

**Let's Organize the Party and the Revolution
with the Decisions of the 2nd Congress!**



Party Publications
www.tkpml.com

[Explanation: This pamphlet is an interview with a member of the Political Bureau of the TKP-ML Central Committee, who recently announced the organisation of its 2nd Congress].

Let's Organize the Party and the Revolution with the Decisions of the 2nd Congress!

– First of all, could you introduce yourself?

–I am a member of the TKP-ML CC, Political Bureau.

- First of all, thank you for accepting our interview request.

-On the contrary, we thank you. In today's world, the capitalist imperialists do not merely seek to dominate the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the world through the apparatus of force. They also strive to impose ideological domination over the struggle of the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the world through the mass media. We are going through a period in which every radical revolutionary practice, let alone communist ideology, is rendered questionable and almost every revolutionary work is tried to be confined within legal limits. In this sense, we attach great importance to the direct communication of the views of our party and revolutionary movements to the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the world. Therefore, we thank you once again.

- It was recently announced that your Party held its 2nd Congress. Naturally, we have questions about the resolutions of the Congress and especially the new decisions made. But first, could you describe the conditions under which your Congress convened?

- I can approach this question from two perspectives. Firstly, our 2nd Congress convened at a time when the imperialists and their regional powers, especially in Eastern Europe and the Middle East, were engaged in conflicts, signaling the deepening of a new imperialist war of division. Seizing this opportunity, the ruling classes in Turkey intensified their fascist aggression both within the country and beyond its borders. This period was marked by escalating attacks against the revolutionary and communist movement, with a specific focus on dismantling the Kurdish

national liberation movement. Every organization that refused to capitulate or compromise in the face of fascism was subjected to severe repression, including targeted assassinations and mass incarcerations. Therefore, our 2nd Congress was convened amid a period of intense surrender campaigns and liquidation efforts targeting those who resisted fascist policies—particularly the revolutionary and communist movements. Secondly, our Congress was originally scheduled to be held a year earlier, under normal conditions. However, the earthquakes centered in Maraş on February 6, 2023, caused our congress to be postponed. As you know, these earthquakes had devastating effects in Turkey and Northern Syria. In a process in which tens of thousands of people were massacred, hundreds of thousands of people were injured and millions of people were deprived of one of their most basic rights, the right to shelter, our party tried to stand by our working class and working people with all its strength in the face of this massacre inflicted on our people, and took action. Naturally, this objective situation prevented our 2nd Congress from being held on the planned date. Yet, as in everything, the two sides of the contradiction also came into play here. We can call it positivity in negativity. The objective postponement inadvertently provided our party with the opportunity to engage in deeper discussions on Congress agendas, ensuring a more comprehensive and well-prepared assembly.

- Are you suggesting that, despite the necessity of postponement, you transformed this setback into an advantage?

- Precisely. For our party operating under fascist conditions, prolonging organizational processes entails security risks. The historical experience of our party attests to this reality. Particularly in such periods, the enemy intensifies its offensive to prevent the successful implementation of our party's "unity-struggle-higher unity" line. The enemy understands for our party, congresses and conferences are crucial moments in which criticism and self-criticism are exercised, shortcomings are evaluated, and forward steps are planned. Consequently, we have

repeatedly faced heightened enemy assaults during such processes. Numerous comrades have been imprisoned, and some—including leading cadres—have attained immortality because of these attacks. This historical experience remains deeply embedded in our party's organizational memory.

Additionally, let us underline a point that is not usually emphasized when it comes to such organizational practices of our party. Congress and conference processes are important for the TKP-ML not only in terms of the enemy's relentless attack on our party, but also in terms of operating democracy at the highest level within itself. TKP-ML stands in a distinct and exemplary position in this regard. This is one of the aspects that make TKP-ML "special". One of the first tasks undertaken by our party during its 1st Conference, following the murder of Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, was the formulation of the party charter. Since then, every leadership has been evaluated in each conference and congress, resolutions have been passed, and the party charter has been updated in accordance with the evolving needs of the struggle.

Our party remains steadfast in its commitment to practicing proletarian democracy internally while advocating for people's democracy externally. For over half a century, amid an unyielding struggle against fascism, we have not only resisted external repression but also ensured the internal application of proletarian democracy within our ranks. This is an indispensable characteristic that defines TKP-ML as TKP-ML. Therefore, our congresses and conferences hold immense significance.

During the 2nd Congress process, our Party conducted extensive discussions, held sub-congresses through our Central Discussion Organ, Party Unions, aligning them with the pre-determined agenda. Delegates elected from these sub-congresses then convened for the main assembly, successfully concluding the 2nd Congress. We think that the success of our congress is of historical importance in terms of our party history, especially in terms of certain agendas. We are confident that as our party

translates its resolutions into action in the class struggle, the significance of these determinations will become increasingly evident.

- We believe it would be beneficial to clarify a matter that has caused some confusion within the international community. Your party has existed for 53 years, yet it has held only two congresses. Could you provide some insight into this?

- As I have previously emphasized, many of the conferences convened by our party have served as organizational processes that, in terms of their scope and agenda, could be considered equivalent to congresses. In these past conferences, especially those from our early years, our party deliberated on and made decisions regarding a broad array of issues, ranging from ideological discussions to organizational challenges. However, these were officially designated as conferences rather than congresses. The primary reason for this classification lies in the fact that, for a prolonged period, our party had not conducted a comprehensive analysis of Turkey's economic and social structure, nor had it formulated a synthesized conclusion based on such an analysis or developed a formal party program. At its 1st Congress, our party formally articulated its party program. At its 2nd Congress, it undertook an in-depth analysis of Turkey's economic and social structure. Based on the findings of this analysis, the party program was revised and updated accordingly. Moving forward, our party intends to convene conferences with a focus on specific thematic issues.

- What message would you like to convey to the people and the revolutionary public regarding the agenda of your congress?

- Our Congress analyzed Turkey's economic and social structure, reaching a comprehensive synthesis. This was a pivotal agenda item in itself for our 2nd Congress. However, before elaborating on that, I must emphasize that the party's central leadership undertook a thorough evaluation of its activities between the 1st and 2nd Congress. Having examined the activity report presented prior to the will of the Congress, the assembly identified both the

successes and shortcomings of the central leadership, drawing critical lessons from them.

Secondly, another item for the Congress was the discussion on the global and domestic situation. This item was particularly pertinent given the intensification of contradictions within the imperialist capitalist system and Turkey's semi-colonial status. As a matter of fact, it was both necessary and important to hold a discussion on the situation in the imperialist capitalist system in an environment where the contradictions between the states representing the imperialist monopolies have sharpened, sometimes evolved into armed conflicts, and the signs of a new imperialist war of division have become more than evident. On the other hand, during and after the days we discussed this agenda, a series of important historical events took place both in the world and in our country. In other words, we are going through such a special conjuncture that the word may be out of date even before it comes out of our mouths. But of course, all this does not change our determinations and analyses regarding the essence of the issue.

Again, I can express that our Congress conducted an analysis of the attack of the Turkish ruling classes in an environment where the developments in the international arena directly affected the Turkish state and the Turkish ruling classes took advantage of these developments and put into effect a new economic attack policy under the name of "Medium Term Program" against the working class and working people. It is crucial to examine both the root causes and the consequences of the Turkish state's militaristic aggression, as it functions as a semi-colony within the broader capitalist, imperialist order and remains a key component of NATO, the military aggression apparatus of EU imperialism, particularly US imperialism. This aggression has manifested most acutely in our region, particularly in the Middle East, where the Turkish state has advanced its aggressive military ambitions in direct alignment with the strategic objectives of imperialist powers.

Under conditions where the fascist aggression of the Turkish state against our people of Turkish and Kurdish nations, of various nationalities and beliefs has increased; In an environment where this aggression was put into practice not only within the borders but also outside the borders, where active military support was given to Azerbaijan together with Israel in the occupation of Nagorno-Karabakh, as well as the military fascist aggression against the gains of the Kurdish nation in Iraqi Kurdistan, especially in the north of Syria, it was extremely important to put forward a revolutionary line against this fascist aggression by focusing on the reasons for this regional occupation and annexation policy of the Turkish state.

This aggression of the Turkish state against our people domestically and against the peoples of the region externally is rooted in the same economic political foundations. Since its inception, Turkish fascism has functioned as a semi-colony of imperialism, and it now seeks to extract its own advantages from the crisis of capitalist imperialism and the escalating market struggles among imperialist monopolies. At this stage, under the leadership of the AKP-MHP fascist alliance, Turkish fascism aims to consolidate the "internal front" and reinforce its positions, particularly in the Middle East, in an effort to fortify its hegemony. To achieve this, it employs fascist terror against all contradictions, primarily the Kurdish question.

In its attempt to strengthen the "internal front" and shift the burden of the economic crisis onto the working class and laboring masses, Turkish fascism has installed "Mehmet the Englishman" as the overseer of the economy, effectively acting as a trustee of imperialist finance capital. Under the pretext of the "Medium Term Program," a policy is being implemented that will further impoverish the working class and toiling masses while exacerbating unemployment.

For the Turkish ruling classes, the success of this program is intrinsically tied to the brutal suppression of all democratic and progressive demands put forth by the working class and the

broader masses. The democratic aspirations of various oppressed nationalities, particularly the Kurdish nation, as well as those of marginalized religious communities, most notably the Alevi population, are met with relentless fascist repression. In the provinces of Kurdistan, the appointment of state-imposed trustees to municipal administrations has once again nullified even the nominal existence of the “right to vote and be elected,” effectively stripping any pretense of democratic participation.

The demands and struggles of women and LGBTI+ individuals, whose very right to live has been systematically eroded under the AKP-MHP regime, are met with brutal state repression. Meanwhile, the peasantry, deprived of fair compensation for their labor and struggling to sustain their livelihoods, has taken to the streets in protest. However, the state facilitates the plunder of their land by handing over vital agricultural and living spaces to international mining monopolies, deepening the destruction of nature and the environment for the sake of capitalist profit. As fascist repression intensifies, an entire generation of youth is left without any prospects for the future.

Following the AKP-MHP government's expansionist and aggressive policies beyond its borders, particularly in the Syrian war, millions of migrants have been positioned as a source of cheap labor for Turkish capitalism. Migrants, especially Syrians, have been instrumentalized as a tool to fuel racism and chauvinism, further exacerbating social divisions.

As contradictions sharpen and class struggle intensifies across our region, the all-out fascist offensive against the working class and the people continue to escalate, particularly in conditions where the relations between the non-systemic revolutionary movement, especially our party, and the masses have weakened. The revolutionary situation is steadily maturing.

Under these circumstances, our party convened its 2nd Congress, where it assessed the conditions of the ruling classes both internationally and in our region, deliberating on the direction our party will take in the upcoming period.

Alongside its extensive agenda, our congress engaged in a discussion on the nature and path of the revolution in Turkey, basing itself on an analysis of the country's economic and social structure. Various decisions were taken in this regard, and as a result of these discussions, significant revisions were made to the party program. Additionally, our congress reviewed and ratified the decisions of the European Conference and the TIKKO Conference. It also deliberated on and officially adopted the program and statutes of our Communist Women's Union, KKB, as determined at its 1st Congress.

In addition, our party also discussed various organizational issues.

In summary, this is how I can outline the main agenda of our congress.

"At the heart of the rivalry between imperialists lies the reality of dominating the markets!

- It is evident that your 2nd Congress had a highly intensive agenda. In this context, I would like to focus particularly on your party's analysis of the danger of a new imperialist war of division, which you also mentioned. What are your party's views on this issue?

- Our party engaged in an in-depth discussion on this agenda and concluded that global developments are becoming increasingly complex and conflict-ridden, with contradictions between the oppressors and the oppressed deepening. The detailed resolution of our congress on this matter will be shared with the public separately. However, I can briefly respond as follows:

It is evident that the military, political, economic, and social strategies employed by the imperialists and their collaborators to suppress the just and legitimate struggles of the world's peoples and oppressed nations will ultimately fail to yield the results they desire, whether in the short or long term. This is because the cyclical crises of imperialist capitalism, which only deepen over time, create an objective basis for class struggle to intensify.

Today, an exceedingly small class of ultra-wealthy individuals, numbering in the hundreds, controls a vast share of the world's wealth. With each crisis, this parasitic minority accumulates ever-greater riches, while the purchasing power of workers and laborers continues to decline. In a world where the divide between exploiters and the exploited widens so dramatically, the slogan "No bread, no peace" inevitably becomes an urgent and concrete reality. The regional conflicts and spontaneous mass movements emerging across different continents are direct consequences of this objective reality.

At this stage, the imperialist-capitalist system has fractured into two dominant blocks. On one side stand the imperialist forces of the United States, Britain, and the European powers: on the other, the imperialist regimes of China and Russia. Since capitalism's transition into its imperialist stage, the only real change in this confrontation has been the shifting positions of the imperialist butchers. For these predatory powers, the struggle to redivide markets continues unabated, and in pursuit of their rapacious interests, they spill blood across every region of the world, most notably in Asia and Africa, plunging the international proletariat and the oppressed masses deeper into a state of poverty and misery.

At the root of inter-imperialist rivalry lies the struggle for control over markets. Thus, contradiction and conflict remain inherent and perpetual in the relations between imperialist powers. Of course, within the framework of bloc formations, temporary compromises and alliances are sometimes established between certain imperialist forces. Many of the economic and military coalitions forged by U.S. and European imperialists in the 20th century against the Soviet Union, or the socialist camp more broadly, continue to exist today. Despite the betrayal of modern revisionists and the resulting disintegration of the socialist camp, institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank still dictate economic policy, while NATO remains the central military instrument of imperialist aggression. Though U.S. imperialism

has experienced a relative decline in its hegemonic dominance, it continues to play the leading role within this imperialist bloc, maintaining a close alliance with Britain.

In response to the formation of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, led by Russian and Chinese imperialists, new military and economic alliances are emerging across different continents. The United States, in particular, has been taking every possible measure to curb China's expanding influence in the Asia-Pacific region. The "Trilateral Partnership" established with Japan and South Korea is a direct manifestation of this strategy. Similarly, all efforts to expand NATO, a war machine of imperialism, align with this objective.

The world is rapidly being drawn toward an imperialist war of redivision. Governments are restructuring their internal affairs, accordingly, appointing the most reactionary, racist, fascist, and militaristic figures as their foreign, "defense," interior, and justice ministers, spokespersons, and other key officials. The democratic rights and freedoms of workers and laborers are being systematically stripped away, and oppressive fascist laws are being enacted. Weapons factories are operating at full capacity, with increased production of fighter jets, missiles, drones, tanks, artillery, ammunition, and explosives. Military forces, equipment, and stockpiles are being repositioned in strategic regions, and NATO continues its expansion with increased joint exercises.

Economic policies are also being shaped in accordance with preparations for war, with the establishment of dedicated war ministries. Nationalism, racism, and hostility toward migrants and foreigners are being systematically inflamed, making access to essential services increasingly difficult for migrants. Some are threatened with deportation or forced relocation to third countries, particularly in Africa. At the same time, repression against progressive, revolutionary, socialist, and communist movements is intensifying.

The uneven and crisis-ridden development of imperialist economies, the concentration of capital, overproduction, and the

drive to control new markets, energy resources, and trade routes are further sharpening inter-imperialist contradictions and accelerating the march toward another war of redivision.

Concrete examples of this unfolding process include Russia's invasion of Ukraine and the ongoing war between U.S.-British-European imperialists on one side and Russian-Chinese imperialists on the other. Likewise, the conflicts in the Middle East and the Caucasus represent early battles in this struggle for market redivision. Behind every imperialist intervention lies the same fundamental objective: to expand their spheres of influence and escape the crises in which they are mired. War, in its simplest definition, means heightened militarization. The acts of aggression by Israel and the occupations and conflicts created in Syria, Ukraine, and other regions have not only fueled an arms race within those countries but have also deepened military dependency throughout the region. This dependency, in turn, has exacerbated economic devastation, forced mass displacements, and intensified moral, cultural, and ideological decay.

At every historical juncture, the dominant principle in inter-imperialist relations has been competition, dictated by the interests of monopolies. As some imperialist states lose ground and hegemony, others rise in economic and military prominence. The world is once again witnessing such a transition today. Despite all the efforts of U.S. imperialism and its allies, China's imperialist influence over global markets continues to grow.

Yet, despite these developments and quantitative shifts, we remain in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. The occupations, conflicts, and shifting alliances driven by inter-imperialist rivalry are unfolding exactly as Lenin described, as the inevitable result of capitalist redivision struggles.

The sharpening contradictions between imperialist monopolies have given rise to new alliances and bloc formations, intensifying inter-imperialist competition. While in some regions these conflicts manifest as "proxy wars," as seen in Ukraine, in others, they escalate into direct military confrontations.

The escalation of inter-imperialist contradictions inherently carries the risk of a full-scale imperialist war of redivision. While the current balance of power and competitive dynamics among imperialist monopolies have so far prevented an outright global conflict, the ongoing crisis of capitalism, exacerbated by declining profit rates and intensifying struggles over markets, creates the conditions for a Third World War. In this regard, the possibility of such a war remains a strong likelihood.

Against this backdrop, our 2nd Congress has conducted the following assessments regarding the international situation and its developments:

1-) The global economic crisis continues to deepen. Though attempts were made to manage the crisis that began in 2008, the imperialist system has failed to overcome its economic turmoil. The struggle for redivision of markets is escalating. Competition among capitalist-imperialist states over dominance and supremacy persists with full intensity.

2-) The alignment of imperialist blocs has become more pronounced. The United States, Britain, and the European Union form one bloc, while Chinese social-imperialism and Russian imperialism constitute the other.

3-) Unable to resolve their ongoing crises, imperialist states have accelerated their moves toward resolving them through war. The threat of an imperialist war of redivision is growing. Each year, imperialist powers devote more resources to militarization and preparations for war. The rise of fascist parties, the escalation of racism, increasing hostility toward migrants and foreigners, the erosion of democratic and social rights, and the enactment of successive anti-democratic laws must all be understood as preparations for a new war of redivision.

4-) Recent developments in the world and the Middle East have made it abundantly clear that the primary instigators of war are U.S. and British imperialism.

5-) In the face of escalating imperialist wars, the formation of anti-imperialist fronts on a global and continental scale has

become a critical agenda for communists, revolutionaries, and all forces opposed to war.

In conclusion, in light of these developments, we define the primary contradictions on an international level as follows:

1-) The contradiction between imperialism and oppressed nations and peoples.

2-) The contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat within imperialist countries.

3-) The contradiction among imperialist states themselves.

4-) The fundamental contradiction of the global order is that between labor and capital. This contradiction determines the principal conflict worldwide, which is the struggle between imperialism and oppressed nations and peoples. Within capitalist and imperialist states, however, the primary contradiction remains between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

- What are the concrete effects of increasing inter-imperialist contradictions on your region?

The region in which our party carries out its struggle has been subjected to the imperialist policy of "divide, rule, and weaken" for over a century—a policy that they intend to perpetuate. The Middle East, due to its strategic position and vast energy resources, has long been at the center of inter-imperialist rivalries.

Having been under Ottoman rule for centuries, the region became a battleground for European imperialism following the empire's collapse. The British and French imperialists took control, with Britain occupying Palestine, Iraq, and Jordan, while France seized Lebanon and Syria. In the Gulf region and Egypt, British imperialists asserted dominance. Their first move was to fragment the population into small, dependent statelets. Then, through "kings," "sheikhs," "emirs," and "princes"—local despots adorned with titles fitting the region—they ensured the continued defense of imperialist interests. All of these counter-revolutionary policies were orchestrated under the strategy of "divide and rule." Ethnic, religious, sectarian, and even tribal divisions were

deliberately inflamed, turning communities into warring factions always on the brink of violence. Through these policies, the first to suffer were the non-Arab peoples, who were systematically oppressed. Likewise, the Kurdish homeland was partitioned into four separate states by imperialists and their regional reactionary allies. The enormous web of problems created at the dawn of the previous century by imperialist powers and local reactionaries has only grown more complex in the present era.

The very same imperialist-capitalist system, driven by the relentless pursuit of profit and perpetuating fascist and racist ideologies, is responsible for the dispossession of the Palestinian people, the division of Kurdistan, and the devastation of Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, and Libya through occupation and internal conflict. This system has forced hundreds of thousands into exile and displaced entire populations. For over a century, imperialist exploitation and oppression—carried out through their puppet regimes—have led to deepening poverty, destruction, and endless wars. However, wherever there is oppression, there is also resistance. History is filled with the heroic struggles of oppressed peoples and nations. The Palestinian people's fight against Israeli Zionism and the Kurdish nation's struggle against the fascist and reactionary states that rule over them have been a source of hope for other oppressed peoples in the region, including persecuted religious and sectarian communities.

As I mentioned earlier, the Middle East has historically been one of the most conflict-ridden regions on the planet. Internal contradictions and conflicts have consistently made the region vulnerable to foreign intervention. In particular, religious and sectarian strife has not only hindered social progress but has also left the region exposed to external aggression. This objective reality has fostered a culture of social decay, collaborationism, and submission, shaping obedience into a way of life. Religion has played a significant role in this process, with religious fanaticism acting as a major obstacle to all forms of progressive development.

For revolutionaries and socialists operating in a region where national, religious, and sectarian contradictions are deeply entrenched, the fundamental task is to forge the united struggle and class-based solidarity of the oppressed peoples. This requires a firm and clear stance against misleading ideological narratives such as "the brotherhood of religions" or "Islam is a religion of peace," which have no real foundation in social reality. The same principle applies to all other religious and faith-based groups in the region.

In the Middle East, the Palestinian and Kurdish questions persist, just as they have in the past. The Zionist state of Israel remains largely unaccepted by the region's peoples. However, its closest ally in the region is the Turkish state. As seen in the attacks against the Armenian people in Artsakh, Turkey aligned itself with Azerbaijan's fascist regime and Zionist Israel. The Israeli state, which supplies Azerbaijan with billions of dollars in weaponry and provides military training, played a key role in these offensives. While Turkey's ruling classes claim to stand in solidarity with the Palestinian cause, they simultaneously cooperate with Zionism to carry out crimes against the Armenian people.

Contrary to some claims, Turkey's servitude to the U.S. and its complicity with Israel have not suffered any significant ruptures. Furthermore, the so-called "Putin-Erdoğan friendship" is not built on anti-U.S. sentiment but rather on a relationship of mutual concessions and dependency.

The extensive and multidimensional economic embargo imposed on Russia by the U.S. and Western imperialist powers has had severe economic consequences. In response, Russia's ruling classes have sought to circumvent this encirclement strategy by leveraging Azerbaijan and Turkey. This explains why Russian elites have tolerated Turkey's indirect support for Zelensky's government in Ukraine and its open backing of jihadist groups in Syria.

However, Russia, China, and Iran have not remained passive. Economically, China continues to expand its influence in the region. Iran, meanwhile, has strengthened its position through various Shiite militias, organized under different names, which have played active roles in conflicts in Syria, Iraq, and other countries under the so-called "Axis of Resistance." Yet, following the Al-Aqsa Flood operation by the Palestinian national resistance, Zionist Israel—backed by U.S. and British imperialism—launched a massive counteroffensive. Gaza was the first target, followed by attacks on Hezbollah in Lebanon. After the escalation of hostilities between Israel and Iran, jihadist groups were installed in power in Syria, diminishing both Russian and Iranian influence while strengthening NATO's and Israel's positions in the region.

Turkey also played a crucial role in this transformation. The Turkish state openly supported jihadist factions, facilitating the collapse of the Ba'athist Syrian government—one of Israel's most significant regional adversaries. In doing so, Turkey effectively safeguarded the security of Israel, which functions as the imperialist outpost of Western powers in the region. Beyond its NATO membership, Turkey's primary motivation for this role was the perceived threat of Kurdish national gains, which it sees as a direct danger to its territorial integrity. The prospect of Kurdish self-determination exacerbates Turkey's fear of fragmentation.

Additionally, the Artsakh issue remains a key geopolitical concern. The ruling classes of Turkey and Azerbaijan now have their sights set on the Zangezur Corridor, a project that could significantly impact regional power dynamics. The realization of this corridor would sever Armenia's land connection with Iran, creating tensions with Tehran. The Russian ruling classes, by tacitly approving Azerbaijan's occupation of Artsakh, have contributed to the forced displacement of the Armenian people—an act that continues the legacy of the 1915 Armenian Genocide.

These developments also carry the potential to further strain relations between Armenia and Russia, a situation that U.S. imperialism seeks to exploit. The muted response of Western imperialist powers to the occupation of Artsakh demonstrates their priorities. Their concern is not the fate of the Armenian people but rather securing access to Azerbaijani oil and gas. To rid themselves of dependence on Russian energy, Western powers are willing to overlook yet another historical crime against oppressed nations. Thus, it comes as no surprise that their representatives Aliyev and Erdogan shake their bloodstained hands.

- Israel responded to the Al-Aqsa Flood Operation launched by the Palestinian National Resistance on October 7, 2023, with genocidal attacks against the Palestinian people, followed by military strikes on Lebanese Hezbollah. The escalation of hostilities, particularly the reciprocal strikes between Israel and Iran, has fueled growing speculation about the risk of a broader regional war. What is your assessment of this situation?

The Zionist state of Israel, established as an imperialist outpost in the Middle East, remains a direct threat not only to the Palestinian people but to all the oppressed nations of the region. Founded artificially on Palestinian land, Israel functions as the military stronghold of imperialist interests, expanding its colonial occupation and annexation policies with increasing aggression. In addition to the territories, it seized through wars with reactionary Arab regimes, Israel continues its ethnic cleansing policies by designating Palestinian lands as “settlement zones” and using mass killings, repression, and mass incarcerations to forcibly displace Palestinians.

Currently, the Zionist state is methodically annexing the West Bank, where it has been constructing illegal Jewish settlements, gradually erasing Palestinian sovereignty. Meanwhile, it continues its stranglehold over 2.5 million Palestinians in the Gaza Strip, turning the region into an open-air prison under a

total blockade, periodically unleashing military terror against its population.

In response to these long-standing aggressions, the Palestinian National Resistance launched its Al-Aqsa Flood Operation on October 7, 2023. The operation was led primarily by Hamas, with participation from revolutionary organizations such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP), among others. The coordinated attack targeted occupied areas in Israel, resulting in the deaths and capture of hundreds of Zionist soldiers, as well as casualties among settlers in illegal settlements.

This offensive shattered the illusion of Israel's absolute military superiority, causing a deep crisis among the Zionist ruling elite and its Western imperialist sponsors. The reaction was swift: Israel launched an unprecedented assault on Gaza, conducting indiscriminate air and ground attacks, killing tens of thousands of Palestinians, wounding countless more, and forcibly displacing hundreds of thousands from their homes.

The unconditional support that Israel receives from U.S. imperialism and Western imperialist powers has enabled its genocidal assault on the Palestinian people in Gaza. While imperialist-capitalist states and reactionary Arab regimes continue to either openly or covertly support Israel—primarily through trade and diplomatic ties—the peoples of the world have stood in solidarity with Palestine. Across the globe, from the imperialist metropolises to the Global South, millions have taken to the streets to denounce Israel's massacres and demand an end to its crimes.

The October 7 operation and Israel's subsequent massacres have once again brought the Palestinian national resistance to the center of regional and global politics. However, a critical weakness of this resistance remains the dominance of Islamist, Sharia-oriented forces like Hamas. Zionist and imperialist propaganda machines have exploited this reality to justify Israel's

brutal collective punishment of the Palestinian people under the pretext of "self-defense."

The ideological stance of Hamas and Islamic Jihad, along with their ties to regional reactionary states, does not diminish the legitimacy of the Palestinian national resistance. The Palestinian people's struggle, as an oppressed and colonized nation, is both just and entirely legitimate. However, if this resistance remains solely defined by religious fundamentalism, it will ultimately alienate significant sections of Palestinian society, including Christians and other religious minorities, thereby weakening the broader national liberation movement.

For the Palestinian national resistance to succeed, it must rely on its own strength while skillfully maneuvering within the contradictions of imperialist and reactionary regional forces—without becoming a mere instrument of their geopolitical interests. Presently, there is a real danger that the Palestinian resistance, under Hamas' leadership, could become subordinated to the Iranian theocratic regime's "Axis of Resistance" strategy, which primarily serves to shield Iran's reactionary rule rather than advance a revolutionary struggle.

Iran's stance toward the Palestinian resistance is shaped entirely by pragmatism. Tehran backs Palestinian forces not out of genuine solidarity, but because its own regional security doctrine is built around countering U.S. imperialism and Zionism. The Iranian clerical regime is acutely aware that it remains a key strategic target of U.S. imperialism. This is why it seeks to preemptively deflect potential attacks by maintaining proxy forces beyond its borders.

There is no doubt that Iran is a long-term target for U.S. imperialism in the region. However, Washington and its allies have not yet launched a direct attack on Iran because they perceive it as a "large prey" that requires careful preparation. As seen in Syria, the U.S. and Western imperialist powers will not hesitate to strike if and when conditions allow. The Iranian regime is well aware of this reality, which is why it aggressively

pursues nuclear capabilities while simultaneously deepening its economic and military ties with Russia and China.

Iran's economic agreements with China's social-imperialist bloc are a direct reflection of the broader imperialist rivalry that has intensified in the Middle East in recent years. China's growing economic and political influence in the region is exemplified by the expansion of BRICS, which, as of August 22, 2023, welcomed Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Iran, Egypt, and Ethiopia as new members—signaling an increasing alignment of regional powers away from U.S. hegemony.

The Caucasus and the Middle East will continue to be battlegrounds in the imperialist struggle for domination in the coming years. The strategic maneuvers of global imperialist powers in these regions indicate that new wars and conflicts are not only possible but highly likely as inter-imperialist contradictions sharpen.

"Feudal remnants persist, yet capitalism has become dominant!"

-In your congress announcement, you stated that an analysis of Turkey's economic and social structure was conducted. What can you say about this?

- Yes, you've touched on a highly significant agenda item. Our party will gradually present its findings on Turkey's economic and social structure to the public. In response to your question, I can briefly summarize as follows:

Analyzing the socio-economic structure is fundamental in determining the strategy and tactical forms of struggle for a revolution in any country. It must be acknowledged that our party has fallen short in this regard. However, this shortcoming does not stem from a theoretical deficiency but rather from a failure to grasp the critical importance of an economic and social structure analysis. This is why, following the martyrdom of Comrade İbrahim Kaypakkaya, our party did not engage in substantive discussions on Turkey's socio-economic reality for an extended period.

Although significant preparations were made for the 1st Congress after the Party's 1st Conference in 1978, the congress ultimately did not materialize due to the central committee's mismanagement of the process. The 1980 fascist military coup further disrupted this effort, and for a prolonged period, the party was unable to resolve its fundamental issues.

For all communist parties operating in their respective countries, the first and foremost task has been to analyze the nation's socio-economic structure. Lenin laid the foundation for the Russian Revolution by analyzing the country's economic conditions and defining the nature and path of revolution. Similarly, Mao examined China's economic and political structure, outlining the stages and trajectory of the revolution.

Comrade Kaypakkaya, upon founding our party, conducted a comprehensive political and economic analysis of Turkey, defining the first phase of the revolution as the People's Democratic Revolution and determining its path as the People's War. He also carried out a class analysis, identifying the revolution's enemies and allies based on this assessment.

In any socio-economic structure analysis, the primary criterion is understanding how exploitation is carried out. In other words, it is essential to determine the predominant form of exploitation within a given social formation. Once this is established, the relationship between the ruling and the oppressed classes can be defined and analyzed. Therefore, grasping the relationship between direct producers and those who control the means of production is key to understanding the fundamental basis upon which the economic and social structure rests.

This is well known, but it is worth reiterating: In class-based societies built on private property ownership, exploitation has taken various forms. In slave societies, slave owners sustained themselves by exploiting slave labor. In feudal societies, feudal lords extracted surplus labor from the serfs. With the collapse of feudalism and the rise of modern bourgeois society, exploitation persisted under a new form.

The capitalist mode of production, which replaced feudal production, is based on the exploitation of wage laborers by capitalists. To fully comprehend capitalist production, one must first recognize that capitalism is fundamentally based on commodity production. In capitalist society, the foundation of production relations is the exploitation of wage laborers.

The precursor to Turkey's social formation, the Ottoman Empire, was a centrally administered feudal society where production was primarily land-based. While the empire amassed a certain level of capital accumulation through territorial expansion and plunder, it never underwent a bourgeois revolution. By the early 19th century, the Ottoman state had fallen under the control of the dominant capitalist nations of the time, Britain, France, and Germany, becoming a semi-colony. This external subjugation, combined with the failure of the local bourgeoisie to dismantle feudal structures, prevented an industrial revolution from taking place. Although capitalism began to infiltrate Ottoman society, its development remained weak and primarily centered on consumption.

During the 15th and 16th centuries, the Ottoman Empire maintained a relatively developed trade economy, and the initial manifestations of manufacturing capital began to emerge within urban small-scale production. If not for the exploitative colonial trade of foreign capital and the subsequent looting of the empire by imperialist powers, it is possible that capitalism could have developed internally through its own contradictions. By the 16th century, European trade capitalism had already integrated the Ottoman Empire into its markets. British and French commodities flooded Ottoman lands, spreading the monetary economy from the coastal regions to the interior. Payment for these imported goods was largely made in precious metals, rapidly depleting the empire's treasury. However, rather than declining, the consumption of foreign goods continued to increase. This situation not only led to growing foreign debt but also expanded the influence of foreign bankers and local usurers,

who profited from the empire's financial collapse. Meanwhile, in an effort to offset its economic decline, the Ottoman state intensified its extraction of surplus from the peasantry.

However, feudal production relations were inherently incapable of expanding production. Since feudal economies are based on subsistence production, the intensification of exploitation without altering the fundamental production structure eventually led to the collapse of the Timar system, the backbone of the Ottoman feudal order.

The Republic of Turkey was established upon the remnants of the Ottoman Empire. At the Lausanne Conference, Turkey's semi-colonial status was officially recognized by imperialist powers. In exchange, the newly formed Turkish state was allowed to annex part of the partitioned Kurdish territories.

When the Republic was officially proclaimed on October 29, 1923, Turkey's economy remained semi-feudal and semi-colonial. The 1923 İzmir Economic Congress formalized this status, cementing the country's dependency on imperialism. A weak comprador bourgeoisie and large landowners, propped up by state resources, began to expand their economic power under Kemalist rule. Due to the bourgeoisie's lack of economic strength, capital accumulation relied heavily on state intervention. With the rise of the Democratic Party (DP) to power, Turkey's economic and political ties with the United States deepened, and barriers to foreign capital inflow were systematically dismantled. This period saw the consolidation of imperialist hegemony through the strengthening of ties between transnational monopolies and the comprador bourgeoisie. The Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan facilitated the removal of bureaucratic obstacles to foreign investment. In 1954, the DP passed the Foreign Capital Encouragement Law, which granted foreign monopolies unrestricted access to investment and trade, effectively bringing the national economy under imperialist control. Further policies, such as the Petroleum Law, opened Turkey's energy resources to imperialist exploitation, while the

Mining Law paved the way for private enterprises to expand their dominance. Additionally, Turkey's participation in the Korean War paved its entry into NATO, further entrenching its subjugation to Western imperialism. Thus, in addition to Germany, France and others, it has also become a semi-colony of U.S imperialism.

During the DP period, the comprador bourgeoisie and the large landowners significantly expanded their wealth. With the development of mechanization in agriculture, a significant portion of the land was cultivated, further increasing the capital accumulation of the landowners. Although increased production somewhat stimulated the domestic market, economic development dependent on imperialism was unsustainable in the long term. By the mid-1950s, due to the agricultural policies pursued, domestic consumption became unsustainable. Turkey's debt to OECD countries had reached \$162.5 million. Furthermore, continuous access to foreign exchange was required to import the necessary equipment and raw materials for "development."

The 1960s were marked by the adoption of Keynesian economic policies. As a result of this economic development model, public sector investments increased. Additionally, this was a period when "planning" was emphasized. Economic plans prepared by imperialist state economists were presented to the governments of semi-colonial countries, promising economic development. Following these developments, a law enacted in 1961 established, the State Planning Organization, and the Five-Year Development Plan was prepared.

As in all semi-colonial countries, the implementation of "development plans" in Turkey was not independent of imperialist institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank; rather, it was designed to guarantee the return of imperialist capital investments.

After the 1960 military coup, a perception was created that the coup would bring "some democratic rights," but this period, in

which certain democratic concessions were included in the constitution under pressure from mass movements, did not last long. The 1971 Military Coup entirely revoked these limited democratic rights enshrined in the 1961 Constitution.

By 1978, Turkey was in a severe economic crisis with no way out. None of the programs attempted could solve the economic problems. By 1979, not only had an economic crisis emerged, but the situation also evolved into a crisis of governance, escalating further. The rising revolutionary wave merged with worker strikes and student protests, mobilizing the masses onto the streets.

During this period, in parallel with the reorganization of the international division of labor by imperialist capital, semi-colonial countries were restructured accordingly, and Turkey's economy, as one of these semi-colonial markets, was "restructured" to fit this process.

The fascist coup of September 12, 1980, was carried out both to suppress the growing mass movement and to implement the "restructuring program." With the coup, decisions were made against the working class and all laborers in both economic and political spheres, and repression was further intensified. The existing system was reorganized under the guise of neoliberalism, prioritizing the interests of imperialists and the Turkish ruling classes. To achieve this, workers, peasants, small producers, public employees, communist and revolutionary organizations, the Kurdish national movement, democratic structures, trade unions, intellectuals, and others were targeted. In short, both class and national oppression reached their peak.

From the late second half of the 21st century onward, the reorganization of the international division of labor by imperialist capital led to significant changes in semi-colonial markets, including Turkey. The policies implemented in these semi-colonial markets resulted in substantial transformations in their economic and social structures. In other words, the conditions of semi-colonial dependency on imperialist capital were updated

and reproduced. In parallel with this updating and reproduction, the semi-colonial semi-feudal economic structure underwent transformations.

Since its establishment, Turkey has had a semi-feudal, semi-colonial economic and social structure. While semi-feudal production relations were dominant, the deepening of semi-colonial conditions and the dissolution of feudal relations led to the development of capitalism dependent on imperialism (comprador capitalism). Although semi-feudal production relations were not entirely abolished, they weakened and lost their dominant status. In today's Turkey, feudal remnants still exist, but capitalism has become the dominant system.

This process has not only transformed the economic and social structure but has also led to significant changes in the conditions of direct producers. For example, in 1927, the total number of enterprises in Turkey, including small businesses, was 65,245. Of these, 43.59% were engaged in agriculture, livestock, fishing, and hunting industries, employing 256,855 people. The textile industry accounted for 14.34% of the total enterprises, with 548,025 employees. The mining sector had 556 enterprises employing 19,232 workers. The timber and wood products industry had 7,986 enterprises, with 24,264 workers employed in the sector. The agricultural and textile industries alone accounted for nearly 50% of both enterprises and workers.

By 2021, the number of people employed in the industrial sector in Turkey had reached 6,143,000 (21.3%). The gap between agriculture and industry widened, with 1,195,000 more people employed in industry, indicating an alignment with Turkey's urbanization rate and demonstrating the development of capitalist production relations over time.

Due to the imperialist policies implemented in Turkey's agricultural sector, agricultural production and relations dissolved rapidly, leading to a mass migration of labor to cities. This labor force was partially absorbed into industry but was predominantly

employed in the service sector and, periodically, in the construction sector.

Numerous examples can be given to illustrate the changes and transformations in Turkish society. However, these figures should suffice. As I mentioned earlier, our party's studies analyzing the socio-economic structure will be shared with the public.

- You stated that within the semi-feudal, semi-colonial structure, feudal production relations have gradually dissolved, strengthening the semi-colonial framework while capitalism has become dominant. What can you say about the nature of this semi-colonial structure and the capitalism that has taken hold?

The development of capitalism in Turkey did not occur through its own internal dynamics. Unlike other countries that transitioned to capitalism, the accumulation of capital in Turkey followed a path shaped under imperialist control and exploitation. The founders of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, on the one hand, carried out the initial capital accumulation by utilizing state resources due to their weak financial base, while on the other hand, through their developing ties with imperialism, they began to emerge as a comprador class, acting as local agents of imperialist interests within the country.

In the Turkish context, the bourgeoisie initially accumulated capital through looting and expropriation, particularly through the Armenian, Greek, and Assyrian genocides. However, due to the weakness of its capital base, it relied heavily on state resources. This process, often described as “creating a bourgeoisie through the state” and promoted under the rhetoric of “national capital,” was, in reality, a means for the bourgeoisie to compensate for its financial weakness by utilizing state mechanisms to secure its initial accumulation and sustain its exploitation. The bourgeoisie flourished by leveraging state resources. The Kemalists prioritized this strategy after 1923, ensuring that state incentives and contracts provided significant opportunities for the commercial bourgeoisie.

Because the inherited Ottoman capital accumulation was weak, the bourgeoisie primarily developed through trade. Through agreements with imperialist powers, the Turkish commercial bourgeoisie became increasingly compradorized, acting as an intermediary for imperialist interests within the country. The comprador bourgeoisie and imperialism's local representatives established partnerships with foreign monopolies, profiting immensely from the sale of goods acquired from these monopolies, thus expanding their capital base.

During the founding of the Turkish state and the early years of Kemalist rule, the comprador bourgeoisie initially maintained its relations with British and French imperialism. However, from the mid-1930s onward, it aligned itself with German imperialism. In its early phase, the comprador bourgeoisie was primarily composed of the commercial bourgeoisie, which accumulated wealth by importing and selling goods from imperialist countries. However, with the transition to an assembly-based industry, it significantly expanded its profits. Instead of importing finished products, as it had done previously, it now acquired components separately and assembled them in newly established mid-sized factories and workshops, thereby increasing its profits.

The mechanization of agriculture led to an expansion of production areas, which in turn facilitated the transfer of capital into commerce and banking. These capital transfers from the agricultural sector played a crucial role in strengthening and further developing the comprador bourgeoisie.

A society that sustains a commodity economy within itself has the potential, over time, to evolve into a self-sufficient capitalist economy. However, in Turkey, the liquidation of feudalism was not achieved through a bourgeois revolution. The Ottoman Empire had been a centrally organized feudal system. Although capitalism had begun to emerge in its embryonic form, its development was obstructed from above by imperialist intervention, preventing it from evolving through its internal dynamics. Instead, feudal production relations were preserved

and continuously restructured in accordance with new conditions to ensure the uninterrupted exploitation by imperialism. This reality also applied to the Republic of Turkey, which was established under Kemalist leadership, where semi-feudal production relations remained dominant for an extended period. However, over time, these semi-feudal production relations dissolved, giving way to the dominance of capitalist production relations.

At this point, the critical question is how semi-feudal relations were dismantled. Over the course of a century, imperialist capital has penetrated even the most remote corners of the country, bringing all units of production under its influence. This prolonged process, though marked by significant turmoil, has ultimately driven the semi-feudal system toward dissolution. However, this does not mean that all remnants of feudalism have been eradicated.

At the same time, this transformation has shattered the foundations of feudalism's self-sufficient natural economy. The policies implemented by imperialist capital and its subordinate Turkish state have drastically accelerated the already slow and painful process of dissolving feudal economic relations in rural areas.

Imperialist capital, shaped by its own internal contradictions, has influenced the early stages of capitalist development in Turkey in two opposing ways.

Firstly, it has played a destructive role by shaking the foundations of the natural economy, integrating local markets, creating a proletariat, expanding commodity circulation and, increasingly, commodity production. From the late 1970s onwards, it has even engaged in direct industrial investment, thereby accelerating the objective conditions for capitalist development. However, this process has been entirely subordinated to and dependent on imperialist interests.

On the other hand, imperialist capital has simultaneously acted as an obstacle to capitalist development by plundering raw

materials, indebting the country, siphoning off accumulated surplus capital, restructuring existing production relations to serve its own interests, and preventing the emergence of a national industry. It has sought to confine social labor within the framework of backward production relations under its control.

This dual and contradictory impact of imperialist capital is an inherent contradiction within itself. This contradiction has directly shaped semi-feudal, semi-colonial Turkish society, leading to profound qualitative transformations in its economic and social structure. While the dominance of semi-feudal production relations has eroded, comprador capitalist production relations have come to define the country's economic and social framework.

This process has unfolded as a natural, inevitable, and spontaneous consequence of imperialist capitalist exploitation. This reality was also emphasized by Comrade Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, who referenced Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* to illustrate how imperialist exploitation in countries like Turkey naturally and inevitably erodes feudal relations, while the emerging capitalism remains dependent on imperialism, taking the form of comprador capitalism.

It is crucial to underline one point here: recognizing the dissolution of semi-feudalism in Turkey does not equate to attributing a progressive role to imperialism. On the contrary, this transformation has occurred entirely in line with the "character and objectives" of imperialist capital, serving only to expand and deepen its exploitation. Thus, the partial dissolution of feudal relations and the development of capitalism have objectively emerged as the "natural, inevitable, and spontaneous result" of the functioning of imperialist exploitation.

Kaypakkaya's analysis highlights that every step taken by imperialist capital to expand its exploitation, including the intensification of direct capital investments, particularly in industrial capital, has also contributed to the development of capitalism. This development has been directly proportional to

the scale and intensity of direct industrial investments by imperialist capital. In other words, as imperialist capital increased its investments to deepen its exploitation, it also indirectly fostered the growth of capitalism. However, the capitalism that emerged under these conditions remained subordinated to imperialism, manifesting as comprador capitalism.

The dissolution of semi-feudalism and the rise of comprador capitalism in Turkey have also reshaped the internal dynamics among the ruling classes. While semi-feudal production relations were not entirely eradicated, their weakening influenced the political positioning of the Turkish ruling classes within state power. Under the rule of the comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie and large landowners, the influence of the latter has diminished, while the dominance of the comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie has grown significantly.

Under the rule of the comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie and large landowners, the increasing penetration of imperialist capital into Turkey's semi-colonial market has led to the intensification and centralization of capital. This, in turn, has resulted in a deeper integration of usurious merchant capital with industrial capital, further consolidating the dominance of the comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie within the ruling class. However, this process has not eliminated contradictions among the factions of the Turkish ruling class. A key factor in these contradictions is that each faction of the comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie operates in alignment with the interests of the imperialist monopolies to which they are directly tied.

Moreover, despite the economic dominance of comprador capitalism in the present conditions, feudal remnants persist and continue to exert their influence.

“The nature of our revolution remains a People’s Democratic Revolution, but it’s essence is not centered on agrarian revolution!”

- Given the economic and social transformations in Turkey, have there been any changes in the ‘nature of the revolution’ or the “path of the revolution”? What is your party’s stance on this matter?

- For a revolution to succeed, it is essential to analyze the social and economic structure of the country on a correct basis. Any errors or inadequacies in this analysis inevitably lead to misconceptions regarding the nature of the revolution, its objectives, methods of struggle, and revolutionary tasks.

To determine the character of the revolution in Turkey, it is important to examine the victorious revolutionary processes of the Soviet Communist Party (SBKP) and the Chinese Communist Party (ÇKP). However, when analyzing these revolutions, it is necessary to avoid dogmatic and schematic approaches by correctly assessing the objective conditions of the present.

When comparing the Russian and Chinese revolutions with the revolutionary process in Turkey today, both similarities and differences emerge. Contemporary Turkey is neither Tsarist Russia nor the China of the past. While Turkey remains a semi-colonial country with capitalism as the dominant economic structure, the nature of its revolution is a People’s Democratic Revolution, though its essence is not centered on agrarian revolution. This revolution, led by the proletariat, will aim to democratize the country and achieve political freedom, making it inherently anti-imperialist.

Furthermore, the People’s Democratic Revolution will seek to resolve all issues related to democratic rights and freedoms, including the national question, women’s liberation, religious and faith-based oppression, and the struggles of oppressed national minorities. This revolutionary process will deepen and advance toward socialism.

It must not be forgotten that our era is one of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. The bourgeoisie has lost its historically progressive role. Therefore, as demonstrated in past revolutionary experiences, all democratic tasks can only be fulfilled through the People's Democratic Revolution led by the proletariat.

In this case, we must seek answers to the following questions: Are there democratic demands in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan today that have become pressing issues for the masses, similar to the experiences mentioned above? The answer to this question is undoubtedly "yes." The struggle for liberation from imperialism, the Kurdish national question, women's rights, freedom of belief and conscience, and many other democratic demands that can only be resolved through a People's Democratic Revolution stand before us.

Secondly, just as in Russia, the dominant mode of production in Turkey's economic structure is capitalist. However, remnants of the previous feudal society continue to persist in significant ways, shaping economic, cultural, and religious life.

The struggle for democratic rights and freedoms by oppressed nations and minority nationalities, as well as the women's movement, remains ongoing. Demands for freedom of belief and conscience continue to hold a place on the agenda. In short, the liberation of the country from imperialism and the democratization of society remains the primary concerns of workers, peasants, laborers, and the oppressed as a whole.

- Is a People's Democratic Revolution possible in semi-colonial capitalist countries?

- It is indeed possible. The fact that Turkey is a capitalist country in economic terms does not invalidate the necessity of a People's Democratic Revolution.

First, Turkey remains a semi-colonial country, meaning that the anti-imperialist struggle remains one of the core tasks of the revolution. Second, Turkey has never undergone a bourgeois democratic revolution in the true sense. While capitalist production relations have become dominant, they have only

narrowed the scope of the tasks of the People's Democratic Revolution but have not eliminated its necessity.

To summarize, the following tasks remain before us:

- a. Liberation from imperialism.
- b. Resolution of the Kurdish national question and guaranteeing the rights of all minority nationalities.
- c. Eliminating gender inequality, which manifests in all areas of life due to the dominance of patriarchal perspectives and fundamentally ending sexist ideology.
- d. Establishing a democratic character for the country and creating the necessary preconditions for the construction of socialism.
- e. Ensuring freedom of religion and conscience.
- f. Securing all democratic rights.
- g. Guaranteeing freedom of thought and organization, thereby democratizing society.

These demands cannot be ignored with an approach that assumes "everything will be resolved through the socialist revolution." Such a stance amounts to nothing more than imposing our subjective desires onto the masses. What we refer to here are the legitimate and democratic demands of broad social segments. Communists cannot disregard these demands; on the contrary, it is precisely through these concrete demands that the masses can be united into a cohesive force. The key point is that all these democratic demands must be addressed from a proletarian perspective, without deviating from the goal of political power. Our revolutionary struggle must incorporate all democratic demands within its program and tactics. In this regard, the struggle for the People's Democratic Revolution, which serves as the minimum program of our revolutionary fight, holds a particularly significant position due to its inclusion of concrete demands. By its very nature, the democratic revolution is tasked with major responsibilities, not only in carrying out land reform but also in securing independence from imperialism, ensuring the Right to Free Separation for oppressed nations, guaranteeing full

equality of rights among nations, and advancing women's equality. The extent and significance of these issues within the struggle for democratic revolution will not be determined arbitrarily but rather in direct relation to the dominant contradictions and pressing issues of the country at any given time. At this stage, as I previously mentioned, the peasantry in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan constitutes only a small portion of the total population. The overwhelming majority now reside in urban areas, particularly in major cities. Consequently, we are speaking of a social force that is continuously weakening in terms of numbers. The diminishing presence of the peasantry necessitates a reassessment of its role in class struggle. However, this should not lead to the conclusion that land, and agricultural issues are no longer relevant. Despite all the transformations that have taken place, these remain essential tasks to be addressed within the framework of the People's Democratic Revolution.

"Revolution, without a doubt, can only be achieved through violence and armed struggle!"

- In your congress, it appears that you have made certain revisions regarding contradictions in Turkey and the identification of the principal contradiction. What would you like to say on this matter?

- Yes, our 2nd Congress has updated the party's views on fundamental contradictions and the principal contradiction. First and foremost, the correct identification of contradictions and the principal contradiction is only possible through a materialist-dialectical approach. At the core of all developments and changes in nature and society lies the existence of internal contradictions. This means that contradictions cannot be artificially created through subjective interventions, as they are objective phenomena, they exist regardless of us. Our task is to scientifically identify them and determine the "primary contradiction," which influences the resolution of all other contradictions in the process.

In this regard, the clearest determination in the historical experiences of the international communist movement was made by the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Mao Zedong. Defining China's economic and political structure as semi-colonial and semi-feudal, the CPC identified the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of people as the "principal contradiction" during the process of the New Democratic Revolution. This MLM approach, just as in the past, must be applied by every Maoist party according to the concrete conditions of its own country today.

To correctly grasp the objective basis that has shaped this understanding, it is useful to examine Chairman Mao's analysis on the matter. What is fundamentally important here is the scientific method that must be followed. When we proceed from Chairman Mao's scientific method, the first conclusion is that our revolution must follow the path of the People's Democratic Revolution. Although comprador capitalism dominates the country's economy, feudal remnants still persist. A series of democratic tasks, including the resolution of the Kurdish national question and the women's question, must be accomplished through the People's Democratic Revolution. The unity of workers, oppressed nations and minority nationalities, women, and LGBTI+ individuals under proletarian leadership can only be achieved through a revolutionary perspective that embraces these democratic demands.

Secondly, it is a reality that multiple contradictions among the primary contradictions have become more visible today. At present, the fundamental contradiction is the one between imperialism, comprador capitalism, and feudal remnants on one side and the broad masses of people on the other. However, during the process of the People's Democratic Revolution, the principal contradiction has emerged as the one between comprador capitalism and feudal remnants on one side and the broad masses of people on the other.

- Your 2nd Congress asserts that the path of the People's Democratic Revolution in Turkey carries its own unique characteristics. Could you elaborate on this?

- In our Congress, this issue was discussed in detail. As we stated in our Congress announcement, based on the analysis of Turkey's social and economic structure, we have determined that the principal contradictions and the primary contradiction in Turkey have shifted. As a result of this analysis, we concluded that the Turkish revolution remains in the stage of the People's Democratic Revolution. We once again emphasized that this revolution can only be realized through armed struggle.

Therefore, our 2nd Congress affirmed that the Turkish revolution will not follow the exact same path as the successful revolutions of the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the world but rather carries its own unique characteristics. I want to emphasize that this has not been a newly introduced topic for our party. In other words, it is not a discussion that has emerged suddenly.

Our party's 7th Conference in 2002 established this perspective, which was further discussed at the 8th Conference in 2007: "Our revolution will carry its own unique characteristics. The People's War in Turkey will not be an exact replica of previous examples. Turkey has its own specific features and regional differences that must be taken into account." This line has now been concretely reaffirmed.

It must not be forgotten that the conditions of semi-colonialism have persisted in our country for over a century. While feudalism has not been eliminated through revolutionary means, Turkey has now reached a stage where the dominant form of expropriation of social productive forces is based primarily on wage labor, making it a capitalist country. Although feudal production relations have largely been dismantled, imperialism, its agents, and collaborators have not been fully eradicated. The complete elimination of feudal remnants will only be achieved through the People's Democratic Revolution.

The revolution in our country has a dual task, both of which are intertwined: the Democratic Revolution and, as its next stage, the Socialist Revolution. The Democratic Revolution will establish the revolutionary democratic power (dictatorship) of the working class, poor peasantry, and laboring classes under the leadership of the proletariat. It will then transition to the proletarian dictatorship, based on the working class and the laboring masses of the countryside and cities.

Without severing all ties and privileges connected to imperialism, without eliminating its local collaborators and the reactionary production modes and relations that serve as their social base, without overthrowing the ruling classes and their political regime (the fascist dictatorship), neither the democratization of the country nor the resolution of the national question, neither the broader social democratization nor the free development of productive forces and production relations, can be achieved. Without these fundamental transformations, the transition to socialism is impossible, and socialism itself cannot be successfully built without first developing its material foundations.

Based on the nature of the upcoming revolution, the path of the revolution will naturally develop in its own unique way. Revolution, without a doubt, can only be achieved through force and armed struggle. When examining the history of revolutionary class movements, it is evident that there are two primary paths to revolution. The first is the protracted armed struggle, People's War, centered in rural areas, which is applicable to colonial and semi-colonial countries where capitalism has not fully developed. The second is the path of armed insurrection, which applies to countries where capitalism is dominant (whether intermediate, advanced, or imperialist), relying on cities and industrial centers as the primary base, with revolutionaries working within the working class to mobilize the class and the laboring masses to seize political power.

Ultimately, both paths necessitate revolutionary violence and the power of arms to achieve victory.

The enemies of the class sustain and uphold their power through armed force. Under these conditions, the proletariat and the laboring masses can only seize power through armed struggle. Naturally, different countries and historical processes give rise to unique circumstances, and these specific conditions will shape the form of struggle. General principles cannot be turned into rigid templates. Where there are unique historical conditions, there will also be corresponding forms and tactics. Communists must act accordingly, adapting their strategy to these specific conditions while maintaining the fundamental revolutionary path.

“Every revolution has its own unique characteristics!”

- “You stated, “General principles cannot be turned into rigid templates. Where there are unique historical conditions, there will also be corresponding forms and tactics.” Are you suggesting that the Turkish revolution will not follow a different path from the October Revolution and the Chinese Revolution?

- Yes. Revolutions cannot be carried out by following a fixed prescription. We believe that revolutions must not be evaluated independently of the contradictions on which they develop and their specific conditions. While there are certain fundamental and indispensable principles, such as the leadership of the communist party and the necessity of armed struggle, every revolution has its own unique aspects and will continue to do so. For this reason, contemporary semi-colonial and comprador-capitalist countries must not turn a blind eye to guerrilla warfare; rather, they should integrate it with the strategy of armed insurrection to make use of it effectively.

It should not be assumed that today’s armed insurrections will achieve victory after a relatively short period of clashes, as was the case in the October Revolution in Russia. In semi-colonial and comprador-capitalist countries, the conditions of class struggle may necessitate retreating to the countryside in the event

of a temporary defeat of an urban-based uprising, utilizing guerrilla warfare in rural areas to sustain the revolution, and then returning to the cities when the conditions allow. In some circumstances, moving the class struggle to the countryside may become not just an option but an imperative. If the revolutionary practical activity of life did not impose this necessity upon Russian communists, it was because the historical conditions of Russia at that time were favorable to the revolution. The same applies to the period of the Civil War. Russian revolutionaries did not base their strategy on relying on the relatively weaker revolutionary movement in the countryside by drawing strength from the stronger urban revolution. Instead of assigning a strategic role to guerrilla warfare, they treated it as a supportive tactic.

In today's world, the conditions in semi-feudal, semi-colonial, and semi-colonial capitalist countries differ from those during the October and Chinese Revolutions. Therefore, instead of a single form of struggle, we must speak of interconnected forms of struggle. Undoubtedly, in semi-feudal, semi-colonial countries, the path of revolution follows the strategy of Protracted People's War, which is based on the countryside. In capitalist countries, the revolution follows the path of Armed Popular Insurrection, centered in the cities. These two strategies are not mutually exclusive. A struggle based in the countryside must factor in the cities, and an urban-based struggle must consider the countryside. The contradictions and struggles of the contemporary world are so complex and intertwined that, within the revolutionary process, both insurrection and guerrilla warfare based in the countryside may be simultaneously applicable.

Therefore, it must never be forgotten that the revolution will be carried out under the leadership of the communist party through violence, with the power of arms. The idea that "our multinational country is predominantly shaped by capitalist production relations, capitalism is dominant, and therefore activities in the cities take precedence" cannot be used as a

justification to reject armed struggle. In the cities, we will have urban military committees and urban guerrillas. As mentioned earlier, they will carry out operations, and in a period of insurrection, these forces must be capable of leading the revolution militarily against the enemy.

It must always be remembered that our class enemy, the bourgeoisie, is not the same as the bourgeoisie of the early 20th century. It has been sharpened through its defeats by revolutions, learned from the consequences of its mistakes, and gained experience. This has made it even more ruthless, relentless, and driven to confront revolutions with its combined strength. In these conditions, guerrilla warfare must serve as a tactic for insurrection. This applies to both urban and rural guerrilla warfare. The path of war in these countries, which integrates the coordination between the city and the countryside, must become the distinctive tactical approach of the future.

However, under any circumstances, the revolutions of the future will not climb the same steps in the exact manner of the October and Chinese revolutions. They will inevitably incorporate new and unique elements into their own revolutionary theory, shaped by the developments in class struggle. Just as protracted and dispersed people's guerrilla warfare, despite following its fundamental principles, has required incorporating new tactics into its theory by accounting for the advancements in struggle, the revolution in every semi-colonial capitalist country must incorporate these favorable factors into revolutionary theory to succeed.

“Our Front policy must adapt to changing conditions!”

- I would also like to ask a question about unions of action, alliances and front politics in the process of the People's Democratic Revolution. Did your congress discuss these issues? If so, what conclusions did it reach?

- Yes, this question was among the agenda items of our 2nd Congress and was discussed in detail. It is widely acknowledged that class struggle never follows a straight path to its goal. Each

country's economic and social structure, the nature of its state, the conflicts and contradictions among its classes play a significant role in determining the objectives of the revolution. This also holds great importance in shaping the programs that communist parties develop. Every communist party has both a minimum and a maximum program. These programs serve as a crucial framework for defining the strategy and methods of struggle in class struggle.

The ultimate goal of all communist parties worldwide is to unite all countries through the revolutions they will carry out in individual nations and to struggle for the creation of a classless world. This is why Lenin, when he stated that “the state will one day wither away,” pointed to the establishment of a classless and borderless world as the final objective. In all countries, the advancement of communist parties in class struggle is not possible without action alliances, coalitions, and the formation of fronts. Furthermore, the thesis of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao that the working class can only achieve revolution by uniting with other laboring strata remains valid today.

According to the dialectical law, nothing remains permanent indefinitely. Everything exists in unity and contradiction. Action alliances, coalitions, and fronts are also not permanent but temporary. Once they achieve their goal, they have fulfilled their mission and dissolve.

Therefore, whether it is an action alliance, a coalition, or a front, all these agreements are made with short, medium, or long-term objectives in mind. The parties sitting at the negotiating table come together based on a shared cause and goal, making mutual concessions to reach an agreement. The primary criterion for forming such alliances is the mutual political recognition and acceptance of all participating components.

Action alliances, coalitions, and fronts—all of these fundamentally represent the unification of forces. They are acts of the communist party coming together with revolutionary, patriotic, and progressive forces outside itself in the struggle for

revolution. However, the issue at hand is not merely a question of strength. It is also about forming common ground with forces that, regardless of their power, are marching toward the same position independently of the communist party.

As the vanguard force, communist parties must not only unite with the working class but also win over other forces within society. Gaining support does not always occur through a single action. The process of winning over different class and intermediary strata has varied from country to country. The social classes and intermediary groups that must be won over in a capitalist-imperialist country are not the same as those in a colonial or semi-colonial country.

The objectives and content of every action alliance, coalition, and front are not identical. This distinction is directly related to both the nature of the forces involved and the goals they seek to achieve. There is a fundamental difference between forces that come together to overthrow the state and those that unite for reforms, workers' rights, political prisoners' freedom, women's rights, or other specific gains. In action alliances, coalitions, and front formations, once a mutual agreement is reached, it is essential that the participating forces maintain their independence. No force within the alliance can interfere with another's agenda outside the agreed framework. The agreements that define action alliances, coalitions, and fronts are strictly limited to the goals and methods agreed upon for achieving those objectives.

One of the fundamental principles of all such formations is independent agitation and propaganda. This means that while participating in a common front or alliance, each party or group retains the right to openly propagate its own distinct objectives outside of that formation. However, freedom in agitation and propaganda is bound by the principle of not undermining or weakening the alliance itself.

Once a detailed agreement has been made in advance, and a commitment has been given to adhere to decisions outside of

fundamental principles, criticizing decisions made by the majority contradicts the spirit of action unity or alliances. This is a matter of particular importance for our party. On this basis, for an action unity to materialize, the organizations and parties within the ranks of the people must implement people's democracy among themselves and unconditionally accept the principle of "freedom in propaganda and agitation, unity in action."

Our party's assessment is not only applicable to action unities. This correct approach is also valid for alliances and the concept of the front. Action unities are formations that cover relatively shorter periods. This is also related to the fact that action unities tend to focus on a single issue and are locked onto a specific goal. The objective is concrete. It encompasses what it is aimed at, and once the set goal is achieved, it comes to an end. The practice of dozens of action unities in which our party has participated has demonstrated this concretely.

Alliances involving the communist party are relatively longer-term collaborations. Their content, scope, and objectives depend on the forces that constitute them. Compared to action unities, alliances are formations with a higher degree of centralization. This is directly linked to their long-term nature and the breadth of the objectives they encompass. In alliances, the rules to be followed, as well as agitation and propaganda, are determined and implemented by the participating forces.

The front, on the other hand, is a class alliance.

- Was there a discussion regarding your party's approach to the front strategy? What are the conclusions of your 2nd Congress on this matter?

- Among the agenda items of our Congress was a discussion on our party's approach to the front strategy. I can say that our Congress addressed this issue with the understanding that class struggle is neither static nor dogmatic. As is well known, class struggle is rich with historical experiences. Beyond universal principles, each revolutionary struggle has drawn lessons from its own conditions. The alliances and fronts formed in Russia, China,

Vietnam, Bulgaria, Albania, Greece, and other countries have not been identical. The specific conditions of each country and the positioning of different classes have led to significant variations in the nature of the alliances and fronts established.

There have been certain changes in our country regarding class dynamics and class alliances. I have already outlined our party's approach to action unity, and this perspective remains valid today. Similarly, our stance on alliances is well known. In this regard, there is not a significant history of alliances in our country; rather, the primary experience has been based on action unity. Our new policy on the front strategy must be adapted to changing conditions. Tying this issue to rigid conditions would only limit us. To concretize:

First, in addition to action unity, it is appropriate for alliances to come onto the agenda from time to time in response to developments in our country, and for our party to take part in such alliances. Every alliance, along with similar formations such as unity of forces, arises as a product of specific conditions dictated by the concrete situation. When such formations emerge, they should be structured around a clearly defined objective and program, encompassing all anti-fascist, progressive, and patriotic forces. Accordingly, such alliances may periodically become relevant to our agenda.

Second, our party's current front policy does not adequately respond to the concrete needs of the present situation. Up until now, our party has linked the establishment of a front to the formation of "Red Political Power" and has upheld the view that "a front cannot be established without the creation of Red Political Power." However, this thesis is no longer aligned with the realities of our country. Given the changing conditions and needs, it is necessary to redefine this policy accordingly. Our front policy must adapt to changing conditions. It is incorrect to tie the establishment of a front to an absolute condition. Developments may arise in which a front can be formed in accordance with the circumstances. For instance, in the event of

an imperialist occupation of our country, the formation of an anti-imperialist front could become necessary. Similarly, in the face of intensified fascist aggression, the formation of a resistance front may come onto the revolutionary agenda. As is the case today, such a resistance front could be established in response to fascism's relentless attacks. It is not wrong to advocate for the formation of a front under the leadership of the communist party. However, making this an absolute precondition is incorrect. The acceptance of the communist party's leadership is directly tied to its influence within the class struggle. If the communist party holds a decisive and effective position within the struggle, then other social forces and classes will naturally gravitate toward it, accepting its leadership within a front.

- *The Maoist Communist Party had issued a call for 'unity' directed at your party. Did your Congress evaluate this call?*

- Yes, our Congress evaluated the letter from the Maoist Communist Party (MKP) containing its call for "unity." However, before addressing your question directly, I would like to clarify that MKP's letter was first published in our internal discussion organ, Parti Birliđi, where our party cadre engaged in a thorough debate. This means that MKP's call for unity was discussed at all our sub-congresses and ultimately at our 2nd Congress, where a final decision was made.

As a result of these discussions, our 2nd Congress determined that while MKP's call for unity was made with revolutionary concerns in mind, the existing ideological and political differences, as well as the lack of ideological cohesion within MKP, led us to respond negatively to the proposal.

However, our Congress also emphasized that, despite the significant ideological and strategic differences between us, MKP comes from the same tradition, upholds MLM and the legacy of İbrahim Kaypakkaya, and thus remains an important force with which we aim to maintain closer cooperation. This includes engaging in joint actions, exploring opportunities for common organizational efforts, conducting bilateral ideological-political

discussions, and aligning more closely within broader alliances or platforms where both parties are involved. These proposals will be concretized through further discussions with MKP and implemented accordingly.

“To be ideologically steadfast, politically competent, organizationally flexible and militarily innovative!”

- What would you like to express regarding your party’s orientation in the upcoming period?

- We consider our 2nd Congress to be of historical significance in the context of our party’s history. At our 1st Congress, crucial steps were taken in response to enemy offensives and liquidationist coup attempts, including the reorganization of the party’s will, the formulation of its party program, and the establishment of the Communist Women’s Union. These were decisive developments. Our 2nd Congress has carried these historic steps even further. Primarily by engaging in discussions on socio-economic structure, it has revised and updated our party program, providing a clearer and more concrete definition of the nature and path of the revolution in Turkey.

Additionally, our 2nd Congress reaffirmed the continuity of the “Close but Forward...” line, which was adopted as a resolution in our 1st Congress. It confirmed that the strategic orientation outlined under the title **“The Main Direction of Orientation, Fundamental Links: Ideological Clarity and Political Depth; Organizational Strength and Military Determination!”** remains largely valid.

Our 1st Congress was followed by notable shifts in global and domestic conditions, as well as in our party’s struggle. It is evident that the crisis of capitalist imperialism has deepened further, intensifying competition among imperialist monopolies and revealing ever-clearer signs of a new war of redivision. The war unfolding in Ukraine between imperialist powers, coupled with Israel’s role as the gendarme of imperialism in the Middle East, marked by its occupation, massacres, and genocidal attacks

primarily targeting the Palestinian people, as well as the peoples of Lebanon and Syria, illustrates this trajectory.

The occupations and wars in Ukraine, Palestine, and Syria also underscore the relentless ideological offensive by the imperialist bourgeoisie against the international proletariat and oppressed peoples of the world. While the war in Ukraine is fundamentally a struggle for markets and dominance between U.S.-EU imperialists and Russian imperialists, it is being falsely framed as a war against communism. Although it is true that modern Russia stands upon the historical legacy of Comrades Lenin and Stalin and the Soviet Socialist Republics, the reality is that today's Russia is not governed by the working class. The USSR has been dissolved, and contemporary Russia has emerged as an imperialist power on the global stage. Despite this fact, U.S. and EU imperialists propagandizing their war against Russia as a “struggle against communism” must be understood as a continuation of their ideological assault on the international proletariat and oppressed peoples.

A similar situation can be observed in Israel's massacre and genocidal attacks against the Palestinian nation. The Palestinian national resistance's “Al-Aqsa Flood” operation on October 7, 2023, targeting occupied territories, sent shockwaves through Israel and the imperialist-capitalist centers. This reaction stemmed from the belief among imperialist capitalists and Israel that their technological superiority rendered them invincible, as well as from the possibility that such an attack could serve as an example and inspiration for the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the world in their struggles.

The presence of reactionary and jihadist organizations like Hamas, which currently leads the Palestinian national resistance, and their ideological stance—along with their misguided actions that at times target civilians—should not cast a shadow over the legitimacy and justness of the Palestinian struggle against oppression, massacres, occupation, and annexation. The imperialist bourgeoisie labels any individual, group, or

organization that shows solidarity with the Palestinian resistance as “terrorists.” In imperialist-capitalist centers, symbols of the Palestinian national resistance are banned, and solidarity actions are criminalized.

It is well known that many Islamist organizations, especially in the Middle East, are products of U.S. imperialism’s “Green Belt” project. Today, such organizations—directly supported through “train and equip” programs in line with imperialist bourgeois policies—are used as tools in “proxy wars.” The most recent example of this was seen in Syria, where these organizations were utilized in attempts to overthrow the Bashar al-Assad regime. These reactionary organizations, which at times act beyond the control of their backers, have their existence and actions—especially attacks targeting civilians—used as justification for imperialist aggression, leading to the branding of the struggles of the international proletariat and oppressed peoples as “terrorism.”

The concept of “terror” serves as a convenient tool for counter-revolutionary propaganda in the imperialists' regional and local military interventions and assaults. For the imperialist bourgeoisie, anyone, any organization, or even any state that refuses to submit, resists exploitation, or does not align with their current policies is labeled as “terrorist.”

In short, in today’s world, the struggle of the international proletariat and oppressed peoples is systematically branded as “terrorism” by the imperialist bourgeoisie, with class struggle being criminalized under this label. Efforts to liquidate and annihilate revolutionary forces are framed as legitimate in the eyes of the masses. What we are witnessing is an intensified ideological offensive aimed at liquidation and subjugation. Given the growing contradictions among imperialists and the increasing signs of a new war for redivision, it is no prophecy to say that these attacks will escalate. In the coming period, not only will ideological offensives against the communist movement and the

broader revolutionary struggle intensify, but physical liquidation attempts will also increase.

One of the crucial points here is maintaining our ideological independence amidst the competition and conflicts between imperialist camps. In today's world, there are no proletarian states in power. The competing forces are engaged in a struggle for the division of global markets. Communists must not align themselves with any imperialist power, nor should they overlook the primary instigators of regional and imperialist wars.

- Isn't a similar situation also relevant for Turkey? Doesn't the semi-colonial economic structure shape the periodic policies of the Turkish ruling classes? Isn't the increasing fascist aggression, both within and beyond Turkey's borders, along with its policies of occupation and annexation, aimed precisely at this?

- Yes, Turkey is an integral part of the capitalist-imperialist world and, moreover, a member of NATO, the military aggression apparatus of imperialism. In this sense, it cannot be evaluated independently of the crisis and contradictions within capitalist imperialism. The so-called "national and indigenous" rhetoric of the AKP-MHP government is nothing more than hollow, racist, and chauvinistic propaganda.

Thus, from the very day of its foundation, the Turkish state, as a semi-colony of imperialism, has been subjected to the same dynamics. The Turkish ruling classes are not only economically dependent on imperialist centers but also ideologically subordinated to them. It is well known that, along with the economic policies formulated in imperialist centers and implemented in semi-colonial countries like Turkey, ideological offensives are also deployed to ensure their application.

Due to this dependency, ideological offensives formulated and brought to the agenda in imperialist centers are adapted and implemented according to Turkey's semi-colonial conditions. The Turkish ruling classes' dependence on imperialist capital and their weak domestic capital base result in the comprador

bourgeoisie maintaining its grip through both ideological attacks against the working class and laboring masses and direct counter-revolutionary offensives.

Even the slightest demand for rights by the masses is met not only with fascist state terror but also with systematic repression aimed at ideologically subjugating, neutralizing, and eliminating the vanguard forces emerging from class struggle. This aggression is not limited to physical suppression; it is accompanied by campaigns of ideological liquidation, destruction, and co-optation targeting the leading figures of revolutionary struggle.

Fascism, in the case of the Turkish state, is not merely a form of government that has existed from its foundation to the present day. Rather, it persists as a continuous method of managing contradictions that emerge within the framework of class struggle. The permanence of fascism must be considered in conjunction with the permanence of the revolutionary situation.

The sharp contradictions embedded in Turkish and Turkish Kurdistan society compel the ruling classes to implement fascism not merely as a mode of governance but as an entrenched form of state organization. This means that fascism is not a temporary response to political crises but a structural necessity for the ruling classes to maintain their domination and suppress revolutionary forces.

One of the most pressing contradictions that currently challenges the Turkish state is the Kurdish National Question. The national struggle of the Kurdish people is systematically labeled as "terrorism" by the Turkish ruling classes, much like how imperialist powers frame national liberation movements that threaten their interests. Millions of people who reject and resist the denial of their national rights are branded as "terrorists." Even the most basic democratic rights of the Kurdish nation are systematically denied.

The stage reached by the Kurdish national movement today has placed the Turkish state in an existential crisis. This has led

Turkish fascism to deploy all its resources and capabilities to crush, co-opt, or neutralize the Kurdish movement. While carrying out military annihilation campaigns on one front, the state simultaneously pursues so-called "peace" policies under the deceptive rhetoric of "a thousand years of brotherhood."

Communists who recognize the Kurdish nation as a distinct nation with the Right to Free Separation, including the right to establish an independent state, are consistently targeted by the Turkish state. Likewise, anyone who expresses solidarity with the Kurdish national movement at any level is automatically placed within the state's "terror" category and subjected to relentless fascist repression.

A similar approach is taken toward the economic and democratic struggles of the working class and the broader laboring masses. Any action or initiative that emerges outside the control and approval of the ruling classes is labeled a "terrorist activity." The independent political line of the working class is met with the fascist state's "counterinsurgency strategy."

Workers' union demands and economic protests are confronted with police batons, military crackdowns, detentions, and arrests. The struggles of national minorities, particularly the Kurdish nation, are branded as "separatism." The resistance of Alevi and other minority religious communities is dismissed as "heresy." The women's and LGBTI+ movements are portrayed as the work of "foreign agents seeking to destroy the family structure." Student demonstrations for academic and democratic rights are trivialized as the actions of a "few misguided individuals." The protests of peasants demanding fair compensation for their produce and resisting environmental destruction are framed as the work of "provocateurs."

In every sphere of struggle, the ruling classes resort to ideological manipulation and state repression to suppress and delegitimize mass movements, ensuring that any attempt to challenge their authority is violently crushed.

Overall, the struggles of the working class and the laboring masses are systematically branded as “terrorism” by the Turkish state and met with a “counterinsurgency strategy.” Any tendency or movement that steps outside the confines of the established order is immediately targeted for suppression. The ruling class fears nothing more than the independent organization and mobilization of the masses. While every action that challenges the system is met with fascist repression, reformist tendencies within the existing framework are deliberately encouraged. In this context, even as the parliamentary system itself has become a mere formality, legalism, parliamentary illusions, and reformist approaches are being promoted as acceptable channels of political activity.


For our party, any political force that moves beyond the boundaries of the system, embraces clandestine organizing, and internalizes a proletarian ideological education is, in essence, engaged in a process of revolutionary transformation and militant consolidation. We are experiencing a period in which radical revolutionary practices are increasingly questioned, and revolutionary activities are being confined within legal boundaries. In such times, it is crucial for every revolutionary force to orient itself toward extra-systemic methods of struggle. Any movement that lacks a perspective of seizing political power will inevitably remain trapped within the limits imposed by the system. In summary, the current period demands a militant approach at every level of struggle.

This reality necessitates that our party's cadres, members, and militants possess a firm and clear ideological consciousness. In concrete terms, this means recognizing that while the objective conditions for a People's Democratic Revolution in Turkey exist, our subjective forces remain insufficient. There are significant shortcomings in channeling the spontaneous struggles of the masses into the broader revolutionary struggle, yet this very situation makes it even more imperative for us to actively engage in these struggles at every level.

It must not be forgotten that all successful revolutions initially began with a small number of dedicated cadres and, over time, gained strength as communist parties merged with the struggles of the working class and the people, ultimately achieving victory. The historical experiences of victorious revolutions unequivocally demonstrate that communist parties with solid ideological foundations, competent political leadership, organizational flexibility, and the ability to implement creative military strategies adapted to concrete conditions have successfully learned from the spontaneous struggles of the masses. By synthesizing these experiences through the science of MLM and applying them back into practice, they have paved the way for revolutionary success.

The key lesson we can draw from both successful and unsuccessful revolutionary experiences is clear: any practice that does not break away from the system, that does not directly target it, and that does not strive to transform internal contradictions into a force for systemic rupture is bound to fail. For this reason, the entirety of our party's work, including legal field activities, will be directed towards a revolutionary break with the system. We operate with the firm understanding that the revolution in Turkey can only be achieved through armed struggle. We are irrefutably that no other path or method will lead to victory. This requires ideological clarity, and all our activities, whether direct or indirect, will serve this ultimate objective.

Provided that we maintain ideological clarity, our failures can be turned into successes, our weaknesses into strength, and our shortcomings can be overcome with the correct political approach. Both globally and in Turkey, we stand on the brink of great upheavals. We are on the eve of new "Gezi" uprisings and "Serhildan" revolts. In a period where the signs of a new imperialist war for redivision are becoming increasingly apparent and where the Turkish ruling classes are positioning themselves accordingly, we have full confidence that our party's cadres, members, militants, and supporters will orient themselves

Party  Publications

towards this turbulent and precarious process with the necessary determination and preparedness.

- ***Thank you for answering our questions.***

- I also thank you for providing this opportunity to our party.

Link: <https://www.tkpml.com/tkp-ml-cc-political-bureau-lets-organize-the-party-and-the-revolution-with-the-decisions-of-the-2nd-congress/?swcfpc=1>