stage, a new phase has begun: repeating what has been taught and applying it in practice.

Today, dependence on industries of other countries in the defence industry, both in terms of raw materials and products incorporating advanced technology, unquestionably continues.

It is well known that Turkey's defense industry is undergoing a major expansion, and that some of the measures aimed at reducing this “dependency” form part of that broader drive. Still, dependence on other countries in the defence industry, both in terms of raw materials and products incorporating advanced technology, unquestionably continues. It does not seem possible for it to disappear in the short term in the key areas. Rather, the outcomes of the latest NATO summit point to an even deeper relationship of mutual interdependence.s. The defence companies that stand out on a global scale are either directly or indirectly linked to the United States through partnership arrangements.

The Turkish Armed Forces (TAF) and Turkish arms companies, having used the undeclared civil war in Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia during the 1990s, and later the Syrian Civil War,

the Libyan Civil War, and the Second Nagorno-Karabakh War as testing grounds, consolidated their partnership during the AKP era within the broader restructuring of Turkey's capitalist class. As Turkish capital expanded abroad under the leadership of the AKP and increasingly engaged in capital export, the Turkish Armed Forces advanced in parallel through military deployments and defence agreements. Today, in addition to maintaining permanent military bases in Cyprus, Somalia, and Qatar, the TAF has an active military presence in Iraq and Syria and is also deployed in Albania, Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lebanon, and Azerbaijan under bilateral agreements and alliance commitments.

Today, Turkey's defence industry, with around 4-5 companies regularly appearing in the annual ranking of the world's 100 largest arms-producing companies, has become particularly prominent in unmanned aerial systems, precision-guided munitions, armoured vehicles, naval platforms, radar and electronic warfare systems. While leading firms such as Aselsan, TAI, Roketsan, Havelsan, STM, and MKE remain the driving forces of the sector, the defence supplier network that emerged during the AKP era has also enabled medium-sized companies such as Alp Aviation, Arca Defence, and Samsun Yurt Savunma to establish themselves successfully in the industry.

What has NATO 3.0 brought, and what will its consequences be?

The NATO Summit held in Ankara has been referred to as NATO 3.0, reflecting the expectation that the Alliance will be reorganized around a new strategic framework. Within this framework, NATO member states are expected to engage in closer cooperation in the defence industry, accelerate procurement processes, and rapidly prepare ammunition stockpiles for potential high-intensity conflicts.

In this context, although it has not been officially declared, the Turkish defence industry appears to have entered an important new phase :

From supplier to co-producer: One of the main objectives of NATO 3.0 is to strengthen the Alliance's defence production capacity through closer industrial cooperation among its members. Given Turkey's capabilities in advanced munitions, UAVs/UCAVs, land systems, electronic warfare, and naval shipbuilding, it is expected to participate in a greater number of joint production projects.

Greater access to NATO projects: Through the NATO Front Door for Industry initiative announced at the Ankara Summit, NATO aims to facilitate industry's access to its procurement

and innovation processes. This is expected to create greater opportunities for Turkish defence companies to participate more effectively in NATO projects.

Expansion of production capacity: NATO is now focusing not only on the development of new weapons but also on the rapid, large-scale production of conventional weapons and ammunition. As a result, serial production capacity in munitions, air defence systems, missiles, and other critical subsystems is becoming increasingly important. The clearest example of this was the sharp increase in demand for missile systems and artillery ammunition during the Russia–Ukraine War, a demand that Turkish arms companies were able to meet while generating substantial profits.

Standardization and interoperability: Compliance of Turkish-developed systems with NATO standards is becoming increasingly important. One of the first examples of this initiative, expected to create greater export opportunities for Turkish arms companies, is the 155 mm NATO-standard howitzer ammunition project, in which Turkey is also participating.

Growth in defence investment: Under the framework of NATO 3.0, Allied member states have committed to increasing their defence

spending. Larger defence budgets are expected to result in the expansion of joint projects and procurement volumes. In particular, collaborations such as Baykar–Leonardo, Alp Havacılık–Sikorsky, BAE Systems–Thales–Aselsan, and TAI–Boeing are likely to deepen further and expand in the coming years.

The S-400 issue and the uncertainty surrounding the F-35 programme

The S-400 air defence systems, procured by Turkey from the Russian Federation in recent years through what was clearly a political decision and which have never been deployed operationally, created significant tensions between Turkey and the United States. Although the Trump administration appeared inclined to seek a resolution to the dispute, no concrete steps have yet been taken. While the CAATSA sanctions imposed by the United States have not significantly affected joint defence projects, Turkish companies, which were excluded from the F-35 programme because of the S-400 purchase, continue to seek re-entry into the programme.

Should such a development occur, it is evident that Turkish arms companies would move towards much deeper cooperation within the

Alliance. In this context, even companies such as Havelsan, which had not previously participated in the F-35 programme and specialize in simulation and software technologies, could potentially become involved. However, no such decision has yet been taken, and it is likely to become the subject of bargaining within the imperialist hierarchy.

Conclusion

With NATO 3.0, Turkey's defence industry is evolving from a structure primarily producing for national requirements towards one capable of assuming a larger role within NATO's ecosystem of joint production, joint procurement, and joint technological development. The extent to which this transformation materializes will depend both on the ability of Turkish arms companies to expand their production capacity and on the development of political and industrial cooperation within NATO. Although Turkish arms companies possess competitive advantages in certain areas, it is equally evident that competition within the imperialist hierarchy remains intense and that these companies will have to engage in fierce competition to preserve “the opportunities” currently available to them.

The once-favoured son of Turkish capitalism: Fethullah Gülen and the Gülen Movement



The opening of the Gülen movement's financial institution, Bank Asya (then Asya Finans), on 24 October 1996, attended by Deputy Prime Minister Tansu Çiller, future presidents Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and Abdullah Gül, movement leader Fethullah Gülen, and other leading political figures.

Beginning his career as a state-employed imam (Islamic religious leader), Fethullah Gülen gradually transformed his personal authority into a national and international religious-political network. From the 1960s onwards, he steadily emerged as one of the most influential

figures of Turkish right-wing politics. The Gülen Movement took shape within the anti-communist political climate of the Cold War and expanded over nearly half a century through the relationships it established with state institutions, business circles, and right-wing governments in Turkey. Enjoying the tacit support of U.S. imperialism and operating in alignment with the imperialist policies pursued within the NATO and U.S. framework, Gülen built an extensive organizational network extending from education and the media to capital and the state bureaucracy. It became one of the principal actors in the erosion of the Republic's secular, statist, and progressive legacy, as well as in the neoliberal and religious restructuring of the Turkish state. The attempted coup of 15 July 2016 marked the most critical stage reached in this long historical process.

A Career Built on Anti-Communism

During the 1960s, the Associations for the Struggle Against Communism were established in Turkey as part of imperialist efforts to curb the rise of the revolutionary movement. Fethullah Gülen first emerged through the role he played in the establishment of one of these associations in Erzurum -an Eastern province- and in its subsequent expansion. While serving

as an imam in state mosques, he travelled across Turkey with the Qur'an in hand, attracting followers through his religious sermons and gradually becoming known as "Hoca Efendi" ("Religious Teacher"). This rise also coincided with the Cold War period.

One of the major turning points of the counter-revolution¹ in Turkey was the fascist military coup of 12 September 1980. Gülen became one of the coup's most prominent supporters. His article entitled "Mehmetçik Came to Our Rescue" (Mehmetcik is the common Turkish term for the ordinary soldier) and his declaration in 2005 that the coup leader, General Kenan Evren, was destined for heaven because he had made religious education compulsory in schools, clearly revealed his political position.

The Gülen Movement maintained close ties with the capitalist system and its governments. Its members openly supported the Özal government, which initiated the privatization of public assets and the sale of state-owned resources in Turkey. During the Özal administration, Gülenists were appointed to influential positions across many sectors of the public administration. Throughout this period, the Movement accumulated capital through donations and zakat (Islamic almsgiving). With

the establishment of the newspaper Zaman in 1986, it also entered the media sector. Until the AKP came to power, the Movement cultivated close relations throughout the 1980s and 1990s with the governments of Özal, Demirel, Çiller, Yılmaz, and Ecevit. Politicians from both the centre-right and the centre-left showed Gülen particular respect and consideration, gave him public visibility, and invited him to official events. Alongside their placement within state institutions, the Movement also created its own business networks and accumulated its own capital.

In 1999, Gülen left for the United States, officially on the grounds of health problems, and continued his activities there until his death.

The Imperialist Connection

Gülen's ties extended beyond the Turkish ruling class. Internationally, he also cultivated relations with prominent religious and political figures such as Abraham Foxman, Morton Abramowitz, and Pope John Paul II. Gülen was included in the list of the "World's Top 100 Living Public Intellectuals," compiled jointly by the U.S. magazine Foreign Policy and the UK magazine Prospect in 2008, and was also named by Time magazine in 2013, as one of the "100 Most Influential People in the World."

Gülen was also known for the language courses, cultural centres, and primary and high schools, more than a thousand in number established in over 100 countries. In 2011, Karen Hughes, one of George W. Bush's closest advisors, was hired to lead the promotion and public relations campaign for these schools. Hughes had served as press advisor to both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush before being appointed Under Secretary of State in 2005. The geographical distribution of the Movement's schools closely followed the priorities of U.S. foreign policy. In regions of strategic importance, the United States actively supported and facilitated the establishment of these schools. Gülen himself openly expressed this alignment when he declared: "With its current position and power, America can direct the entire world. America is still the one at the helm of this ship called the world. Nothing should be undertaken anywhere while ignoring America." Indeed, the number of Gülen schools in Africa expanded rapidly, particularly during the Obama administration, when the continent became one of the principal priorities of U.S. foreign policy. In Latin America, as left-wing governments came to power, the Movement's educational network was expanded as one of the instruments reinforcing U.S. political and ideological influence in the region.

The Gülen schools were not merely educational institutions; they constituted an international organizational network through which the Gülen Movement trained its cadres, cultivated ties with business circles, expanded its political influence, and established spheres of influence aligned with U.S. imperialist interests in the countries where it operated. In a number of countries, numerous allegations, investigations, and testimonies concerning links between certain administrators and members of this network and the CIA entered the public domain.

The RAND Corporation, a think tank directly linked to the CIA, identified Fethullah Gülen as one of the “modernists” in its report *Civil Democratic Islam*, under the section entitled “Options for Supporting Moderate Muslims.” The report further argued that this group should be the primary recipient of U.S. support. It stated that “their publications and ideas should be promoted through financial support for publishing and distribution; they should be encouraged to reach wider audiences, particularly young people; assistance should be provided for the establishment of civil society organizations, access to educational facilities, and participation in the political process; support should be given for the creation of

websites, schools, and institutes through which they can disseminate their views; and reformist Islam should be promoted as an alternative for the broader population.”

Following the attempted coup in Turkey on 15 July 2016, when Turkey requested his extradition from the United States, Gülen himself made his position unmistakably clear in an article published under his own name in The New York Times: “At a time when Western democracies need moderate Muslims, my friends in the ‘Hizmet’ (a name Gülen and his followers used for themselves) movement and I stand with the West.”

Alliance and Conflict with the AKP Government

When the AKP came to power, a major opportunity opened up for the Gülen Movement, whose members had already secured positions in numerous state institutions. United by their shared hostility towards secularism and the Republic, these two political Islamist forces paved the way for the rapid rise of the Gülen Movement.

The clearest manifestation of this alliance was the series of fabricated trials directed against the military, aimed at purging those within the state who were regarded as obstacles to the new

government's project of transforming Turkey. The Ergenekon trial was initiated on allegations that members of the military and various civilian bureaucrats were plotting to overthrow the government. As part of this process, hundreds of military officers, journalists, and academics were detained and prosecuted. The Balyoz (Sledgehammer) trial, in turn, was launched on allegations that senior military officers had been preparing a coup in 2003. Years later, it emerged that the police officers who had fabricated evidence and carried out unlawful surveillance and wiretapping, were members of the Gülen Movement, while the prosecutors and judges responsible for these trials were likewise affiliated with the Movement. During the AKP government, the Movement was applied as an operational instrument against the military, while the Movement had become deeply entrenched within the armed forces.

In 2010, Turkey held a constitutional referendum. Among the proposed amendments were significant changes to the structure and powers of the Constitutional Court, reforms to the composition of the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors (HSYK), and the subordination of the military judiciary to the jurisdiction of the civilian courts. During the referendum, one of the

AKP's most important supporters was the Gülen Movement. Indeed, it was in the aftermath of the referendum that the Movement systematically consolidated its presence within the judiciary.

The United States was not the only beneficiary of the schools established by the Gülen Movement. These schools also made a significant contribution to the international expansion of AKP-affiliated segments of the capitalist class. Turkish companies, most notably those affiliated with the Turkish Confederation of Businessmen and Industrialists (TUSKON), which was widely known for its close ties to Fethullah Gülen, signed commercial agreements in the countries where these schools operated, with the support of the AKP government. Turkish Airlines (THY) complemented this network by establishing direct flights to major cities in countries hosting Gülen schools, especially in Africa. Turkish Airlines' first destination in Latin America was São Paulo, where one of the Gülen schools was located.

Relations between the AKP and the Gülen Community were so close that then Prime Minister

Recep Tayyip Erdoğan publicly invited Gülen to return to Turkey, declaring that it was time to end their long separation.

The alliance between the AKP and the Gülen Movement eventually collapsed as the two sides entered into a struggle for control over the state apparatus. From 2012 onward, tensions escalated through intelligence, judicial, and police crises, culminating in major corruption investigations targeting senior government figures in late 2013. Erdoğan denounced these investigations as an attempted political coup orchestrated by the Movement, and the government responded with sweeping purges and reassignments across the bureaucracy, particularly within the police and judiciary.

The Military Coup attempt

The conflict between the AKP and the Gülen Movement reached its climax with the pro-US military coup attempt of 15 July 2016. The coup first became apparent when soldiers blocked the Bosphorus Bridge in İstanbul, and was confirmed after then Prime Minister Binali Yıldırım appeared on television and announced that an uprising was under way. Shortly after the coup declaration was broadcast by the Gülenists on the state television channel TRT, President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan appeared on another television channel, describing the events as “an uprising by a minority within the armed forces, a movement of the parallel structure,” and called on the public to

take to the streets. Clashes between the military and the police continued throughout the night at state institutions and strategic locations in İstanbul and Ankara. By the end of the events, more than 300 people had been killed, including 104 soldiers who had taken part in the coup attempt; over 2,000 people were injured, and 8,036 military personnel of various ranks were taken into custody. The coup attempt left behind a country governed under a state of emergency, accompanied by operations, dismissals, and purges comparable to a witch hunt. In Turkey, capitalists, the AKP government, and even the parliamentary opposition parties—all of whom had once competed for meetings with Gülen—declared him a terrorist after 15 July. When he died in 2024, those attending his funeral were forced to conceal their identities.


Although the coup attempt ultimately failed, the Gülenists nevertheless fulfilled their historical function of paralysing the republican legacy while succeeding in their mission of keeping Turkey aligned with NATO and the United States. Moreover, a significant proportion of the cadres cultivated by the Community over half a century within the state, politics, and the capitalist class continue to exercise influence under different identities. For this reason, the AKP government was never able to carry out a genuine reckoning

with Gülenism. What required confronting was not merely an organization, but the counter-revolutionary order that had nurtured it for decades, strengthened it within the state, and shaped the country's political trajectory. That same order continues to maintain its powerful presence within both the bureaucracy and the economy through different religious orders, religious communities, and fractions of capital.

1- In this article, the concept of counter-revolution refers to the process through which the Republic's secular, statist, independent, and progressive achievements were eroded, while Turkish capitalism was restructured in accordance with the requirements of the capitalist class and Western imperialist alliance. This process advanced through a set of mutually reinforcing dynamics, including anti-communism, the unrestricted plunder of capital and public resources, the dismantling of the public sphere, the repression of the organized labour movement, and the transformation of religion into a determining force in political and social life, culminating in the dismantling of laicism.

Defense industry in Turkey

%48 INCREASE IN EXPORTS



In 2025, Turkey exported 230 types of defense products to 185 different countries, pushing its total goods and services exports above \$10 billion. This represents an approximately 40-fold increase compared to 2002. Compared to the previous year, 2024, exports increased by roughly 48%, and this stands as the highest annual export level ever recorded.

DEFENSE EXPORTS DOUBLE THEIR SHARE OF TOTAL EXPORTS



The share of defense and aerospace exports in Turkey's total exports increased from 1.7% in 2022 to 3.6% in 2025, more than doubling in just three years. This

reflects the sector's rapidly growing role in the country's export economy.

11th LARGEST ARMS SUPPLIER

The share of defense and aerospace exports in Turkey's total exports increased from **1.7% in 2022** to **3.6% in 2025**, more than doubling in just three years. This reflects the sector's rapidly growing role in the country's export economy.

5 COMPANIES IN THE RANKS



By 2025, Turkey’s defense giants had climbed the ranks of the world’s largest defense companies list, with ASELSAN placing 43rd, TUSAŞ 47th, ROKETSAN 71st, ASFAT 78th, and MKE 80th. This rise was also reflected in the companies’ market values, with significant gains seen on the stock exchange as well.

Highlights from Turkish Foreign Policy



Military and energy cooperation in the Black Sea

Following the NATO Summit held on 7-8 July, the increased focus on Russia is clearly apparent in the measures taken both before and after the summit. Over the past two months, there has been discussion of sanctions—including those faced by Turkish companies—based on allegations that Turkey has supported the shipment of Russian energy resources. In addition to European sanctions, U.S. calls to phase out Russian energy resources are pushing the government to plan for replacing Russian gas with supplies from the U.S. and Central Asia.

The issue of diversifying energy sources is being advanced in parallel with Europe's new security strategies. Following European Commission

President Ursula von der Leyen's statement that said, "we must consolidate the European continent so that it does not fall under Russian, Turkish, or Chinese influence," a clarification was issued that was hardly an apology but essentially defined Turkey's roles and boundaries. Approximately two months after the emphasis on Turkey's roles and responsibilities in the South Caucasus, the Turkey-Azerbaijan-Georgia Trilateral Foreign Ministers' Meeting was held in Istanbul. In his remarks during the press conference held after the meeting, Foreign Minister Hakan Fidan emphasized peace and stability in the South Caucasus while also highlighting the importance of the normalization process between Turkey and Armenia.

Another development in this context occurred at the NATO Summit in Ankara. Agreements were signed to expand the pipeline infrastructure—a legacy of the Cold War era that connects military bases—toward Turkey and Eastern Europe. The project will be financed from a \$28 billion infrastructure expansion fund allocated from NATO's joint budget. The countries where the projects are built will cover the maintenance costs. It is reported that Turkey will cover the costs of the project's civilian-use components itself.

Although Turkey's policy of diversifying its energy sources has reduced energy imports from Russia to below 40 percent, the fact that a complete phase-out is not possible leaves the AKP government—which has steered the country full steam ahead toward Westernization—in a vulnerable position. On the one hand, the country is participating in air drills along its border in response to the Russian threat; on the other hand, it remains silent regarding the drone attacks that have been ongoing in the Black Sea for months. When asked about these unofficial “sanctions” imposed on trade relations with Russia via UAVs, the Turkish Foreign Minister characterized them as unfortunate incidents and misunderstandings. Following the injury of two of Turkish citizens in the latest ship attack, however, the government sought to soothe public sentiment by stating that displeasure was expressed to both sides!

In the Western Black Sea, meanwhile, a form of cooperation with a strong military focus appears to be forming. Turkey, Romania, and Bulgaria have expanded the scope of their joint naval operations in the region through an additional protocol to the memorandum of association signed at the NATO summit regarding the Black Sea Mine Countermeasures Task Group. Immediately following the NATO summit, the

Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Southeast European Cooperation Process took place in Sofia under the main theme of “Strengthening Regional Unity for a Stable, Secure, and Sustainable Future.” The joint statement issued at the conclusion of the summit emphasized the need to preserve unity and cooperation among the countries of the region in the face of current geopolitical challenges. When considering the Southeast European Cooperation Process, it is worth recalling the joint meeting organized by the Presidency’s Communications Directorate in late June in Sofia with the anti-Russian “think tank” known as “CSD.” At that meeting, NATO’s military buildup in the Black Sea was discussed. Last year, CSD had targeted Turkey-Russia relations in its report titled “The Kremlin Playbook in Turkey.”

After attending the Coalition of Volunteers Leaders’ Summit on Ukraine held in Paris, Foreign Minister Fidan, who visited Ukraine, stated that Turkey had agreed to lead naval forces in the Black Sea. An international military force led by France—known as “Ukrainian Volunteers” and formed in this manner to allow non-NATO countries, including the United Kingdom, to participate—is to be established in Beykoz, İstanbul, the allocation of a naval base in the

section of the Bosphorus leading to the Black Sea—even if the leadership of naval forces in the Black Sea is framed within the context of a potential peace—indicates that Western imperialism will exert pressure on this region even outside of a peace scenario.

The hope of the faithful, Trump's approval

President Erdoğan, certain members of his party, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs frequently issue statements condemning Israel, its attacks, and its expansionism. The role of the U.S., however, is either ignored or reduced to Israel's repressive stance. President Erdoğan of the AKP, who said he "welcomed with satisfaction" the agreement signed between Iran and the U.S., once again pretended not to see, hear, or speak—as usual—in the face of the attacks that Trump resumed as soon as he arrived in Turkey for the NATO Summit. Following Trump's statement that "I think the ceasefire is over," Erdoğan, speaking at the opening of the NATO Summit in Ankara, said regarding Iran, "I commend the resolute stance supported by Mr. Trump."

Erdoğan, who has left Gaza—and subsequently Iran and Syria—to fend for themselves against U.S. imperialism and Israeli aggression, still does not fail to spout "ummah" rhetoric at party meetings. Erdoğan's statements, in which he



declares the AKP to be “the hope of the ummah,” not only reflect a neo-Ottoman expansionist policy but also imply that the “ummah” itself—and even all other actors with whom the AKP maintains relations in the region in question—are inadequate.

Foreign Minister Hakan Fidan naturally drew significant backlash when, in a statement to The National regarding Iran, he claimed that Iran’s actions in the region resembled Israel’s occupation policies. In the early months of the U.S. attacks on Iran, his remarks—made without prior preparation—that “we should not even engage in a dispute with the U.S.” also drew a harsh response, and ultimately, the Iranian people demonstrated their readiness to confront imperialism.

“We need to return to a situation where the sovereignty and territorial integrity of every nation are fully recognized. Iran has long claimed to be pursuing a preemptive security policy by maintaining proxies in these countries, just as the Israelis occupy the rest of the region as part of their security,” said the Foreign Minister—who seems to have forgotten the jihadists nurtured and empowered in Syria out of neo-Ottomanist ambitions.

Continuing the struggle after the NATO Summit



The conclusion of the NATO Summit did not mark the end of TKP's anti-NATO struggle. Instead, the TKP intensified its political work by exposing the decisions adopted at the summit and continuing anti-NATO activities throughout the country.

The Central Committee published a political [statement](#), The Truth of NATO after the Ankara Summit, arguing that the summit had once again confirmed NATO's role as an alliance preparing for imperialist wars. The statement explained the historical roots of NATO's presence in Turkey, rejected attempts to present the alliance as a guarantor of security, and called for strengthening the struggle for a sovereign, independent and socialist Turkey on the basis of class politics.

TKP gathered in Ankara after the NATO Summit at the “Long Live Life, Independence, and Socialism” event, where General Secretary Kemal Okuyan shared his assessment of the summit, and new comrades who joined the struggle were welcomed.

TKP’s political interventions spark broad public debate

Following the detention of Haluk Levent, a popular Turkish singer and the founder of the charity organization Ahbap, over allegations that earthquake relief funds had been used for gambling, a statement by TKP General Secretary Kemal Okuyan attracted widespread attention. Rather than focusing solely on the individual case, Okuyan highlighted the broader dangers of society’s tendency to elevate individuals into “heroes,” arguing that solidarity should rest on collective organization and accountable institutions rather than charismatic personalities. In the days that followed, politicians, journalists, and commentators from across the political spectrum referred to Okuyan’s remarks, and he was repeatedly asked to elaborate on this perspective during television appearances.

One of the most widely discussed follow-up interviews was Okuyan’s appearance on Sözcü TV, where he expanded on his criticism of “hero politics.” He argued that societies lacking strong collective organizations inevitably become dependent on “charismatic” individuals. He argued that systems built around individual leaders are inherently fragile, as individuals are easier to manipulate, pressure and buy. Okuyan also argued that the wealth created by the overwhelming majority of society is appropriated by a tiny minority that controls the means of production, and that lasting

social prosperity requires ending this concentration of economic power by bringing the means of production under public ownership.

TKP continues to expand nationwide and strengthen its organization



Following its widely noted opposition to the NATO Summit, the Communist Party of Turkey (TKP) has accelerated its nationwide organizing efforts. Under the slogan, “We need more people, not heroes. Don’t walk alone—join TKP,” the party has been expanding its membership campaign while strengthening its presence across the country through the opening of new local party centers.

As part of this effort, TKP inaugurated a new party center in the Karşıyaka district of İzmir. At the opening ceremony, the party called on all those who aspire to a brighter future and a country where people can live with dignity to join the struggle within the ranks of TKP. Speaking at the event, TKP Central Committee member Berkay Kemal Önoğlu stressed that resistance and determination can only become an effective political

force when they are organized collectively, describing the new party center as a place where that political will can be built and inviting people to join the struggle for a more livable and independent Turkey.

TKP salutes 26 July, the assault on the Moncada Barracks



In cooperation with the José Martí Cuba Friendship Association, the TKP commemorated 26 July 1953 with talks held at the party's neighbourhood houses in İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir, attended by the Ambassador of the Republic of Cuba and Cuban diplomats.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkey released a statement in honor of 135 young Cuban revolutionaries who became the symbol of the Cuban people's uprising against the Batista dictatorship. The assault on the Moncada Barracks was the first spark of one of the twentieth century's finest revolutions. TKP CC saluted the people of Cuba and honored the revolutionary vanguard cadres.



AÑOS CON FIDEL

"Cuba can never be subdued. We will fight for every inch of our land until death, should imperialism dare to attack our socialist homeland."

Fidel Castro

