FREEDOM AND SOLIDARITY PARTY AND ITS POLITICS:
AN ATTEMPT TO REDEFINE THE TURKISH LEFT

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

OLTAN EVCİMEN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN

THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 2004

Approval of the Graduate Scholl of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master

of Science

_____

Prof. Dr. Feride Acar
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Okyayuz
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Okyayuz   _____

Asiss. Prof. Dr. Ceylan Tokluoğlu   _____

Instructor Dr. Barış Çakmur   _____

ABSTRACT

FREEDOM AND SOLIDARITY PARTY AND ITS POLITICS:

AN ATTEMPT TO REDEFINE THE TURKISH LEFT

Evcimen, Oltan

MS. , Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Okyayuz

January 2004, 105 pages

This thesis interprets the unification process that the Turkish left undertook during the 1990s as a redefinition and re-identification of leftist values according to the recent changes in the economic and political areas in the world. This redefinition process will be investigated by looking at the ÖDP (Freedom and Solidarity Party) case, the main task of which was defined by the founders as the unification of various leftist movements as well as the representation of the new social movements. For this purpose, different theoretical perspectives concerning the new social movements will be read by means of observation of their position in the ÖDP. It will be investigated, to what degree the ÖDP was successful in unifying and including the new social movements. In that sense, this work will emphasize the role of the ÖDP in the history of the Turkish leftist movement.

Key words: Turkish leftist movements, the new social movements, orthodox Marxism, identity-based movements, class-based movements.

ÖZ

ÖZGÜRLÜK VE DAYANIŞMA PARTİSİ VE POLİTİKALARI:
TÜRK SOLUNU YENİDEN TANIMLAMAYA ÇALIŞMAK

Yüksek Lisans,Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Mehmet Okyayuz
Ocak 2004, 105 sayfa

Bu tez, Türkiye Sol Hareketinin 1990'larda içine girdiği bütünleşme sürecini, dünyada değişen ekonomik ve politik yapı çerçevesinde Türk solunu yeniden tarifleme çabası olarak ele almaktadır. Bu yeniden tarifleme süreci 1996 yılında bir çok sol fraksiyonu ve yeni sosyal hareketi içerisine alarak kurulan Özgürlük ve Dayanışma Partisinin özgün yapısı ve politikaları bağlamında anlatılmaya çalışılacaktır. Bu amaçla, yeni sosyal hareketler teorilerinden ÖDP'nin bu hareketlere bakışına referans vererek bahsetmektedir. ÖDP'nin bu yeni sosyal hareketleri kendine eklemleme çabasında hangi noktalarda başarılı olduğu hangi noktalarda tıkanıklık yaşadığı bu tezde anlaşılmaya çalışılmaktadır. Tez bu anlamda ÖDP'nin Türk sol hareketi içindeki ayrıcalıklı rolünü vurgulamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türk sol hareketleri, Yeni Sosyal Hareketler, Ortodoks Marksisim, kimlik temelli hareketler, sınıf temelli hareketler

To Oblada Melanura…

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: Signature:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this thesis is to investigate the redefinition and re-identification process of the left which began after the 1970s among the leftist movements in Western Europe and North America by looking at the case of ÖDP (Freedom and Solidarity Party) in Turkey.

The process of the redefinition of leftist values, I conceive, has emerged from some representational crisis of the left. Beginning from the 1960s, the leftist movements in the Western countries have increasingly understood the fact that they could not express the demands of various social and political groups unless they would revise their political discourses that were constructed mainly on the base of class analysis. They recognized that their political strategies were primarily based on class-based categories and necessarily excluded the newly emerging conflicts within society. In that sense, the impact of the new social movements, such

1

as queer politics, environmentalist, anti-militarist, anti-nuclear, women, and generally student movements, which have egressed in the context of the 1960s and 1970s, on the leftist movements cannot be exaggerated. Their demands and the people who have actively involved in those movements did not seem to be compatible with the traditional categories of the leftist movements at that time. Especially the student movements in 1968 and anti-nuclear demonstrations organized in the capitals of Western Europe in 1974 can be seen as the concrete embodiments of the power of the emerging new social movements.

Therefore, in that context, the leftist movements in Western countries were obliged to confront with the problems arising from the tradition of the left itself. Those problems were mainly the representational crisis and incompatibility of the traditional political categories of the left with the contemporary social and economic changes. The consequence of such confrontation and redefinition was their committed effort to include or represent those new social movements. Another development which had a considerable impact on the left was the transformation of the capitalist system itself especially after the 1970s. The restructuration of the capitalist system has necessarily involved a transformation within resistance movements as well. In many countries, leftist movements have begun to

adopt more cultural and identity-based political discourses which, they believe, seem to be better compatible with the contemporary changes within the political realm. Although it seems that this transformation within the discourses of the left was mainly related with the rising power of the new social movements in the political realm and totally pragmatic, it was profoundly connected with the radical changes in the capitalist system as well. The distinct categories of workers and capitalists have become more and more unclear mostly when they were used in political discourse. Besides, economic structure has become more complex and hardly suitable for any kind of simplification for any political reason.

The restructuration of the capitalist economy has directly influenced organizational structures in the society. The collective solidarity among members of the society has ceased to exist and all procedures in the society have been organized on the notion of the survival of the individuals. This fact has increasingly constructed new identities which are highly different from the former ones, for example the identity of being worker. The main difference between the new and traditional types of identities is that the traditional one is based on the concepts of integrity and solidarity, thus permanent, while the new identities are constructed upon fragmentation and are therefore transitory. This difference was reflected in the changes of

the economic field as well: flexibility in the organization of work, permanent capital flow among countries, and the increasing importance of financial sectors which are represented by transitory and unreliable relations.

The campaign organized by the Labour Party in England for doubling the number of party members in 1989 and the emergence of the Greens movement which aimed at representing various identities under one umbrella exemplify the transformation of leftist movements perfectly. Furthermore the collapse of the socialist systems in the USSR and Eastern Europe has contributed considerably to this transformation process.

The presence of the new social movements in the political realm has not been felt in Turkey till the 1990s. In addition to the social and cultural reasons, the level of capitalist development must be pointed out in order to understand this delay in Turkish case. The emphasis on flexibility in the organization of work, and the individualism in all aspects of social life that was partly brought about by the economic transformation has not been on the agenda in Turkey till the 1990s. In addition to the emergence of the new social movements, another issue, the issue of unification which has been on the agenda for decades among leftist circles has increased the need for a

restructuration of the left and the revival of its position in the political realm.

The task of unification and redefinition of the left has been undertaken by the ÖDP. ÖDP is interpreted as a turning point for the Turkish left for being the first real attempt of unification and advocacy of a high level of pluralism within the Turkish left. Its newness does not come from these characteristics only; it has also claimed to redefine and reidentify the leftist values. ÖDP has attempted to question some basic categories of Marxist politics (e.g. the central position of class within Marxist thought, the identity problem, political strategies etc.) and to criticize political strategies of the former leftist movements.

The main task that the founders of the ÖDP attributed to the party was not only transcending the traditional understanding of leftist politics but also pioneering the new social movements in Turkey. The question, whether and to what degree ÖDP was successful in the unification of the leftist movements, the redefinition of the leftist concepts and the inclusion of the new social movements is one of the central questions in this study. It is obvious that this thesis cannot claim to make an elaborate historical account of the ÖDP. However, a brief summary of the historical antecedent of the movement will be presented in Chapter 3.

The new social movements are not based on the category of class. They are mainly constructed upon the categories of gender, occupation, ethnicity, etc. In contrast to the traditional leftist movements primarily based on the basic categories of Marxism, the new social movements adopt a political strategy which is not based on fixed categories and identities. Another main characteristic of the new social movements is that their demands are primarily cultural rather than being economic. Besides they try to redefine personal affairs in terms of politics and political struggle. In this context it is possible to give the example of the rights of gays and lesbians, and the right to abortion.

In Chapter 1, the changes in the capitalist system in Western Europe and North America in the past few decades and the impacts of those changes on the general social structures will be investigated. This transformation, whether it is named as post-Fordism, global capitalism or late capitalism should be analyzed in order to elaborate on the new social movements. The possible reasons of the digression of leftist political parties in Europe from the class-based discourses will be demonstrated in this chapter. Furthermore, the impacts of this transformation on the Turkish left will be inquired. In the Chapter 2, the features of the new social movements will be investigated by looking at the theories of the new social movements.

Among those theories, the ones which tend to look at the issue from an identity-based perspective will be emphasized. The reason for that is related with the emphasis on identity by the ÖDP in its effort to unify various political movements in itself. The differences and various identities in the ÖDP have been defined on the principle of equality among various groups and this general orientation has been presented as the main axis of the party. In the final Chapter, ÖDP will be regarded as the consequence of the unification efforts of Turkish left which have had a long history. The relations among various political groups which have played primary roles in the establishment of the party and their political positions will be investigated in this chapter. Furthermore, the relations between the ÖDP and the new social movements which have engaged in the political activities of the party will be considered. Finally, the structural duality between the political discourses of different political groups in the party and the language that has been used in the official documents of the party's headquarter, for example bulletins, party's charter and party program etc., will be examined. On the base of this investigation, the similarities and differences between the theories of the new social movements and the case of the ÖDP will be inquired.

CHAPTER 2

POST-FORDISM AND LEFTIST MOVEMENT

The worldwide leftist movement has developed a new approach that could provide itself with a new chance of ascendance and that could create new mechanisms of resistance against the system. In many countries, socialist and leftist parties have distanced themselves from class-based discourses and adopted rather cultural and identity-based ones. Even these discourses of identity and culture themselves questioned the very definition of these parties. In order to understand the debates within the political strategies of the left, it is critical to understand the socio-economic changes. Globalization is accepted to be one of the most prominent factors of this change. The claim that the world economy has reached a new stage has given way to a series of theses. This new stage that is called as globalization started with the internationalization of production and marketing. At this stage, firms are dependent more than ever on the international market. In order to survive they have to turn into multinationals and organize the very

production at the international level by denying national borders. It is claimed that the international organization of production will render the interventions of governments and labor organizations useless. The capital encountering demands by a government or laborers for reform will switch to a region free of disturbances. The capital capable of moving globally will move to wherever the labor is the cheapest. This is the element that is determining in the qualitative change of capitalism:

> Transnational corporations have now obtained the capacity to function throughout the world, to discriminate wages and to take the benefit of different legislations in different countries, to divide production into various subunits, and to force workers to compete with each other (Lash and Urry, 1987: 147).

For example, IBM has scattered its production of its II E microcomputer items on a broad geography such as Texas and California in America; Denmark and Germany in Europe; and Singapore, Japan and Taiwan in Southeast Asia (Piore and Sabel, 1984: 204). According to John Urry, in contrast to the mobile, innovative and such flexible organization of the employer, the labor force pursues to protect the previous industry, technology and values, and to return to the past. On the other hand, developments help laborers identify themselves with private sector companies. Many laborers have started to get career opportunities, which were not accessible in collective contracts, as a result of their individual

attempts and such attempts have weaken the collectivism that had formed

the basis for labor organizations in the past.

> Since the mid-1960s, the increasing demand for goods produced
> in short series to satisfy better the desires of a more differentiated
> customer structure have been one of the greatest threats to the
> Fordist mode of production, which had shaped the social and
> cultural spheres until the 1960s (Brosco, 1982:171).

Fordism was utterly successful in providing standardized goods

cheaply and in a mass scale. There emerged no problem for the Fordist

mode of production as far as there were social groups in population who

wanted to benefit from the advantages of it. However, when the

consumption habits of the society were transformed and differentiated,

producers applying Fordist mode of production faced with a set of

questions. According to Krishan Kumar, these questions were as follows:

what will happen when these massive consumer groups come to an end?

What will happen when the transformation of production needs to be

accomplished so rapidly according to the commands of fashion, new ways

of life, and the constant replacement of technological products with new

ones? Exactly in this framework drawn by these questions, a new pattern of

production and consumption, the flexible specialization pattern of post-

fordism, has arisen. The main basis of the supporters of the post-Fordist

theory was the concept of flexible specialization depending on newly

developed information technologies. Flexible technology gave rise to

flexible specialization. New ideas were being transformed into new products, and newer ideas were being transformed into even newer products. Only in this way the production process could be compatible with the specific demands and the flowing needs of the consumers. A production process sensitive to the desires of customers could neither lean on production based on long series, which is the basis of Fordism, nor could depend on skilled or quasi-skilled laborers, which were the common characteristics of Fordist industrial organizations (John Urry, 1987). Such a production requires flexible specialization, which implies not only the flexibility of laborers, but also the one of machines. Many social scientists consider these new developments as a marker of the rebirth of artisanal production. This reveals a process that is favorable for small-scale firms. Yet, many cases display that within this process which is marked by flexible specialization; large firms can also achieve very successful results. The case of Benetton, as mentioned by Perez, is a good example of this. Benetton is a family corporation consisting of 2,500 national and international stores. The specially designed electronic payment system in these stores transmits the sale data online to the center. The data collected at the center are used as the main source for design and production. Although Benetton employs only 1,500 workers in its main workshop, it employs more than 10,000 workers in more than 200 subcontractor firms spread all over the world. With a

particular cost, these subcontracting firms provide an additional flexibility in scale. Through such a network, Benetton has been able to achieve a decrease of its response-time to the changes in the market to 10 days (Perez, 1985). Such a small response-time is the result of flexible specialization and global production which are the bases of the post-Fordist mode of production. This example shows that post-Fordism does not appear only in small-scale firms, but in all of the sectors with various scales.

Almost all of the supporters of the post-Fordist theory emphasize the replacement of national economies by flexible specialization and global economy. In the Post-Fordist theory, flexible specialization and the capacity of technological innovation combine with the notion of change in the late twentieth century market conditions, and with the notion of globalization. Michel Piore and Charles Sabel point out that this emerging production process -flexible specialization- is the sign of leaving behind the global economic crisis of the 1970s and the 1980s. Though Piore and Sabel mention that this road before us is full of ambiguities, they expect a revitalization of artisanal production along with the process. For them, the restoration of artisanal production under more convenient conditions would lead to not only economic, but also social and political advantages for the left. Piore and Sabel mean that flexible specialization renders artisanal qualities more

valuable and thereby paves the way for all kinds of workers' cooperation. Hence, Piore and Sabel have a more optimistic view of the matter and they put forward a more optimistic vision in their claim that the competition based on workers' cooperation, which determined artisanal production in the 19th century, would reorganize forms of collective individualism that would open new frontiers for the Left (Piore Sabel, 1984).

On the contrary, Scott Lash and John Urry, though they agree on the concept of flexible specialization in the sense that all post-Fordist theorists understand it, are not so hopeful about the positive impacts of flexible specialization on the political struggle(s) of the left. The crisis of mass production is the underlying cause of the end of what Lash and Urry call "Organized Capitalism", i.e. Fordism. According to Lash and Urry, while mass production organized in line with Fordist and Taylorist principles; a corporatist pattern of industrial relations; concentration of people and economies in urban industrial districts; and cultural modernism formed organized capitalism, disorganized capitalism, the beginnings of which might differ in different countries but which has generally appeared in the 1960s and has been continuing since then, reversed all these assumptions written above. Contrary to Piore and Sabel, Lash and Urry emphasize that flexible specialization and forms of flexible work organization gradually

eliminate mass production and, with this, mass industries, and the working class is shrinking and getting fragmented. Moreover, this process results in a collapse of class politics and causes national corporatist system of industrial relations to disintegrate (Lash and Urry; 1987.3-7, 300-13). In this theory, the service class, which originally came into being as an outcome of organized capitalism, then begins to act as the source of the gradually disorganizing capitalism's new values and social movements. As far as people and workplaces move further away from industrial cities or sites and as far as production shifts to the third world countries, the decomposition of space accompanies the decomposition of industry. Pluralism develops and a social formation made of individuals with different ideals emerges. In this sense, for Lash and Urry, the modernist culture has been replaced by postmodernism (Lash Urry, 1994).

The theory of "disorganized capitalism" gives more meaning to flexible specialization. In this sense, disorganized capitalism does not imply a disintegrating system or a disorder in capitalism. In Lash and Urry's theory, this term simply menas the opposite of organized capitalism. Their main emphasis is on the restoration of the system itself, not on a new production process. According to Lash and Urry, the novelty of this process does not lie in the instability of capitalism, since instability is essential to

capitalism. What is new about this process is the death of the project of remaking the history through working class struggles.

> Once upon a time, all the economic, spatial, and social developments in the body of capitalism seemed to be emphasizing the working class. Working class was on the side of the history. It was representing modernism; it had an intrinsic connection with the forces that had the capacity to reorganize the society in such a way that would realize at least some of its forces of causality). Our argument arrives to the conclusion that this possibility has been lost in several western countries. The flow of the time cannot be reversed; that period passed away. The force of the industry originated working class mass to reshape the society in its own image has been worn off deeply for a foreseeable future (Lash Urry, 1987: 310-311).

Another theory about post-Fordism, a quite distinct one, is the Regulation theory. According to the Regulation School, which was founded by Michel Aglietta, Robert Boyer, and Alain Lipietz, the events we are experiencing today is nothing but the founding of a "Global Fordist" system and an attempt to resolve the crisis that has been ongoing since the 1960s. This attempt has taken the form of "neo-Fordism" (Boyer, 1990:122). The Regulation School critique of post-Fordist theory stresses that this production system in global scale contains all of the conflicts of classical Fordism. Considering the criticisms brought by Regulation School Krishan Kumar states;

> Contrary to what many members of the old left did, Regulation School does not ignore transformations merely as transformations of an old pattern. Although Regulation School does not fully agree on the notion of post-Fordism, it accepts that something new is in motion (Kumar, 1995; 75).

Though the core of the post-Fordist theory is the economic transformation that I am going to consider in the first part of my thesis, most of the supporters of this theory expand these concepts so as to cover political and cultural changes.

While mentioning the extermination of a movement leaning on the working class, Lash and Urry also emphasize that new social movements, in other words disorganized capitalism, have the potential not only to disintegrate old forms of individual and collective movements, but also to create a new social mobility through the formation of new modes of identity. An even sharper approach came from Andre Gorz. In his book, *Farewell to the Working Class,* Gorz used new social movements almost as a slogan.

In his work titled 'Americanism and Fordism', Gramsci defined Fordism in a very wide scope and emphasized that Fordism started a new period of capitalist civilization. According to Gramsci, Fordism did not only plan the production, but it also planned the individual. Fordism did not invade the factory, but it also invade the household, the most private

spheres of the life if the worker. Its aim was to create a new form of worker and a new form of people. Fordism, according to Gramsci, cannot be separated from new methods of work, a new style of life, and a new form of thought. Hall and Jacques accounts for this as follows:

> Just as Fordism was not only an economic organization, but also represented a whole culture, post-Fordism is a summary of utterly comprehensive and deep social and cultural developments. Because of this reason, the named transition marks a whole era (Hall and Jacques, 1989: 12).

Thus the differences between Fordism and post-Fordism are not only defined economically, but they are mentioned in many different fields, which can be summed up under three titles: Economic sphere, political and industrial sphere, and cultural and ideological sphere.

All of the theories of post-Fordism, or with Lash and Urry's saying, disorganized capitalism, or with Perry Anderson's conceptualization `late capitalism`, and post-modernism talk about great changes in the act of politics. According to many theorists, this change implies a revision of left politics, and especially of the classical leftist discourse.

Leftist discourses based on class could reject such a conceptualization of transition, but the situation for the right is totally different. Especially new right policies having started with Thatcher in Britain, and with Reagan in the U.S., triggered the reproduction and expansion of post-Fordism to the

social and cultural spheres. Especially Thatcher's individualism and post-Fordism got into a very close contact. The route covered by the left by establishing a particular relation between traditional common interests and general public interests is blocked by Thatcher's individualism (see Charlie LeadBeater, 1989). Thatcher's individualism structurally functions for the economic structure of post-Fordism in many fields. In this sense Thatcherism does not only justify market economy, but it also justifies the 'marketification' of the society in general. The main point of Thatcherist individualism is to transfer power from collective movements to the individual himself. According to Charlie LeadBeater, society is just a center for gathering the plurality of individual wills, an arena for individual satisfaction, and a set of opportunities for individual success, progress and pleasure for Thatcherism. Society is just a tool and a servant helping people to achieve their individual goals determined in advance (Charlie LeadBeater, 89). Thereby any attachment to collective solutions would become vulnerable before individual goals, and people retreat from the sense of belongingness and obligation towards such solutions. After the privatization of responsibilities and obligations under such individualism, the greatest attack against collective movements, especially against classical movements directly attached to such collectivism has taken place.

Thatcherist individualism also supports Jean-François Lyotard's phrase declaring the end of grand narratives. Every containing system of belief based on the premises of Enlightenment, from rationality to science and causality, and to the belief in progress and class struggle, all grand narratives has become vague. According to Jean-François Lyotard, for more than two hundred years these grand narratives have been used to legitimize too many things, from wars to revolutions, concentration camps, and to Taylorism and Fordism. After the rise of neo-liberal individualism, the validity of grand narratives has been questioned; thus the structures which were legitimized through those grand narratives, including nation-states, entered into a legitimacy crisis (Lyotard, 1984). For Frederic Jameson, those grand narratives were replaced with the universal logic of the market. Political and cultural maps of modern times are being redrawn in this process (Jean Francois Lyotard, 1984).

In the following chapter the main characteristics of social movements and the effects of economic restructuration described above on the new social movements will be elaborated.

CHAPTER 3

NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

The aim of this chapter is to investigate the new social movements, their underlying theoretical approaches, and their characteristics. The theories that are usually labeled as "Postmodern", "Post-Fordist", or "Late Capitalist" question and usually reject the classical theories of social movements, which is to say orthodox strands of Marxism or classical views of liberalism. Furthermore, the new social movements claim to transcend the totalizing and the foundationalist position of the class-based social movements with their praxis and theory. It has been debated that the classical theories of social movements are no longer capable of understanding the present situation regarding the significance of the new social movements. These movements have been subject to many debates and they have been claimed to be the sources of new theories of social movements. This chapter attempts to analyze the so-called transforming

power of these movements and their contribution to the realm of political resistance.

3-1 Characteristics of the "New Social Movements"

Social movements are often viewed as the indicators of a contemporary social crisis. This supposed social crisis has been embodied in the form of transformations in the internal structure of the pertinent literature itself. The literature on social movements has clearly undergone major changes in the past two decades. Such changes are nowhere more evident than in the increasing application of the term, "new social movements". The term was first seen in the works of the French Sociologist Alain Touraine and Alberto Melucci. The term "new social movements" indeed aims at eliminating the difference among contemporary social movements and listing them under a generic rubric in order to render them an integral thing which is subject to social research. Based on the distinction between this 'entity' of new social movements and the older ones, new social theories which attempted to understand this entity have emerged. However, as shall be shown in the chapter, this distinction is problematical by itself, given the theoretical difficulties to discern the elements in the new social movements which make them different from the older ones.

The term "new social movements" seems to cover a wide range of contemporary movements, for example ecological and environmentalist movements, feminist and woman movements, various rights movements, such as movements conceptualizing the rights of people who are infected by HIV virus, gays and lesbians, indigenous or aboriginal people, antipoverty campaigns, various solidarity groups, anti nuclear protest groups. Touraine tries to understand the historical development of new social movements:

> The emergence of the new movements is usually traced back to the 1960s. In Europe especially the 68 student events in France, the rise of women's rights advocacy groups and anti nuclear anti cold-war protest register the advent of new form of social movements In United States, civil rights and woman's liberation movements, anti-Vietnam war campaigns and new gay movements are frequently noted to have marked the inception of the new movements (Touraine, 1992:129).

New social movements became forces to be seriously considered by some political movements and political parties in the late 1970s in Western countries (see Touraine, 1992). Combining the heterogeneous range of social movements and collective actions under the new banner of the new social movements would inevitably result in the necessity to look for similar elements among those movements. Social theorists strive to investigate how the hegemony of revolutionary or liberatory discourse has weakened in the political discourse of the new social movements. In this sense, the new social movements are 'representational'. (see Touraine, 1992) Thus, the new

social movements are interested in rising a certain level of awareness rather than monopolizing and appropriating the power which is the major goal of the former types of social movements. Furthermore, they are interested in the idea of democracy unlike the older ones that are interested in the idea of revolution.

The common characteristics of the new social movements are variously defined in different texts. However, there are some particular features that are accepted as the common elements in the new social movements. These characteristics of the new social movements can be summarized categorically as follows: Firstly, the new social movements emphasize the significance of the cultural sphere in their political discourse. Secondly, they primarily operate within the field of social area rather than the political society (see Touraine, 1992). This actually refers to their political position which struggles for the social change by not limiting itself to the class politics. Thirdly, their strategies aim at transforming individual or group identity and values and engendering new or alternative life styles as well. According to Melucci (1988: 330) claims to group or individual identity as a particularity in contrast to other group or state the state in fact becomes the pivot around which movements are arranged. Identity claims are important tools for understanding the peculiar characteristics of the new

social movements. The universal identity of citizenship has been covering all the people living in the territory of sovereign states since the emergence of the nation states thereby channeling the citizens' practices and perceptions in to their common identity. In this respect, the new movements' claims to identity have shown the inadequacy of the universality of national identity. Finally, "new social movements mostly engage in the direct action through different social networks or cultural institution."(Alan Scot, 1990: 16-19) This point refers to the cultural politics.

These four basic characteristics of new social movements indicate the relationship between the new social movements and the overall institutional structure of modern societies. According to Vahapzadeh (see 2003) this relationship itself has some implications. The first implication is the exorcizing of the class roots of the contemporary social issues which means practically removing the burden of totalizing ideologies from the shoulders of these movements. The second one is the exclusion of the formal political organizations from the political strategies; the organizational flexibility of the new movements largely renders the individual and the collective interchangeable. The third one directly refers to their organizational structure; many of the new social movements operate through not only personal or intimate relations but also relations emerging from systems of

network. The fourth one is their decentralized, segmented, and non-hierarchical organizational structure. The fifth one is that these new social movements normally engage in nonviolent practices, and that their strategies include the resistance through civil obedience. The sixth one is related to their emphasis on the cultural domain which politically means a legitimization crisis of the conventional political movements which usually exclude the cultural sphere from their political strategies. The final implication is that "new social movements stress the individual or group identity such that identity becomes the key theme around which grievances, actions and strategies converge to cry the name of one defining being in the past, present and the future of the identity" (Larana, Johnston, Gudsfield, 1994:7).

New social movements generally put emphasis on identity, whether it is the identity of any individual or any group. Theories of new social movements tend to adopt necessary methods of analysis in order to elaborate on the issues concerning identity. The significance of identity in the practices of new social movements may account the great importance assigned to identity in the theories of these movements. Moreover, as stated, "new social movement theory should be able to open new analytical spaces that would account for such claims to particularity."(Vahapzadeh, 2003: 11).

Thus, the central position of identity in theory refers to an attempt to derive the particularity of the new social movements. Among the thinkers who investigate the significance of identity, Alain Touraine, Alberto Melucci, Ernesto Laclau, Chantal Mouffe, and Claus Elder are the most prominent ones. The methodological positions, assumptions, and paradigms of these thinkers will be explained in this chapter.

This chapter tends to consider the emphasis on identity as a peculiar feature of the new social movements and the pertinent theories. Although there are many similarities and common methodological positions of these theories, the fact is that there are many crucial differences among them. Their understanding of the concept of identity in the context of the new social movements directly determines the relation between those theories and the new social movements. Payman Vahapzadeh pointed out the subtlety of the situation:

> We will have to refine in the to practice in new social movements by asking: Is Identity-claim expression of some underlying structural change which are reflected in the practice of new social movements? Or is identity constitutive of the new social movements. The responds of these questions will determine its approach to the new social movements (Vahapzadeh, 2003: 12).

In an attempt to understand the complexities of the issue, this chapter will investigate the three main theoretical approaches to the problem regarding the new social movements. These are the Post-Industrial

theory represented by Touraine and Melucci, the middle class theory of Klaus Eder, and finally the theoretical perspectives raised by Laclau and Mouffe. There are some crucial differences among those theories, one of which is their understanding of identity. While the first and second approaches see the identity as the expression of some particular structural changes, the last one considers identity as a constitutional element of the new social movements. The other differences among those theories will be elaborated in the consecutive sections.

3-2 Post-Industrial Approach

> On the other side, the reference to Third World national and social movements was for other groups the way to discover or to create new social movements in their own countries. This tendency was mush much more visible in the United States and in France than in Japan, Germany and Italy during the late sixties. It became predominant in most countries during the late seventies. Progressively, this new left became more and more anti-revolutionary and liberation. It opposed the idenfication of social movements with state power (Touraine, 1989:43).

The theoretical assumptions of Alain Touraine's new social movement theory radically set it apart from the previous theories. His works primarily put emphasis on action and conflict in its account of the formation of modern societies. His theoretical position also attempts to adopt new methods of scientific inquiry in accordance with his emphasis on action and conflict in the explanation of the social processes. The Post-Industrial approach, which was dealt with in Chapter II, states that from the

early 1970s onwards, the Western countries have gradually undergone some crucial historical transformations which directly related with the features which characterized industrial societies. This transformation has taken place mainly in the processes of production which led the concepts of informatics, programmed society, symbolic objects. This transformation was explicated by Touraine (1981:7) by following statements: Production society is brought about by the technological production of symbolic goods that hinges on four components: research and developments, information processing, biomedical science and technologies and mass media. These components suggest that the central investments are now made at a level of production management and this are not like the industrial society at a level of organization of labor. Programmed society is informed by three major shifts in the configuration of society: one from "mechanistic" tendencies to "human Government" as well as political struggles, reproduction to change; and finally, third shifts towards "less unified power".

Besides the transformation of the organization of the production process, the recent developments led to various changes in other realms of the society. Institutions tend to lose their intermediary role. According to Touraine, on these conditions, the post-industrial society does not represent an entity implying a certain social historical configuration in the future

anymore. It rather turns to be a field of conflicts, the features of which are completely different from the features of the conflicts in industrial era. The difference between these two types of conflicts lies in the resolution of these conflicts indeed. In the industrial era, conflicts were resolved by the means of liberal distinction established between public and private domains. Touraine argues that this liberal distinction which plays a primary role in conflict resolution and maintenance of social unity is not viable anymore in the post-industrial society. As a result of this unresolvable nature of conflicts in post-industrial society, conflict itself becomes the matter of private life.

Touraine states that the post-industrial society tends to abandon the cultural ideals of the industrial society, namely the limitless economic growth, consumption, and identification with the nation-state. Social movements are seen as reactions to some particular elements post-industrial society. As the society ceases to exist as a unified totality, it becomes increasingly pluralistic, divergent and even irreconcilable. Touraine attempts to explicate the plurality of conflict in post-industrial society as:

> The image of two or more actors confronting each other in the name of opposition interest, but sharing the same cultural model, such as each actor is define negatively by their will to fight an adversely and positively by their will to agent of realization of cultural models (Touraine ,1990:130).

This plurality of conflict has some implications for democracy.

Touraine points out the conditions of democracy in such system as follows:

> One can only turn to a conception of democratic action as the liberation of the individuals and groups who are dominated by the logic of power, or, in other words, subject to control by the masters and managers of system, who wiev them as mere resources (Touraine,1997:10).

Although Alberto Melucci criticizes Touraine's account of the Post-Industrial society and the new social movements, he agrees with him that there have been some particular fundamental changes in the world that can contribute to a better understanding of the new social movements. According to Melucci, some developments have emerged as a result of the process. Firstly, the distinction between public and private spheres has collapsed. This seems to be the result of the changes happened after the Second World War: the individual's needs have become the expressions of the particularity of the individual vis-à-vis the society. Secondly, opposition against the forms of domination takes the form of deviance and marginality. Thirdly, a cultural oriented political action has emerged as a result of the increasing importance attributed to group autonomy and the freedom from traditional political communities. Finally, group particularity and identity have become the major concern for the action groups.

Consequently, Melucci (1998) sees the industrial conflicts between workers and managers, the problem of nationhood, and the extension of political rights as the main indicators of the crisis of the industrial period, thence the end of it. However, this end does not mean the end of struggles for citizenship or democratic rights. The ideas of Melucci in his inquiry on the end of the industrial period have many parallels to the ideas of Touraine. In his investigation of the end of the industrial cycle, Touraine attributes the main role to the changes in the nature of conflicts in the new era; the contemporary social conflicts are increasingly multifarious, because the points of conflicts cannot be confined to some particular key issues, such as the issue of labor. In a similar way Melucci stated that: "We can observe the formation of new field of conflicts, which specifically belongs to Post-Industrial, complex and advance capitalist societies" (Melucci, 1981: 99). Those new conflicts are diversified to the extent that the focus or the gist of the conflicts is rather ambiguous. The main reason of the ambiguity of the focus of the new conflicts is that they are formed in a new society, namely the informational or 'Post-Industrial society' which is based on a highly complex system. This society emphasizes the individual receivers and producers of information.

Group autonomy as the inherent element in the Post-Industrial society has a radicalizing effect on the idea of democracy. Liberalism's invented conception of democracy as an institutional notion cannot express those multifarious political tendencies of various actors in those complex societies. The distinction between public and private spheres in these societies refers to the distinction between the state and the civil society. All of these elements bring about some paradoxes of the Post-Industrial democracy. The role of the institutions is twofold: On the one hand, they tend to encourage the actors for the integration and political participation, and on the other, it prevents them from participating to such integration. In Vahapzadeh words:

> New social movements embody struggles for identity building vis-à-vis the political institution. Thus, through their efforts to attain collective autonomy and freedom from state intervention, they uncover the issues that have been excluded by and political decision (Vahapzadeh, 2003:17).

This point is further summarized in Melucci's words: "The paradoxes of Post-Industrial Democracy are linked to both pressures for integration and need for identity buildings." (quoted in Vahapzade, 2003: 17). The Post-Industrial era marks the end of an idea of society as a unified and fixed totality. According to Touraine (1988), society has turned to be a realm of conflicts in which no main actor can represent the rationality of the society even if this actor would be the state. Touraine, instead of seeing the social

movements as agents of history, regards them as the indicators of the existence of the plurality of movements. Given the structural configuration in any social organization, only one main conflict can be given the opportunity to make the status quo disfunctioned. In Scott's (1991:42) statements, "there is only one social movement for each class in each type of society"

Although, Melucci agrees with Touraine that some movements can play significant roles, his accounts are very different from Touraine's accounts in many ways. As a proof for the crucial difference between their perspectives on the issue we can quote from Melucci (1989:80) "Even though I am not in search of the central movement of complex society, I am maintaining that there are forms of antagonistic collective action capable of affecting the logic of the complex system". Touraine stated that Melucci does not consider the fact of the plurality of contemporary social movements as refusing the idea of one central conflict for every social type. There are some major differences between the ideas of Melucci and Touraine on the question of central conflicts. In Touraine's perspective, the roles of the actors are predetermined in a given society, in which for example workers and the managerial class are social actors trying to control the industry. Melucci, on the other hand, refuses the notion of structurally

determined identities. To express in Melucci's (1989:80) words, "actors can not be constant because their identities will inescapably undergo changes in the process of conflict."

Post-Industrial theory regards the post-Industrial society as causing a transformation within the older types of social movements. This new conception of social movements encouraged critical reflections in the method of sociological inquiry. According to Touraine unless a new practice of sociology is implemented, neither Post-Industrial society nor social movements can be theorized. On such premises, Touraine suggests a new practice called as "sociological intervention". The main purpose of Touraine's sociological intervention is to find a certain conception of worker's movements in the logic of Post-Industrial societies. "The sociological intervention identifies the specific directions of the different new movements in order to register their diverse areas of conflict which tomorrow will take over the central role that the workers' movements held in industrial society" (Touraine, 1981: 9). If we accept that diverse social conflicts can be organized under the rubric of a single central social conflict, from the point of view of Touraine, then the task of sociology will be to investigate that central conflict which can speak on behalf of other diverse social conflicts. Therefore, the object of study should be social relations and

conflicts, not social actors and systems for Touraine. Thus the central conflict emerges from the present social relations which are themselves the consequences of the major transformational shifts in the structure of the Western society. Studies concerning the significance of the social movements attempt to reveal the potentialities of the actors engaged in the actions of those social movements and investigate whether those movements are capable of historical actions. According to Touraine, the sociologist studying the issue engages in such research as an agent of social change. Melucci (1989: 240) takes a different theoretical position; he sees "the relationship between actor and researcher as contractual". This position, I think, takes its inspiration from his ideas on the nature of knowledge in the new society. In his definition, knowledge in such social system which includes primarily the differentiation and variability becomes inextricable resources for social actors.

In this point, one final note about the relationship between new social movements and modernity is necessary. While studying the relation between modernity and new social movements, Touraine refuses any understanding of modernity as a totality and claims that cultural differences have influenced the principles of modernity. However, at the same time, Touraine agrees with the idea that the spreading prevalence of instrumental

rationality inevitably undermines cultural differences. In Touraine's (1995: 27) words: "The passionate craving of enlightenment thinkers for a unified word founded upon reason rendered them blind to the fact that they mistook their own particular, historically and culturally bound, theories universal project.". What is central in the idea of new modernity is the social movement as a social actor. According to Touraine, (1995:240) "it is notion through the struggles against the fusion of power with technical reason that the subject is produced and formed. The subject is social movement because its very existence lies in its struggle against all form of governmentality." Thus Touraine discredits the notion of social class in favor of social movements. As a social movement, "the subject is at once social conflict and cultural project" (1995:234).

Indeed, Touraine's concept of 'new modernity' refers to the Post-Industrial society which is deliberately positioned in the context of the historical development of the Western societies. The term Post-Industrial society means a radical break from the industrial society in Western societies. Both the terms Industrial and Post-Industrial society imply modes of social organization of labor and distribution of products. By adapting the Post-Industrial thesis to the theory of the new modernity, this thesis produces a model of historical development that considers nature of conflict

and new social movements as indicators of a transformation in Western societies. While seeing social movements as a subject in this new social system, Touraine, I think, challenges the current accounts of authority which defines them as a totality. Indeed, his conception of subject as social movement includes some premises about the multifarious character of the new social movements. This subtle understanding of new social movements as being an entity and at the same time as a structure which includes variety of elements is, I think, the central contribution of Touraine's theory to our understanding of the new social movements. With such a perspective, we can conceptualize those movements as being the main actors of social change and also having new potentialities for a new sociology of political action that challenges the current theories of political power.

The theories of Touraine and Melucci on the new social movements operate within the conceptual framework formed by the post-Industrial discourse. In such framework, the post-Industrial society is a new social organization with new power centers and new social relations. This newness of the post-Industrial society gives Touraine the opportunity to call the new social movements as such. Contemporary social movements struggle within the new social relations that the post-Industrial society is claimed to open. This new domain of struggle refers not to any struggle for

the power in the sense of capturing the state apparatus, but to gain hegemony in the realm of the social area. Touraine sees the new social movements as emerging from the struggles concerning the structure of civil society. Therefore, the new social movements are new as far as they can differentiate themselves from the 'former' social movements which had aimed at capturing the state apparatus and attempt to transform the realm of the civil society. On the base of these conceptual considerations, Touraine and Melucci do not put emphasis on the social and political aspects of the new social movements which mainly deal with the changes in political domain but on the social and cultural aspects of them that represent desire for transformations in the present values, norms, and identity structures in the society. These new social movements differ from the 'older' social movements in their social base or their actors who engage in the political actions. Melucci depicts the actors in the former types of social movements as playing the role of hero or traitor according to the changing conditions but always tragic characters who are in the pursuit of great ideals or a dramatic fate (Melucci:1981). On the other hand, the actors in the new social movements return themselves rather than to external world.

3.3 New Social Movements as Middle Class Radicalism

> It is the petit bourgeoisie that express the collective protest of the new social movements. New social movements are historically speaking a second wave of protest of the honest man and petit-bourgeois radical democrats….. A phenomenology of new social movements must start from the assumption that is part of history of the petit-bourgeois protest which has from the outset accompanied the modernization of society (Eder, 1993: 145)

There are also some significant theories of the new social movements which are mainly based on the concept of class. One prominent example to this approach is Eder's theory which has some significant contributions to the theory of the new social movements. In his account, the former social movements are characterized as class movements or movements on behalf of classes. Communist or Socialist parties utilized the discourse of class politics, which directly influenced the political aspiration and programs of the social movements, such as early feminist movements or the peace movements. According to Eder, the hegemony of the master discourse of class politics over different social movements had continued until 1960s. After the 1960s the picture began to change increasingly. The emergence of various social movements which were mainly based on non-universalist and non-class tenets and their recognition among the intellectual and popular circles undermined the common belief about the nature of the actors of social change. However, class analysis did not disappear with the emergence and recognition of the new social movements which have that

undermining effect on the traditional understanding. While the new intellectual attempts to understand the new social movements tend to place themselves outside the class-based theories, Eder and Claus Offe try to explicate the issue by putting emphasis on the notion of class but in a very different methodological position from the classical class-based theories. In this regard, Eder's and Offe's studies seem to offer the most comprehensive class analysis of the new social movements. The main actor in their account of the new social movements is 'new middle class'.

Offe, (1985) in his theory of the new social movements, uses some categories of class, namely the new middle class, the old middle class, and the people outside the labor market in periphery. In his view, the new class politics refers to the new middle class politics. Offe seems to realize the subtle differences among the old working class politics, the middle class politics, and the new politics of class. He has developed a triangular model to explain the structure of the new social movements. These movements include three major forces in its political realm. These are the unions, sectors of the new middle class and the old middle class, and non-unionized workers. According to his triangular model, belonging is no longer considered as being a determining factor in class positioning. Offe(1985:857) stated that "the succeed of new social movements depends on whether and

how the cleavages between the new middle class, old middle class, and the marginal elements in the new social movements will be overcome".

Melucci's criticism of Offe's class analysis of the new social movements actually lies in his understanding of the class as an analytical tool. He considers the class analysis as essentially belonging to the industrial society. Melucci points out:

> I have gradually abandoned the concept of the class relationship to address the question of systematic conflicts... the notion of class relationships has been for me a temporary tool with which to analyze systematic conflicts and forms of domination in complex societies. But in contemporary system classes as real social groups are withering away (Melucci, 1995, 117).

Eder's perspective on class politics aims at a "sociology of collective action" beyond agency and system. Eder attempts to develop a perspective which implies an increasing separation between class and collective action. This is a theoretical tool for him to reveal the relative independence of collective action and class structure. Vahapzede elaborate on this point by stating that:

> Eder's work is particularly important because instead of the seeking to shed light on the relationship between the new social movements and the new middle class by merely looking at the class based of the individual constituents of the movements, Eder seeks a middle ground between new social movements and middle classes (Vahapzede, 2003:26).

Eder argues that "class" as a theoretical tool cannot offer sufficient explanation of the rise and the fall of social movements in modern societies. It has only some influence on the collective action through cultural constructions that are produced in historically specific life forms. Eder (1993:45) elaborates on this point by stating that "one's class origin is no guarantee that one's action is class action."

Eder utilizes Bourdieu's concept of habitus to explain the disappearance of "class consciousness". He transforms the concept of habitus to class habitus in order to operate it to investigate whether the concept of 'class consciousness' has the same significance in the present period. Besides, the concept provides Eder with analytical means to tackle with the complex relations between the subjective and objective. Class habitus gives the actor the possibility to be relatively free within determined, objective structure. Elder(1985:160) states that "What is decisive is Bourdieu's idea that this habitus has also reproduce the subjective conditions of the habitus if it is make possible reproduction its underlying objectives structures." Eder defines social movements as independent of class, and conceptualizes them in terms of a theory of collective action.

In Eder's theory of the new social movements, class is not a social fact, but a social construction. Thus, class relations are partly constructed by

42

social movements. Thus Eder' theory of class, which is called constructive theory of class, includes three elements: Agency, the context within which the agency located, and the structural outcome of the action that takes place in the cultural fields (Eder, 1985: 173). Agency refers to the capacity of a group of actors to redefine norms, values, and interests that set them apart from the other social groups regardless of their demographic similarities and differences. The formation of the class cultures is confined by the cultural resources. So "agency is intricately related to the cultural space that it creates and draws upon to constitute and reproduce itself as a collective capacity for action" (Eder, 1985: 173). In short, any conflict in the cultural environment refers to a class conflict, but only indirect and diffused way.

Eder's new class theory offers a different perspective on the realm of the new social movements. In his view, marginal collective actors engage in the actions of the new social movements for inclusion. However, he does not consider the new social movements as being confined with these groups. It also reflects the antagonistic norms, interest and values. Those new social movements will be the sphere which includes the newly emerging social conflicts of radical middle class (See Eder: 1985). The concept of the middle class plays an instrumental role allowing a trace of the evolution of collective action from the labor movements to the new ones.

Besides, it emphasizes the notion of continuity in the historical development of the practice of social movements in Eder's theory.

The Post-Industrial approach of Touraine and Melucci and Eder's approach of Middle Class Radicalism theorizes the new social movements in the context of the notion of identity. According to Calhoun (see 1994), social theorists attempt to define the women movements and excluded identities of gays and lesbians as politically significant and recognizable in public domain. This attempt of social theorists indicates that identity can be a momentous political field of struggle. The processes within which the identity is constructed can both shape a series of social movements and can be shaped by those movements in turn. Melucci defines the meaning of identity in the new social movements as:

> Every conflict which transgresses a system of share rules concerning the distribution of material or symbolic resources is a conflict of identity. Central question is why has theme of identity become such a central issue? The probable reason is that it reflects the capacity of contemporary action to go beyond modifying and transforming the natural environment (Melucci, 1989:46).

In sum, both Touraine's and Melucci's post-Industrial thesis and Eder's Middle class radicalism attempt to explicate the increasing significance of the notion of identity in the new social movements, thence the new politics.

Furthermore, to view the new social movements by emphasizing their focus on the identity reveals the analytical weakness of the traditional theories of the social movements in understanding the newly emerging social movements.

3-4 Post-Marxist Approach to New Social Movements

> The symbolic, overdetermined character of social relations implies that they lack any ultimate reality which would reduce them to necessarily moments of an immanent law. Society and social agents lack any essence, and their regularities merely consist of the relative and precarious forms of fixation which accompany the establishment of a certain order (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: 98).

Laclau and Mouffe regard the new social movements as emerging from the consequences of hegemonic formation and antagonisms that happened in post World War II. Trying to investigate those movements regarding to the changes in Western societies, they argue that the political realm has undergone dramatic changes especially since the beginning of the 1970s. They believe that the term 'new social movements' is far from explaining the range that these movements embrace; they actually comprise a wide range of contemporary social movements. This character of the new social movements means a serious challenge to the current social and political theory, the theoretical framework of which is constructed on the traditional understanding of conflict. The conflict that the new social

movements refer to cannot be confined to the limited category of class or any identity which directly refers to any socialist consciousness. Mouffe pointed out this point as follows:

> New antagonisms are indicate forms of resistance to the commodification, bureaucratization and increasing the homogenization of social life against which new social movements construct themselves through a proliferation of particularisms and crystallize in to a demand for autonomy itself (Mouffe, 1984: 139).

Laclau's and Mouffe's theory indicates that the concept of identity is interrelated with hegemony and articulation. In her article, "Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci", Chantal Mouffe explicates her understanding of hegemony by elaborating the concept of hegemony in Gramsci. In Gramsci, hegemony was understood in the context of the class alliance of the working class with the peasantry; in this sense his understanding of hegemony was still Leninist according to her. In this regard, the political leadership of the proletariat is the essential one. Only in Gramsci's later ages, the concept of hegemony went beyond a simple class alliance. Hegemony, then, is not a simple class alliance but a fusion of economic, political, intellectual and moral objectives. Transformation and appropriation of existing ideological elements and creating new ones are essential for the creation of new hegemonies. This process also includes rearticulation of existing ideological elements.

Laclau and Mouffe argue that every identity is a designation of an "ontological privilege agent or historically position within society" (Laclau, 1985:164). Far from being positive, the constitutive outside is an external threat to that offers the consolidation of elements in the structure. Every identity is meaningful as far as it is contextualized in a discourse or a structure. The identity of each element in the system can only be defined if the boundaries of the system are defined. This assertion practically means that the identity and actor is never predetermined or pregiven; thus they are totally contingent. There is a closure of the system which means positioning of elements within that system in a relational way. This closure occurs when the system prevents the outside threat from functioning. Laclau and Mouffe refuse the final closure of the system which means the permanent fixing of the differences between elements as well as the boundaries of the system. Thus, in order to attribute meanings to the identities, the external element and the elements within it must be defined. The natural consequence of this assertion is that every identity is inevitably dislocated because the dislocated center that it stands on is in an external relation to that identity. Identity as negativity a concept which is incompatible with rational objectivity Negativity, as Laclau (1990:180) states, has a "constitutive and primordial character."

Identity which is of crucial importance in Laclau's and Mouffe's theoretical approaches plays also a central role in order to better understand the new social movements. Identities are never pregiven and they can only be understood in discursive practices. Thus the new social movements which are claimed to operate through the element of identity cannot be investigated unless those features of identity are elaborated. In their theoretical abstractions, identity is defined in terms of conflict. Besides;

> The collapse of the public private distinction conflict has now become pervasive various external forces (for example; economy, media, bureaucracy) pose treat to autonomy of the individual. It is in regard to conflict that the concept of articulation and its twin concept, antagonism, enjoy the central in Laclau and Mouffe (Larrain Jorge, 1994:46).

Antagonism, having a central place in Laclau and Mouffe's theory, designates the ontological constitution of the society. As it is theorized in their writings, it establishes the limits of society and social objectivity. The impossibility of the structural closure means that no identity is complete or pregiven. This is also directly related with the meanings that are produced through these identities. As Laclau (1988:254) points out, "each element has a surplus of meaning because it can not be located in a closed system of difference. And at the same time, no identity ever definitely and definitively acquired". Thus, as Laclau elaborates, social action always requires a symbolic character. He gives an example from the strike of workers; it

48

means both economic dissatisfaction of workers and their resistance against the regime at the same time.

The discourse is directly related with the articulation. As Laclau and Mouffe stated, "The structured totality resulting from the articulatory practice, we will call discourse. The differential positions, insofar as they appear articulated within discourse, we will call moments. By contrast, we will call element any difference that is not discursively articulated." (Laclau, 1985: 105). The decision, then, turns out to be an articulatory practice.

The contingent character of the articulation constitutes its most important aspect. There are no predetermined relations between elements in a system; they are in contingent relations with each other. If that is so, there would be no articulation but only fixed identities in a totality. As Laclau argues, there is no completely articulated totality (Laclau, 1985: 113). Meanings are only partially fixed; there is no ultimate fixing of meanings. These have implications for the definition of the social: "Society as an enclosed totality then turns out to be impossible, and theoretically replaced by the social as the milieu corresponding to the political the terrain of the constitution of social practice" (Laclau, 1995:93).

The impossibility of the social totality in Laclau and Mouffe definitely rejects any privileged center which predetermines the

consciousness of the social actors. This also means questioning the subjectivity of the class interests as well as the position of the working class as playing ontologically a central role in transforming capitalist relations. The proletariat, the hero of the story, is replaced with actors with multiple identities who have not class belongings; the social struggles of which should be combined in order to create the strategy of radical democracy. This strategy proposes a way of politics which articulates different categories that are not based on class, such as gender, ethnicity, and different social movements, such as environmentalist, peace, or anti-nuclear movements. It proposes a new strategy which is primarily based on pluralist social identities.

CHAPTER 4

REIDENTIFICATION AND REUNIFICATION PROCESSES

WITHIN THE TURKISH LEFT: THE CASE OF THE ÖDP

4-1 The Reunification Period of the Turkish Left after the 1980s

In this chapter, I will elaborate on the theories of the new social movements having dealt with in the previous chapter in the case of the ÖDP (Freedom and Solidarity Party), the analysis of which reveals some social and political peculiarities of Turkey. The choice of the ÖDP as a case in this study results from its deliberate effort to embrace a wide range of political movements in Turkey.

Interestingly, while trying to include various political groups, the ÖDP claims to have a socialist upper identity and calls itself as the 'most leftist'[1] among other political parties in Turkey. However, it is rather

---

[1] Interestingly, in the General Elections of April 18, 1999, ÖDP's logo was accidentally at the left edge of the vote papers. ÖDP utilized this accidental situation by wanting people to vote for the most leftist party.

misleading to define the ÖDP either definitely as a platform in which different political movements can represent themselves and pursue their political interests without changing their particular political positions and as a party of socialists sharing similar views. It is neither a political platform nor a socialist party in that sense. As shall be argued in this chapter, the practices of the ÖDP and its theoretical position reveal both of the definitions above.

The orthodox line of thought in Marxism considers almost all social issues as emerging from the basic conflict between labor and capital; they tend to reduce the issues, such as oppression of women, the environmental pollution, sexism e.g., to the conflict between labor and capital. On the other hand, the ÖDP, although it has inherited a strong leftist tradition from the political movements active before 1980s, has attempted to develop a political strategy which is comprised of mainly a collaboration with various political movements, not only the leftist ones, without interfering their autonomies and different political views. In this sense, the ÖDP has tried to be more than sum of the elements it includes.

How would one elaborate on the ÖDP (Freedom and Solidarity Party) in the context of the theory of the new social movements of Touraine and Melucci? What is the possibility of placing a party who claims to be in

the Marxist tradition and the groups of which try to flourish this tradition in the framework of the theoretical accounts of Touraine and Melucci on the new social movements? This consideration will be elaborated in details in the next chapter. However, it can be argued that the ÖDP was capable of including many groups who have diverse interests and claims that are similar to the examples given by Touraine and Melucci in their account of the new social movements. Besides the ÖDP has tried to posit itself in the domain of struggle which is the intersection point of those diverse interests and claims. It has given various political identities to express themselves in socialist leftist identity which forms the upper identity of the party claimed to embrace all those multifarious political claims. For example "We must resist every pressure on different sexual choices. We must fight the discrimination and contempt directed on the people because of their differences." (ÖDP Programs and Party's Charter, 1996:10)

A radical example to this point can be given from the relation of gays and lesbians to the party. In the beginning of the establishment process of the ÖDP, the journal, KAOS GL, which claims to speak on behalf of gays and lesbians in Turkey, proclaimed the establishment of a party as such:

> Finally, gays and lesbians will have their own party… Freedom
> and Solidarity Party (ÖDP) is the one and only party which have
> an explicitly positive attitude towards gays in Turkey for Today.

In its statute there are direct references about sexual minorities (KAOS GL, 1996:1-5).

Another point which is directly related with the case of the ÖDP is about the Melucci's statements on the relation between older leftist tradition and the new social movements. He stated that the organizational structure of the older socialist formations is suitable to the political representation of new collective demands. However, according to him, the parties in Europe adapts themselves to these new conditions; either the former parties are replaced with the new ones which are suitable for such new organizational structures or they change themselves according to the new political demands and new organizational structures which can hopefully reflect the multifarious character of the new social movements. These parties are competing with each other to pervade their political messages to the society while at the same time preserving the autonomy of those new social movements. The ÖDP seems to have such political mission on behalf of Turkish socialist groups to the great extent.

This duality (or dilemma) between containment and autonomy of the new social movements has actually a long history in the case of advanced capitalist countries. The new social movements in western countries have tended to refuse the containment of any party; they have tried to preserve their autonomies and expressed their political demands by various types of

actions which usually cannot be considered as a part of a general political strategy. Having similar characteristics, the new social movements in Turkey have tried to represent themselves and express their political demands within the ÖDP. Another issue which will be dealt with in this study is the discourse that the new social movements developed within the ÖDP which has a particular party's charter and program by the definition. This consideration will investigate to what degree the new social movements express themselves in an institutional structure like a political party.

However, unless the political tradition that ÖDP inherited from the earlier political movements is understood, it is almost impossible to explicate the attempt of the ÖDP to be both a unified party and a platform that offers an environment that plural voices can express themselves. It is obvious that this thesis does not claim to make an elaborate historical account of the ÖDP; to write a history of party means nothing but writing a monograph on a general history of a country (Gramsci, 1971: 151). This effort necessarily includes a detailed explanation on the inherited political tradition, organizational activities, ideological debates within among various political organizations, features of the partisans and represented social groups, and the position of the party or political movements in

different social and political contexts. Since such an explanation would surpass the limits of this thesis, a brief account on the developments within the Turkish left especially after the 1980 coup d'etat is necessary in order to understand the relation between the new social movements and the ÖDP.

The period beginning from the 1980 coup d'etat can be considered as a turning point for the leftist movements in Turkey. The impact of the coup d'etat on Turkish leftist movements was very harsh. This devastating effect has reached its peak point when the leftist groups increasingly lost their members after the coup d'etat (they were prisoned or they went abroad as refugees) and the dissolution of communism after 1989. This process has accompanied with the rise of neo-liberalism which has meant a need for a restructuration and a reconsideration of the theoretical and practical means of political strategy of the leftist movements.

Many people who have gone abroad as political refugees after 1980 have shared their experiences and accumulation of knowledge with the people in the political movements in Turkey after they came back to Turkey in the late 1980s. At the late 1980s Turkish leftist movements had some particular debates on the position of the left in the world and particularly in Turkey. The most prominent of those debates was about the fragmentation in the leftist movements before the 1980s; they regarded this fragmentation

as the main reason of the marginalization of the left and they discussed what can be done for preventing this fragmentation that the left inherited from the former leftist movements. Fragmentation has continued during 1980s among leftist groups. There are some factors that fostered the crisis of leftist movements: left did not respond adequately to the coup d'etat in 1980; the violence between rightist and leftist movements has formed some negative attitude among people towards those movements; the oppressive conditions that were formed by the coup d'etat.

After the late 1980s there were many attempts to overcome this fragmentation and marginalization of the left. The most prominent of those attempts was the Kuruçeşme meetings[2] held in the summer of 1989 and 1990 in which many socialist groups did participate. The main purpose of those meetings was an assessment of the position of the left and the development of new strategies for the success of the left in the future. The impact of those meetings was very profound although there were many controversies among different groups and there was a strong affiliation of the groups with their different political traditions. One of the significant debates in the meetings was about the strategy which should be used in order to regain the popularity of the left in the political arena. The main

[2] Kuruçeşme meetings have a special meaning in the history of Turkish left. It was the first and the most salient effort to solve the problems of fragmentation and marginalization in Turkish left after 1980.

discussion was which strategy should be taken; should this strategy be legal or illegal?[3] The people defending legal strategy into two main groups: the ones who believed that the unification should only comprise of socialists and it should be established on the base of Marxist revolutionary principles; and the others who believed that the unification should contain many different groups, Marxists and the new social movements which are based on the anti-capitalist political positions which were explained above.

Another issue debated during the Kuruçeşme meetings was to overcome the fragmentation of Turkish leftist movements. These meetings have also revealed that unification was not possible without reidentification of the left. Ufuk Uras, the leader of the ÖDP at the time, in his response to a question about the Kuruçeşme meetings in an interview, stated the significance of the meetings regarding the changes within left itself.

> There was everybody in Kuruçeşme. These were the people who do not want to prefer the worse ones among the worst ones ... everybody talked. They reached an agreement by discussing. The ÖDP is totally a formation emerging from that process. The ÖDP is the end of the consensus reached in Kuruçeşme ...the ÖDP is a new route drawn in Kuruçeşme (Uras, 2003: 26).

Political groups in the meetings have argued that the unification should contain not only orthodox Marxists but also other socialist groups.

---

[3] Birlik düzlemleri ve parti. Birlik tartışmaları. 6. tartışma tutanakları İstanbul: BTDK yayınları,1990

This can be seen as a new orientation in the Turkish leftist movement. Aylin Özman pointed out the significance of Kuruçeşme meetings for the future developments in Turkish leftist movements:

> One may argue that the Kuruçeşme process was significant for clarifying the points of controversy among the socialists and delineating of the boundaries of the new socialist ethos. Thus, although, the process did end up wit the establishment of a political party or an organization, it prepared the ground for the formation of major guidelines for the unification (Özman, 2002: 231).

The attempt of unification has increasingly continued till the mid 1990s. At the end of the 1980s, the Communist Party of Turkey (TKP) which has a very significant position in the history of socialist movement, and the Turkish Labor Party (TİP) has unified under the name of United Communist Party of Turkey (TBKP). This unification was strengthened by two decisions taken in the first congress of the TBKP. The first was that the members of TBKP should participate in the formation of the SBP (The Socialist Union Party) in order to maintain the unification of socialists. The second decision was that a foundation should be established for the preservation of the archives of TKP, TİP and TBKP. The name of the foundation was TÜSTAV (Social Research Foundation of Turkey) which

was established after the decision. While TKP was withering away, SBP did join the BSP (The Unified Socialist Party) and BSP the ÖDP.[4]

Another main debate among socialist groups was the validity of orthodox Marxism which had been debated for a long time among intellectuals in Western countries. Indeed it was debated more than the unification itself in the meetings. Although the orthodox Marxism was interpreted differently by different political groups, it was a main theoretical line in the Turkish leftist movements before 1980s. The main concept which was questioned in those debates was the centrality of class conflict in Marxism. Indeed the new trends in world economy have accompanied to those debates of the Left. Under the light of these new trends in economy, there was a line of thought emerged in economics which proclaimed the end of the industrial era (see Chapter 2). These theoretical efforts in economics have created new theoretical lines in social sciences as well: Post-industrialism thesis considering the contemporary transformations in the world economy as the indicators of a new form of capitalism is mainly based on assumptions which are totally different from

---

[4] The establishment of the socialist Union party (SBP) in 1991 was the first attempt of socialist unification. However, the party was far from representing the majority of factions. Later, SBP led to the way towards the establishment of the United Socialist Party (BSP) in 1994 by extend in its support base. Kılıç, A., "Sosyalist Solun Parti Serüveni", Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi. Yüzyıl Biterken, 1281-5

the assumptions of Marxist theory. The conflict between capital and labor which is a main theoretical mean for Marxist theory has been questioned in the post-industrial thesis. This has contributed much to the crisis of Marxist theory. However, this challenge to the Marxist theory has also created some new alternative perspectives for Marxists. One of the most prominent socialist figures, Sadun Aren, stated in an interview that "... Consequently, the new formation of new organizations, new unions became high on agenda, and the majority of Marxists began searching for a new kind of socialism. The idea of new world new socialism gained significance."(Sadun Aren, Turkish Daily News, June29, 1995)

In the mid 1990s, the reidentification process of the Turkish left did accelerate and the leftist values were redefined. Although there were many parties established for the unification of leftist groups till the late 1980s, the establishment of the ÖDP in 1996 has meant a turning point. It was both an attempt of leftist groups to collaborate with other non-orthodox leftist groups and to organize different political movements on the base of democratic and anti-hierarchical principles. Oğuzhan Müftüoğlu, one of the founders of the ÖDP, summarizes the organizational structure of the ÖDP:

> the organizational structure of the ÖDP was very different to the Leninist Party model, which was one of the standard models throughout the historical evolution of socialist parties in turkey. However, by its nature the ÖDP does not constitute an

alternative to the Leninist party model. So the organizational structure of the party is not resulting from Leninist principles but from the conditions of the country (Oğuzhan Müftüoğlu, 1996, 279-80).

In the next section, the establishment and the organizational structure of the ÖDP will be briefly discussed.

4-2 The Establishment of the ÖDP

As has been stated, the reidentification and re-unification constitutes were the main element in the establishment of the ÖDP.[5] The first steps towards unification were already taken in Kuruçeşme meetings. In that sense the ÖDP has claimed to solve a main problem of the Turkish left, the problem of fragmentation, by attempting to embrace various political groups with different struggle strategies and organizational structures. Although the idea of unification has been shared by almost all political groups, the problem of re-identification has remained a central controversial issue among different political groups. The problem of re-identification which was seen as crucial for the revival of the Turkish left by particular groups within the party has been remained without any concrete undertaking. The results of the general elections in 18 April 1999 were not

---

[5] The concept of reunification has been frequently used in the debates and publications of that period.

as successful as the ÖDP expected to be. After the elections the problem of re-identification was almost completely forgotten.

In order to analyze the various dynamics and later developments in the party, a brief account of the establishment process is necessary. There were four main groups which contributed to the process of the establishment of the party which are explained below:

Emek ve Demokrasi Grubu (Labor and Democracy Group):

TKP (Communist Party of Turkey), TİP (Turkish Labor Party), and TSİP (Turkish Socialist Worker's Party) were merged in order to form the Geniş Açı Grubu (Wide Perspective Group). The Labor and Democracy Group was formed by the fusion of the Wide Perspective Group and Yeniden-Dev Yol (Again Dev Yol) [also called as Özgürlükçü Sol Platform (Liberal Left Platform)]. The Labor and Democracy Group joined the ÖDP in 23 January 1996 when the party was established. The group criticized the orthodox Marxist elements in the party and defended a new socialist and a new left position in which they defined themselves as radical democrats who advocate the primacy of non-governmental organizations within political strategy. Liberal Left Platform represents a great majority of the ÖDP. After the dissolution of the ÖDP, it remained the only group within the party.

Ekmek ve Gül Platformu (Bread and Rose Platform):

It was formed by the coalition of Sosyalist Alternatif (Socialist Alternative), Emek (Labor), and Toplumsal Özgürlük (Social Freedom) which supports the thesis of Hikmet Kıvılcımlı.[6] After the General Elections in 1999, this group left the party. This can be interpreted as a first step within the process of the dissolution of the ÖDP.

Sosyalist Eylem Platformu (Socialist Action Platform):

It was formed by the combination of Sosyalizm (Socialism), Kurtuluş (Emancipation), Devrimci Marksist Kolektif (Revolutionary Marxist Collective), and Emancipation for Socialist Democracy (Sosyalist Demokrasi için Kurtuluş). Socialist Labor Platform argued that the ÖDP cannot be a revolutionary party unless its' organization is based on workers and the relations in workplaces. In that sense, it emphasized the importance of class based struggle in the party.

---

[6] Kıvılcımlı is a dissident communist who was a prominent figure of the Turkish Communist Party. He entered the party in as early as 1920s.

Sosyalist Politika (Socialist Politics):

The political position of Socialist Politics is reflected clearly in one of its official bulletin. They criticized the following policies which they claimed to belongs to the party:

> Positive attitude to the Customs Union, a 'strange' kind of socialism of the party which is based on the concept of citizenship rather than the notion of concept, a political position advocating freedom but the freedom of individuals, and the idea of autonomization against the idea of privatization (Socialist Politics Bulletin, February 2002).

Socialist Politics group proclaimed their separation from the ÖDP in the extraordinary meeting held in 17 November 2001. Socialist Politics party then participated to Sosyalist İktidar Partisi (Party for Socialist Power) in June 2002.

Besides these groups, Yeni Yol (New Way), a group separating from Dev Yol, Devrimci Sosyalist Yön (Revolutionary Socialist Direction), independents who engaged in leftist movements in the past, members of various non-governmental organizations, students, environmentalist people, people from women movements have also participated in the ÖDP.

The composition of Party Council formed in the second Ordinary Congress of the party held in 2000 gives clues about the weights and

numbers of various groups in the party. Liberal Left (Özgürlükçü Sol) had 61 members, Socialist Action Platform, 24, Bread and Rose Platform, 7, Socialist Politics, 3 independents, 4, and Hareket (Movement) had 1 member in the council totally formed 100 members of the council.[7]

The main task that the founders of the ÖDP attributed to the party was transcending the traditional understanding of leftist politics and pioneering the new social movements in Turkey. The founders were on the one side the leftist political movements that were active in the political realm before 1980s, and on the other hand, different political movements, such as environmentalists, feminists, or the ones supporting human rights, the common characteristic of which was their respect for leftist values.

When Ömer Laçiner states that "this unification should be an effort of various political components to create a particular way of thought and perspective" (Birikim Aralık 1996; 12), indeed he implicitly asks the question whether there is any possibility of such a common way of thinking and consensus. According to him the answer is negative. Although the ÖDP has a party program and a party's charter, the journals and booklets

---

[7] The numbers were evaluated according to the numbers of the candidates who entered the Party Council in the General Congress of ÖDP held in 2000.

that various political groups published within the ÖDP do not have any common understanding of even the common identity of the ÖDP.

However, when the party's charter and the party program of the ÖDP are examined, it can be clearly stated that all groups and movements constituting the ÖDP are free to represent themselves to a great extent. Nevertheless although this freedom provides the necessary ground for them to express their political ideas, on the contrary, it also created a kind of common language that results in a dilemma for the party. This problem of common language is well presented by Tanıl Bora in one of his articles:

> To create a common language within the ÖDP requires an effort in which jargons and a language that includes too much constraints and memorization should be avoided; it should also keep away from vulgarization in favor of simplification ... the meaningful plurality of the party depends on that condition. On the contrary, a naive language that is constructed for not disturbing anyone would be a dilemma for the party (Bora, 1996:16).

The speech of Ufuk Uras, the leader of the party at that time, exemplifies that naiveness perfectly: "The ones who do not know and the ones who know are the same in our party" (Ufuk Uras, 2003: 216[8]). The speech of Uras can be interpreted as a reconciling one that proposes an

---

[8] Ufuk Uras's ÖDP 1st Ordinary Congress speech

environment in which the debates of various groups in the party would not

harm the supposed unity among them or the minority groups in the party

would be guarded. According to İnsel, although such protectionism seems

to be a requirement of democracy and pluralism, it also implicitly eliminates

the difference emerging from a particular issue and conceals particular

issues brought forward by various groups. According to İnsel, the result of

such a contradictory attitude is very significant:

> Since the main of purpose of the party is the unification of
> various political movements, even the conservative leftists, it
> prevents any possibility of an establishment, the main promise of
> which is to redefine the socialist future. (İnsel; 2002, 116)

Indeed, the situation can be viewed from another perspective: That

naive language characteristic to the discourse of the party seems to be a

necessity for the contradictory nature of the party. Paradoxically, this

contradictory structure decreases the possibility of realizing any project of

re-unification and re-identification of according to him Turkish left. The

effect of the contradictory structure of the ÖDP can be seen much clearer

when we look at publications of different groups within the party. A clique

supporting Dev-Yol tradition[9] in the Labor and Democracy group which is

---

[9] It dates back to Dev-Genç in 1970s. Most of the members of the organization went abroad after 1980 coup d'etat. The majority of the group was in Labor and Democracy group. Their periodical was Yeniden Devrim (later Bir Adım). For a detailed explanation, see. Türkiye Sosyalist Hareketler Ansiklopedisi.

one of those groups constituting the ÖDP explicates the meaning of party

for them in their publication, Yeniden Devrim:

> A party of masses which emphasizes labor dynamics can enhance
> a healthy organization of Turkish left as long as it can transform
> various political groups and help them renew themselves. In that
> sense, Devrimci Yol also will maintain its independent political
> being within its own legitimation (Yeniden Devrim, 1980: 663-91).

According to the statement, Dev-Yol tradition will never be a part of

the ÖDP. No matter how the ÖDP will be shaped in the future, Dev-Yol

tradition will save its independent political structure; even the ÖDP is seen

as a suitable environment to strengthen the political line of Dev-Yol

tradition. The ÖDP as an upper identity above all other identities of various

political groups is likely to be never realized with such statements of

different groups. Such statements are also characteristic to the other political

groups within the ÖDP. Socialist Action Platform, in its bulletin dated 15

October 1999, the section 'Thesis towards Congress' expresses the

significance of that thesis:

> The draft thesis of Socialist Action Platform presented in this
> bulletin was prepared in order to maintain that the
> congress/conference process of our party would be realized
> according to the political understanding of Socialist Action
> Platform and it serves as helping the political development and
> formation of the platform (SEP bulletin 15 October 1999; pp: 1).

Another group within the ÖDP, Socialist Politics in their bulletin

'Final Assessment and Political Proposals before the Congress' (February

2000)expresses their attitude towards the ÖDP as: "Socialist Politics has never had such a perspective which defends collaboration with left liberals, radical democrats, the people supporting civil society, and similar ones in the way of socialism till the end ... Socialist Politics will never and ever see the ÖDP as the final aim" (SP February 2000 Bulletin; 1). It is clear that the groups in the ÖDP put more emphasis on their own development than the development of the party. Their discourses usually address to their members rather than to the members of the party.

Furthermore, the ÖDP's definition of a socialist party who defends the interests of according to him working class is different from the definitions of former leftist parties which have generally positioned themselves as orthodox Marxists. According to the 2nd article of the party charter, "Freedom and Solidarity Party is the party of the laborers, oppressed ones, and other people who support them and want to create a new world" (ÖDP Party Charter, Article 2). As can be derived from this definition, the ÖDP includes different political groups to the realm of its struggle. Besides, the definition of socialism also differs from the definition of traditional socialist parties: "libertian, advocating self-governance, internationalist, anti militarist, environmentalist, against discrimination

between the sexes and for the system where local initiatives have utmost importance" (ÖDP Party Charter, Article 4).

The definition of socialism and the ÖDP according to various political groups in the ÖDP also differs considerably from each other especially when the issue comes to the content of the party program. Although the founders of the party did pay a distinctive attention to the fact of high multifariousness in the party in the process of creating party program, it has always been the subject of harsh debates among different political groups in the party.

The main debate among the components of the party is whether the ÖDP should be defined as a party or not in its conventional sense. The question might be asked in the reverse way: whether it is a platform in which various political movements can express themselves or not. Indeed the answer is rather ambiguous given the different conception of the ÖDP by various political groups in it. There are political groups in the ÖDP who support the approach that ÖDP should be a party. But their definition depends on the condition that it would be a socialist pioneer party[10] which is impossible in the present situation of the Turkish socialist movement. The

---

[10] Lenin's term of pioneer party refers to a leadership in socialist revolution, a formation which includes all elements that share similar visions about the consequences of the system.

present form of the ÖDP is a necessity but it is temporary; when the present

situation of Turkish left is overcome in the future, it should maintain the

position of a pioneer socialist party. This assertion is defended by many of

the political groups in the party. The other side of the debate argues that the

traditional definition of socialism and the form of socialist party should be

questioned and abandoned. Accordingly, their answer to the question

whether the ÖDP is defined as a party or not is clear: The ÖDP must defend

a political position demanding democracy and freedom in which the

autonomous movements such as women or environmentalist movements

actively engage in the activities. The first position considers the present

heterogeneity in the party provided by the new social movements as a

temporary one and necessarily and gradually fading away in the future.

This would happen when the socialist elements in the party and generally

in the country are ready to do so and those 'new' elements in the party

would be assimilated in the general framework of socialist elements. The

result would be a homogeneous structure in which the socialist position

captures hegemony and power. Indeed these two different positions

regarding the definition of the ÖDP reflect the oscillation of the ÖDP

between the 'traditional' and the 'new'.

Those different conceptions of the ÖDP create some discourses which indicate various positions of the ÖDP: being a party, not being a party, and not being able to be a party. Those various discourses actually reflect the political positions of different groups. Placing the party issue to the center in debates is not accidental. The structure of a socialist party and its definition has always been a major debate among socialist intellectuals. In the case of the ÖDP, these debates on whether ÖDP is a party or not are so much considered that the word 'party' in the ÖDP is questioned, or even rejected. On the other side, this ambiguity also proves the claim of newness of the ÖDP. However, for some people it is a major problem of the party. This problem of being a party or not is expressed in Özmen's statements as:

> The main problem that the people who have the hope, faith, enthusiasm, and-most importantly- persistence to create a new leftist movement suffer most from till the beginning of the establishment and most seriously now is the debates arising from the very uncertainty existing in the party (Özmen,1997: 41).

This uncertainty as Özmen states increases when we consider the effort of the ÖDP to define itself by the concepts of class, party of masses, party of class, left, radical democracy. Although this effort needs to reach an end in the process of establishment and become a common ground for various political groups to express themselves, it becomes a main subject of the politics of the ÖDP, even a way of politics. The main purpose of the ÖDP to unite Turkish leftist groups has become ambiguous with the

discourse of pluralism which has a central place in the general principles of the party. According to Ulus Baker (1997: 37), "this understanding of pluralism brings nothing but a language which seems to exist in every situation and to represent common elements; however, it never exists and it is nothing but an artificial language". The notion of pluralism and the equality that it produces are the most frequently used concepts in the definition of the ÖDP in the party's charter and program. Article 4 of the party's charter seems to be designed for asserting the equality of groups and individuals in the party:

> The party is a pluralist and mass party based on the dynamics specified in the 2nd article and it adopts a way of politics in which those dynamics should have the right to speech and decision at every stage. Party, in its internal processes, believes in transparency and equality among its members. Any kind of privilege is not possible. In its activities and internal course collective management and individual responsibility are essential. Democracy is a principle in its internal course and procedures. Party employs an election system which guarantees pluralism, legitimacy of differences, and minority rights. (ÖDP Program and Charter, 1996:26).

A considerable part of Article 4 which specifies the qualities of the party emphasizes pluralism and equality within various groups and individuals within the party. The emphasis on pluralism and equality among groups and individuals which have a distinct place in the party program and charter can be categorized into two kinds of pluralism: The first one is a kind of pluralism as a part of an artificial language which

emerges from the unification that remains incomplete in the process of the establishment of the party (Sarıoğlu, 1997:51). The second one is pluralism as a heterogeneity which is an imaginary one supported and believed to be more humanistic (Atamer; 1997, 46). Pluralism which operates in the documents of the ÖDP's headquarters and discourses are an example of the latter. The consequence of this imaginary pluralism is a general doubt on the pluralism of the ÖDP and the heterogeneous identity emerging from that.

This plurality which is subject to debates in the party is deliberately concealed in order to make is invisible from outside according to the same Article 4 of the party's charter. According to the article, the groups and platforms in the party can circulate their bulletins, newspapers, and various publications to only the members of the party. Such a restriction, in my opinion, operates in order to suppress the difference in those publications which is believed to transcend the level of difference that is permitted by the party. For a newcomer, the plurality expressed in the official publications of the party can be easily interpreted as something very extreme; even it can be said that there is more than one party's charter or program within the ÖDP. This situation contradicts with the idea of

unification, the formation of which was one of the main purposes of the party.

However, when one looks at the discourses of various groups, the first thing to be recognized is the criticism towards the pluralism and heterogeneity of the ÖDP. In the draft decision, titled as 'Organizing our Party again', prepared by ÖSP to present to the 2nd Congress of the ÖDP it was stated that: "ÖSP asserts that pluralism which is one of the most important principles of our party, must not be understood as an element which can undermine the unity of the party and 'small parties within the party' and proposes to change the party's charter in order to solve this problem" (Labor and Democracy Platform, Draft Decisions Bulletin of the 2nd Congress, 2000:5). On the other hand, another group within the ÖDP, SEP interpreted this draft decision in their bulletin titled as 'After the 2nd Congress' as: "The draft decision that ÖSP based on the slogan of 'small parties within the party' is employed actually to exclude and isolate practically the groups and platforms which are not from the majority in the party ... this persistence has ideological and political consequences that have more significances than to be expected." (After the 2nd Congress, ÖDP 2000; 6). Another proposal for restructuration was prepared by Sosyalist Politika (Socialist Politics):

Another version of the fashioned approaches 'the end of ideologies' and 'the end of history' which were designed once in order to break socialism is the assertion declaring the end of centralized organizations. It was such a conception that party which is actually a political organization is conceptualized as an amorphous formation, civil organization, civil society organization, the field of non-hierarchy, a structure in which there are no controllers and controlled ones and there are no organizational nucleus of cadres in which the initiative of the base can determine and solve any problems. Against the threat of such a conception of organization, our party should maintain a more institutional structure (ÖDP: Final Assessment before the Congress and the Proposals of Socialist Politics, 2000:14).

When we elaborate on the debates of various groups concerning the pluralism of the party, it seems that the gist of those debates is the overall structure of the party. Pluralism both contains and excludes at the same times the groups and individuals by the concepts of 'equality', 'a heterogeneous party', and 'a non-party party' (Erdoğan Özmen; 1997, 42). In the next section, we will attempt to see to what degree the ÖDP with its contradictory structure is capable of including the new social movements.

4.3 ÖDP and the New Social Movements

The main approach of the ÖDP which is based on the socialization of political struggle and the politicizing of social struggle can reach its goal only it can succeed to collaborate with and to become spokesman of a wide range of masses, laborers, women, youngs, poors, excluded ones, who cannot express themselves in the present political structures and institutions, have problems with the system not only in economic terms but also in cultural and moral terms, and have desire for the political struggle (ÖDP Draft Decision of Party Council, 1997).

Except for the major groups (Labor and Democracy Group (ÖSP), Bread and Rose Platform, and Socialist Labor Platform (SEP)), there are many large and small groups in the ÖDP. These are feminist groups, environmentalists, anti-globalization and anti-capitalist groups and other non-governmental organizations representatives. The inclusion of those various groups reflects the ÖDP's main task to unite all political groups and establish collaboration among them. Although this task is sometimes subject to suspicion by particular groups[11], the overall structure of the ÖDP reflects such kind of pluralism. Most importantly, the presence of the new social movements has become a central component of the very definition of the ÖDP the embodiment of which can be saliently observed in the publications of the party council and headquarter of the party. "The aim of the ÖDP is to embrace all fields of social struggle like ivy by inclusion of all anti-capitalist resistance movements and dynamics and movements social struggle." (ÖDP Party Council Draft Decision, 1997). Thus, the unification of leftist movements is only a part of the task that ÖDP was claimed to be responsible for. Since its establishment, the ÖDP has been claimed to redefine the position of the left. This definition necessarily involves the

---

[11] "Socialist Politics finds the plural structure of the ÖDP useful and necessary, but never sees it as an absolute structure for all historical periods and conditions." (February 2000, Socialist Politics Bulletin, pp:12)

inclusion of new social movements. Article 4 of the party's charter defines the party as a party of masses which is open to all resistance movements. The reality of this statement can be examined by looking at the position of the groups which define themselves as independents in the party. For Demir (2001: 26), although it seems that the main groups are the ones who define themselves as socialist groups, the contribution of independents to the party politics that have various individual identities is considerably significant.

When we look at the bulletin introducing candidate independents to the party council which was published for the 2nd General Congress, we see such introductory statements under the name of those candidates: "participated to the green movement", "engaged in the activities of anti-globalization movements", "his/her contribution to the student movements was great", "participated to the peace movement and put in jail", "working for an alternative social organization", "working for the environmentalist and anti-war movements".

The preference of those people for the candidates of General Congress delegates owes much to their alternative identities. Among 78 candidates introduced in the bulletin, 34 people define themselves as belonging to various groups different from socialist groups and movements.

23 people among those candidates mention their relation with leftist movements in the past or define themselves as leftist but they add their engagement in the environmentalist, feminist or other social movements. As an example to this, a candidate for the Party Council defines himself as: "I have worked in SBP and BSP as a founder. At the same time, I am one of the founders of the ÖDP. I am one of the candidates of Party Council as a feminist in order to contribute to party politics by women issues (Introductory Bulletin, ÖDP 2nd General Congress). As can be derived from the statement above, the candidate has multiple identities which enables her to express herself in various political platforms.

Among the candidates those who define themselves as independents, only 15 people introduce themselves by adding their socialist identities. The other candidates, however, do not express themselves by their engagement in any institution or movement. There are some questions regarding the relation between the new social movements and overall structure of the ÖDP: What is the position of the representatives of the new social movements in theoretical terms against the traditional Marxist tendencies in the party? Does the inclusion of those movements by the party contribute to the redefinition and the reidentification of the left which has been seen as a main task till the establishment of the party? To what degree do the

individual identities of the new social movements represented and remain autonomous within the party?

The answers of those questions seem to depend on the clarification of the position of the ÖDP: Is it a party which has strict rules and forms an entity or a platform which claims to embrace various social resistance fields in itself? The pluralist stance of the ÖDP and its theoretical effort to define a boundary between old and new forms of the left represents a breaking point for not only the ÖDP but also generally the Turkish left. For Baker (1997, 38), the basic principle for the ÖDP is a perspective of resistance which is not necessarily based on the working class; it is not a sort of the revolutionary perspective in the traditional sense anymore. This perspective which can easily be noticed in the party's charter and the program has been criticized by the many groups. Those groups have asked for a clarification of the identity of the party which is directly formed through the definition of the struggle perspective. Even those groups respecting for the pluralism and multifariousness ideals of the party has demanded that clarification. The most prominent ones of those groups are the Socialist Politics and the Socialist Labor platforms. In a draft decision prepared by the Socialist Labor Platform to present to the headquarter in 1999, it was stated that:

> It is a necessity for the ÖDP the main of which is a world without classes, exploitation, and boundaries to clarify its definition of

itself and socialism. In that sense, the ÖDP is a necessary but temporary stage in the way of such world which aims at socialism and has a pioneering position in establishing the power of workers and laborers with its labor perspective (Socialist Labor Platform, 1999; Draft Decisions, 22).

Another group in the party expresses the necessity for the ÖDP to define itself:

ÖDP must clarify its perspective of class. ÖDP shall act with the belief that there is no class or social strata except for the working class who is capable of emancipating both itself and humanity in the capitalist system ... ÖDP shall take urgent measures in order to overcome the deficiencies in the class-based politics and organizations (ÖDP Final Assessment before the General Congress and Proposals of Socialist Politics Group, 2000; 5).

The issue of clarification which is frequently addressed by those two major groups in the ÖDP actually means an end to the discourses of the pluralism, the liberal socialism, heterogeneity, and the mass party that have been the main tenets of the general structure of the party till the establishment. The biggest group in the party, Liberal Left Group has remained deliberately outside those criticisms and always emphasized its respect for multi-identity and pluralism of the party. In their bulletin, "At the threshold of a corner" they pointed out the significance of the meeting of multifarious identities in the party (ÖSP, Bir Dönemecin Eşiğinde 1999:4). The failure of the ÖDP in unifying the Turkish left, according to Demir (2001, 28) is resulted from the old organizational fetishes and unconscious belonging to the former identities of the traditional leftist elements in the

party which has inescapably prevented any alternative politics in the meantime.

Although there are many traditional elements in the ÖDP which has always emphasized necessity of a class based and the orthodox Marxist politics, it seems that its orientation has been mainly a kind of the new socialism the main principles of which are liberalistic, advocating self-autonomy, internationalist, democratic, environmentalist, anti-militarist, and anti-sexist. However, after the failure in the 1999 General Elections this new conception of the socialism has been questioned among groups in the party.[12]

It is argued that ÖDP has never reflected sufficiently the demands of the various identities, especially the new social movements. Although the establishment process was based on such promises, the new social movements have never represented themselves enough in party politics. Hülya Demir who defines itself in the ÖDP as a feminist depicts the situation in the ÖDP 2nd Congress as:

> The Congress was almost a soccer match for us, the
> independents. That ball was in the middle of the game field; it
> never came to our field. Finally we understood that we were in

---

[12] In the elections ÖDP received only 0.87% of the total votes.

83

the place where they were expecting us to be; we are at the grandstand (Demir, 2001:28).

However, the establishment process of the party witnessed hot debates on the significance of the unification of a variety of the resistance movements and the prospective contribution of the new identities to the Turkish leftist movements. The leader of the party at that time, Ufuk Uras's (1996:20) statements indicate this consideration: "there are revolutionists, socialists, social democrats, greens, feminists, anti-militarists, radical democrats in the party". Although the discourses emphasizing plurality and the new identities were reflected in the party's charter and the program and the decisions of the headquarter, the daily language of the party has never indicated those discourses. Türkeş's statements explain this problem very well:

> any organization which cannot articulate individual and various identities to its daily language will necessarily remove those discourses from its structural language after some time, even it is capable of expressing them in its official language (Türkeş, 1997: 78).

In the post-Industrial thesis, a new social movement is not conceptualized as a resistance in its integrity; rather it is defined in a context asserting a new understanding of social condition: the social condition is the consequence of the conflicts among social movements which are struggling for the control of the cultural models and 'historicity' (see Touraine, 1981).

For the ÖDP, however, the new social movements are not the sources producing social conditions but alliances in the struggle. The debates among different leftist groups in the ÖDP have shadowed the issue of the new social movements in the party. The ÖDP, on the one hand, expresses the demands of the new social movements in the official documents of the party and generally criticized for this, it maintains a definite position in its daily language which implicitly excludes the new social movements from its agenda on the other.

4.4-ÖDP and Post-Marxist Approach

> Radical Democracy is maybe a thing which is capable of transforming daily life that the ÖDP frequently expresses and emphasizes rather than fulfilling the traditional aim of revolutionary perspective. We know that the older projects promise transforming life while restricting it to some field of revolution. Undoubtedly this is a transformative thing but it defines transformation as belonging to the era of post-revolution. Now, radical democracy- we can call it post-Marxism- means a projection which refers to the widening of the boundaries of bourgeois democracy by socialist principles, perhaps the abolition of property. Presently the ÖDP offers a similar project (Uras, 2003:45).

In 1997, the leader of the ÖDP, Ufuk Uras, in an interview published in a journal points out the significance of various resistance forms which are not based on class. He tries to articulate those various forms to the resistances based on class:

Now, we must accept the historical, sociological and political reality of the agents of various social resistances which are different from the ÖDP. These are sometimes the movements of public servants or students, sometimes various political resistances ... we aim at recognizing those various identities. You know that we do that for our struggle against the nationalist fascist ideology which tries to gain advantage from the present conflicts in the society (Uras, 2003:45).

Laclau and Mouffe mention various antagonistic forms which cannot be totally considered as the consequences of the capitalist system, such as anti-sexism and feminism, and add that transforming capitalist system cannot necessarily solve the issues that brought forward by those antagonistic forms. Besides, capitalism itself produces many different problems different from the exploitation of workers; the struggle against those problems, although it seems indirectly related to the capitalism itself, is absolutely the struggle against capitalism. For example, any struggle against the activities of a factory which bring about pollution is an anti-capitalist struggle. However, the workers of that factory do not necessarily engage in the struggle; even they might be against those people struggling against the pollution in order to preserve their jobs (see Laclau and Mouffe, 1985). This example is identical with the example given by Ufuk Uras of the conflict arising from two different groups in the ÖDP: " we are facing with a serious problem when our members engage in actions against the pollution created by Yatağan thermic powerhouse in which there are also workers that are members of the ÖDP" (Uras, 2003:46). The relation of

86

equivalence among various resistance forms that Laclau and Mouffe mention actually implies the peculiarity of different resistance forms. In party's charter it is stated that:

> Party in its internal course is based on a total transparency and the equality of members. Privilege in any sense is not possible ... In party's procedures and course democracy is essential. Party applies an election system which guarantees plurality, the legitimacy of differences, and the rights of minorities (Party's Charter, 1996: Article 4).

Every group and individual exists in the party with their differences and various identities. In that sense, the theories of Laclau and Mouffe on the plurality and the multiple identities seem to be reflected in the ÖDP's structure and practices. The project of the ÖDP can be considered as taking its inspiration from a particular kind of radical democracy which also forms the basic tenets of the theoretical position of Laclau and Mouffe. The ÖDP has tried to include the agents of all resistance forms who share similar visions about the consequences of capitalist system:

> We will continue our struggle in a great decisiveness and enthusiasm together with laborers, students, revolutionists, socialists, greens, feminists, youngs, housewives, and retireds. If politics means reconstructing life itself, we are going forward by reconstructing politics from within life itself and we are increasingly becoming more mature in this sense; we are primarily adopting the task of forming a new constitutive will (Ufuk Uras, 1997:233 'Introductory Statement to the 6th Party Council PM').

This position that the statement above indicates also means a reconsideration of Marxist principles on the organizational structure. The main organizational principles are formed on the base of equality, liberal socialism, and pluralism. Some critics interprets this position as a break from traditional Marxism for Özman

> Socialism is regarded as a process that will be succeeded by democratization. The new meaning attributed to socialism effects socialist terminology. The shift in the orthodox perception of the meaning the revolutian and revolutionary position is the major point. Thus rather than denoting the overthrow of the existing the state and insurrectionary popular upheaval respectively, these two concepts currently signify the process of the radical transformation of the social order through democratization (Özman, 2002:236).

However, groups within the ÖDP have tried to construct their hegemonic fields by including other groups. In such a condition, the new social movements in the ÖDP, by using the metaphor of soccer game of Demir, see themselves at the grandstand. For Sarıoğlu (2001), although pluralism and multiple identities are always encouraged in the discourse of the party, the identities and individual differences are always determined to a great extent; as an example any individual who does not belong to any group in the party is proclaimed as the other or apoliticized. A group of people who do not belong to any particular political group in the ÖDP states their sufferings from this stigmatization in a declaration as:

Once again the actual issues that are considered by everyone other than us are far from our agenda; they are processed in the hands of some particular groups and transformed into archaic debates; they are removed from their contexts. In such a situation, the thing that we can only do is voting for the issues which become unproductive and archaic from now on (Declaration of the a Group of People who do not belong to any particular group, 'We will Win ÖDP' 1999 pp: 1).

Laclau and Mouffe, in their accounts of radical democracy, emphasize the significance of the practices which never resemble to those practices inherent in the ÖDP. For them hegemony is not formed through the containment of one group by another. If any movement sees the total concordance of its own interests with another movement, movement need to transform its own structure including its language and culture. Especially after the 1999 General Elections, particular groups have tried to return to their traditional identities which they had never actually given up. Indeed, this regaining also proves the persistence of those identities within the party; while they were engaging in the activities in the ÖDP they have always preserved those identities, the reflections of which can be found in their debates and the issues. This 'returning' is explained by Özmen as:

The theoretical inconsistency and the related fluctuations in the rhetoric of the party can be attributed to lack of consensus on the part of different socialist factions within the party, which in the final analysis leave the future the progress of the party and feasibility of pluralistic formulation for unification as open ended question (Özman 2002;236).

A new notion of socialism has come to the main agenda of leftist political movements in the 1990s when the traditional identities and political structures (in the sense of state power and political parties) have faded away. However, the solution of this depression of traditional elements was a state of balance established by the ÖDP that referred to a catastrophic situation in which most political groups cannot move or express him/herself.

To what degree the theoretical structure of the ÖDP resembles post-Marxism can be understood more clearly when looking at the historical antecedent of the ÖDP. Groups from Dev-Yol tradition constitute the majority of the party quantitatively and their thesis is embodied in the official documents of the party to a great extent. Actually Dev-Yol tradition was blamed of being pragmatist in the past by some particular leftist groups, the main principles of which is claimed to be based on the refusing of class perspective, ignoring the primacy of labor/capital conflict, and petty bourgeois radicalism. For Erdoğan, both the criticism of Dev-Yol as being populist[13] and their response of Dev-Yol to those criticism as pretending to

[13] Populism is used in the following sense: Populism defines the social realm within the framework established by the antagonistic relations between popular and sovereign stratas, people and power blocks (Laclau, 1977; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985).

adopt a more orthodox Marxist position prevent us from recognizing the peculiarities of the movement (Erdoğan 98; 23). Socialist Politics Group criticized the ÖDP as: "ÖDP increasingly avoids the theoretical position which emphasizes class and socialist values. The ÖDP will solve its impasse by adopting a class-based politics (Socialist Politics, the ÖDP after the elections, ÖDP, 1999:5).

Both of the Dev-Yol tradition and the ÖDP have tried to transform system by addressing to people as an exploited category against the oppressing, exploiting power. They have tried to articulate popular ideologies, traditions, and symbols to their political discourse. In that political position there is a kind of relation which is explained by Erdoğan (98; 23). "The struggle between two camps or poles which are defined as homogeneous, not permeable, and external to each other, namely the people and its enemies determines the social and political field".

Although the ÖDP recognizes the plurality of social antagonisms, it argues that the boundaries that separate the poles of these antagonisms from each other are the same; in that sense there is an equivalence among them. However, Laclau and Mouffe's definition of this antagonistic relation is quite different: Every antagonism does not constitute a different relation

of boundary; they share the constitutive boundaries of social and political field (see Laclau, 1977; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985).

The close resemblance between the ÖDP and Dev-Yol tradition can be stated in their reference to class in explaining their principles of struggle. For Erdoğan, the point that differs Dev-Yol tradition from the traditional Marxist political groups and makes them to be a influential social movement is their understanding of class conflict; they have placed class conflict to the base of their argument and thesis but also emphasized various social dynamics which form the peculiarities of the social formation and political conjuncture, thus enabling them to deviate from economic reductionism (see Erdoğan: 98). The point that differs the ÖDP from the traditional political movements is the same. However, this position only offers a redefinition and questioning of traditional leftist principles. In that sense class conflict is still the base of the argument, although the embodiment of this theoretical position in practical fields has never been coherent and solid enough. Thus the resemblance of the ÖDP with post-Marxist theoretical position is quite doubtful.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The new social movements have not been investigated adequately in academic fields yet in Turkey. This lack of academic curiosity on the issue continues in the political domain as well: both the leftist movements and the other political groups have not been interested so much in those movements and the significance of them. This lack of interest in the issue academically and their inadequate representation in the traditional parties, I believe, is the result from the newness of the issue in the Turkish political agenda. While the roots of those movements in Europe and North America date back to the late 1960s and the early 1970s, they have emerged in Turkey almost a decade ago. The reason of this 'delay' can be explained by looking at some factors that are directly related to the historical peculiarities of Turkey. These can be grouped into two: The military intervention of 1980 has prevented any social resistance movements as well as the new social movements, such as feminism, anti-capitalism, environmentalism, anti-

nuclear movements. Another point which is directly related to this is that although the leftist movements in Europe and North America have redefined themselves by considering the activities of the new social movements in the late 1960s and become more plural and decentralized in order to include those movements, in Turkey the situation was almost the reverse: The leftist groups in Turkey have become more rigid and centralized in the same period. The main reason of the situation seems to be the harsh debates among different leftist groups and some peculiar characteristics of Turkish left. The main features of the Turkish left have been questioned after 1980 military intervention which has meant a real failure for the left in Turkey. This questioning of Turkish left has given way to a notion of a more plural and decentralized structure within Turkish left. However, any considerable emergence of some forms of the new social movements could not be seen till 1990s

Another important reason of this delay is related with the economic development of Turkey. As has been stated in Chapter 2, the new social movements are the products of advanced or 'late' capitalism (even post-capitalism) the emergence of which has not even debated till 1990s in Turkey. In that sense the thesis supporting that the new social movements cannot be normally seen in the countries which do not reach the advanced

capitalism seems to be valid in Turkish case (see Touraine, 1997). Following the same thesis, economic conditions in 1990s can also be conceptualized as the proper conditions for flourishing of the new social movements. Especially the new middle class which has emerged in 1990s has participated to the new social movements. The natural consequence of this situation was a rising interest in the new social movements academically and politically.

In that sense, ÖDP has a special significance for the history of political movements, especially the leftist movements in Turkey. The value of its efforts to include the new social movements and to offer an environment for them to represent themselves cannot be exaggerated. This was a first systematic and institutional attempt in Turkey which represents a new definition and reconstruction of leftist values in Turkey. The discourse of pluralism and heterogeneity of the headquarter of the party always emphasizes the significance of various feminist, environmentalist, anti-nuclear, anti-militarist movements and non-governmental organizations. This 'hospitality' means not only a recognition of those political groups: the ÖDP tries to articulate the discourses of those various elements to the discourse of left in Turkey. This 'containment' means a new theoretical expansion for the Turkish left.

The significance of the ÖDP does not owe its value only to its hospitality to the new social movements. This process of articulation has included not only a new way of thought that refers to new organizational strategies but also questioning of classical Marxist categories, especially the forms of socialism, the central position of class conflict, economic reductionism, the position of socialist elements in the political struggle. In that sense, ÖDP has tried to abolish some fetishes of the traditional left in Turkey, for example various identities which are considered as characteristic of petty bourgeois, namely feminism, homosexualism. It is worth stating that this theoretical break from the traditional leftist elements has operated within the field of discourse. Its embodiment in practical field was very restricted as has been explicated in Chapter 3.

Another attempt of the ÖDP is creating a kind of 'cheerful' socialism instead of a gloomy one. The articulation of some personal experiences, such as love, to the political domain, I believe, is a deliberate act of the ÖDP in order to bring about an alternative definition of politics of which personal experiences constitute a significant part.[14] ÖDP, with its 'cheerful' and transparent notion of socialism, has tried to become the spokesman of the new middle class. In such a perspective, the agent that tries to change the

[14] ÖDP defines itself as the party of love and revolution.

practices of daily life must also be changed in itself with those changing practices. The relation between the ÖDP and post-Marxism must be investigated in that context. The transformation of the process of reunification to the process of redefinition is related with to what degree ÖDP has been successful in questioning the heritage of traditional leftist movements in Turkey. This would have been possible only with the condition that the various groups within the ÖDP had been successful in defining themselves and transcended the prejudices and stigmatization towards the other groups. The existence of the representatives of the new social movements depended on their membership to the party and they have not contributed enough to the course of party politics.

Although the discourses emphasizing plurality and new identities were reflected in the party's charter and program and the decisions of the headquarter, the daily language of the party has never indicated those discourses. In that sense the language remains artificial since it has never reflected in the practices of the party. In that sense, ÖDP can be defined as a platform in its theoretical position while it can be seen as a platform in its practices. However, the significance of ÖDP in the history of leftist movements cannot be exaggerated. Its efforts and attempts, although it has experienced a real failure in elections and the ideas of pluralism and

multiple identities has never embodied to a great extent, would be a real contribution to the new political formations in the future and Marxist thought as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amin, S. 1997. Capitalism in the Age of Globalization. London: Zed Books.

Atamer, B. 1997 'ÖDP'den Ne Bekliyoruz'. 103(8): 43-48

Axford, B. 1995. 'The Global System : Economics, Politics, and Culture.' New York: St. Martin's Press.

Baker, U. 1997. 'ÖDP: Parti mi Hareket mi?' *Birikim.* 103(6): 36-40

Benli, F. and Ünüvar, K. 2000. 'Parti Olmak yada Olmamak'. *Birikim.* 132(4): 24-32

Blauner, R. 1964. '*Alienation and Freedom*.' Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bora, T. 1996. 'Parti ve Keşke' *Birikim.* 82(3):15-17

Boyer,R. 1990. *'The Regulation Scholl: Critical Introduction'.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Breitenfellner, A. 1997. 'Global Unionism: A Potential Player'. *International Labour Review,* 136(4): 531-555.

Broad, D. 1995. 'Globalization versus Labor'. *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine*, 47 (7): 20-32.

Brosco, s. 1982. 'The Emilian Model: Productive Decentralization and Social Integration'. *Cambridge Journal of Economics.* 6:167-168

Calhoun,C. 1994. *'Social Teory and the Politics of Identity'. Social Theory and Politics of Identity'.* Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Chase-Dunn, C. 1989. Global Formation: Structures of the World Economy. New York: Basil Blackwell

Clauss, Offe. 1985. 'New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Developing Countries'. *World Development*, 13, 441-463

Çelik, N.B. 1997."Radikal Demokrasi ve Sol", *Mürekkep* 7: 49-59.

Declaration of the Group of People who do not belong to any particular group, 'We will Win The ÖDP'. 1999. pp: 1

Demir, Hülya. 2001. 'ÖDP'de Bağımsız Bir Duruş mu?' *Birikim.* 146(4): 26-29

Demirer, Temel. 1997. 'ÖDP'ye Kenar Notları' İstanbul: İnsalcıl Yayınları

Devrimci Yol 1980 *"Devrimciler Ne İçin Savaşıyor?"* , pp: 663-91.

Eder, Klaus. 1985. 'The New Social Movements: Moral Crusades, Political Pleasure Groups, or social Movements?' Social Research 52(4):873-879

Eder, Klaus. 1993. *'The New Politics of Class: Social Movements And Cultural Dynamics Advance Society'*. London: Sage

Erdoğan, N. 1992 "Demokratik Sol ve Sosyal Demokrat Portreler", *Birikim,* 44:34

Erdoğan, Necmi. 1988. 'Demokratik Soldan Devrimci Yol'a: 1970'lerde Sol Popülizm Üzerine Notlar', *Toplum ve Bilim,* 78: 22-37

Erdoğan, Özmen. 1998. 'Ciddiyet İyidir Aslında'. *Birikim.* 113(5): 37-40

Freeman L. and Medoff J. 1984. *What Do Unions Do?* New York: Basic Books.

Giugni, M., McAdam, D. and Tilly, C. 1999. *'How Social Movements Matter'*. Minneapolis: The University of Minneapolis Press

Gorz, A. 1989. *'Farewell to Working class: An Essay on Post –Industrial Socialism'*. London: Verso

Gramsci, A. 1971. *'Selections from the Prison Notebooks'.* Londra: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hall, S., Jacques, M. 1989. *New Times : The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990's'.* London: Lawrence and Wishart.

İnsel, A. 1997. 'ÖDP'de Ekonomi Politikaları'. *Birikim.* 103(3):20-24

İnsel, Ahmet. 2000. 'Solu Yeniden Tanımlamak'. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları

Johnsont, Hank. Enrique, Larana. and Gusfield, Joseph R. 1994. 'Identities, Grievances, and New Social Movements'. In: Johnsont, Hank., Enrique, Larana. And Gusfield, Joseph R. ed., *New Social movements: Ideology to Identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press

KAOS GL, 1996. 'Giriş' 29:1-5

Keyman, F. 1993. 'Postmodernizm ve Radikal Demokrasi'. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 62: 126-155

Konukman, A. 1999. 'Esnek Üretim Tekniklerinin Türkiye'nin Sanayileşme Stratejileri Açısından Geçerliliği' (The Validity of Flexible Production Techniques in respect to the Strategies of Turkish Industrialization), in *Türk-İş Yıllığı'99*, Cilt:2 (TÜRK-İŞ Yearbook, Vol. 2). Ankara: Türk-İş Araştırma Merkezi.

Krishan, K. 1995. *'From Post-Industrial to Post-Modern Society New Theories of the Contemporary World'.* Oxford: Blackwell

Labor and Democracy Platform, 2000 *'Draft Decisions Bulletin of the 2nd Congress'* pp:5

Laclau, E. 1977. *'Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory'.* London: Verso.

Laclau, Ernesto 1988. 'Metaphor and Social Antagonism' In Nelson,C, and Grossberg Lawrence Urbana?Chicago: University of Illinois Press

Laclau, Ernesto. 1990. *'New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time'.* London: Verso

Laclau, Ernesto. 1995. 'The Time is out of Joint'. *Diacritics* 25(2):93

Laclau, Ernesto. and Mouffe, Chantal. 1985. *'Hegemony and Socialist Strategy'*. London: Verso

Laçiner, Ö. 1996. 'Esasa Dair Sorular: ÖDP'. *Birikim.* 92(2):9-17

Laçiner, Ö. 2000. 'Geldiği Yerde ÖDP' *Birikim.* 132(1):10-13

Larrain, Jorge. 1994. *'Ideology and Cultural Identity: Modernity and the Third World Presence'.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lash, S., Urry, J. 1984. *'Economies Of Sing and Space'*. London: Sage Publication

Lash, S., Urry, J. 1987. *'The end of Organized Capitalism'*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Lawrence G. Ed. *Marxism and the Interpretation of Cultures.* Urbana/Chicago:

Leadbeater, C.1989. *' In Search of Work'*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books

Lyotard, J.F 1984. *'The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge'*. Manchester: Manchester University Press

McLoughlin, I. and Jonh, C. 1994. *Technological Change at Work*. Buckhingam: Open University Press.

Melucci, A. 1980 'The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach'. Social Sciences Information. 19(1): 199-226

Melucci, A. 1988. 'Getting Involved: Identity and Mobilization in Social Movements". *International Social Movement Research,* 1:329-348

Melucci, A. 1988. 'Social Movements and the Democratization of Everday Life'. In: John Keane. Ed., *Civil Society and State.* London: Verso

Melucci, A. 1989. *'Nomands of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society'.* Ed. John Keane and Paul Mier London:Hutchinson Radius

Melucci, A. 1995. 'The new Social Movements Revisited: Reflections on a Sociological Misunderstanding' In Lois Maheu. Ed. *Social Movements and Social Classes*. London: Sage

Mouffe, C. 1984. 'Toward a Theoretical Interpretation of New Social Movements' in Politics'. *Social Research.* 52(4):831-832

Mouffe, C. 1993 'The *Return of the Political'*. London: Verso

Munck, R. 1994. 'Workers, Structural Adjustment, and Concertacion Social in Latin America', *Latin American Perspectives*, 21(3): 90-113.

Okyayuz, M. 2002. 'Küreselleşmenin Tarihsel ve Toplumsal Gelişimi Üzerine', *Toplum ve Hekim*, 17(2):83-85

ÖDP, 2000. 'Introductory Bulletin for *ÖDP's 2nd General Congress* pp: 1-5

ÖDP. *'Party's Charter and Programs'* 1996. http://www.odp.org.tr/parbel.asp?page=progtuz

ÖSP Bülteni, 2000 'İkinci Kongre'den Sonra ÖDP'

Özkaplan, N. 1994. *Sendikalar ve Ekonomik Etkileri: Türkiye üzerine bir deneme* (Trade Unions and their Economic Influence: An Essay on Turkey). İstanbul: Kavram Yayınları.

Özkonur, K.K. 1997. 'ÖDP'nin Meselesi Ne'. *Birikim.* 103(5): 31-35

Özman, A. 2002. 'The Socialist Ethos in Turkey after the 1980s: from Marxist Orthodoxy to New Left Politics'. *Orient* 43(2): 225-238

Özmen, E. 1997. 'Çoğulculuk ve Ahlak, ÖDP' *Birikim.* 103(7): 40-43

Özmen, E. 2000. 'ÖDP'nin II. Olagan Konferans/Kongresi ardından İnsan ve Ütopya'. *Birikim.* 132(3): 19-23

Painter, J. 1993. 'Regulation Theory, Post-Fordism and Urban Politics', in D. Judge, G. Stocker and H. Wolman, eds., *Theories of Urban Politics*. London: Sage Publications.

Perez,C. 1985 'Microelectronics, Long waves and Word Structural Change: New Perspective

Piore,M:J, Sabel, C.F: 1984. *'The Second Industrial Divine: Possibilities for Prosperity'*.: Basic Books.

Sakari H. and Leena P. Ed. *Rethinking MARX.* New York: International General

Sarıoğlu, S. 1997. 'Mümkünlerin Kıyısında' *Birikim.* 103(9): 50-62

Sarıoğlu, S. 2001. 'Yitik ÖDP Masalları' *Birikim.* 146(3):10-25

Scott, A. 1990. *Ideology and the New Social Movement*. London: Rutledge

Scott, A. 1991. 'Action, Movement, and Intervention: Reflections on The Sociology of Alain Touraine'. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology.* 28(1): 42

SEP. 15 October 1999 Bülteni ;

Simai, M. 1995. 'Employment and the Internationalization of the Labour Markets', in M. Simai, ed., *Global Employment. An International Investigation into the Future of Work*. London: Zed Books

Socialist Labor Platform Bülteni. 1999. '*Taslak Kararlar'*.

Socialist Politics Bülteni, 1999 'Seçimlerden Sonra ÖDP'

SP Bülteni, 2000. 'Kongreden önce Son Değerlendirmeler ve sosyalist politika Önerileri'

Sunar, İ. 1985 "Demokrat Parti ve Popülizm", *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Cilt 8.

Thorpe, V. 1998. *Global Unionism: The Challenge*. http://www.antenna.nl/~waterman/thorpe.html

Touraine, A.   1995 . '*Critique of Modernity'.* London/New York: Blacwell

Touraine, A. 1981. *'The Voice and The Eye: An Analysis of Social Movements'.*Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Touraine, A. 1981. '*Return The Actor: Social Theory in Post Industrial Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Touraine, A. 1990. 'The *Idea of Revolution'*. Theory, Culture and Society. 7(90):121-141

Touraine, A. 1992 'Beyond Social Movements?'. *Theory, Culture and Society*. 9(1): 125-145.

Touraine, A. 1997. *'What Is Democracy?'*. Boulder: Westview Press

Turkish Daily News. 1995. 'Sinan Yılmaz,inteview with Sadun Aren'. Turkish Daily News, June29 , pp:11

Türk, H. B. 2003. 'Unutulanların Coğrafyasının Bahtsız Prensi ÖDP'. *Birikim.*

Uras, U. 1996. 'Somut Sorunlar Üzerine Politika Yapıyoruz'. *Birkim.* 92(3): 18-27

Vahapzade, P. 2003. *'Articulated Experiences:Toward A Radical Phenomenology of Contempory Social Movements'*. New York: State University of New York Press

Wood, S. 1989. 'The Transformation of Work?' in Stephen Wood, ed., *The Transformation of Work*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Periodicals

Sosyalist Eylem, 1998-2000 (SEP Yayın Organı)

Özgürlük ve Dayanışma (Özgürlük ve Dayanışma Partisi Yayın Organı)

Kadıköy (Özgürlük ve Dayanışma Partisi Kadıköy İlçe Teşkilatı Yayın Organı)

Büyüteç (Özgürlük ve Dayanışma Partisi Yayın Organı)