

REPRESENTING CENTRE-RIGHT OR CONSERVATIVE RIGHT?  
THE CASE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN TURKEY, 1970-1980

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

BY

GÜLBİN AYŞI ATEŞ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND  
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

JULY 2012

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık  
Director

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

---

Prof. Dr. Raşit Kaya  
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.

---

Assist. Prof. E. Attila Aytekin  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu (METU, SOC)

---

Assist. Prof. Dr. Attila Aytekin (METU, ADM)

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdođan (METU, ADM)

---

**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.**

First name, Last name: Gülbin Ayş1 Ateş

Signature:

## **ABSTRACT**

REPRESENTING CENTRE-RIGHT OR CONSERVATIVE RIGHT?  
THE CASE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN TURKEY, 1970- 1980

Ateş, Gülbin Ayşı

M.S. Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. E. Attila AYTEKİN

July 2012, 158 pages

The Democratic Party which was established in 1970, splitting from the Justice Party will be analyzed within this thesis in terms of its ideological components. In this sense, centre right wing and conservative political parties are taken into account to understand the ideology of the party. The period of the Democratic Party is so sufficient to compare and contrast the ideologies of different parties. The Democratic Party is also critical as the party did not participate into any governments, different from the all parties at that period. So, it will show a centre right wing party's reactions in the absence of patronage routes which is a difference from other members of the centre right wing tradition of the DP and the JP. The absence of the concrete ideological explanations, doctrines which can be observed as an handicap of the centre right wing will be analyzed whether the Democratic Party can overcome or not.

Keywords: The Democratic Party, centre rightwing tradition, conservatism, rightwing ideology, the Justice Party.

## ÖZ

### MERKEZ SAĞ'IN YA DA MUHAFAZAKAR SAĞ'IN TEMSİLİ: TÜRKİYE'DE DEMOKRATİK PARTİ ÖRNEĞİ, 1970- 1980

Ateş, Gülbin Ayş

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. E. Attila AYTEKİN

Temmuz 2012, 158 sayfa

Adalet Partisi'nden koparak 1970 yılında kurulan Demokratik Parti'nin ideolojik öğeleri bu tezde analiz edilecektir. Bu sebeple, merkez sağ ve muhafazakar siyasi partiler, bu partinin ideolojisini anlamak amacıyla dikkate alınmaktadır. Demokratik Parti'nin bulunduğu süreç, farklı partilerin ideolojilerini karşılaştırmak anlamında bereketli bir süreçtir. Demokratik Parti, dönemin diğer tüm partilerinden farklı olarak hiç bir hükümete dahil olmamasıyla da dikkate değerdir. Böylece, merkez sağ olma iddiasında bir partinin, Demokrat Parti ve Adalet Partisi'nden farklı olarak patronaj yolları tıkalıyken nasıl tepkiler verdiği anlaşılabilir. Merkez sağın handikap olarak düşünülebilecek net ideolojik açıklamalar ve doktrinlerinin eksikliğini Demokratik Parti ile beraber üstesinden gelinip gelinmediği tartışılacaktır.

Keywords: Demokratik Parti, merkez sağ gelenek, muhafazakarlık, sağ ideoloji, Adalet Partisi.

*To the ones who fulfill their professions -whether academics or not- with  
enthusiasm and  
To all beloveds that make life meaningful...*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Truly, this moment of fulfilling the thesis work is very meaningful and full of happiness for me; because it was an experience full of emotion; but done through the help of mind.

I am indebted to many people who have been supportive throughout the formation process of this thesis. Every piece of scientific work is a product of a collective activity. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. E. Attila Aytekin for his patience, guidance, encouragement and intellectual support throughout this study. Without his help, this thesis could not be completed. I would like to thank to the members of the examining committee, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu who has been supportive to me since the beginning of the undergraduate years and led me with her knowledge and kindness; and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdođan from whom I learned the seriousness of studying the politics and found the energy to learn and study more with his deep knowledge; for their valuable suggestions comments, their enriching contributions.

I am particularly grateful to Berkay Ayhan and M. Gökhan Uzuner who always relaxed and supported me since the very beginning of the master study; also to Hasan Faruk Uslu and Hacer Fidan who always listened my endless story with patience.

I would like to thank to my big family that consists of my dear friends and my relatives for their help and concern.

In fact, it is not easy for me to find enough space for thanking the deserving ones; but I am sure that they will know and realize that I mention about them. While the study got more important for me, my dear friends also continued to support me and wished for my success. Their pure and genuine desire for my success and endless care helped me to understand again that “my life is beautiful with them in all hard and entertaining times”.

I would like to thank to my parents, Ömer Alan and Şengül Alan -who beautifies everything she touches- for leading me in the long path of the education and for believing in me without hesitation.

Last but not least, my dear husband, Himmet Ateş deserves the most as sharing the long period of the thesis study and encouraging me that made him so familiar with this science. It is not possible to thank him anyway; but I have to declare that it is such a luck for me to share the life with him.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	xii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THE DP-JP TRADITION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.....	6
2.1. The DP-JP Tradition.....	6
2.1.1. Nationalist Conservatism of the DP-JP Tradition.....	7
2.1.2. Concluding Remarks.....	9
2.2. Turkish Politics in 1960s.....	13
2.3. Fragmentation within the JP.....	22
2.4. Establishment of the Democratic Party and 70s .....	33
2.4.1. Elections and the Democratic Party.....	38
3. THE ACTUAL POLITICS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY .....	40

3.1. Politics in 1970s.....	40
3.2. 1971 Memorandum.....	45
3.2.1. Constitutional Amendments Enacted After 1971.....	50
3.3. 1971-3 Technocratic Governments.....	53
3.4. 1973 Election Results .....	58
3.4.1. The RPP-NSP government.....	61
3.4.2. The Idea of A Rightwing Coalition.....	63
3.4.3. The Democratic Party-RPP Government Attempt in 1974.....	65
3.5. First National Front Government.....	66
3.5.1. Resignation of Nines' from the Democratic Party.....	67
3.6. 1977 Elections and the Democratic Party's Single MP.....	73
3.6.1. Ecevit Government in 1978.....	74
4. IDEOLOGICAL STANDPOINT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.....	77
4.1. Nationalism of the Democratic Party .....	77
4.2. Conservatism of the Democratic Party .....	88
4.2.1. National Spiritual Values .....	94
4.2.2. Ideas about Religion .....	98
4.2.3. The National Salvation Party and the Democratic Party.....	102
4.2.4. Nationalist-Conservatism of the Democratic Party.....	106
4.3. Democracy and National Will.....	110
4.3.1. National Will Conceptualization of the Party .....	110
4.3.2. Fundamental Rights and Liberties Understanding of the Party .....	111

4.3.3. Democracy Notion of the Party	115
4.3.4. Populism of the Party	121
4.3.5. The Party's Ideas about State	125
4.4. Views on the Military	126
4.5. Views on Anti-Communism	128
5. CONCLUSION	132
REFERENCES	145
APPENDIX	158

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

- DticP** Democratic Party
- JP** Justice Party
- DP** Democrat Party
- NSP** National Salvation Party
- NOP** National Order Party
- NMP** Nationalist Movement Party
- NF** Milliyetçi Cephe (National Front) Governments

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The centre-right mentality has controlled politics in Turkey since the Democrat Party's rise to power in 1950. The ideology of centre-right cannot be identified without introducing its components as right wing ideologies are devoid of doctrines. The literature on rightwing parties has analyzed the parties that formed governments and occupied policy-making positions such as the DP and Justice Party. On the contrary, debates within the parties and breaks from the parties have not drawn much attention from the scholars. Therefore, as a movement that separated from a major political party and established a political party, the study of the Democratic Party (DticP) seems to be critical. Moreover, the Democratic Party is a rightwing party that contained different elements of the rightwing ideology.

The literature on the party is very limited; so I have had to start with the general literature on the DP and the JP. To overcome the scarcity of sources, I have consulted biographies, autobiographies and party documents. The only monographic study<sup>1</sup> –as far as I know- about the topic is a historical study which discusses the events relating to the party. However, there are no any studies that analyze its ideology.

It is argued here that the DticP shared the general rightwing ideological elements. These elements led me to define the party in terms of conservatism, nationalism, democracy and their relations with the military. Because of the DticP's organic relations with the DP and the JP, this study extends to the discussion of those parties as well. The two parties are taken into account in order to overcome the first and

---

<sup>1</sup> Çavuşoğlu, Hüseyin, 2005, *Türk Siyasal Yaşamında Demokratik Parti (1970-1980)*, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi Anabilim Dalı, İzmir.

foremost challenge of the study, which is the lack of a relevant literature on the DticP.

In this thesis, the methodological approach was not built upon the center-periphery paradigm, which is very common in Turkish political science. Understanding conservatism on the basis of the center-periphery dichotomy would inhibit us to determine the fluctuating center as well as the periphery. Understanding Turkish politics, especially the period of my thesis topic, 1960-1980, with this paradigm, would be restrictive because of its division of the society into two camps of “Kemalist hegemony” and “Islamist opposition” (Açikel 2006: 33). Ironically, both of these “opposite camps of the society” have underestimated the antagonism to value-dependent differences. Besides the DP, the JP and the DticP would not be analyzed through this paradigm as this paradigm cannot provide the outlook that enables one to handle highly ideologically polarized period of the 70s. The petty bourgeoisie which has lost power in late 1960s because of big bourgeoisie oriented policies of the JP can not only be explained by values or religious inclination of these classes. In fact, I will try to underline that the DticP in Turkish political history represents more than basic tacit assumption in the literature that posits intellectuals and bureaucrats of the center vs. harmonized, religiously sentimental mass. The aim of this study is to describe and understand the DticP’s ideology.

One reason that makes the study of the party significant is its establishment nearly at the same time with the 1971 Memorandum and that its cadre witnessed both pre-Memorandum and post-Memorandum periods. So, it would help to understand the basic changes in the general right wing ideologies between the early 1960s and late 1970s. The study underlines the attitude changes of the right wing and the DticP cadres to the military and to fundamental rights/liberties. The DticP cadres symbolized the transition from the relatively free environment of 1961 Constitution and single party governments period of 1960s to more authoritarian and more ideologically and politically fragmented 1970s.

The second factor that makes the study interesting is that the party was one of the important actors in the conjuncture of the time, but not the hegemonic power. As I have pointed out above, the hegemonic parties have been studied well but others like

the DticP have been disregarded. This makes the study of the party all the more important as one of the important foci of the study is the ideological representation of the DticP which did not implement any policies within actual politics. Interestingly, it is searched in this thesis whether the DticP would fill the ideology gap of the center right wing ideological formation.

One of the main foci of the thesis will be the reason behind the fragmentation of the DticP group from the JP; namely whether it was conjectural or there was an ideological crack between the two parties.

The DticP's structure can be seen as lying within the stream of the rightwing in Turkey. However, I would like to question whether it could obtain an authentic place in the axis of the congregating items of centre right wing. The DP and the JP are also important for this study as these parties were the past and the future of the DticP. In other words, the cadre and mentality of the DP was continued by the JP and the DticP; it became their common past. At the same time, the JP, although it shared the same time interval with the JP, became the future of the DticP as the members of the DticP returned to the JP and the DticP at the beginning was on its way to replace the JP.

The study will stress the similarities and differences of the DticP within the centre-right tradition; and a minor conclusion would be built upon based on this sub-question. The DP, the JP and the DticP can be counted as the members of the same tradition since that they offered the same ideological standpoint for the masses at different time periods. Hence, in this thesis, I would look into the DticP on the basis of this right wing account containing the DP and the JP. In order to answer the question, we would like to look at how Turkish politics evolved in 1960s with the perspective of the JP and the internal conflict of the JP between the *Yeminliler* and Extremists who would establish the DticP. In the second section of second chapter, I will examine the politics of Turkey in the 1960s to give an idea about the structure of politics before the DticP was established. Moreover, the cadre of the DticP was actively in politics at this period; this information would offer the reasons behind the fragmentation.

This section will continue with the break and the establishment period of the DticP. After the formation of the party on December 18, 1970, the Demirel government was brought down. I will examine the 1971 Memorandum, which was important for Turkish politics in general and also for the DticP. The 1971 Memorandum strongly signaled the end of 1960s politics and the beginning of that of 1970s. Thus, the DticP stood between the relatively democratic and free political atmosphere of 1960s; and 1971 Memorandum which interrupted that but could not solve the ideological polarization of the period.

Between the Memorandum and 1973 elections, technocratic governments were formed with members from all parties in the Parliament. The DticP intended to participate only in the Ürgüplü government which was not ratified by the President. The results of the 1973 elections will be discussed for all parties as well as the DticP. It is my contention that that the DticP did not join a government despite the high number of parliamentary seats it gained in the 1973 elections renders it an important case to be examined. It seems that the DticP's ideological preferences about forming a coalition government determined its failure to join any government in that period. The First National Front government will be taken into account as it led to the disintegration of the DticP through resignations. Lastly in this chapter, the end of the real politics of the DticP with the 1977 elections and the Ecevit government that included Sükan's presence will be discussed.

The fourth chapter seeks to analyze the ideological formation of the DticP in terms of nationalism, conservatism, democracy and relations with the military. The conservatism of the party will be considered in detail with its components of national-spiritual values and religion. Its approach to religion will be compared to that of the NSP, which was the rival party about this particular issue. Finally, the DticP's conservatism will be clarified in relation to nationalist conservatism.

The idea of National Will has been critical for rightwing politics; the concept therefore will be discussed with reference to the DP and the JP. Democracy and national will thought of the party will be examined with fundamental rights and liberties, populism and ideas about state. The goal is to show that the DticP's notion of sovereign state and its stress on limited rights/liberties are connected to each other.

The last section of the chapter will define the DticP's relations with the military, which has been an important actor of politics in Turkey. The DticP claimed to possess the heritage of the DP and its support for the anticommunist state will be explained. The chapter will end with the argument that anticommunism was shared by all rightwing parties of the period; it was thus one commonalty of the DticP with other rightwing parties. The main problematic of the study is whether the DticP owned an authentic place within the Turkish political history that they could add to the right wing ideologies.

## CHAPTER II

### THE DP-JP TRADITION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

#### 2.1. The DP-JP tradition

It is believed that the Democratic Party had the characteristics of general right wing ideology as it was the representative of the centre right politics. It is therefore meaningful to look at the DticP within the frame of the general right wing ideology. Nonetheless, it should not be overlooked either that the DticP's structure which could model itself on all the right-wing parties or right wings, created an authentic place for itself in the axis of conservatism and Anatolian nationalism. The extensive literature on Turkish nationalism and conservatism which goes beyond the aim of this study will not be a part of this thesis.

To understand the DticP, we should look at the Justice Party and its formation period. Through out this chapter, we look at two of the most important parties of centre right in Turkey, we would like to understand how they adapted and clung to the similar principles in their actions which changed depending on the conjuncture (Göka &Göral &Güney 2003: 302). They developed the tradition by reflecting the same attitude to concepts and events that were experienced in Turkish political life. In fact, neither the Democrat Party nor the JP had clear political-intellectual patterns; they were rather umbrellas changing according to the "enemy" ideological position. As it will be seen in next chapter while analyzing the party, the DticP was expected to have continuities with the DP-JP tradition. As far as the DticP was established due to debates within the JP and the cadre of the DticP was ex-cadre of the JP, the ideological standpoint of the JP was heeded for the sake of understanding the DticP. Also, the DP and its actions were taken into consideration because the DticP was

defending and embracing the DP to explain itself to the voter mass. So, both the DP and the JP were analyzed to understand the convergences and divergences within themselves and between them and the DticP.

The DP constructed its political dimension by congregating all the opposite groups against the Republican People's Party (Mert 2003: 314). The DP was the joint party of;

The peasants who opposed the RPP both because they failed to understand the reforms it was trying to enact and because they suffered severely as a result of the economic difficulties accompanying World War II. Second, there were the merchants and entrepreneurs, whose numbers had been steadily increasing, and who saw in the DP a possibility of bringing an end to the RPP's statist economic policies. Third, there were the nouveaux riches and small businessmen of the provincial towns who flocked to the DP for reasons both of economic policy and of social prestige. Fourth, there were those of the generation raised under the Republic who either failed to join the civil service or for idealistic reasons failed to find the opportunity for public service they had been taught to seek. Finally, there were those who had never accepted the reforms of the RPP and now who sought to use the DP as a means of counterattack (Ülman & Tachau 1965: 160).

The JP continued the RPP opposition with its alliance with military between 1960-1970; then communism and leftist movements as rising forces became the constructive element of the JP to form the right alliance which had become restricted because of polarization of ideologies and fragmentation of politics. But it is important to note that economic liberalism, religious sensitivities, spiritual values (Karpal 1982: 375) and nationalism under the abstract format of "national will" were the common discourses for both the DP and the JP.

### **2.1.1. Nationalist Conservatism of the DP-JP Tradition**

Nationalist-conservative ideology was a product of many different ideologies and segments of ideologies which contained religious-nationalism-conservatism-liberalism. The most important identifier of the right wing understanding of nationalist-conservatism or conservative-nationalism was the unorthodoxy of the right wing in Turkey (Bora 2009a: 8) that it could articulate or become component of any particular right wing thought unless it was distinct "enemy" of the right wing.

However, the “other” of right wing also fluctuated from time to time; but particularly for the era of the Democrat Party and the Justice Party, it was generally communism and leftist movements. Leftist movements were criminalized with the critical weapon that Kemalists did not have, which was morality. One of the most striking elements of anti-communist discourse was the intensive emphasis on morality/virtue (ahlak/namus).

So, Islamism coded the internal pressure of the Republican regime and its immorality, secularism and modernism to the anti-communist warning of Cold War era. As far as Islamism was conformist with the State, it became the State Conservatism. The ideological cement that established the proper relationship between State and Islamism in the form of Conservatism was nationalist-conservative discourse (Bora 2009a: 83).

While the left-right polars were defined and nationalist-conservative discourse was the preclusion of the centre-right wing, this discourse was part of the centre right wing populism. Nationalist conservative discourse rehabilitated both nationalism and conservatism; nationalism transformed as a value which would protect “Our Essence” and “Our Tradition” rather than universalist Republican version. It also legalized the religion to the State forms and elevated it to the “the first among equals” level within the values of the nation. Nationalism was, during that time of the right-left wing differentiation in 1960s, one of the critical components of right wing. According to conjectural reasons, it had connections with Islamism and conservatism at variable rates; so the most general phrase adapted to the ideological mixture was “nationalist-spiritualist” (Can 2002: 663).

Despite this legalization process, the JP tried to purify the conservative-nationalist discourses in the eyes of the people. The discourse which was labeled as backwardness and negation of modern life and capitalist economy; was an attempt to rehabilitated to represent it as positive, constructive and forward-looking side of nationalism, so nationalism was completed with developmentalism (Demirel 2004b: 211). Nationalism within the context of spiritualism had access to religious conservatism and so Islamism. However, developmentalism made the discourse gain a more modern conceptualization that educated mass or opposition critics would be

disvalued. This development issue was aimed at establishing a Westernized component that would turn Turkish-Islamic synthesis to Turkish-Islamic-Western synthesis with the “Strong State” (Bora 2009a: 125) and so that it would not conflict with Kemalism or Westernism.

Despite this articulation, the synthesis of Turkish-Islam with the Western culture did not change the cliché of the right wing’s conservative-nationalist stand: The West was only powerful in the sense of technology and material issues; Western culture should not be articulated to our culture; rather protection of Turkish-Islamic civilization was required critically. Turkish economy and development had to add Western culture as a pillar for modernization; but culture should be excluded from this synthesis. Unless Turkish-Islamic civilization would be passed to next generations, communist/socialist ideas would extend by taking support from the spiritual gap created by Republican secular/materialist culture (Demirel 2004b: 206).

### **2.1.2. Concluding Remarks**

The Democrat Party and the Justice Party were taken into account to understand contingencies between these parties and the Democratic Party. To understand these parties, nationalist conservative ideological position including nationalism, conservatism, national-spiritual values, religion, anti-communism and the JP’s ideological manner were taken into account. For understanding national will, the parties were analyzed according to their approach to populism and fundamental rights/freedoms concepts.

Nationalist conservative manner had contents of religious sentiments, conservatism and also liberalism. These values were in mixture as clear ideological explanations were avoided for these values. Beginning with nationalism, the DP addressed its actions to nationalist ideas and carried this view to the point of ultra-nationalist organizations to stop non- DP supporters. The Justice Party, like the Democrat Party, introduced a nationalism that was not totally for from Kemalist tradition. Resembling Kemalist nationalism, the JP supported the nation’s state that looked for development and economical well-being. The nationalism of the JP reached masses

better than Kemalism as far as secular understanding of nationalism within Kemalist tradition had missing concepts of religious sentiments. While hegemonic struggle for representing authentic nationalism was on the scene, the definitions of Turkish nationalism reached to state-nation equality and also to conservative search of nationalism.

As regards nationalism, conservative analysis of Turkish modernism rejected the Jacobin style of Republican values. The negation of Republican values resulted in including religious symbols and values. Moreover, state action for conservatism helped keep conservatism within the borders of State. The development goal in the DP period normalized conservative voters' desires and transformed them. The JP also activated the conservative voter and was the representative power for conservatism until the establishment of the NSP. The JP translated conservative-nationalism in Turkey in respect to national and religious values and protection of state from communism. Secularism of the DP and the JP also maintained this view of conservative voter within State values, reminding that citizens should practice their religion. They modernized conservatism in this sense and did not give way to polarized religious movements.

Catching the conservative voter and demanding their approval were achieved through the negation of single party rule. But this negation is inconsistent, fragmented, unsystematic. Spiritual-national values were added to Republican nationalism which was denied because of Westernized elites' non-spiritual values. The JP continued the line and explained their point of view in respect of spiritual values, even within economic plan. As Westernized elites were criticized because of their lack of spiritual values and irreligiousness, their secularism and secularist nation understanding should be degraded. Voter base also demanded religion especially for the regulation of daily life. The DP reached consensus with the society concerning religion especially in relation to allowing reciting of Azan in Arabic.<sup>2</sup> In

---

<sup>2</sup> On 16 June 1950, barely a month after they came to power, they passed a law restoring the call to prayer (ezan) in Arabic; the ezan had been called in Turkish only since June 1941 (Ahmad 2003: 108). Turkey as witnessed by an unprecedented increase in religious publications, in visits to local shrines, in mosque attendance, and in the pilgrimage to Mecca." (Binnaz Toprak 1988: 123, *The State, Politics, and Religion in Turkey*, eds. Metin Heper and Ahmet Evin, in *State, Democracy and the Military: Turkey in the 1980s*, pp.119- 136, Walter de Gruyter & Co. Berlin). The government reinstated religious instruction in schools, established a faculty of divinity at the University of Ankara,

fact, elites of the DP were not different from the “Westernized” elites of the Republican People’s Party. Tachau also explains the difference between the elites of the Democrat Party and the JP:

Although the question of public policy on religion was already a bone of contention among the political parties in the 1950s, the gulf widened noticeably with the rise of the Justice party in 1961. Part of the explanation undoubtedly lies in a disparity in the social and political backgrounds of the parties: while, as already noted, their parliamentary delegations became more alike, their leadership became more disparate. The leaders of the Justice party were younger men who had grown to maturity under the republic. They were raised in small, provincial towns where the modernizing, secularizing reforms of Ataturk were not popular. They supported the Democratic party (G.A.A. meaning the Democrat Party) during the 1950s because it was an effective vehicle of opposition to the Republican party. Several of them had risen to positions of power at the provincial or local level by the time the military coup brought down the government in 1960.

By contrast, almost all of the Democratic leaders of the 1950s had been men who had gained political experience within the Republican Party during the single-party regime; and they came from social backgrounds not greatly different from those of the Republican leadership (Tachau & D. Good 1973: 569).

The JP was successful in satisfying this mass by increasing the number of Religious Vocational Secondary Schools and High Schools. Both the DP and the JP were successful in religious populism. To overcome the decline in the electoral support, the DP increased relations with religious authorities and also attended religious rituals.

Depending on right wing’s social religion understanding, communism was disvalued within right wing politics. Class interest issue was criminalized as “dividing society into enemy groups”. It can be claimed that during the period of the DticP, anti-communism was the general characteristics of right wing. The DP was also anti-communist as it was seen as a threat for collaboration with Western culture. The JP had to be more anti-communist as far as the voter mass was fragmented because of newly established right wing parties. Also, Turkish politics had more strong ideological polars during that period. Anti-communism as a right wing stand helped the JP to have alliance with the military which made it even harder because of the

---

and failed to implement meaningful land reform, despite enacting a far-reaching law to that effect (Frank Tachau 2000: 131, Turkish political parties and elections: Half a century of multiparty democracy, Turkish Studies, 1:1, pp.128-148).

Justice Party's organic relations with the DP. Both the DP and the JP had an anticommunist ideological position also because of their economic plan based on property and free enterprise.

Both parties relied for their actions and ideological stands on National Will concept. National will as the collaboration of all powers has been assigned to the authority by the elections. National will gave the duty to the citizens to give all political rights to the State through the elections. So, the ruler could act according to nation's needs during four years without interruption. Tachau (2000: 130) explains that 1950 election ushered in a new political era which had continued since Young Turk period. However, the 1950 election continued the tradition of single party and Republican authoritarianism in multi-political system as "national will" still could not be divided between power groups. National will also divided the society as the ones for the national will and others against the national will who did not represent the nation and its values. National will made the masses to conform to State's rule. In order to persuade people to National Will, populist discourse had to be achieved. The masses should feel having contact with the charismatic leader without any mediator and should feel close to the authority. The populism which acted on the dilemmas of good vs. bad, moral vs. immoral, had to be fed through the clientalist and patronage network systems. The DticP which was the member of this tradition could not achieve these networks as far as it could not rule.

The right wing citizen, who had the desire to be "the first class citizen" against the immoral Westernized elites, did not demand fundamental rights/liberties. This was not a political argument to convince the voters, but it was for political demagogy; because both the DP and the JP did not have a concrete liberal attitude about fundamental rights and liberties. The DP during single party rule criticized the RPP for their illiberal acts; however they were more authoritarian when they ruled. Also, the JP depended on injustice done to the DP with the 1960 Coup D'état; but they were against the fundamental rights/liberties of left wing movements as were the DticP. The DticP and the JP reduced the fundamental rights/freedoms to the right of electing and to be elected. Constant abuse of military power over civil politics increased the popularity of the JP that the DP and continuation of tradition of the DP and voter base has been succeeded with this popularity. However, the first

competitive election in Turkish political history was 1946 election (Tachau & D. Good 1973: 552-553) and the DP and so the tradition demanded their rights/liberties on this election.

The DP, the JP and the DticP shared the common abstract format of centre- right wing politics. They did not have concrete plans about conservatism, nationalism, religion, fundamental rights/freedoms. Rather they explained their ideological positioning according to ‘the other’ and according to masses. By taking account of the conjuncture and right wing political sentiments of right wing voter base, they had the representative power for a long time in Turkish political history.

## **2.2. Turkish Politics in 1960s**

After the Democrat Party was closed with the coup d’état of 1960, it was necessary for the party’s populace to be represented by parties which would be established. Consequently, the DP’s political base was in the position of heritage for these parties (Ahmad 1977: 232). In the first years, the most important agenda items which kept the party busy were amnesty of the DP members, how the party would have an attitude in the referendum of Constitution, prevention of execution of Menderes and his friends, keeping the party open and completing the organization. The struggle between the Justice Party members who defended a reconciliatory line in this subject and the former DP members who saw them as free-rider consignees consumed most of the energy of the party (Demirel 2004b: 39). After the trials in Yassıada, the JP was quiet in the sensitive subjects such as the criticism of the Constitution of 1961 or political rights of the DP members which was one of the critical matters in the period of the establishment of the JP (Demirel 2004b: 39).

After 1960, different than the DP and Single party period, Turkish politics moved gradually to a hybrid system of moderate and polarized pluralism (Ergüder 1988: 119). In 1960s, the JP’s economic policies resembled a promise for the public and confidence to them despite the severe economic problems (Hyland 1970: 5).

The Coup D'état of 1960 was done upon the decision to normalize the politics by the army. However, after the Coup D'état, military control over politics continued and also more intense and fragmented political parties and groups arose (Karpat 1964: 50). Demirel also accepted that the relations with military had to be sustained during 1960s about the amnesty of the ex-Democrats:

My fellow colleagues will appreciate the unique aspects of this matter. The matter was more than just a simple legislation issue. Beyond that was a coup d'état (ihtilal) movement that could never be underestimated, in which we were not involved, did not trigger and where we did not have any negligence. The coup d'état (ihtilal) was attributed to the military. In addition, it was our duty as the government not to offend, and not to cause the army be offended and be mistrusted. No matter what our feelings, ideas and beliefs were while we were trying to establish the complete civil peace across the country, we were obliged to utmost careful and attentive. On the other hand, the parliament and military should not be contradicting each other (Adalet Partisi Genel Başkanı ve Başbakan Süleyman Demirel'in A.P. Beşinci Büyük Kongresini Açış Konuşması 1970: 12)<sup>3</sup>

At the beginning of 1960s, it was seen in the coalitions of the JP and the Republican People's Party, the economic policy of these parties began to diverge. The RPP demanded etatist policies which depended on the intellectual interpretations of the State Planning Organization that was founded after the 1960 military intervention. However, dominated by newly rising families and economic groups, the JP had to carry out less etatist economic policies that would decrease the role of the state in economics, reduce the high taxes on agriculture and real estate (Karpat 1964: 64). In the campaign of 1969 elections, the main emphasis of Demirel was the strong and single party government of the JP. To affect the voter base, Demirel gave bad example of coalition governments between 1961-1965, and also he warned for unwanted results unless the JP would rule as majority (Hyland 1970: 7).

The main dilemma between the RPP and the JP was the changing role of the state. In the eyes of the public, the DP was the savior that brought justice to the public in its relations with the state. The state seemed to be transforming from the omnipotent

---

<sup>3</sup> Arkadaşlarım bu meselenin kendisine has özelliklerini takdir edeceklerdir. Mesele bir yasama meselesi olmanın ötesinde bir mesele idi. Gerisinde, bizim içinde olmadığımız, sebep olmadığımız sun'u taksirimiz bulunmadığı hiçbir ölçüde küçümsenmeyecek bir ihtilal hareketi vardı. İhtilal orduya mal edilmiş idi. Orduyu rencide etmemek, ettirmemek, güvensizliğe sevketmemek de iktidar olarak bizim vazifemizdi. Memleketi eksiksiz iç barışa götürürken hislerimiz, düşüncelerimiz, kanaatlerimiz ne olursa olsun, çok itinalı olmak mecburiyetinde idik. Diğer taraftan da parlamento ile orduyu karşı karşıya bırakmamak gerekiyordu.

entity to a functional welfare state (Karpat 1962: 306). So the JP, especially at the beginning of 1960s, introduced itself to the society as the mediator between state and the public.

The insulting name of “Kuyruk” (a tail separated from its body) used for the Democrats, resulted in the longitudinal pity feelings for the JP. Both the JP and the Democratic Party used their linkage with these insulting words that they tried to inherit the DP’s “unjust” political downfall. Besides this, the JP was accused of changing their party symbol from an open book above rising to a white horse before the elections as this was an attempt to accomplish their link with the DP as “Demirkirat” (Iron-Grey Horse) in Anatolia. Also, the abbreviation of AP was decoded as Allah and Prophet (Allah–Peygamber) as to appeal religiously sentimental voter base (Szyliowicz 1966: 481).

After the coup d’état and the DP’s removal from politics, the political gap left behind the DP had to be filled with new political party and party members. These people were not a homogenous group which was divided as one of them not estimating the role of the JP as the “watchman” until ex-DP members hold the party, the other group was formed from ultranationalists and religious traditionalist. The ultra-group began to disappear from the top cadre of the party in 1964 (Ülman & Tachau 1965: 165-6).

After the civil political rule started up after the abolition of the DP in 1960, the imprisoned leaders and efficient organization of the party helped the Justice Party to get the ex-DP votes. The JP consolidated the right wing votes, at the same erased the other right wing party, the NTP (New Turkey Party). While the JP increased its votes from 35 percent in 1961 to 46 per cent in the 1963 local elections and to 49.8 per cent in the 1964 senatorial elections; the NTP’s votes decreased from 14 percent to 6.5 per cent in 1963 and 3.8 per cent in 1964 (Szyliowicz 1966: 476).

Intraparty opponents who did not decide to establish a new party during the conflicts within the JP supported New Turkey Party which was founded in 1961. This party was supporting the groups who gained strength with agricultural revolution which

was a legacy of the DP. But as it was realized that this party was losing support, they joined forces with petite bourgeoisie.

Meanwhile, Demirel was under the attack of contrary groups who called him “Morrison Süleyman”, meaning being pro-American and member of Masonic Lodge. While Gümüşpala could keep firm opposition supporters called as Extremists in the JP, he enabled to protect the relations in the party with this group and moderates by playing the role of a coldblooded, fair and intimate adjudicator (Demirel 2004b: 33). Demirel who was elected as the chairperson after death of Gümüşpala did not manage the party without fraction. The neo-fascist, religious and old DP elements existed in the party besides Demirel’s liberal entourage (Dodd 1990: 12). But in terms of economic policies, it can be said that it acted as a voter catch-all party. While it came up trumps from cities, it protected support of people in rural area with populist policies such as peasant’s by increasing his product’s price support. Demirel carried out balance policy until 1969 against different factions in the party (Tosun 1999: 104). Views of Bayar were effective in leadership debate of Demirel-Bilgiç. Infallibility of the will of the nation was a tendency which displayed sources of moral democracy and attributed importance to the majority of the masses. Sadettin Bilgiç who was more nationalist-conservative than Demirel in representing the essence of the nation, lost the leadership election in the JP against him in 1964. Bayar was anxious that Sadettin Bilgiç would question the victimhood of the DP (Taşkın 2007: 83). Ümit Cizre (1993: 62) explains that Demirel worked as a softening, soothing mediator in the controversy between rulership rights of the army and nationalist-holier (mukaddesatçı) and/or clientalist-liberal “national sovereignty” desires in this period.

After the revolution, faithful voter base of ex-DP for the JP and weakness of coalition governments entrenched the political success of the JP (Szyliowicz 1966: 491). Despite the national remainder system which helped the smaller parties to be represented in the parliament, the JP got the grand share of the right wing until 1970s.

The problems since establishment of the party led the JP to find its identity late which should be different than anti-May 27 front. Although the JP started its

political life as successor of the DP, it formed an independent and changing identity at the end of 1960s. The JP did not clearly cut off its relations with traditional classes; but priorities began to change. Moreover, different segments of society were taken into consideration; depending on that intra-party organization changes occurred (Hyland 1970: 12). Having populist policies for peasants in which Demirel tried to separate himself from RPP was losing technical support; but it was still based on urban and rural proletarian groups. This was a turning point for the JP to make a distinction between modern and conservative point of views. The DticP became a coalition against 1970 capitalism of Demirel. When Süleyman Demirel gained leadership of the JP, he tried to get away from ideology and retrospective connections of the DP. He adapted requirements of capitalism rather than the ideology of old-fashioned Democrats. Therefore, he preferred technocratic experts instead of conservative politicians. A coalition was formed with the army by supporting the army financially for this modern policies and it was joined forces with peasants not to lose votes (Shaw 1976: 425).

The JP had been the representative of entrepreneurs, landowners and big businessmen dating from 1960s as successor of the DP. After mid-1960s, this alliance started to fall apart. Large industry owners and businessmen started to have a larger share. The system headed for giving more importance to aggressive competition and large industry and this made the situation worse for craftsmen and tradesmen. Economic, social and rapid shift which was developed by agricultural and commercial developments forced industry sector to expand. In short, interests of small bourgeoisie and big bourgeoisie began to disintegrate. The DticP was a product of this shift. This disintegration which emerged during the discussions of 1970 budget and became concrete with the establishment of the DticP symbolized that the JP cleared a big hurdle in the way to become the party of industrialists (Çavdar 1983b: 2094). The JP changed into representative of the big bourgeoisie and consequently disintegration became inevitable. In the beginning, the DticP could undertake the representation of the small bourgeoisie; but then the NSP took over the role. Power of large industrialists made traditional large landowners suppliers. For more profit, large industrialists tried to get agricultural products produced by large landowners at the lowest price. Small craftsmen would be affected from the new mode of capitalism because large industrialist would be able to produce products

cheaper. Moreover, small craftsman could not compete with product variety of large industrialist. Company owners who carried out foreign trade transaction, insurance business, banking business and large industrial institutions built up large capital in large capital-small capital conflict which caused the JP to disintegrate at the end of 1960s. At the elections of 1969, Demirel faced a dilemma between keeping up good relations with ex-Democrats and their electorate and transforming the party to a new and moderate form. The Demirel group which since the establishment formed the Moderates of the party, had a balanced relation with the army which controlled these tendencies since the 1960 military intervention (Hyland 1970: 4). The “melting in one pot” system in the JP which was granted from the DP, turned out to be a conflict between the fractions within the party. Demirel had to choose which classes to represent and also to risk severing the relations with the Extremists. So, the intra-party struggle to surface after the 1969 elections. Besides class base of the voter mass, when we look at professional distribution of 41s who were founders of the DticP and the JP, we can observe that although professional occupation and civil servant distributions were considered equal, 20% consisted of businessmen in the JP, while it was 7% in 41s, the proportion of landowners was 7% in the JP, while it was represented by 10% in the group forming the DticP (Sencer 1971: 377). The DticP undertook the representation of groups which were made inactive by fast, “immoral” capitalizing. Sophisticated landowners lost their position during the DP as being the main means of the party in 1950s with their tradition, culture. As also expressed by Açıkel (1996: 155), the ones whom they could not capitalize were oppressed (mazlum) and to the extent that they could not find a point to articulate the traditional culture; namely (other parties) “If they have state finances, television screens, bank loans and newspaper printing houses, the D.P. [Democratic Party] has the belief in its nation and Allah. The ones who are on the right way, will triumph sooner or later” (Radio Speeches 1977 of The Democratic Party General Election of 1977). Accusing Demirel of Masonry during presidential election in the congress was because of attribution to a part of society which was seen as the cause of country’s falling behind and being not able to reach at the level of “modern civilizations” (muassır medeniyetler).

Until 1970 and the expulsion of Bilgiç group from the JP, the re-election rate of the JP was high. But this should not mean that the General Administrative Committee

had continued to be formed from the same group of people. The internal fractions in the top leadership of the party had resulted in GAC restructuring in 1962 for three times (Sayarı 1976: 195).

Hyland (1970: 9-10) explained that the 1969 elections had the lowest rate of participation for general elections as one of the reasons might be that Celal Bayar demanded from his voter base not to vote for the JP which was not faithful to ex-DP members' amnesty; so the voters chose neither vote for JP nor for the other parties. Hyland (1970: 12) also offered to ex-DP members and anti-Demirel Independents to take into consideration the decline in the JP's votes (53 percent to 47 percent) as the attitude of Celal Bayar's being critical for the JP's electoral support. However, Demirel explained that they tried to handle the Amnesty issue and it was on their agenda:

Relieving from the damages of the 1960 coup d'état was an issue over which the Justice Party was quite sensitive since its establishment. The Justice Party had embraced the principle of recovering from the 1960 coup d'état while on the other hand maintaining the homeland peace and order, yet it was another point that no new wounds should bleed while overcoming the previous ones. We all were aware of the fact that normalization and stabilization after a coup d'état would be rather and more difficult compared to a war. Restoration of the civil peace in our country was only possible once the adverse impacts of the 1960 Coup D'état were completely erased. I expressed this in my speech in the 1968 Congress and in my previous speeches. The political power of the Justice Party has had enacted a "general amnesty" law in 1966. Causing great uproar under the circumstances of those days, the second stage of this general amnesty was to amend the Article 68 of the Constitution and annulment of the provisional article 11, which would redress the inequality of political rights. The Justice Party did not have strength to realize such amendment to the Constitution in terms of quorum. 301 votes were needed in the National Assembly and also 122 votes in the Republican Senate. Unless adequate number of members from other political parties supported, it was not possible for us to put this amendment to the Constitution into practice.

While our 1968 Grand Congress passed a resolution on this issue to be called later as the reinstatement of political rights, it wished that the Justice Party could achieve the power to amend the Constitution and instructed its directors to inquire into whether ensuring the adequate number of participants for the studies to be conducted prior to achieving such power was possible (Adalet Partisi Genel Başkanı ve Başbakan Süleyman Demirel'in A.P. Beşinci Büyük Kongresini Açış Konuşması 1970: 8)

... The primary issue for us was to forthwith reinstate the political rights. No matter what the abettors of 1960 coup d'état thought, full and right away recovery from the problems was the main point for us.... Being thus opened up in early May 1969, the issue, as you all know, covered two significant elements. One of these elements was not to cause any doubt and mistrust

because the incident was in itself the outcome of a coup d'état and that maintaining the stability was fundamental, and the other was not to hurt those whose rights were restituted due to the arguments to occur because of reinstatement of rights. The Justice Party Political Power had undertaken to actualize the reinstatement of rights; in addition to this, it had another duty, which was to restore and establish the peace and order and keep the political stability on the rails. In fact, the fulfillment of this duty would open the one and only road to reinstate the rights (Adalet Partisi Genel Başkanı ve Başbakan Süleyman Demirel'in A.P. Beşinci Büyük Kongresini Açış Konuşması 1970: 9)<sup>4</sup>.

Traditional middle classes that were small enterprises of Anatolia struggled not to lose the competition with big cosmopolitan capitalists. At this period, Demirel was accused of giving too much support to large companies. So, these traditional groups directed their support from the JP to the Nationalist Movement Party, the Reliance Party (GP, Güven Partisi), the National Order Party, NOP (MNP, Milli Nizam Partisi) and the DticP formed by JP dissidents (Ahmad 2003: 132).

Rapid urbanization and industrialization triggered social change in Turkey at the end of 1960s. So, new social groups had to be represented with divergent and different political parties. In this complexity of party politics, parties should have to define themselves critically different from each other (Turan 1988: 65).

---

<sup>4</sup> 1960 İhtilalinin yaralarını sarmak Adalet Partisinin kurulduğu gündenberi üzerinde hassasiyetle durduğu bir konu olmuştur. Adalet Partisi 1960 İhtilalinin yaralarını yurttan iç barışı muhafaza ederek sarmayı kendisine şiar edinmişti. Yaralar sarılırken yeni yaraların açılmaması lazım idi. Bir ihtilalin yaralarını sarmanın bir harbin yaralarını sarmaktan daha zor olduğunu hepimiz biliyorduk. Memleketimizde iç huzurun teessüsü, 1960 İhtilalinin yaralarının eksiksiz olarak sarılması ile mümkündü. Bunu 1968 Kongre konuşmamda ve daha önceki konuşmalarında ifade etmişim. Adalet Partisi siyasi iktidarı 1966 da "bir genel af" kanunu çıkarmıştı. O günkü şartlar içerisinde büyük gürültülere sebep olan bu genel af kanununun ikinci merhalesi Anayasanın 68 inci maddesinin buna dayanarak tadili ve muvakkat 11 inci maddesinin kaldırılması olacaktı. Böylece siyasi hak eşitsizliği ortadan kalkacaktı.

Adalet Partisinin bir anayasa değişikliği yapmağa adet bakımından gücü yoktu. Millet Meclisinde 301, Cumhuriyet Senatosunda da 122 oy lazım idi. Diğer siyasi partilerden kafî sayıda üye katılmadıkça Anayasanın değişikliğini gerçekleştirmek tek başımıza mümkün değildi.

1968 Büyük Kongremiz, sonradan siyasi hakların iadesi adı ile anılacak olan bu konuda karar alırken Adalet Partisinin Anayasayı değiştirecek güce erişmesini temenni etmekte ve bu güce erişmeden önce yapılacak çalışmalarla kafî sayının sağlanmasının imkan dahilinde olup olmadığının araştırılmasının yöneticilerine direktif olarak vermekte idi.

...Bizim için mühim olan mesele, siyasi hakların biran önce iadesi idi. 1960 ihtilalinin teşvikçileri ne düşünürse düşünsün, açılmış olan yaraların tam olarak sarılması ve biran evvel sarılması idi.... 1969 Mayıs ayının başında böylece açılan bu konu hepimizin bildiği gibi, iki mühim unsuru ihtiva etmekte idi. Bunlardan birisi hadisenin bizatihi bir ihtilalin neticesi olması dolayısıyla ve istikrarı muhafaza esas olduğuna göre güvensizlik ve kuşku doğmaması, diğeri de hak iadesi dolayısıyla cereyan edecek münakaşaların hakları iade edilenleri rencide etmemesi idi. Adalet Partisi Siyasi İktidarı hakların iadesini kendisine görev edinmişti. Bunun yanında bir görevi daha vardı. O da huzur ve sükunu, siyasi istikrarı muhafaza etmekte. Esasen bu görev ifa edilemediği takdirde siyasi hakların iadesini gerçekleştirmek mümkün değildi.

In terms of the transformation of the economy, power of small manufacturer and small commercial bourgeoisie decreased gradually as a result of the economic development which was in favour of large industrial and commercial bourgeoisie in Turkey. Decrease in bank loans received from banks on behalf of small industrial and agricultural sector was also presented as an indicator of this. After 1965, the JP's increasing tendency for representing large industry caused cracks between big-small bourgeoisie groups in the party. It was one of the economic-political reasons in the formation of a new party of 41 JP members who were representatives of small bourgeoisie in general (Yücekök 1983: 136). The Party was in the nostalgia of the Democrat Party in terms of not only cultural, sociological but also economic policies.

The JP kept its majority in Grand National Assembly of Turkey after the DticP's breaking away from the JP. But, Demirel could not fix politics or develop economy (Kalaycıoğlu 2005: 106). Intra-party struggles because of Extremists during the first years of the party could create an effect that could limit the power of Süleyman Demirel in the JP. But with the establishment of the DticP, Demirel made his mark on the JP and achieved the condition of being "Single Man" (Demirel 2004b: 109).

The newly established parties in the end of 1960s, were in the competition for clientelistic networks which would lead them to public patronage. But to have these, grand parties –so to speak- as the JP and the RPP were organized forms of specific interests, labor and business groups and also as voter base they were supported by large voter groups that were appealed to the leader, ideology or policies of the party. So, when these small parties participated in coalitions, they tried to gather clientelistic networks under their rule which also supported by the authoritarian emphasis on the leader and the ultra ideology (Turan 1988: 65-66).

The DticP, the NMP and the NSP which included parts from the old social structure of the JP broke up the voter base of the JP and were effective in its being not able to come to power. As well as losing small capital groups and agricultural bourgeoisie to small right-wing parties, the urban poor and low-incomers slipped to RPP. Therefore, the JP started to head its support which was given to large capital at the beginning of 1970s for small capital and proceeded to a policy which appeased more

to the conservative, radical right (Yücekök 1983: 190). To be able to gain back some of the vote base which was felt to be lost with the disintegration; the JP responded in quid pro quo manner for provincial and local power groups such as especially minimum price policy, expanding exemption of business tax in terms of local administrations were the compromises that contained divergence from the programme of industrialists (Çavdar 1983b: 2094).

The JP was affected by serious internal conflict. Moreover, the battles within the JP and the RPP fragmented their votes and ended the period of single party governments; but they were still the leading parties that established the coalitions.

### **2.3. Fragmentation within the JP**

The younger men in the Justice Party were not by any means a homogeneous group; they split along two axes: the first group would like to establish the ex-Democrat Party regime and the JP would be the only channel for this goal. The other group had more polarized ideologies in the sense of right wing that were ultra-traditionalists and religious conservatives (Ülman & Tachau 1965:166). There were three important groups in the JP: The ones joining the party after the 1960 Revolution, old deputies of the DP and supporters of Islamic Nationalism. Sadettin Bilgiç, Mehmet Turgut, Fethi Tevetoğlu, Faruk Sükan and Cevat Önder were present in the last group. Two conflicting groups came into being from these different fractions: Moderates and Extremists. In 1964, the latter group lost strength when two of them were not elected to Central Executive Committee of the party. The sources of disintegration which would come up later in the JP should be searched in the establishment of the party. On the other hand, there was the JP which tried to keep all the meaning of the right alive in the period it existed, the sum of a policy which was tried to be stopped by the Military guardianship dating from the 1960 revolution. It should be discussed whether factions in the JP were bodies of a disintegration process or we should see them as different cores of the formation of the centre right.

At the establishment process of the JP, conflict between the Moderates and Extremists began while the party focused on party's maintenance in politics,

preventing execution of Menderes and his friends, amnesty of DP members. The Extremists analyzed new comers as expropriates that conquered ex-DP members' place in the party (Demirel 2004b: 39). In fact, the Moderates were right that the JP's governance depended on the "trust" that the military would have them for not having revanchist tendencies (Çavdar 1983b: 2090). Tökin (1965: 105) thought that the first password of the JP during establishment was: Moderation and Balance (İtidal ve Muvazene). But conflicts, divergence in ideas and thoughts started to threaten the first aim. Grouping in the party affected also popular vote. Moderates, extremists, rightists and racists in the party started to gnaw the structure of the JP. Conflicts between them removed the party from its aims, their standard of service to motherland and some positive principles.

Until his death, Gümüşpala played the role of congregating leader between the Moderate and Extremist group that handled the Extremists not to get into fierce opposition (Demirel 2004b: 32-33). Until 1964 General Congress of the JP, Sadettin Bilgiç was in power of provincial organization. However, opposition group's delegates could not take control in 1964 General Congress. This was the starting point for Demirel group to overcome the opposition within the party (Sayarı 1976: 190).

In 1965, it seemed that the JP, having a definite majority in the general elections, would stabilize intra-party politics and the country's politics in general. However, 1969 general elections showed that despite the result of elections as parliamentary majority, internal split reduced the parliamentary majority of the JP (Tachau & D. Good 1973: 553).

In the end of 1960s, heterogeneity of the party came forward and the disintegration process of different traditions gained speed. One of the factors that enabled this process to gain speed was the weakening of May 27 front which was common opponent for all the wings. Unequal support for petty and big bourgeoisie increased the tension of the feud (Demirel 2004b: 54). After 1969 Elections, formation of the new government revealed the cracks in the party.

The JP's definite majority in the parliament after 1969 elections, increase in Assembly seats, and defection of Erbakan faction powered the moderate Demirel group against the opponents which arose after 1969 general elections according to Hyland (1970: 13).

On December 22, 1969, a Member of Parliament of the JP submitted a motion to the Parliament for restricting the long interpellation discussions to twenty minutes as they were interrupting the Parliament's work. There was not a group discussion of the JP and 34 MPs of the JP voted to reject. Some Members of Parliament, who did not enter the Meeting Saloon and sat in the Lobby of Parliament not to vote for the Motion, were accused of acting against the Party Charter. Also, they were claimed to have declarations which were estimated as improper to party discipline (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 2). The group that was going to establish the Democratic Party concerning this Motion explained that MPs had "legislative exemption" (Teşrii muafiyet) which lead to irresponsibility of MP (Milletvekilliği sorumsuzluğu- Teşrii mes'uliyetsizlik) and legislative immunity of MP (Milletvekilliği dokunulmazlığı- Teşrii masuniyet). "Legislative exemption" was the right not to be restricted according to others' desire or orders and not to get under pressure. The dissident group also proposed that in Party Charter (Article 61), there was the obligation for General Administrative Committee to meet at least once a month. However, this Committee did not meet to discuss the dismissed members of the Party according to the Motion in December 22, 1969. So, they claimed that dismissions from the JP violated the by-laws of the party (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 4)

Tökin (1965: 105) thought that the Freedom Party while breaking up from the DP, voting contrary to the decision of the party about the Article of "Right of Proof" was similar to the DticP's, before the break with the JP, voting against the party's general stance on the proposal of the law that limited the talking time in parliament to 20 minutes.

On December, 30 1969, 3 MPs among 34 non-supporters were referred to National Assembly Group Administrative Committee of the JP with the aim of dismissal. So, Kadri Erogan, Ekrem Dikmen and Vedat Önsal were been dismissed from the Justice

Party. The JP was begun to be ‘cleaned up’ from the ones who were not close to Demirel. The group that was going to establish the DticP claimed that the decision was not legal; because according to the Code of The Party, article 88: “If there has not been a decision on it, Members of Parliament are free for their expressions and votes”. Compromise and interaction aims of the DticP group were unsuccessful and Demirel disregarded them. 72 members of Bilgiç group who were against Demirel gave a memorandum called “Yetmişikiler Memorandum” on January 17, 1970<sup>5</sup> (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 16).

In the Memorandum, first of all they claimed that the dismissals from the Justice Party were against the law. They believed that there was a systematic and gradual purge of the opposite group facilitated by the Head of Party. Instead of putting together, ensuring harmony, Demirel disintegrated and supported the ejection of some MPs. They tried to persuade Demirel to stop the process and reunite the party. However, the Memorandum did not affect Demirel who responded “We would not work on the basis of Memorandums”.

On January 7, 1970, the JP General Administrative Committee decided to terminate some provincial and district party organizations. Moreover, the Members of the GAC; Erzurum MP Cevat Önder, Konya MP İ. Etem Kılıçoğlu and Bingöl Senator Arif Hikmet Yurtsever and Samsun Mayor Kemal Vehbi Gül, Eskişehir Mayor Sabahattin Günday were referred to the Council of Honor on the recommendation of expulsion. On this occasion, 8 Members of the GAC left the meeting and Yüksel Menderes, Dr. Sadettin Bilgiç, Dr. Faruk Sükan, Talat Asal, Mehmet Turgut, Cihat Bilgehan and Ali Naili Erdem resigned from the General Administrative Committee on February 2, 1970.

Later, they tried to meet with Demirel and attempted to explain their desires of the working together in the party:

We do hope that these demands will be taken into account, which do not have any intention other than getting back to status before October 12, 1969 and getting one step closer to democratic ideals we have been trying to realize since 1946 (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 35).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Here after, this group will be called as 72’s.

I am now in this position after numerous fights with certain members of the JP who say «there is no room in this party for those licking from the bowls of democrat dogs,” and I will continue this fight of mine. My strict loyalty to the democratic government has pushed me to this way. You are my senior brother as colleague. Today is the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the party. There is a remedy for everything. I urge and request that you find a constructive solution» (Özer Ölçmen, 72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 35)<sup>7</sup>.

The organization fears of being wound up. No opportunity to speak is granted to anybody except those under oath (yeminli). Yet, those daring to have a say have to risk being expelled. If these did not happen, the memorandum of 72’s would not have been prepared. We now see that the memorandum has been brushed aside though we have declared in our memorandum that we shall not be liable for the incidents to take place unless intra-party democracy is established» (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 37)<sup>8</sup>.

The crisis within the JP reached to its peak especially at budget vote of 1970 since the group that was going to establish the DticP had negative votes. 46 members used dissenting votes for the budget of their own party on February 11, 1970. Among 72 Members of Memorandum, 46 Members of Parliament used dissenting votes; the rest did not support the Memorandum Group (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 40).

After the 72’s Memorandum and their meeting with Demirel on Memorandum, the persistent attitude of Demirel changed the dissident group’s focus of criticism. They directed their hatred towards Demirel and accused him again of establishing “one man party”. They explained their negative vote for the budget of new Government as “prevention of abolition of right to vote which is the guarantee of the democratic regime” (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 40). They offered that a government without Demirel’s leadership would be an efficient government and claimed that they would support and give vote of confidence for this government in the Parliament.

---

<sup>6</sup> 12 Ekim 1969 tarihindeki statüye dönmek ve 1946’dan beri gerçekleştirmeye çalıştığımız demokratik ideallere bir adım daha yaklaşımdan öteye bir gaye taşımayan bu taleplerin dikkate alınacağı ümidi içindeyiz.

<sup>7</sup> Ben «demokrat köpeklerin çanaklarından yalayanlara bu partide yer yok” diyen bazı AP’lilerle mücadele ederek buraya geldim. Bu mücadele de devam edeceğim. Demokratik idareye sıkı sıkıya bağlı olmam beni bu mücadeleye itmiştir. Siz meslekdaş olarak da benim ağabeyimsiniz. Bu gün partinin 10.yıldönümüdür. Her şey halledilebilir. Sizden konstruktif bir çözüm yolu bulmanızı rica ediyorum»

<sup>8</sup> Teşkilat feshedilme korkusu içindedir, Grupta yeminli arkadaşlar dışındakilere söz verilmemektedir. Konuşabilenler de ihraç edilmeyi göze almak mecburiyetinde kalmaktadır. Bunlar olmasa idi 72’lik muhtıra hazırlanmıyacaktı. Muhtıramızda parti içi demokrasi kurulmadıkça cereyan edecek hadiselerden mesul olmayacağımız belirtildiği halde muhtıranın hiç kale alınmadığını görmüş bulunuyoruz.»

On February 13, 1970, the JP Joint Court of Honor wanted the 41 MPs to defend themselves against their dismissal from the party. 38 out of 41 MPs did not defend themselves, only A. Şeref Laç, Osman Özer, M. Fevzi Güngör sent their defence (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 41).

Those attempting to cast a cloud over the vitality of Turkish democracy and our parliament are the people having a private purpose. Our democracy and parliament are not at all in a deadlock. Our parliament has reached to its strongest point in our history of democracy by showing that it has the sensitivity to draw the line and say «stop» to the course of state of affairs in violation of the national interests in any event through the rejection of the Budgetary Proposal (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 43)<sup>9</sup>  
Would our parliament be more reputable and respected if the owners and representatives of free will diverted from the conscientious conviction and operations? That Mr. Demirel tries to block the paths to service opportunities for our party, favored by the national will, outside his own desires at a point where the strength of our government is at the peak, and asserts by this means the parliament has no alternative reveals the fact that his goal of becoming the only and single man. However, the JP majority in the parliament is capable of responding to various solution ways. Our movement is oriented advantaging this capability at best and power and discarding the burdens that might drain this power (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 44)<sup>10</sup> (25.2.1970)

44 party members who accused Demirel of forming his own group in the JP and abusing the party power for the sake of prosperity of his relatives and friends founded the DticP by breaking away from the party. Although they tried to separate Demirel from leadership of the party, when they failed, they decided to found a new party (Geyikdağı 1984: 123).

Yet, a JP government to be formed leaving Mr. Demirel outside will enable that our power will get to the strongest level. While there is such a clear and essential situation for national interests, it is not possible to consider the insistence of Mr. Demirel favoring the party conscience and the safety and welfare of the country (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 45)<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> Türk demokrasisinin ve parlamentomuzun hayatiyetini gölgelemeye çalışanlar hususi maksat taşıyanlardır. Demokrasimiz ve parlamentomuz asla bir çıkmaz içinde değildir. Parlamentomuz. Bütçe Tasarısının reddiyle, memleket menfaatlerine aykırı gidişe her hal ve şart altında «dur» diyebilecek hassasiyete sahip olduğunu göstermek suretiyle demokrasi tarihimizdeki en güçlü noktaya gelmiştir.

<sup>10</sup> Kaldırılmaya müsait gördüğü hür iradenin sahip ve temsilcileri vicdani kanaatlerinin istikametinden ayrılırsalardı parlamentomuz daha mı itibarlı hale gelecekti? Sayın Demirel'in milli iradenin teveccühüne mazhar olan partimize iktidarının en güçlü noktasında, kendi emellerinin dışında hizmet imkanlarını kapatmaya çalışması ve bu suretle parlamentonun alternatifsiz kaldığını iddia etmesi tek adam olma, maksadını bir kere daha, ortaya koymaktadır. Halbuki parlamentodaki A.P. çoğunluğu çeşitli çözüm yollarına cevap verecek güçtedir. Hareketimiz bu gücü en iyi şekilde değerlendirmek ve bu gücü zaafa uğratabilecek yüklerden kurtarmak istikametindedir.

According to the JP, the dissident group which was present before the elections also, came to surface after 1969 elections. They rejected the consolidation proposals and seemed to see themselves above the Party Charter, the Party Program and the Grand Congress. According to them, the 72's group insisted on "minority's dominance against majority". They accused them for trying to establish their rule in the party and of eliminating the Head of the Party. Due to this purpose, they were blamed to cooperate with the RPP, the TWP and National Council Members.

Honorable delegates,

The reason we have included in our report the incident caused by 26 deputies so much is based on the fact that those people we as the Justice Party organizations have helped to be elected as deputy with good will, sincerity and great effort also take part in any kind of unjust and unsupported allegations we have underwent as the Justice Party government (Adalet Partisi V. Büyük Kongresi Raporlar 1970: 58).<sup>12</sup>

The point we have focused on since the very beginning is the continuance of the Justice Party Government. We have studied and worked on the precautions for this. In the end, the efforts of 26 deputies who stood by those not desiring to submit to the people's will have come to nothing as well without any fruit they expected (Adalet Partisi V. Büyük Kongresi Raporlar 1970: 59).<sup>13</sup>

They also accused 72's group of not fulfilling their duty in the election campaign and not working for the party, but for themselves only (Adalet Partisi V. Büyük Kongresi Raporlar 1970: 65).

The JP in its reports claimed that the JP members (after the dismissals) did not discuss the individuals; rather they depended on the issues and concepts. They accused the dissident group because of showing disrespect for the elections within the party. They explained that the dissident group did not follow the laws of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Halbuki Sayın Demirel'in dışında, kurulacak bir AP Hükümeti iktidarımızın en güçlü devreye geçmesini sağlayacaktır. Bu kadar açık ve milli menfaatler için zaruri bir durum varken Sayın Demirel'in ısrarını parti şuuruna ve memleketin selametine uygun bulmak imkanı mevcut değildir.

<sup>12</sup> Aziz delegeler,

Raporumuzda, 26 milletvekilinin sebep olduğu hadiseye bu kadar yer verişimizin nedeni, Adalet Partisi iktidarı olarak uğradığımız her türlü haksız ve mesnetsiz ithamlara Adalet Partisi teşkilatının iyi niyet, samimiyet ve büyük gayret sarfederek milletvekili seçtiği kimselerinde katılmasından duyduğumuz üzüntüye dayanır.

<sup>13</sup> Bizim, başından beri üzerinde ehemmiyetle durduğumuz mesele, Adalet Partisi İktidarının devamı olmuştur. Bunun tedbirleri üzerinde durmuş ve çalışmışızdır. Neticede millet iradesine boyun eğmek istemeyenlerin yanında yer alan 26 milletvekilinin gayretleri de boşa çıkmıştır.

Party Charter; rather they traduced the JP; but by doing this they in fact degraded themselves (AP Politikasında Genel Görüşler 1969: 9-10-11). They warned that dividing the Justice Party which was a mass party would not be beneficial for the country (AP Politikasında Genel Görüşler 1969: 29).

Demirel explained that just after the 1969 Elections and the government's establishment, the dissident group members became discontent and accused them of being at the side of the opponent parties:

There are revolutionaries, Marxists, supporters of absolute rule and waiting for theocratic state. We are standing here against them. Where should those attempting to damage to their own parties be? With whom are they, and why? After a 25-year fight with the RPP, now that they are with this party, then who has been proven right here considering that it did not change its opinions? Which motive justifies a person in damaging one's own party? Is not a pity for all these good efforts? The formula of those who consider any and every method and tool fair to destruct the government is clear. They have applied the same procedures in the 1960 - 1970 period as well in the same way they did in the 1950 - 1960 period (Adalet Partisi Genel Başkanı ve Başbakan Süleyman Demirel'in A.P. Beşinci Büyük Kongresini Açış Konuşması 1970: 17).<sup>14</sup>

Demirel analyzed that the factions which reached to their peak after 1969 elections, had its roots before. According to Demirel, there was a coalition within the party, which should not be maintained for the sake of party. The opponent group would like to take control of the party or there would be "a two headed monster"; Demirel thought that the JP should have one leader and others should be respectful towards the elected one (Adalet Partisi Genel Başkanı ve Başbakan Süleyman Demirel'in A.P. Beşinci Büyük Kongresini Açış Konuşması 1970: 18).

Aydın Yalçın, MP of the JP, was anxious about the JP's losing parliamentary majority after some MPs left or were dismissed from the party. He accused both groups in conflict, Yeminliler and Extremists. According to him, Demirel should have collaborated and lead to a more harmonious party; at the same time the

---

<sup>14</sup> Düzen değiştiriciler, Marksistler, diktacılar, teokratik devlet özlemcileri her türlü kışkırtmayı ve bölücülüğü kendilerine meslek edinmiş olanlar vardır. Biz, bunların karşısındayız. Kendi partilerini zedelemeye kalkanların yeri neresidir? Kiminle beraber oldular, niçin?

25 sene C.H.P. ile mücadele ettikten sonra, şimdi onunla beraber olmak, o fikrini değiştirmediklerine göre kimi haklı çıkarır? Hangi sebep kimi kendi Partisini zedelemekte haklı çıkarır? Bunca gayretlere yazık değil mi? İktidarı tahrip için her vasıtayı mubah görenlerin formülü bellidir. 1950- 1960 devresinde hangi usullere müracaat edilmiş ise, 1960- 1970 devresinde de aynı usullere müracaat edilmiştir.

dissident group should not have acted contrary to the Party Charter and should not have struggled with the Party leader. He claimed that some young and not Extremist MPs were also dismissed from the party because of Demirel's attitude (Adalet Partisi V. Büyük Kongresi Raporlar 1970: 78 Prof. Aydın Yalçın Ankara Milletvekili).

Celal Bayar resented Demirel as party that was founded on the value of "bringing justice" for the old Democrats and as "a defender of democracy"; became a party of authoritarian regime under him" (Demokratik Parti Eyüp İlçesi 1. Kongre Faaliyet Raporu 1971) as a result of Demirel's supporters' (within the Justice Party) evasive behaviours. For this reason, he supported the DticP which was established on 18 December 1970<sup>15</sup> (Harris 2008: 65). Bayar supported this group led by Sadettin Bilgiç, Mehmet Turgut, Ferruh Bozbeyleli for acquiring the amnesty rights for ex-DP members (Demirel 2004b: 58).

The DticP argued that Demirel remained passive regarding the return of the political rights of the former DP members and even tried to prevent this:

Managers of the dark days, idealists were expelled from the Justice Party which was founded with the desire of citizens upon sufferings and tears and has become the Largest party in Turkey. He could not keep the trust taken from the nation and overthrew in the country in which anarchy increased (Demokratik Parti Eyüp İlçesi 1. Kongre Faaliyet Raporu 1971: 18-19).<sup>16</sup>

The DticP also claimed that the JP did not give importance to the spiritual development by reducing the development to factory, dam, electricity, water and roads. The Extremists within the JP were criticizing Demirel's attitude about politics for underestimating development as only economical development; not spiritual development (Demirel 2004b: 55).

Society is a whole with its material and spiritual and moral values. The power and belief brought by the spiritual values are one of the most important components of the material development.

Thus, we are of the opinion that attaching importance to spiritual and moral values and capabilities and ensuring the moral improvement based on science

---

<sup>15</sup> In general, defining events and the conjuncture has been analyzed by Feroz Ahmad ve Bedia Turgay Ahmad in Türkiye'de çok partili politikanın açıklamalı kronolojisi (1945-1971), 1976, Bilgi Yayınları, Ankara.

<sup>16</sup> Göz yaşları ve ızdıraplar üzerine vatandaşın arzusu ile kurulan ve Türkiye'nin en Büyük partisi haline gel(di). Sonra da karanlık günlerin idareciler, idealistler... partiden ihraç olunuyor. Memlekette anarşi almış yürümüş, ...Milletten aldığı emaneti tutmayışı ve iktidardan düşüşü.

and education are requirements of Democracy, which is a regime of virtue, and one of the ways towards collective development (Demokratik Parti Programı: 19).<sup>17</sup>

Moreover, they believed that the JP did not react enough against May 27 Front and leftist/socialist movements which became evident particularly from the mids of 60s (Demirel 2004b: 56). In fact, there was not a clear distinction between two groups within the Justice Party in this sense. The 72s criticized Demirel's passifying; however Demirel succeeded in theorizing the "nationalist" or "rightist" in Turkey. Hitherto, Demirel did not use the word rightist; as it had the risk of meaning having connections with America. Instead, Demirel used the word "nationalist" to define right wing. Instead of the class fragmentation within the right, rightism was attributed a political, relatively militant, relatively rigid, –of course again defined as being opposed to the left in fact-, "upper identity" for the first time in that period. The architecture of this rightism was Demirel between the years of 1971-1980 (Bora 2009b: 506). Bozbeyli (1976: 48) also actively embraced the rightism that was the mixture of different ideologies:

What is right? Right partnership is the strength and movement of service. Right partnership is a service power and movement to be established in order to protect and preserve the unity, nationality, religion, conscience; political, social, economic rights and freedom of the nation against the imperialist and aggressor communism.<sup>18</sup>

The dissident JP faction that represented an outburst of ideological difference according to Tachau & D. Good (1973: 572), was formed by ex-Cabinet members, ex-Interior Minister and ex- Head of the Parliament (Meclis Başkanı). This group which was strong in provincial organizations, was thought to be a more polarized ideological group that differs from the ideology of the JP. They rejected the Darwinian theory of evolution because of its improperness according to the Koran and concrete opposition to any kind of socialism, communism or minorities or their control in Turkish economy. Tachau finds this group as not-reflecting the ideology

---

<sup>17</sup> Toplum maddi ve manevi değerleriyle bir bütündür. Manevi değerlerin ortaya koyduğu güç ve inanç, maddi kalkınmanın en önemli unsurlarından biridir.

Bu sebeple manevi değer ve kabiliyetlere önem vermeyi, ilme ve eğitime dayalı manevi kalkınmayı sağlamayı fazilet rejimi olan Demokrasinin icabı ve topyekun kalkınmamızın başlıca yollarından biri olarak görüyoruz.

<sup>18</sup> Sağ nedir? Sağ ortaklık bir hizmet gücü ve hareketidir. Sağ ortaklık emperyalist ve mütecaviz komünizm karşısında milletin bütünlüğünü, milliyetçiliğini, dinini, vicdanını, siyasi sosyal, ekonomik hak ve hürriyetlerini korumak amacıyla kurulacak bir hizmet gücü ve hareketidir.

of the JP as they were intolerant towards nationalist and religious ideas which expected to polarize Turkish politics more.

Turan (1988: 65) considers the intra-party and inter-party instability of political parties in Turkey as the result of absence of intra-party democracy and also the dependence of Turkish political life on clientelistic networks. As party politics were seen as an access channel to public resources, disputes within the party arose when the resources were not allocated “justly”. If this “injustice” occurred, rebellions and leave-outs from the party seemed unavoidable. Not only intra-party conflicts but also inter-party exchanges might have this cause.

The DticP is claimed to represent the small and middle class –petty bourgeoisie- and provincial culture against the JP’s metropolitan big bourgeoisie (Turan 1988: 87). The DticP is seen as a conservative offshoot headed by formerly prominent Justice Party leaders (Özbudun & Tachau 1975: 460).

At the beginning of 1960s, ex-DP members and the ones who were active in politics before 1960 stayed away from politics or at least could not take direct control of the JP. As the party had considerably high electoral success and the tense atmosphere became less visible, the newcomers of the party who took part in politics after 1961, and the locally strong ‘old ones’ had a feud. This struggle continued not only at the General Administrative Committee, but also around nominating candidates at provinces (Szyliowicz 1966: 482).

Hyland (1970: 5) argues that the Extremists tried to persuade Demirel to abuse the 1965 election victory for revenge against the junta. Demirel together with his Moderate group curtailed the activities of intra-party opponent. In this way, Demirel achieved to rule civil politics and help the maintenance of civil politics until 1971 Memorandum.

Still during the break up process, Demirel did not accept that the JP excluded craftsmen and artisans with its economic policies (Demirel 2004b: 59). In the period of late 1960s, provincial and small bourgeoisie were neglected because of the need of the big bourgeoisie to gain the international markets and to monopolize. As the

economic allocations could not be satisfactory for different classes, Demirel facilitated the process, at the expense of losing petty bourgeoisie votes and splits from the party like the DticP. In ideological sense, Demirel tried to enlarge the discourses for these classes and reunion them under the “Sağcılık” which positioned itself against left wing (Bora 2009b: 506).

The JP or the DticP leadership would not define the separation as an interest representation of struggling classes. However, after the split of the DticP, the JP realized the representation of the big bourgeoisie. The decision of tax reform and devaluation that would favor the industrialists was put into practice. The devaluation which eased the flow of the currencies of the Turkish workers in Europe and abroad into Turkey facilitated the imported inputs for production and investment (Çavdar 1983b: 2094).

#### **2.4. Establishment of the Democratic Party and 70s**

The dissident group declared their plan to establish a new party on September 5, 1970. They explained that they had made visits around the country to estimate the views for a new party. According to them, the mass analyzed the Justice Party went far away from the missions of it and the real Cadre of it. It demonstrated the Justice Party could not be a solution to their problems.

We, as people who have acted in accordance with the tendencies of the national conscience, and believed in the ruling of the country in line with the common desire and will of the public so far, take the opinions of our people into account. In this respect, we are currently working on preparations to establish a party that has the aim of enhancing and improving the right and honor of freedomist person whose goal if the overall peace in the country in a nationalist, spiritualist and moralist social justice that will have a major role in deepening the roots of the parliamentary order.

Once the by-laws and program of our party has been officialized, it will be declared to the public opinion (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 57).<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Bizler bugüne kadar milli şuurun temayülleri istikametinde hareket etmiş, memleketin, halkın ortak arzusu istikametinde yönetilmesi gerekliliğine inanmış kimseler olarak, vatandaşlarımızın görüşlerini değerlendirmekteyiz. Bu bakımdan parlamenter nizamın kökleşmesinde ağırlığı bulunacak milliyetçi, maneviyatçı, sosyal adalet içinde milli huzuru gaye edinen hürriyetçi insan hak ve haysiyetini yüceltmek amacını taşıyan bir partinin kuruluş hazırlıkları içindeyiz. Partimizin tüzük ve programı resmi hüviyete büründükten sonra efkarı umumiyyeye açıklanacaktır.

On October 18, 1970, Faruk Sükan criticized the new economic plan of the JP because it was improper to the Party Charter and philosophy of the party and it would increase the taxes which would deteriorate the mass' economical conditions (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 62).

Ferruh Bozbeyli who resigned from the Chairman of the Assembly on October 19, 1970, declared that the Fifth Grand Congress of the JP was "Demirel's Congress". He supported his idea by announcing that the badge given in the Congress has "Demirel" written on it that explained why it was a "Demirel's Congress" (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 66). He rejected the criticism that they opposed Demirel because they were not given seats in his new government and explained that it was due to the divergence of the ideas about the party. He resigned from the JP in November 13, 1970. He declared that Demirel was assigned to the Chairmanship of the JP because of his membership of Masonic Lodge and the partnership of American firm (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 78).

On December 18, 1970, the Democratic Party was established with sixty-nine founders under the leadership of Ferruh Bozbeyli and Yüksel Menderes and Sadettin Bilgiç as vice presidents.

While the DticP was established, the JP decided to reform the pre-election laws within the party. They also declared that they were attacked in local units:

...Those persons who put themselves in for duty at the closing of the 1970 congress, but not approved by our delegation, who argued that they were members of the party on that day, not only busted our District Clubhouse on 18.10.1970, destructing and disposing some documents, but also tore apart the portrait, hanging on the wall, of SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL, then Prime Minister, and our Chairperson, and spilled out their so-called grudge and hatred by writing on the portrait (YOUR DEATH IS IN MY HANDS) by means of certain nefarious means they encouraged with the greed and fuss resulting from their loss of the Convention and seats....

The most distinguished Delegates:

In performing our administrative works, we as the Board has fully observed, Law on Political Parties No. 648, and the Party by-laws and regulations, done our best to discourage lionizing the AGENCY opened in Bakirköy by those fond of RED Votes with an effort to resume their ruling, and numerous concessions and compromises have been granted in the light of the proverb (DON'T LET IT OUT OF THIS ROOM).

In the 1970 Convention, those who were saying on this rostrum ‘WE ARE the founding stones of JUSTICE PARTY, everybody can resign, but we never do’ unfortunately revealed once more their character and moral quality by submitting their resignation one day after the 12 MARCH Coup D’état in those days of crisis and calamities of our Country. Likewise, regrettably they not only resigned, but also joined the Agency we just mentioned, and this way, believed that you would be able to break apart the Justice Party. However, the honorable noble members of our organization did not trust in their lies and manipulations, did not leave the Party sticking by their common sense. We are the board extend my gratitude and appreciation to all the members of our organization (AP Bakırköy 6. Kongresi 1972: 10-11).<sup>20</sup>

The DticP founders explained that they tried every way possible for the betterment of the JP; but the Chairman of the party did not listen to them. So they established the DticP:

The idea of establishing a new party developed because of giving up hope of the fact that the Justice Party would be on the true path.

The representatives of 1946 spirit, a golden page in the history of Turkish democracy, founded the DEMOCRATIC Party and Children of the ever-living names in the heart of this nation have gathered in order to add works to their works on the course of serving for the country. The remaining from now on is vested within the effort and favor of our glorious nation having a good head, of which we are sure, they will not withhold” (Demokratik Parti Eyüp İlçesi 1. Kongre Faaliyet Raporu 1971).<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> ...1970 kongresinin hitamında vazifeye talip olup delegasyonumuz tarafından tasvip edilmeyen o gün için partili olduklarını iddia edenler, Kongreyi ve koltuğu kaybetmenin hırs ve telaşı içerisinde teşvik ettikleri bazı menfur eller vasıtasıyla 18.10.1970 tarihinde İlçe Lokalimizi basıp içerdeki bütün eşyaları tahrip, bazı evrakları yok etmekle de kalmayıp, O zamanın Başbakanı ve genel Başkanımız SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL'in duvarda asılı bulunan portresini parçalayıp üzerinede (ÖLÜMÜN BENİM ELİMDE ibaresini yazmak suretiyle güya kin ve nefretlerini kusmuşlardır...

Çok muhterem Delege Arkadaşlarımız:

idari çalışmalarımız, yürütürken, Kurul olarak 648 sayılı, Siyasi partiler kanununa, Parti tüzük ve yönetmeliklerine tamamen riayet edilmiş olup, Bakırköy de KIRMIZI Oycuların saltanatı sürdürebilmek çabası ile açmış buldukları ACENTELİĞE rağbet gösterilmemesi yönünde elimizden gelen bütün gayretler sarf edilmiş, (KOL KIRILIR YEN İÇİNDE KALIR) Vecizesine uyarak birçok tavizler verilmiştir.

1970 Kongresinde, Bu kürsüden, Bizler ADALET PARTİSİNİN temel taşlarıyız herkes istifa edebilir fakat biz asla diyenler ne yazıkki Memleketimizin badireli günlerinde 12 MART Muhterasının verildiği günden bir gün sonra istifalarını göndermek suretiyle karakter ve seciyelerini bir kerre daha ortaya koymuş oldular. ve gene ne yazıkki sadece istifa etmekle kalmayıp biraz evvel bahsetmiş olduğumuz Acenteliğe girmek suretiyle güya ADALEAT PARTİSİ ni parçalayacaklarına inandılar. Fakat teşkilatımızın çok muhterem asil üyeleri onların yalan ve tezvirlerine inanmadı, sağ duyularını kullanarak Parti bünyesinden ayrıldılar. Huzurlarınızda bütün teşkilat arkadaşlarımıza kurul olarak minnet ve şükranlarımızı arz ederiz.

<sup>21</sup> Adalet Partisi'nin doğru yola geleceğinden ümit kesildiğinden ümit kesildiği için yeni bir parti kurma fikri olgunlaşmıştır.

Türk demokrasi tarihinde altın sayfa olan 1946 ruhunun temsilcileri yine DEMOKRATİK partiyi kurmuşlar ve Milletın Kalbindeki ölmez İsimlerin Evlatları, Vatan hizmeti yolunda onların eserlerine eser katmak üzere bir araya gelmişlerdi. Bundan sonrası sağduyu sahibi aziz milletimizin göstereceğine emin olduğumuz gayret ve teveccühüne kalmıştır.”

From 1965 general elections to 1971 Memorandum, the JP governed as a single party. This absolute majority in the parliament transformed to fragmentation in 1973 and 1977 general elections which made it arithmetically impossible for any big party to rule alone (Tachau 2000: 135). Despite becoming the first party for the first time in history via competitive elections in 1977, the Republican People's Party could not form a government and as all the other parties were in collaboration against the RPP, this resulted in National Front Governments.

In mid-seventies, Turkish society experienced dramatic changes such as the increasing migration to big cities and crisis of import substitution industrialization (ISI) strategy. Clashes between left and right wing students increased. The fragmentation between right wing and polarization of the left and the right wings destroyed the possibility of two main parties to form government. As the RPP had close connections with labor activities and socialist groups, the JP encapsulated the polarized right wing terror as the NMP was the unchanging coalition partner in NF Governments. The relations of patronage which enabled electorally weak parties (1975 government: the NMP- 3 MPs, 1977 government: the NMP-16 MPs, the NSP- 24 MPs) to have more power, also locked the system (Demirel 2003b: 257-8).

The JP's naming its coalitions in which it performed as the grand partner, "The National Front" (MC, Milliyetçi Cephe) came from the fact of the central theme of the right wing ideology during the period of anti-communism (Tachau 2000: 136). The RPP elaborated a left-wing stand that was at the time purporting to be more left than it really was which curtailed the grand parties, the RPP and the JP to form a coalition.

The party system of 1970s was different from the two-party system of 1960s, that it became a multiparty system which critically was experienced only at that period at that extent. The ideological representation became main aim for all parties as the ideologies gained sufficient importance. According to Turan (1988: 66), the likert scale of the politics of the period forced the parties to broaden the distances between their wing and opposite wing, and also within the same wing. So, he claimed that the parties persuaded the voters not to change their selection of parties which would be psychologically hard and to maintain their attitudes towards political parties.

The elections resulted in the coalition governments where decision making processes could not be balanced. As two/more polarized parties formed the government and the parties tried to show their clear tendencies to the issues, the policies could not be handled in the government.

The radical left did not perform well in elections even though it was popular among students, workers who participated and organized meetings, marches, strikes. The NSP and the Nationalist Movement Party composed of ideological stand on ethnicity and religion got enough votes to get part in coalition governments because of the fragmentation of the votes. So, the JP and the RPP which did not experience such political atmosphere in 1960s, forced to move against the center and tried to capture the voter base of smaller parties (Turan 1988: 68).

The failure of any of the two main parties to gain majority in elections to form single-party government in 1970s, encouraged splinter parties to have bargaining powers against the major parties. The rivalry between two major parties led parties and also Members of Parliament to fluctuate their party position which directly affected the governments. So, party politics focused on the maintenance of the governments rather than the policy making (Harris 1988: 191-2).

However, their length of time in the government was also crucial as far clientelistic relations of the government partners which prepared the parties for the next elections. Public resources allocation made policy politics inevitable and immobilized the governments. In order to maximize their support, each party attempted to enlarge its own clientelistic networks (Turan 1988: 67). “Civil society”, labor organizations, occupational, voluntary associations were within the battle of the parties as parties had to have organizational ideological support. The 1961 Constitution especially after 1971 Memorandum, had tremendous effect of enlarging the political spectrum to the society as well.

Unlike 1969 and 1977 elections, the 1973 elections was the peak for the fragmentation of the right wing in Turkey. The JP got 29.82 percent of the votes, while the DticP and the NSP obtained nearly 12 percent of the popular vote. Despite

its weak electoral support of 3.38 percent and number of MP as three, the NMP became one of the most important parties as far as it was strictly hierarchical and its militant anti-communism and polarized nationalism showed its power in the streets with paramilitary type youth organizations (Özbudun 1988: 21).

In 1973 the JP lost its votes to the smaller parties that split from it. With this, the NMP, the NSP and the DticP gained bargaining power for the coalition governments. This trend also weakened the decision making power of the main parties. 1977 Elections did not end this fragmented political structure; but the JP and the RPP had less loss than the 1973 elections (Turan 1988: 86). Keyder (1979: 35) claims that the DticP represented the agrarian capitalists while the NSP tried to outburst their discontent with economic policies favoring big bourgeoisie, into Islamic revivalism.

#### **2.4.1. Elections and the Democratic Party**

The Democratic Party won of 11.9 percent and 45 chairs in the Parliamentary elections. But the DticP could only get 3.1 percent in the elections of Senate replacement in 1975 and the number of MPs fell to 23 chairs (The General Directorate 1975: 83). With this disintegration in 1973 elections, the Republican People's Party came first by taking votes at the rate of 33.3 percent.

1975 elections in which the DticP could not get senatorship, gave clue that Turkey would turn back to two-party system and push small parties out of system. In this direction, a tendency contrary to the DticP developed in the General Elections of 1977 and it could take only 1.9 % of votes (Dodd 1990: 19). According to Bektaş (1993: 36), the DticP polled from the places where agricultural units which were producing for the dominant markets and the large land ownership were existing instead of large capitalists of the period. In a sense, this was a result of the rural reaction given to industrialist and large capitalists of the Justice Party. Some of the groups who supported the NSP, the RPP and the DticP in the elections of 1973 switched to the Justice Party in 1977 elections. Obtaining the support of the former Democrats was critical as the drastic decrease of votes in 1977 election explained

that there were common characteristics with the part supporting the DticP in 1973 elections and the JP in general.

It was observed that the DticP and the JP could be successful in developed cities. Free market speculations, agricultural bourgeoisie, over-taxing, capital heading for real estate and base prices of 1971 removed votes from the JP. The RPP could only collect the potential vote with economically deprived people (Yücekök 1983: 145).

According to the research made by Raşit Gökçeli and İlhan Tekeli (1976: 553), in 1973 elections, the DticP got less votes than the NSP in the election regions with populations more than 120,000 but it got more votes than the NSP in the countryside which could be regarded as the main voter base for both parties. The DticP got the highest vote from settlements with a population of 60,000- 70,000. It was observed that small parties shared the votes in the settlements with a less population and the DticP shared its votes with the Nationalist Movement Party in under-populated regions. When we came to 1975 elections, the loss of votes was experienced in the countryside rather than small cities. While total loss of votes of the DticP and the NSP was calculated as 15 percent in the settlements with a population of 120,000 to 250,000, decrease in the JP's votes by 9 percent in these constituencies was explained that in rest of the votes flowed to the RPP.

Along with the Nationalist Movement Party's and the NSP's coming into existence as a different power, the masses who tended to vote for the JP started to vote for these parties and these parties got votes at a considerable extent in the South and East Anatolia Region. The same applies to the DticP. Although this party took votes from the JP in the mentioned regions, it was wiped up in the general elections of 1977 and most of the votes taken by this party returned to the JP (Demirel 2004b: 89).

## CHAPTER III

### THE ACTUAL POLITICS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

#### 3.1. Politics in 1970s

1970s witnessed the social growth and emergence of new classes as a result of the economic growth. Nevertheless, the Turkish left which got stronger and politically more organized with the relatively free constitutional environment of 1960s, forced rightist parties to define conservative elements more clearly as in the NSP. The Democratic Party was founded in this polarisation period. Demirel drew the line of fundamental distinction of policy-making between leftism and rightism in the country in 1970s. Demirel's discourse opposing the left maybe first of all aimed to rehabilitate the power of the Justice Party by creating a hegemonic political antagonism in the right-wing, which had been disintegrated by the establishment of the DticP, the Nationalist Movement Party (NMP) and the NSP as well as perceiving it as a serious threat directed to the regime (Bora 2005b: 564). The JP moved further to the right and joined forces whenever necessary with the rightist NSP and NMP (Karpat 1982: 375).

According to Sencer (1971: 375), although there was a serious fraction in the Justice Party and need for another party to represent the mass, the NSP would not be an alternative because peasantism point of view, indifference to agricultural bourgeoisie and discordance of religious point of view with the big bourgeoisie prevented this. The group of Bilgiç which was formed to be an alternative to the JP tried to distinguish the ideology of the party, also from the NSP.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Anayasa Mahkemesi, 20 Mayıs 1971'de, partinin "laik devlet niteliğinin ve Atatürk devrimciliğinin korunması prensiplerine aykırı olduğu" gerekçesiyle kapatılmasına karar verdi.

It appeared that conservatism did not have any problem with the state except the threat of communism and the Constitution of 61. It got rid of this problem with the Memorandum of 71 and constitutional amendments –there was even a brochure related to constitutional amendment- and policies which made centre-right relieved, were applied with the Memorandum of 1971. Nationalist-conservative mentality holified the State in Turkey as its most fundamental container of rational and ethical construction process (Taşkın 2007: 58). Consequently, the image of the Democrat Party which was “threat to the State” in 1960s was destroyed when it came to 1970s. In this sense, the Memorandum of 1971 made it possible for nationalist-conservative mentality to continue in their discourses of survival of the state. Culturalist nationalisms had to develop state-centred strategies to be able to institutionalize their own ideals. Legalizing discourse with the claim of elements distorting the social order, state-sponsored culture policies would be active instead of cultural lag and attack. Nationalist-conservative finge (bakiye) which criminalized the rising left as follower of Moscow rendered the Americanist discourse in it (Taşkın 2007: 68). In 1970s, not only the NSP but also the JP changed into an identity movement which put forth nationalism against communism and this also helped to create opportunities to ally with the army against the left wing (Demirel 2005c: 257).

When Erbakan first made an appearance on the political stage, the Justice Party was taking the support of Nakşibendiler, Nur Cemaati, Süleymancılar, Kadiriler and other religious societies. As Sadettin Bilgiç could not take a seat in the cabinet established after the 1969 elections, conservative circles environments moved to the DticP which was newly established and to Erbakan who founded the National Order Party and gained power in Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (Özdalga 2008: 146). In fact names such as Sadettin Bilgiç and Mehmet Turgut revealed that they represented conservative part with their comments like “secularism does not mean atheism” and emphasis on religious education (Geyikdağı 1984: 98). The DticP should form an entity of ideology which could establish itself and transfer to the masses at the conservative axis. For this reason, it made its conservative stand sharper in contradiction to the colourlessness of the JP which was mentioned by nationalist intelligentsia. For this, they took the risk of showdown with secularism principle of Kemalist ideology and re-defining it by dearticulation.

The DticP tried to solve the dilemma of secularism by satisfying the public with populist policies and protecting public from “Private firms that make resource to illicit methods for excessive profit and acting with profit ambition over normal limits” (Bozbeyli 1976: 69) and from excessive wealth of centre right which can appeal to public’s world view and balancing the civilization concept with development (Sayın 1997: 34).

In addition, Taşkın (2007: 90) thinks that the emergence of center-right’s support for big bourgeoisie with the breaking of alliance of different financial segments that center-right had difficulty in maintaining; directed nationalist conservative intellectuals to speak to the secondary parts.

Özbudun and Tachau (1975: 478) analyze that at crisis times of politics, major parties struggled over the limits of the policies; but not about the policies. The parties in Turkish political life during 1970s mentioned their political polarizations and distanced themselves from each other. The JP’s exploitation of the fright about the labor unions that they would treat the authority and lead to a class war increased the dilemma between the party, business, military leaders and the Unions that believed to have the power to direct the democratic regime (Bianchi 1984: 213)

The urban oriented preference of the JP directed its provincial votes to the DticP and the NSP. Before, in 1960s and 1950s, the politics was mainly dominated by one party that was either the DP or the JP (Özbudun & Tachau 1975: 478-9). When Erbakan was the Head of the TOB (The Union of Chambers), based on his rejection from the JP; he proposed to end the alliance of TOB with the JP (Bianchi 1984: 255). Erbakan’s attacks on “Masons, Jews, and unbelievers” attracted the artisans and craftsmen in the provinces which were unsatisfied by the new policies of the JP. However, Demirel did not compromise with Erbakan; instead decreased the role of TOB and transferred it to the Ministry of Trade (Bianchi 1984: 256).

The two major parties were also emphasizing on their ideological stand point; also new ideological minor parties were established that were the Nationalist Movement Party and the NSP. While the JP showed clear tendencies of anti-communism; the RPP declared their policies of changing the corrupt order. Both the major party

leaders were stubborn not to have a coalition together which marked the period despite their combined popular vote of 89 percent (Tachau 2000: 136). Çarkoğlu (1998: 557) thinks that the JP was even more polarized than the NMP which was one of the most polarized parties at the end of the 1970s. The Justice Party tried to show its sharp nationalist tendency while the NMP targeted the moderate right wing voter base of the JP with the statist economic policy.

Tachau (2000: 138) thinks that the 1970s led the traditional parties to deny their traditions in the sense that the RPP transformed from a status quo lenient party to a social protest one; while the JP and the DTCİP as a periphery party desired status quo. Polarization in the streets increased to the point of assassination of political figures, Members of Parliament, professors, even ex-Prime Minister.

The 1970s witnessed the short lived, ideologically struggling coalitions that could not cope with increasing political violence and unsuccessful policies (Özbudun 2000: 74). The insufficiency of the seats of the parties in the Parliament decreased the solution making ability of the Parliament but increased the risk of blocking each other's acts. Not only the opposition parties but also the coalition partners would even interrupt the order of the government that the mutual distrust and activating partisanship in the bureaucracy within limited timed coalition governments consumed much energy and time than the policies (Tachau & Heper 1983: 31). Antisystem parties that were ideologically polarized the NSP and the NMP into the coalitions locked the political system in terms of their overvalued emphasis in the politics and their partisanship within the cadres. The politics of the period was so deadlocked that radical left groups –almost fifty- and the “Idealist Hearths” that were linked to the NMP could not be controlled through the martial law regimes which suggested a Military Intervention to limit the civil liberties (Özbudun 1995: 236).

The populist economic policies of Demirel in 1970s led to economic crisis that the cheap loans and the reluctance of the business's dependence to ISI and no export frustrated the economic system. The economic inability of the governments was curtailed by making compromises socially and economically (Arat 2008: 104). The isolation of Turkey after Cyprus issue and the US embargo in 1975 deteriorated the economy even further which reached its peak in 1980. Moreover, OPEC oil price

shocks, the inevitability to import oil, stagnation of economy, rising strikes, unemployment and lack of basic consumer goods symbolized the economic condition of Turkey between the years of 1970 and 1980 (Ismael 2001: 160). The social change in 1970s was triggered by the internal factors like import substitution industrialization (ISI) strategy and migration as well as international factors like the attitude of US for tending to protect the integrity of Turkey. The RPP accused the JP for protecting violent acts of fascists and the JP accused the RPP for its communist tendencies (Demirel 2003b: 257).

Both Ecevit and Demirel tried to consolidate their respective political camps despite polarization. For this, Demirel supported the limitation of the fundamental rights/liberties; Ecevit flirted with radical left wing groups (Heper 2008: 269). Ecevit also tried to hold the political power of the Unions in terms of intervening in the election of Head of the Unions (Bianchi 1984: 214). It must also be remembered that the 1970's relatively free constitutional environment helped to facilitate the democracy in terms of ideologies whether represented in the parliament like the NMP or not represented like extreme left that was supported by some groups of workers, teachers, students (Özbudun 2000: 79). The right wing factionalization was triggered by political independence and big industrialists' rising power and unionism helped the left to enlarge its political spectrum (Bianchi 1984: 211).

Ecevit only offered to form coalition with Demirel after being unable to form a government. In 1978, when Ecevit's government failed to receive vote of confidence, Ecevit proposed the alternatives for the RPP-JP government that are led by the RPP leader, the JP leader or an independent (Özbudun 2000:39). Demirel declared; "such a coalition is against the nature of the things".

Until 14 October 1979, it was said that there was a possibility of saving the country from the military intervention if the two main parties have had formed a coalition; but Demirel rejected that it would be inevitable if the military decided to change the Constitution and take over the government and sweep the cadres (Özbudun 2000:40).

Tolerance for political opposition increased despite the participation of radical right wing parties in the parliament. However, radical rightist parties' coalition

partnership increased the polarization in the streets and so the assassinations increased to incredible numbers (Kalaycıođlu 2001: 55).

At the bureaucratic level, the system was locked up because of the partisanship within the public agencies even at the level of lower rank civil servants (Özbudun 1995: 237). Despite their low vote percentage, the NMP and the NSP had power in the parliament depending on the proportional representation which did not exclude any interest group to be represented (Özbudun 1995: 252). The shareholders of social system within Turkey did not want extremist or out of center parties in politics. Otherwise, the civil liberties were curtailed and the civil war would be prevented (Heper 1992:161). Meanwhile, military action was seen more legitimate in controlling ideological polarization in the streets than the police's by the public because the military was believed to be more immune to political influence in the 1970s (Özbudun 1995: 252).

### **3.2. 1971 Memorandum**

On March 12, 1971, Turkey experienced another military intervention. The military sent a letter to the Prime Minister, Süleyman Demirel and asked for his resignation. The military declared that they would take control of the country unless anarchy, fratricidal strife, and social and economic unrest problems are solved.

The Democratic Party criticized Demirel that although he had declared that he would not act according to a Memorandum about before; he left the government with a Memorandum (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 158). Although the DticP also accepted that 12 March Memorandum was illegal; they claimed that, it was done to find a legal route (Demokratik Parti Birinci Büyük Kongresi Raporlar 1973: 25). After the resignation, post-Memorandum period witnessed technocrat governments. The 1971 regime did not forcefully implement the governments and their structures, as compared to other military regimes, the military left a larger arena for the civil rule. However, they did not hesitate to remind that the martial law would be used and warned that "real coup" was on the way unless effective rule was established (Harris 1988: 187).

The DticP defined that the reasons of the Martial Law that was imposed in April 26, 1971; should be discussed in detail; so the need for another Martial Law would not occur. It openly declared that the communists and their foreign links should be found out and punished (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 190). The 1971 Memorandum seemed to be “moderate” military rule that the military officers vetoed the civilian rule to modify it with some constitutional amendments. The alleged reasons for the Memorandum were increasing violence, political fragmentation, and ineffectiveness of the government (Tachau & Heper 1983: 23). The DticP justified the Martial Law that the events –like sabotage and terrorist movements and others that rock the public order and security of country- ended with the Memorandum (Sıkı Yönetim ve Demokratik Parti'nin Görüşü 1972: 5). The military in fact warned to maintain the social and political order that has the risks to change according to extremist ideology. The 1961 Constitution would be chopped off to achieve authority of the government. With the army's intervention, the bureaucratic elite became less powerful with the constitutional amendments and laws (Akarlı 1975: 151). The 1971 Coup was seen as the result of general lack of the order (Bianchi 1984: 204).

The 1971 Coup was analyzed to be the third try of democracy; but different than other Coup D'états that looked for the economic development and social peace. The Third Five Year Plan, according to these aspirations, induced less social justice and less satisfaction for distribution according to Bianchi (1984: 205). Martial Law helped the bourgeoisie to understand that Turkish society which with less democratic rights would be more easily governed. The “law and order” system would be satisfactory for the bourgeoisie; but they were themselves in conflict. Economic enlargement came to an end at the end of 1960s and big industrialists wanted to reach more to the limited resources. Chambers of small industrialists helped to control the resources and their share of the loans. The balance between the agriculture and industry could not be achieved any more and became one of the reasons for the establishment of the DticP. The ISI model was in crisis that could be seen from the industrial growth rate that fell from 12 percent (1965-9) to 1.5 percent in 1970 (Keyder 1979: 30-1).

Taşkın (2007: 130) claimed that although people like Bayar were victims of the coup d'état, they preferred authoritarian stands in the dichotomy of democracy-authoritarianism by supporting the Memorandum of 1971. Because while the DticP which was the continuation of the same movement perceived the coup d'état of 1960 as a threat, it informed that it owed

“a debt of gratitude to our Armed Forces which protect our national existence on March 12<sup>th</sup> by doing the thing which could not be done by an inefficient administration over against subversive activities conducted by international communism together with local partners against our integrity of nation and state” (N. Talu Hükümeti Programı hakkında Ferruh Bozbeyli'nin Millet Meclisinde Yaptığı Konuşma 1973: 29)<sup>23</sup>.

Not only 1971 Memorandum but also Martial Law was concretely supported by DticP. They legitimized their stand for Martial Law as it was against the ones who were against the national will.

The government has declared Martial Law in 11 provinces considering the extraordinary circumstances and conditions across the nation. The reason and justification of the martial law is provided as “emergence and occurrence of definite signs and indications referring that as observed for a long time in our country, the attitudes of the self-interested and manipulative circles and actions and behaviors of anarchical nature inclined to goals of let alone disturbing the public order and safety, yet primarily a strong and actual riot against the basic order of the state, homeland integrity, country and the secular Republic with their ideological purposes (Sıkıyönetim ve Demokratik Parti'nin Görüşü 1972: 3).<sup>24</sup>

They claimed that the main enemy of the Turkish regime and the Martial Law should be communist movements that Turkey should be a balance country between the blocs of the world (Sıkı Yönetim ve Demokratik Parti'nin Görüşü 1972: 6). They supported the extension of the Martial Law as they were against communist movements. So, they believed the fight that was serious, informative and legal based. They supported the activities of the military because the military resembled to be a part of the society which could not be separated from the spiritual and

---

<sup>23</sup> Beynelmillel komünizmin, kendine yerli ortaklarda bularak, devlet ve millet bütünlüğümüze karşı giriştiği yıkıcı faaliyetler ve bunlar karşısında, tesirsiz kalan bir yönetimin yapmadığını yaparak 12 Martta milli varlığımızı koruyan Silahlı Kuvvetlerimize şükran borcumuz vardır.

<sup>24</sup> Hükümet, memleketimizin içinde bulunduğu fevkalade hal ve şartları gözönünde bulundurarak, 11 ilimizde Sıkıyönetim ilan etmiştir. Örfi idarenin ilanına sebep ve gerekçe olarak da, “memleketimizde uzun süredenberi gözlemlenen çıkarıcı çevrelerin tutumu ile anarşi nitelikteki eylem ve davranışların sadece kamu düzeni ve güvenliğini bozucu amaçlara yönelmiş olmayıp, aslında ideolojik maksatlarla devletin temel nizamına, yurt bütünlüğüne, vatan ve laik Cumhuriyete karşı kuvvetli ve eylemli bir kalkışma mahiyetini aldığını gösterir kesin belirtilerin meydana çıkması” gösterilmektedir.

national society. The military frightened the ones who were against the “enemies of humanity” (Sıkı Yönetim ve Demokratik Parti’nin Görüşü 1972: 10).

Demirel who was the direct addressee of the Memorandum did not raise opposition against the Military, either. He, differently from the DticP tried to get the support of the masses as far as his government was put down because of the Memorandum. In fact, basic difference in the attitude towards 1960 coup d’état and 1971 Memorandum reflected the pragmatist view point of the DticP and the Justice Party. As long as the pressure was not on them or they were not affected by the military regime, it could still be the expression of national will. The JP was the candidate for 1971 Memorandum rule’s obedient officials that would establish the “law and order” rule with martial law and military courts to punish activism and activists of 1961 Constitution (Keyder 1979: 32). The military being the member of other camp, the Republican elites became the force against national will. After 1971 Memorandum, Demirel balanced the relations with the military unlike the period after 1960 Coup d’état. The military which had wanted to prevent the domination of the Democrat Party searched for “Strong Turkey” between 1970 and 1980, an idea that was shared by the JP and the DticP.

A big push for big industrialists was one of the aims of post-1971 regime that broke up the old political coalitions. So, different political and economic groups came into bargaining with more actors of military, technocrats and bureaucrats (Bianchi 1984: 206). The period after 1971 Memorandum witnessed the support of the big bourgeoisie that when cheap loans were granted to business at the expense of inflation, the strike and labor association rights limited which decreased the chances to oppose the decreasing wages, and base prices were decided in favor of industrial, not agricultural interests (Keyder 1979: 33).

The 1971 Memorandum was different from other coups in that it did not outlaw political parties or dissolve the Assembly; rather offered to form “supra-parliament” government to have more power on it to deal with Land Reform, political violence and more executive power (Özbudun 2000:24). Rising socialist movements and risk of unplanned non-hierarchical coup led the military for March 12 Memorandum (Demirel 2005c: 256). The 1971 Memorandum showed that the military could not

be depended as the “progressive and flag of the revolution” (Demirel 2005c: 256). The military also understood that the military taking action in politics deteriorated its position in public and its own standing (Demirel 2005c: 263).

Demirel in 1960s compromised with the military which was not willing to leave the civilian government alone. After 1960s, the military sought to have an identity that was anti-political so that it would be a solution to “over-ideological” atmosphere. According to Cizre Sakallıođlu (1997: 156), 1971 Memorandum was given as the result of general corruption of politics. Tanel Demirel (2004a: 127) found out a different analysis about the military interventions that the military-civil relations were reciprocal that were reproduced by the parts and the military did not trust the civilians for governing alone.

Demirel was uncomfortable to deal with the State officials; rather chose to capsule them under his rule (Akarlı 1975: 149). The liberal atmosphere of 1961 Constitution which led to the violence in streets, student and workers’ activism ended with the memorandum signed by the chief of the general staff and the three force commanders (Özbudun 2000: 33). The Constitutional amendments between 1971 and 1973 were collaboration with the Constitution thesis of the JP as for strengthening the executive power, curtailing civil liberties and increasing the autonomy of the military in social, economic and legal senses (Özbudun 2000: 74). The DticP thought that the situation after the Memorandum did not change; the mass was still desperate and in need (N. Talu Hükümeti Programı hakkında Ferruh Bozbeyli’nin Millet Meclisinde Yaptığı Konuşma 1973: 9). The DticP did not find the restrictions and post-Memorandum actions effective. They were just thankful that the secrecy of the anti-national organizations were revealed (N. Talu Hükümeti Programı hakkında Ferruh Bozbeyli’nin Millet Meclisinde Yaptığı Konuşma 1973: 22-23). The DticP claimed that they were the only party whose party program contained Constitutional change.

Bozbeyli declared that the most harmed one in 1971 Memorandum was the DticP because it was the establishment period of the party and the party organization (teşkilat) did not continue to work for the party as the civilian government was not certain to continue (Bozbeyli 2000: 105). Bozbeyli (2009: 336) explained that from

18 December 1970 to 12 March 1971, forty-two city branches were established, but they could not continue because of the Memorandum.

### **3.2.1. Constitutional Amendments Enacted After 1971**

For the Constitutional amendments, the Democratic Party proposed that the 19<sup>th</sup> article of the Constitution about “secularism” should be explained in detail. The 38<sup>th</sup> article of the Constitution about “tax value” in “nationalization” should be decreased to ten years from twenty years. The 47<sup>th</sup> article about “strike right” should be expanded to include the “lockout right”. The 56<sup>th</sup> article about the economic aid for political parties should be allocated in justice. 57<sup>th</sup> and 148<sup>th</sup> articles should be designed so that the Constitutional Court’s decision could not abolish the political parties through higher courts. The 60<sup>th</sup> article about military service should be modified to “bedel style” (paid). The DticP claimed that 63<sup>rd</sup> article should be changed and there would just be one Parliament. It argued that the 1961 Constitution did not trust the democracy and the nation.

So, it deconstructed the sovereignty to different bodies. The antagonism between different bodies resulted in chaos and dilemmas of 1971. The least duties were given to the National Assembly. Instead, the Constitutional Court, National Security Council, the Council of State, the Supreme Court, Turkish Court of Accounts and Turkish Radio and Television Institution had unlimited power and free from audit. The Democratic Party claimed that these state institutions were in conflict because there was no state authority. There could not be found any institution to maintain order within the Constitution; so an institution that was out of Constitution had to take control to save the national unity (Demokratik Parti İstanbul 1.İl Kongresi 1971: 50).

68<sup>th</sup> article about suffrage rights should be changed. 95<sup>th</sup> article which precluded the President to be elected by the Parliament, should be modified in order to let the President be elected by the public for once. The 102<sup>nd</sup> article about the Ministers should be restricted that not any out of Parliament Minister could be taken. For 147<sup>th</sup> article about the duties of the Constitutional Court, Constitutional Court’s duties should be explained and “Public Veto” and “Public Initiative” should be put into the Constitution.

They planned that the National Assembly would totally change the 1961 Constitution in one year time and go to elections (Demokratik Parti İstanbul 1.İl Kongresi 1971: 48). New constitution should be directed to protect the unity of the country and national values harmonic with balanced and democratic Turkey. In fact, they thought that “the inconsistencies about the Constitution were not about some articles; but about the soul of the Constitution” (Demokratik Parti İstanbul 1.İl Kongresi 1971: 48). They directly targeted to the foreword of the Constitution as it embraced May 27; instead of it, according to them there should be October 29, 1923 or April 23, 1920. The “National Liberation War” could be the root of all Constitutions of Turkey. The controversial issues such as Coup D’etat, Revolution should not be the founding points of a Constitution. The 1961 Constitution brought a system that did not trust the Nation (Demokratik Parti İstanbul 1.İl Kongresi 1971: 49). The flag of the Turkish Republic was celebrated as “glorious Turkish history has entrusted to Great Turkish nation as an integral part of it”, so it should not have any signs on it. Also, National Anthem of Turkish Republic is İstiklal Marşı should be added.

So, these should be included into the Constitution:

- a) The rights and liberties in the Constitution cannot be abolished; there is not such right to abolish rights.
- b) The conflict about language, religion, ethnicity or sect could not be provoked depending on the rights and liberties in the Constitution.
- c) The freedom of education would not exempt from the debt of loyalty to the Constitution (Demokratik Parti Birinci Büyük Kongresi Raporlar 1973: 35).

The President had to have the criterion of being a member of the Parliament at least once. Also, out of parliament Members could not establish a government unity (Demokratik Parti İstanbul 1.İl Kongresi 1971: 51). It is critical that they desired a Constitution that would help to get the peace within the country. But they thought that “Good Constitutions can be prepared by the nations, not intellectuals. Nations would better know and choose which one of wide and varied concepts of the science would be beneficial for them”<sup>25</sup> (Demokratik Parti İstanbul 1.İl Kongresi 1971: 54). They also asked for a National Constitution (D. P. Genel Merkezi (Eylül 1972). The DticP proposed the idea of equality of law to be placed between the freedom and the

---

<sup>25</sup> İyi Anayasaları alimler değil, milletler yapabilir. İlmin geniş ve çeşitli kavramlarından hangisinin kendisine yarayacağını; milletler daha iyi bilmekte ve seçmektedirler.

authority (Anayasa İslahatı ve Demokratik Parti 1973: 5); because they established a father-child relationship between the State and the citizen. It should not be confused that the term “citizen” used above; as the child was a member of the family; but not the writer of his fate or decision-maker, in a country of the DtıcP, the individual could be the chooser of the decision-maker; and nothing more. The State would love the child like the father of the nation; but this was not a promise for “the child” taking own control.

They clarified the equality before as the right to be elected for ex-Democrats (Anayasa İslahatı ve Demokratik Parti 1973: 6). They commended that “the right of resistance” was understood as “the right of rebellion” and so should be corrected. In the second article of the Constitution, one of the principles of the Republic as “Social State” should not be interpreted as “Socialist State”. Moreover, secularism which was defined in the 19<sup>th</sup> article of the Constitution should not acquire the meaning to “be against the religion” (Demokratik Parti 946 hareketinin mana ve felsefesi etrafında elele 1973: 30).

They also wanted the extension of the time period of the Martial Law and supported the military in their activities as they explained these activities as the outburst of Turkish national and spiritual values (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 195, sıkıyönetimin uzatılmasına ilişkin). Bozbeyli claimed that the “democratic” view of Demirel for the meetings and boycotts would lead the society to a non-spiritual and non-national society that became vulnerable to communism (Ferruh Bozbeyli Demokratik Parti Birinci Büyük Kongresini Açış Konuşması 1973: 4).

They also criticized the RPP for its resistance to change the 1961 Constitution. They claimed that the RPP’s view on the constitution depended on extreme leftist tendencies which made the citizens insecure; so the Constitution had to be modified.

The people from the RPP said “We cannot even touch this Constitution”. The trust of the citizens in law has weakened just because of such issues, too. What will the citizens credit, the Constitution? A philosophical concept called progressivism? Shall we rely on the Constitution and the laws enacted based on it, or the norm of revolutionism with a definition hidden in the mind of this or that revolutionary?... At this point, the problems and matters between the governments in the past, but more clearly coming to the front, resulted in the

some doubts on the law, citizen-state relations, and perception of citizens towards the state (Bozbeyli 1976:195).<sup>26</sup>

The changes in the Constitution resembled that the military did not want to abolish the parliament but applies “fine tuning” to the system (Harris 1988: 188).

Basically, the changes in 35 regular articles and the addition of nine temporary articles to the Constitution took two general approaches: strengthening the powers of the government against threats to national unity, public order, and national security; and increasing the autonomy and freedom of action of the military establishment in more or less subtle ways. As regards the first, the changes sought to reinforce the powers of the authorities to prohibit the exploitation of “class, sect, religion, race, or language” to divide the nation; to restrict the press from promoting violations of “national unity”; to limit the right to form unions and associations; to give the cabinet power to issue decrees with the force of law when so instructed by parliament; to specify that university autonomy should not be allowed to shield perpetrators of crimes; to strengthen state control over radio and television; to extend the length of time that the cabinet could impose martial law without parliamentary approval; and to postpone elections due in October 1971 to October 1973. In terms of bolstering the position of the armed forces, the amendments provided authority to pass a law to adjust the powers of the minister of defense; specified that the National Security Council could present to the cabinet not merely its basic views on security, but its recommendations as well; increased the possibility that civilians could be tried in military courts; removed review of military personnel actions from civilian administrative courts; and increased the rank of members of courts martial.

### 3.3. 1971–3 Technocratic Governments

Despite their gratitude for the military, the Democratic Party had a clear attitude against the governments that were formed after 1971 Memorandum because the cabinets were established with the force of the military.

Bozbeyli claimed that the government that was going to be established after 1971 Memorandum should be based on the Parliament. According to him, if a government

---

<sup>26</sup> CHP’li çevreler «Bu Anayasanın kılına bile dokunamayız» dediler. İşte bu türlü mes’eleler dolayısıyla de vatandaştaki hukuk inancı zaafa uğradı. Neye itibar edecek, Anayasa’ya mı itibar edecek, ilericilik diye felsefi bir mefhuma mı itibar edecek? Anayasa’ya ve ona bağlı olarak çıkan kanunlara mı itibar edeceğiz, yoksa târifi falan veya filân devrimcinin zihninde saklı devrimcilik mefhumuna mı itibar edeceğiz?.. İşte bu hükümetler arasında, daha evvel olan fakat daha belirli şekilde, daha mütebariz şekilde ortaya çıkan mes’eleler de vatandaşta, hukuk inancı, vatandaş-devlet münasebetleri, vatandaşın devlete bakış şekli konusunda bazı tereddütler uyandırmasına vesile olmuştur.

did not have links to the Assembly, it should be called “out of touch with the parliament” (parlamentodan kopuk) not “Supra-Party Government”. The members of the government had problems at the party and at personal level; so it interrupted the working of the government (Bozbeyli 1976: 171).

The DticP after the Memorandum 1971 declared that they would like the establishment of the government under the leader who was a member of the TGNA. They explained that the DticP’s attitude would be clear according to the leader and his ideas (Muhtıra Sonrası Kurulacak Hükümete İlişkin Görüşler: 156). With above-parties government, the political parties were degraded according to Bozbeyli (Bozbeyli 1976: 176).

The DticP would not like to accept the new government without any limits or principles (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 163). Nihat Erim who resigned from the RPP established the first technocrat government after 1971 Memorandum, formed a government which included five ministers from the Justice Party, three ministers from the RPP, one minister from the Reliance Party and fourteen technocrats out of the Parliament. Bozbeyli criticized the Erim governments that they were not akin to maintain the political stability; rather they were parliamentary form of the out of parliament opposition and forces (Bozbeyli 1976: 172).

The Assembly voted positively on the Erim government with 321 votes and negative 46 and 3 abstain votes. The RPP and the NTP voted positively and 51 positive and 25 negative votes came from the JP (Kıvanç 1978: 76-7). The DticP was expecting to see the deterioration of the government so that they would have the chance of replacing the JP (Kıvanç 1978: 78). The first Erim government had crisis when Demirel decided to withdraw 5 Ministers. The 14 Ministers who complained of not being able to work resigned from the government and the government fell.

The second Erim government was established on December 11, 1971 with seven ministers from the JP, four ministers from the RPP, one minister from the NTP and 2 senators. The DticP again did not enter this government and did not support it. Second Erim government was accepted by 301 positive votes. (Kıvanç 1978: 79-80). The DticP decided not to take part in Second Erim government as they claimed Erim

had left wing tendencies and his decisions were not coherent enough to take direct and strong actions against the problems of the country (Demokratik Parti Birinci Büyük Kongresi Raporlar 1973: 26).

Kıvanç thinks that the DticP has trusted to their voter base according to their reaction to the Erim governments. Erim suggested that the democracy should be saved by sacrificing the authenticity of the democracy and it was claimed to be anti-democratic by the intelligentsia (Heper 1992: 162).

The Erim government was criticized by the DticP as far as the program of the government was not fixed to any ideology or tendency; so it was thought to have inconsistencies within itself (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 174). The governments were established with the people that were not in accordance ideologically; so these ideological differences would block to work together according to Bozbeyli (Bozbeyli 1976: 178).

However, they wanted to believe that Erim Government should be the leader of the mass who wanted actions against the communist movements. The party asked for a strong authority of the government against “evil movements” as the authority would be more efficient than a limited Martial Law (Sıkı Yönetim ve Demokratik Parti'nin Görüşü 1972: 12). They criticized the Ministry of the Interior for not labeling the anarchy within the country as “organized, centrally managed, oriented Marxist-Leninist movement” but as “left-right wing conflict”. Also, they did not respect the terminology of “the polarized” as they described it as the “anarchy of notions” led by the polarized left (Sıkı Yönetim ve Demokratik Parti'nin Görüşü 1972: 13).

After the end of two Erim governments, Suat Hayri Ürgüplü was assigned to form a government on April 29, 1972. DticP proposed that “Democratic Constitutional regime should rule, unemployment problem should be solved, a government that takes its power from the Parliament should be formed, reforms should be done according to national interests, the changes in the law of Political parties and election should be done”. Bozbeyli declared that they decided to participate into the Ürgüplü government on the party meeting on May 9, 1972 (Bozbeyli 1976: 171).

The Erim governments period came to an end with the strong opposition of the DticP. Bozbeyli explained that they decided to participate in the Ürgüplü government because Ürgüplü told them that the government would be a phase to reach to democratic regime and governments of political parties again. Also, Ürgüplü explained that the government would not have any stigma of any party or person or power. Bozbeyli strongly accused the President for the rejection of the Ürgüplü government and described that Melen government would be on the same way with the Erim governments because they depended on non-parliamentary powers (Bozbeyli 1976: 172). The Cabinet of Ürgüplü government which would not be accepted by the President, had 3 Ministers from the RRP group of 13 MPs, 10 Ministers from the JP group, and 5 Ministers from the RPP group of 142 MPs which singalled the majority of the JP group in the government (Kıvanç 1978: 89).

The government that would be established by the leadership of Suat Hayri Ürgüplü was rejected by the President on May 13, 1972 because he claimed that this government was against the principles of the 1971 Memorandum and 102<sup>th</sup> article of the Constitution. The DticP claimed that the only difference of these governments from other governments was that the DticP did not participate in others but had three Ministers within this government.

The DticP Ministers were Cevat Önder as National Education Minister, Vedat Önsal as Transportation Minister, Cemal Tarlan as Village Minister in Ürgüplü government. According to rumors, the government was not accepted either because of the presence of MPs that were against March 12, presence of MPs that were in quarrel with each other, the participation of the DticP or the inability of the government to deal with the chaotic condition of the country. The DticP claimed that the President did not decide due to the inappropriateness of the Ürgüplü government because of the Constitution or March 12 decisions; but because the DticP participated in this government (Kıvanç 1978: 91).

After Ürgüplü, Melen was assigned to form the government on May 15, 1972. Meanwhile, the 6<sup>th</sup> Grand Congress of the JP did not satisfy the DticP members as Demirel did not lose power (Kıvanç 1978: 93).

The DticP claimed that Melen did what they have decided about the Constitution change. Melen proposed constitutional amendments on issues that were:

- The establishment of State Security Courts;
- The efficiency of the Parliament which should be achieved in budget, plan, economic State enterprises and decision on the execution of death sentences;
- Quorum for the meeting and the decision that should be re-determined and designated;
- The 114<sup>th</sup> article titled “Legal Channel” (Yargı Yolu) in Constitution that was about the Council of State should be changed.
- The 57<sup>th</sup> article about the economic audit of political parties should be modified.
- The 120<sup>th</sup> article about universities should be discussed (Demokratik Parti Birinci Büyük Kongresi Raporlar 1973: 43).

Accepting his constitutional amendments, the DticP still criticized the Melen Government because of continuing the leftist tendency of the Erim Governments despite the Melen Government contained people who were close to the private sector. The Melen Government accepted the Third Five Year Plan Draft and Land Reform Draft without any change. The Justice Party, according to their claim, did not react much to it because they were akin to left wing politics since 1970 Budget (Demokratik Parti Birinci Büyük Kongresi Raporlar 1973: 42).

When the RPP resigned from the Melen government, the DticP claimed that the supra-party governments were in their nature against parliamentary democracy and the parties participating did not take any responsibility of the governments. So, the resentment of the RPP for the government would not change the circumstances (Bozbeyli 1976: 186).

The DticP criticized the parties in the Parliament and the post-Memorandum governments. According to them, the parties that had members within these governments, did not support the governments. So, the governments were led by the out of parliament powers which were given extra and unnecessary power to rule (N. Talu Hükümeti Programı hakkında Ferruh Bozbeyli'nin Millet Meclisinde Yaptığı Konuşma 1973: 3). The discourses within the governments like “revolutionism”,

“progressivism”, or “reform” are attributed to the RPP by the DticP (Bozbeyli 1976: 186). Bozbeyli accused those governments as they did not depend on the political parties in the parliament; the parties just provided the members for the governments that were requested (Bozbeyli 1976: 177).

### **3.4. 1973 Election Results**

14 October 1973 election was important because it would show whether the voting tendencies continued or not after 1971 Memorandum. Out of eight parties, the RPP came first for the first time in its history in competitive elections (33.3 % and 185/450 seats). Modernization transformed territorial and cultural cleavages to functional (class) cleavages; so political participation and more institutionalized forms of voting increased (Özbudun & Tachau 1975: 461).

Although the military did not directly control the political life in 1973, it established a *modus vivendi* between civilians and the military (Demirel 2004a: 134). The first government in 1973 resembled the military’s aspirations for restoration of one-party rule. When Fahri Korutürk was elected against Faruk Güler, it meant the defeat of the military’s candidate that decreased the control of military in politics (Akarlı 1975: 151). The military regime ended up in 1973 election unlike its versions in Latin America and Greece (Keyder 1979: 34).

In 1973 elections, the Justice Party got 29 percent votes; while the DticP and the NSP gained about 12 percent of the votes. When the Democratic Party was closed, at the end of 1970s Turkish politics had four parties of which were two center parties; the JP and the RPP and the ultra-nationalist NMP and the pro-Islamic NSP (Özbudun 2000: 93).

1973 helped the right wing to shake hands against the common enemy of communism; so military interventions were seen by the right wing as favorable (Demirel 2005c: 257). The JP in 1973 performed worst elections since its establishment. While the Democratic Party could win votes from the whole country according to election results, the NSP had regional votes. The DticP performed well

especially in Konya in Central Anatolia. The RRP's votes decreased and their popular cities were Kayseri –hometown of the leader- and Van, Senator Ferit Melen's hometown (Özbudun & Tachau 1975: 464).

Bozbeyli claimed that the results of the 1973 elections did not satisfy them and their constituency; so searching for an alternative began (Bozbeyli 2000: 97).

Propaganda trips and visits came to an end, the 1973 elections were held, and the DticP obtained 45 seats for its deputies. This conclusion was underestimated by some of our fellow members since they were expecting more. This outcome drove them to despair for the future; despair lowered their efforts. They neglected and disregarded their election regions and party works and studies. They set out for hope in front of other doors (Bozbeyli 2000: 97).<sup>27</sup>

1973 and 1977 elections differed in their political vote fractionalization; that the system turned out to be a two-party system in 1977 (Çarkoğlu 1998: 550). The votes in 1973 election were fragmented since 1969 elections; and it could be attributed to being the first election after the military regime and fragmentation of anti-RPP votes after military intervention (Özbudun & Tachau 1975: 469).

Until 1973 elections, the JP did better in urban areas; but in 1973 elections it lost more votes in cities and less in rural areas (Özbudun & Tachau 1975: 472). Bilgiç claimed that the public supported their action as the founders of the DticP when the JP's votes decreased in 1973 elections and also speculated that the NSP should be capsulated by the DticP so that they would gain 112 seats rather than 93 seats. This solution was not supported by the NSP and the DticP; but the DticP would have the chance to form a single party government (Bilgiç 2007: 235).

While agrarian capitalists were represented by the DticP, the NSP attracted the town petty bourgeoisie and became a cry against their destruction by the large capital. The NMP addressed to the young generation and mobilized them against communism, in favor of strong government and militarism. The masses of the NMP were satisfied by the rapid transformation offered and also frustrated and lumpenized (Keyder

---

<sup>27</sup> Propaganda gezileri bitti. 1973 seçimleri yapıldı. Demokratik Parti, 45 milletvekilliği kazanmıştı. Sonuç, bazı arkadaşlarımıza küçük göründü. Daha fazlasını umuyorlardı. Bu sonuç, onları gelecek için umutsuzluğa düşürdü. Umutsuzluk gayretlerini kırdı. Seçim bölgelerini ve parti çalışmalarını ihmal ettiler. Başka kapılarda umut arayıcılığına çıktılar.

1979: 35). The votes of the DticP increased in negative correlation with the community's sizes; in other words the Democratic Party performed better as the place got smaller. It is concluded by Tachau and Özbudun that the JP's votes in provinces went to the DticP, but the urban votes were gained by the RPP (Özbudun & Tachau 1975: 473).

The total votes of the JP and the RPP showed the political institutionalization and class voting pattern; while the DticP votes reached to its top in moderate provinces and the NSP did well in the least developed areas. They claimed that the DticP was in competition with the JP (Özbudun & Tachau 1975: 475). In the election campaign of 1973, the DticP was welcomed by the public and claimed that the JP was no more a hope for the public (Bozbeyli 2000: 105).

The source of the votes of the NSP was the old, Islamic leaning electorate; while the RPP's was organized worker masses in urban areas (Keyder 1979: 36). While the urban development characterized the RPP voter support, the village development increased the voters of the JP. Both the JP and the Democratic Party got higher votes in the highly developed rural provinces, which showed their similarity (Özbudun & Tachau 1975: 475).

In 1973 elections, support from traditional least developed areas decreased, but urban support increased for the RPP (Tachau 2000: 135). The leadership of Ecevit in the RPP transformed the distinction between two main parties to a genuine status which facilitated the RPP to address itself to the voter base of emergent urban workers (Tachau & Heper 1983: 24). The new RPP appealed to the new urban lower classes (Özbudun 1995: 234). In 1973 elections, there were more top level bureaucrats in the ranks of the JP than the RPP which resembled an exchange of their political places in "periphery-centre". The main reason for the defeat of the JP in 1973 elections was thought as the failure to recover from the split of the DticP and the NMP (Akarlı 1975: 154).

While the Ecevit cut the relations of the RPP with the military, he responded to anti-statist electorate and also with personnel reform which made him appeal to the voter base and succeed (Akarlı 1975: 153).

The coalition governments were the results of the 1973 elections; first one of the RPP- the NSP and the other National Front governments of the NMP, the NSP and the RRP under the leadership of the JP (Özbudun 1995: 234).

The DticP declared that the government crisis just after the Memorandum should be solved quickly and the Talu government could not solve the problems because of the proposed incorrect budget. They wanted the Parliament to reach a consensus on the candidate of the RPP for Head of the Parliament which would help to get out of the chaos (Bozbeyli 1976: 208). In fact, the RPP-JP government was expected by many sectors of the society. In 1973 and 1977, no party could win the majority and coalition governments arose. Although the RPP moved to the left and became the first party, the system got more rightist. The DticP did not oppose the establishment of the coalition of the JP and the RPP, but they declared that such government would not be successful as their programmes were different and their voter bases would be unsatisfied (Bozbeyli 1976: 210).

#### **3.4.1. The RPP-NSP Government**

After the Talu government, the RPP-NSP government was established by the leadership of Ecevit. The short-termed coalition government's most famous and long-living success was the 'Cyprus Victory'. So, the Democratic Party considered this government from this view point. Bozbeyli complained that the Ecevit government did not have stable foreign affairs and was confronted by other nations' foreign affairs. "The foreign affairs of a country should be debated with full attention and should have a consistent line; but the road of the Ecevit government could not be analyzed even by the Turkish public" (Bozbeyli 1976: 219). Bozbeyli expected that some Greek executives would compromise with Turkey in order to have good neighborhood relations with the Turkish State and he announced they would criticize the government for not having a concrete and efficient role in Cyprus issue and they would support the government whenever needed (Bozbeyli 1976: 221).

Despite confronting the government about Cyprus issue, Bozbeyli attributed the political success of Turkey in Cyprus to the military (Bozbeyli 1976: 224).

On the other hand, the good will, peaceful and negotiant attitude of the Turkish Governments when confronted with the undesired and upsetting events for the last 15 years were used as an advantage for those stirring up incorrect and baseless worries and doubts regarding the power of Turkish Nation and Turkish Army and caused a propoganda against our good intentions. At a point when the chips were down, the Turkish Armed Forces divided Cyprus into two in a definite and swift operation, and destroyed all the plots armed or unarmed. In this respect, we gratefully and thankfully convey our regards to the Turkish Armed Forces (Bozbeyli 1976: 224).<sup>28</sup>

Bozbeyli claimed that Turkish government should not prevent the military in Cyprus issue and supported the conquer of the Cyprus (Bozbeyli 1976: 228):

We request from the Government that it should not put an obstacle before the Turkish Military and not slow the army!.. Hoping to be excused by my fellow citizens, I will say a proverb here: «Slow spit will mess the beard!..»

As the nation, we are right, strong, determined and strong minded.

The Turkish Nation has taken the risk of any kind of sacrifice with its life and property in its material and moral integrity as long as the dissemination of doubt-creating and misleading news are prevented across the public and the Government makes the official statements and announcement via ona channel...

I once more wish that may Allah give the Government of Republic and the Turkish Armed Forces success. God willing, the help of Allah will be with us (Bozbeyli 1976: 228).<sup>29</sup>

The DticP was against the RPP-NSP government's amnesty (date: May 18, 1974) proposal which included "revolutionary, communist, anarchist, activist" or "the ones who used the autonomy of the universities and freedom of science for brain washing" or "abusers and thieves of nation's properties" "agents of foreign countries against

---

<sup>28</sup> Diğer taraftan; 15 küsur yıldan beri devam eden acı olaylar karşısında Türk Hükümetlerinin gösterdiği iyi niyet, barışçı ve müzakereci tutum, Türk Milletinin ve Türk ordusunun gücü konusunda yanlış ve yersiz kaygı ve tereddütleri körükleyenler için malzeme oluyor ve iyi niyetimiz aleyhimizde bir propogandaya yol açıyordu. Bıçağın kemiğe dayandığı bir noktada, Türk Silâhlı Kuvvetlerimiz kesin ve sür'atli bir harekâtla Kıbrıs'ı ikiye böldü. Silahlı veya silahsız ne kadar fesat yuvası varsa, hepsinin de ocağını söndürdü.

<sup>29</sup> Hükümetten rica ediyoruz: Türk Askerinin elini tutmasın; Mehmetçiğin hızını kesmesin!.. Vatandaşlarımızın beni mazur göreceklarını ümit ederek bir Ata sözümü tekrar edeceğim: «Yavaş tükürük sakala bulaşır!..» Milletçe haklıyız, güçlüyüz, kararlı ve azimliyiz. Türk Milleti maddî ve manevî bütünlüğü içinde; canı ile, malı ile her türlü fedakârlığı göze almıştır. Yeter ki kamuoyunda tereddüt yaratıcı ve yanıltıcı haberlerin yayılması önlenmiş ve Hükümet tarafından yapılacak resmî açıklamalar tek kanaldan dile getirilsin... Cumhuriyet Hükümetine ve Türk Silâhlı Kuvvetlerimize Allaha başarı dilekelerimizi tekrar ediyorum. İnşallah, Allahın nusreti bizimle beraber olacaktır.

Turkey” (Kutay 1985b: 234). The DticP accused the RPP-NSP government for abolishing the 141 and 142<sup>nd</sup> article of the Constitution and replacing it with a “Law of Freedom of Opinion” (Fikir Hürriyeti Kanunu) that would help the activities of the anarchists, communist, separatists, regionalists and traitors.

One of the issues over which the RPP - NSP coalition reached a consensus is the “general amnesty.” Meanwhile, the Democrats come with an interesting amnesty bill of law. This bill envisages the abolishment of Yassıada resolutions along with all associated consequences, even enables freedom to the Ottoman family members to come to Turkey. Thus, the bill of amnesty law by the DP included the family of Vahdettin as well (Kutay 1985b: 234).<sup>30</sup>

### 3.4.2. The Idea of A Rightwing Coalition

After the elections of 1973, Bozbeyli assumed that no single party was assigned to rule, rather all parties were expected to form a coalition. He argued that the right should be in collaboration against the left. Otherwise, all rightist parties would be responsible of the RPP government (Bozbeyli 1976: 196-7).

...So, let us lend an ear to the voice of our conscience for those voted for the nationalist right and let us come together against the RPP and create a coalition excluding this RPP. Yet, we did not do that. We could not do it... I do not know if they will get offended if I say it now (Bozbeyli 1976: 197).<sup>31</sup>  
...But we are ... there is a saying in the Black Sea Region; «we are all the same bundle on one ceiling», that is to say, they will make calculations as to this was there and that was here... We are all the same bundle on one ceiling. In this respect, this should be taken into account by the parties acquiring the votes of the right wing... We are all the single unit... we should come together. We must form a strong Government (Bozbeyli 1976: 198).<sup>32</sup>

Bozbeyli criticized the NSP which was ready to form government with either left or right wing parties and claimed that right wing parties should congregate and stop

---

<sup>30</sup> CHP - MSP ortaklığının üzerinde anlaştığı konulardan biri de “genel af”tır. Bu arada Demokratikler de ilginç bir af teklifiyle ortaya çıkarlar. Bu teklifte; Yassıada kararlarının bütün neticeleriyle kaldırılması, hatta Osmanoğullarının yurda girebilmesi istenmektedir. Böylece DP nin af teklifi içersine Vahdettin sülalesi de girmiştir

<sup>31</sup> Öyle ise bunu CHP karşısında, milliyetçi sağ inançla rey vermiş olan için vicdanımızdan gelen sese kulak verelim de, bir araya gelelim, şu CHP’nin dışarıda kalacağı bir ortaklık kuralım. Ama, bunu yapmadık. Bunu yapamadık... Şimdi böyle söylersem incinirler mi bilmiyorum.

<sup>32</sup> Ama biz bunları da Karadenizlilerin bir tâbiri vardır, «biz hepimiz bir tavanın bağıyız», yâni o orada idi, bu da burda idi diye hesap etmeyecekler... Hepimiz bir tavanın bağıyız. Bu bakımdan bunu, sağ’dan rey alan partiler değerlendirmelidirler... Hepimiz bir tavanın bağıyız... bir araya gelmeliyiz. Güçlü bir Hükümet kurmalıyız.

preventing each other (Bozbeyli 1976: 201). Bozbeyli claimed that the parties should explain to the public that they were rightist or not (Bozbeyli 1976: 202).

... when you utter the idea of a right coalition, if this idea is explained in a different way than each other among the parties potential to be a member of such coalition; presented in a manner different from each other, then separation instead of unity occurs. Therefore, it is compulsory that this point be attached importance as well. Namely, to cause a separation, as in the answer I provided for your first question, this drawback is eliminated when we act without forgetting that we are inspired by a nationalist, conservative philosophy devoted to its historical roots, traditions and customs, religion and beliefs ... If we forget this, that problem will emerge (Bozbeyli 1976: 203).<sup>33</sup>

Bozbeyli was preoccupied by the getting together of the left and their distribution of roles as writer, artist, partisan, militant and alarmed that the right wing also had to have these (Bozbeyli 1976: 204):

Otherwise, one communist told that: «a person being born will be to my side, and each person to die will to their account».. In saying this, he wants to encourage his own men, and enhance their enthusiasm. On the contrary, each person being born should also be from our side and every old man dying should also be from our side, and we should be able to wish the blessings and peace of God for him as much as we can. Namely, this is the soul living on these lands!.. And inspirations from China should not have and be given a right to live on this land!.. (Bozbeyli 1976: 204).<sup>34</sup>

Bozbeyli claimed that their only condition for the right wing coalition was that Demirel should not be the leader (Bozbeyli 1976: 256). They supported the establishment of this coalition on the expense of having some loss from their own party (Bozbeyli 1976: 210). The right wing coalition would be again the result of the “National Will” that won the 67 percent of the votes and it would save the “Last Turkish State” with the “National Coalition” (milli koalisyon) (Bozbeyli 1976: 211). However, Demirel used the thesis of Bozbeyli against the Democratic Party and

---

<sup>33</sup> ...yere bir sağ koalisyon fikri koyunca, bu fikir de ona ortak olması muhtemel partiler arasında, birbirinden farklı şekilde izah edilir, birbirinden farklı şekilde takdim edilirse, birlik kuracağı yerde ayrılık meydana gelir. Onun için bu noktaya da ehemniyet verilmesi zarureti vardır. Yâni bir ayrılığa sebebiyet verilmesi için de, yine birinci sorunuza verdiğim cevapta olduğu gibi, vatandaş vicdanından gelen sese ve vatandaşın «sağ» derken, milliyetçi, muhafazakâr, tarih köküne bağlı, an’anesine, dinine, inançlarına bağlı bir felsefeden ilham aldığımızı unutmadan hareket etmemiz halinde bu sakınca ortadan kalkar... Bunu unutursak buyurduğunuz sakınca ortaya çıkacaktır.

<sup>34</sup> Aksi halde, komünistin birisi demiş ki: «Doğan bir insan benden ölen her insan onlardan olacak» demiş.. Bunu söylerken kendi adamlarını teşvik etmek istiyor. Kendi adamlarının şevkini arttırmak istiyor. Aksine, doğan her insan da bizden olmalı, ölen her ihtiyar da bizden olmalı ve arkasından gönlümüz dolusu fatihalar okuyabilmeliyiz. Yani, bu topraklarda yaşayan ruh bu!. Ve yurt dışından, Çin’den ma Çin’den gelen ilhamlara, bu topraklar üstünde hayat hakkı olmamalıdır, tanınmamalıdır!..

formed National Front governments (Kıvanç 1978: 102-3). Bilgiç had another idea about the right wing coalition that he offered to have an election coalition in 1975 elections to the NSP and the NMP (Bilgiç 2007: 247-249).

### **3.4.3. The Democratic Party-RPP Government Attempt in 1974**

In an interview by Abdi İpekçi, Bozbeyli was asked whether they had promised the RPP to form a coalition government so that the RPP decided to end the RPP-NSP government. Bozbeyli answered that despite the contrary comment by Sükan the Democratic Party did not promise to form a government with the RPP. They had decided and announced their ideas about early election not depending on any coalition proposals. The main point of not having a coalition government with the RPP was not reaching a consensus about the time of early elections. The RPP decided to have early elections in June in party group which was unsuitable for the DticP that proposed the early elections should be held with 1975 Senato Elections on October 12 (Bozbeyli 1976: 250-251). Bilgiç also explained that he could not accept the proposal of the RPP for forming coalition as the time period was too short until the early elections (Bilgiç 2007: 241).

According to the DticP, the RPP would like to use Cyprus Victory as an election campaign discourse; so wanted to have the elections even in December 1974. On 25 September 1974, Ecevit proposed to form coalition with the DticP; but the DticP needed more time for the early elections and to rule more in the government to form their own cadres. They rejected the RPP's proposal and wanted to form a government with right wing parties but without the leaders (Kıvanç 1978: 114-5).

In his memoirs, Bozbeyli explains the impossibility of the RPP- DticP government on the grounds that they had different ideological stands and government would not be short term (Dağı & Uğur 2009: 363-4). Bozbeyli also criticizes Ecevit for announcing to the public his plans for early elections (Dağı & Uğur 2009: 365).

### 3.5. First National Front Government

Bozbeyli declared that the idea of the Nationalist Front governments was initiated by Ortadoğu Gazetesi (Dağı & Uğur 2009: 368). After the meeting of the party leaders, Bozbeyli claimed that there was a humiliation in the letter sent by the Justice Party; the letters sent to four other leaders were signed by Demirel, their letter was signed by the JP General Vice-Chairman Sabit Osman Avcı (Dağı & Uğur 2009: 370). Bozbeyli says that they proposed to congregate after deciding on the issues; but others announced to the press that the Democratic Party would not enter the coalition (Dağı & Uğur 2009: 370). The right wing coalition was primarily set up for preventing the Ecevit transform the Cyprus Victory to electoral success (Çınar & Arıkan 2002: 28).

Bozbeyli claimed that the JP was not a rightist party and criticized the patronage-client relations of the party as the JP could not understand the aspirations of the people and dramatic change in the society (Bozbeyli 1976: 255). The DticP criticized the partners of the first National Front government claiming that they were not real rightists or conservatives. For the leader of the NMP, they claimed that Türkeş who has been the speaker of the 1960 Coup D'etat, was together now with the sons of Menderes and ex-Democrats. They reminded that Türkeş did not support the religion based policies and was not religious himself, so his religiosity was fake. For example, he did not want ezan to be recited in Arabic, but in Turkish (Siyasi Ölüler Müzesi: 13)

The movement to purify Turkish of foreign words was one of the most useful and beneficial gifts given by Atatürk to this nation. They started first of all with treason of this when they repealed the ban on the Arabic ezan and restored it. Koran is to be recited in Turkish, not in Arabic, in Turkish mosques (Siyasi Ölüler Müzesi: 13).<sup>35</sup>

Bozbeyli accused Erbakan for his pre and post-election discourses that he had wanted votes for preventing communism and Demirel; now he would like to prevent communism with Demirel (Bozbeyli 1976: 259). The DticP criticized the NSP for their participation to every kind of ideological coalition, right wing or left wing.

---

<sup>35</sup> “Türkçecilik bu millete Atatürk’ün en büyük, en faydalı hediyelerinden biriydi. Evvela ezanı Arapça okutmakla buna ihanet’e başladılar.”  
“Türk Camiinde Türkçe Kur’an okunur Arapça değil”

They reminded their celebration to congregate the “Milli Görüş” and “Sol Görüş”; this time they had with “Masonik Görüş,” “Renksiz Görüş” (Siyasi Ölüler Müzesi: 13).

Being a Leftist when together with a Leftist, and being a Mason when with a Mason!..

(those sleeping in every bed)

Mr. Erbakan, Chairperson of NSP, said on 25 January 1974 after he signed the protocol of 109 articles of the PRR and NSP Coalition:

“The two parties will work and act as a single party...” (Siyasi Ölüler Müzesi: 13).<sup>36</sup>

At the end of 1970s, governments could not handle the violence in the streets. It was not even rejected by the leader of the NF governments that NF governments protected the ultra-right terrorist activities, which were informally linked to the NMP (Özbudun 2000: 38). Also, Bozbeyli criticized the newly forming NF partners; the NMP for their illegal acts and the NSP as valuing sects in Turkish society. But he reminded the RPP’s criticism against the NMP would be the result of their lenience with “extreme left” (Bozbeyli 1976: 253-4).

Bozbeyli thought that the first NF government would not be successful, so it would help them to explain themselves to public. The failure of the government would result from their resources out of the parliament and their indecisiveness because of many partners (Bozbeyli 1976: 256-7). In 2009, Bozbeyli admitted that their non-participation to the first NF government fragmented and brought an end to the DticP (Dağı & Uğur 2009: 382).

### **3.5.1. Resignation of the Nines<sup>37</sup> from the Democratic Party**

Akın Kıvanç explained that Demirel understood after 1973 elections that he should reach a compromise with ex-Democrats to succeed in the elections (Kıvanç 1978:

---

<sup>36</sup> Solcu ile Solcu Mason’la Mason!..

(her yatağa yatanlar)

CHP ve MSP Koalisyonununun 109 maddelik protokolünü imzalamadıktan sonra MSP Genel Başkanı Erbakan, 25 Ocak 1974 tarihinde şöyle diyordu:

“İki parti, bir parti imiş gibi çalışacak...”

<sup>37</sup> The keyword “Nines” is used to explain the nine MPs who have resigned from the Democratic Party just before the First National Front government.

106-7). The provincial cadre of the Democratic Party was also committed to Bayar and Menderes and ready to follow these names (Kıvanç 1978: 109).

The period between the end of the RPP-NSP coalition and the first NF coalition was a government crisis during which no government could be established. The DticP did not accept the proposal of the RPP of early election government. Then, Sadi Irmak's try for a right wing coalition without the leaders was not supported by the Justice Party. Lastly, Demirel managed to form the coalition governments with the dissidents from the DticP. Demirel decided just after the 1973 election that he had to have alliance with the ex-Democrats to increase his votes (Kıvanç 1978: 106).

The DticP in its discourse ascribed "victimhood" to both entities –to the nation and the party- by matching itself with the nation like "degeneracy, unworthiness to the nation" and hereunder the stand looked for "delivery of his right," "to be possessed" turned into a deeper incision with the leaving of Bilgiç and his friends from the party. Moreover, "Our Beloved Nation watches despicable people swinging dagger to the cause of DticP like Brutus" (Demokratik Parti'nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977). This puritan sense which neither supported nor opposed national will in a sense dragged to a deeper "purification, purgation" discourse than the one at the establishment phase of the party.

Leave of Bilgiç and his group from the DticP and this group's support for the I. NF cabinet increased the resentment in the DticP that resulted from not coming to power. Conservatism which builds an instrumental relationship with the past, can adapt to present conditions; so that its status quo would not need status ante (Çiğdem 1997: 33). But in the case of the DticP, it seems that it calls on the past when they did not become hegemonic power.

Today the Justice Party has become the party of robbers, jobbers, former members of Republican People's Party, putschers of May 27, devshirmehs and political periods. While they were within the Democratic Party, the ones who don't like Demirel are now very close with him. The Justice Party is neither the continuation of the Democrat Party nor the epitome of it. Now the JP is the party of Ferruh Adalı, the judge of Yassı Ada who judges the Democrat Party. Now the JP is the party of General Ali Elverdi who raided Head Office Building of the JP with anarchists in 1963. Ömer Hocaoğlu who says "If Demirel is nationalist, I'm communist!... If Demirel is rightist and Muslim, I'm Russian infidel!..." is now candidate of the JP for Trabzon. The

person called Bedii Faik who called Decedent Adnan Menderes and Great Turkish Nationalist, Tevfik İleri as “traitor” is now spin-doctor of the JP and speaker of Demirel! (Demokratik Parti'nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977).

The DticP classified the Members of the First NF government and blamed them according to these classifications: They blamed Gıyasettin Karaca, Mehmet Sait Reşa, Vahit Bozatalı and Ali Elverdi for being the supporters or ex-members of the RPP. But İsmail Hakkı Yıldırım, Ragıp Üner, Seyfi Öztürk, İbrahim Göktepe and Selahattin Kılıç were accused of being the member of the May 27 Front (Siyasi Ölümler Müzesi: 9-10). The DticP could not cope with the reconciliation of the JP and the ex-Democrats with the May 27 Front; because they had established and contrasted themselves with the JP mainly on this negation of May 27 Front. However, old dilemma between May 27 Front and the ex-Democrats seemed to be swept away especially after acquiring the election rights.<sup>38</sup> In his memoirs, Bozbeyli explains that even in 1973 election campaign, the party was disorganized and both the Nines and the ex-Democrats chose to be in the JP to be re-elected (Dağı & Uğur 2009: 357). Bozbeyli claimed that the ex-Democrats have supported the DticP to form an opposition against Demirel; but when they acquired the election rights, they chose Demirel (Dağı & Uğur 2009: 361).

Ex- Democrats lined up with this will as well. Even Mr. Bayar united himself with the line of will of Mr. Demirel, too. Meanwhile, some deputies who do not think they are happy under the umbrella of Democratic Party and who set out seeking for extra-party hope and for this reason leaving our party gathered together on the willpower of Mr. Demirel. From now on, Mr. Demirel is a symbol for those parties I named, for Mr. Bayar as well as those fellow party members who left us. They united around his name. This, naturally, is a success for Mr. Demirel. I acknowledge this situation as a success. This is a success not depending upon the will of nation. This success is based on stealing and sneaking (Bozbeyli 1976: 243).<sup>39</sup>

However, the DticP had declared the importance and urgency of the amnesty for the political rights of the ex-Democrats repeatedly in the Parliament:

---

<sup>38</sup> The political rights of the ex-DP members were granted on 23 April 1974.

<sup>39</sup> Eski Demokratlar da bu irade hizasına geldiler. Hatta Sayın Bayar da, Sayın Demirelin iradesinin çizgisinde birleşti. Bu arada Demokratik Parti çatısı altında kendilerini huzurlu görmeyen ve parti dışı ümit arayıcılığına çıkan ve bu yüzden de partimizi terk ederek giden bazı milletvekilleri de Sayın Demirel'in iradesi çizgisinde birleşti. Artık Sayın Demirel adını saydığım partiler için de, Sayın Bayar için de ve bizi terk ederek arkadaşlar için de bir semboldür. Onun adı, etrafında birleşmişlerdir. Bu tabii Sayın Demirel için bir başarıdır. Bunu başarı olarak kabul ediyorum. Millet iradesine istinat eden bir başarı değildir. Bu başarı çalma- çırpma bir başarıdır.

We regard that withholding the right to vote from one single Turkish elector is the severest wound in the national consciousness (Demokratik Parti İstanbul 1.İl Kongresi 1971: 46).<sup>40</sup>

Today, it is of national benefit to forget what happened in 1960. We have to combine all patriotic forces in order to overwhelm the domestic and foreign enemies. Taking into account this point in amending the Constitution will be complementary to the new constitutional order and clear up the past and old (Demokratik Parti İstanbul 1.İl Kongresi 1971: 52).<sup>41</sup>

The DticP also criticized Demirel as he became one of the member of the May 27 Front and his congregation with them.

“WE ARE NOT OPPOSED TO MAY 27 AND MARCH 12.”

According to his own utterance, Demirel is not opposed to May 27 and March 12.

What Demirel is against or what he favors is an ambiguity. Sometimes Demirel is a fan of May 27, and at other times he supports March 12... sometimes not... But the truth is this:

If Demirel were opposed to May 27, would he work in collaboration with professor Turhan Feyzioğlu, who is involved in any formation of coup d'état, who said “you will go pale if I talk about the National Revolution Army!...” and who prepared the Constitution of the Constituent Assembly?.. Would Demirel “lend” him a deputy to enable him to create a group?..

If Demirel were opposed to May 27, would he go arm in arm with Colonel Alpaslan Türkeş who announced “Attention.. Attention..” on the morning of May 27, 1960?..

If Demirel were opposed to May 27, would he pitch woo with Necmeddin Erbakan, who is the inventor of “DEVRİM” automobile which stopped only after two meters of its first movement and now being left to rust out in a warehouse in Eskisehir; who bankrupted the Gümüş - Engine factory and who requested the position of “Minister of Heavy Industry” from the Full General Mr. Cemal Gürsel?..

If Demirel were opposed to May 27, would not he attend the funeral ceremony of Yüksel Menderes?.. (Note: other than that, Fahri Özdilek, a supporter of May 27, attended the funeral of Yüksel Menderes; but Demirel did not because of his grudge...)

The Justice Party is the collaborator of professor Turhan Feyzioğlu, who is one of the promoters of May 27.

The Justice Party cannot in any way be a continuance of the Democrat Party since the guarantor and protector of both the Justice Party and its chairperson, Demirel, is the speaker of May 27; Alpaslan Türkeş.

In the General Elections of 1973, candidates of Justice Party and men of Demirel severely insulted Mutlu Menderes in Aydın. Cevat Önder, Vice Chairperson of Democratic Party left Ankara for the city of Aydın, held 24 meetings in three days and answered them back..

Now Mutlu Menderes stands with Nahit Menteşe and İsmet Sezgin. He is with Demirel, who did not even attend the funeral of his elder brother; Yüksel Menderes (Siyasi Ölüler Müzesi: 10).<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Bir tek Türk seçmeninden oy hakkının esirgenmesini milli vicdanda açılacak en büyük yara telakki ediyoruz.

<sup>41</sup> 1960 da olanları unutmakta bugün milli menfaat vardır. İç ve dış düşmanlarımızı kahretmek için bütün vatansever güçleri birleştirmek zorundayız. Anayasa tadil edilirken bu noktanın da dikkate alınması, yeni anayasa düzenini tamamlayıcı ve eskiyi tasfiye edici nitelikte olacaktır.

<sup>42</sup> “BİZ 27 MAYISA VE 12 MARTA KARŞI DEĞİLİZ.”  
Kendi ifadesine göre, Demirel, 27 Mayıs’a ve 12 Mart’a karşı değilmiş.

Bozbeyli claimed that this coalition had to pay back the support that it had taken through the establishment process. Moreover, the parties within the coalition had to make compromises with each other (Bozbeyli 1976: 243).

The Nines resigned from the DticP on March 28, 1975 and the First NF government was formed on March 31, 1975. The nine MPs were Sadettin Bilgiç, Nilüfer Gürsoy, Mutlu Menderes, Bahri Dağdaş, Kubilay İmer, Abdullah Çilli, Hasan Değer, Ata Bodur and Talat Asal. After the resignations, the RPP had 189, the JP had 150, the NSP 48, the DticP 31, the RRP 9 and the NMP had 3 MPs (Kıvanç 1978: 121).

In the confidence vote on 13 April 1975, the NF government took 222 confidence and 218 non-confidence votes. After the vote, the DticP lost five more MPs, Yasin Bozkurt and Orhan Tokuz, Necati Kalaycıoğlu, Süleyman Tuncel, Ömer Hocoğlu and Hüseyin Kalpaklıoğlu resigned from the DticP and got into the cadre of the JP (Bilgiç 2007: 245) and there remained 26 MPs of the DticP.

In fact, Nines' break up resembled their break up from the JP. While they claimed that paying no attention to the democracy within the party (the Justice Party) brought them to the point to establish a new party, they did not hesitate to call the intra-party notice given by them as "Memorandum". Bozbeyli told about his delusion related to

---

Demirel'in neye karşı olduğu ve neye karşı olmadığı belli değildir. Demirel, bazan 27 Mayıs'dır. Bazan değildir.. Bazan 12 Mart'tır.. Bazan değildir.. Ama gerçek şudur:

Demirel, 27 Mayıs'a karşı olsaydı, her ihtilalci teşekkül içinde yer alan, "Milli Devrim Ordusundan bahsedersen renginiz uçar!.." diyen, Kurucu Meclis'in Anayasa'sını hazırlayan, şerbetçi profesör Turhan Feyzioğlu ile ortak olur muydu?.. O'na grup kurması için "Ödünç milletvekili" verir miydi?..

Demirel, 27 Mayıs'a karşı olsaydı, 27 Mayıs 1960 sabahı, radyolardan "Dikkat.. Dikkat.." çeken Albay Alpaslan Türkeş ile kol kola girer miydi?..

Demirel, 27 Mayıs'a karşı olsaydı, iki metre yürüdüktan sonra stop eden, şimdi Eskişehir'de depoda çürüyen "DEVRİM" otomobilinin ünlü mucidi, Gümüş-Motor Fabrikasına iflas topu attıran, Orgeneral Cemal Gürsel'den "Ağır Sanayi Bakanlığı" isteyen Necmeddin Erbakan ile öpüşür ve koklaşırmıydı?

Demirel, 27 Mayıs'a karşı olsaydı, Rahmetli Yüksel Menderes'in cenazesinde bulunmaz mıydı?.. (Not: Kaldı ki 27 Mayısçı Fahri özdilek, Yüksel Menderes'in cenazesinde bulundu.. Fakat Demirel kini yüzünden cenazeye gelmedi...)

Adalet Partisi, 27 Mayıs'ın teşvikçilerinden şerbetçi profesör Turhan Feyzioğlu'nun ortağıdır.

Adalet Partisi, Demokrat Parti'nin davamı olamaz. Çünkü Adalet Partisinin de o'nun başkanı Demirel'in de kefil ve himayecisi, 27 Mayısın spikeri Alparslan Türkeş'tir.

1973 Genel Seçimlerinde Aydın İlinde Adalet Parti'sinin adayları ve Demirel'in adamları Mutlu Menderes'e en ağır hakaretleri yağdırmışlardı. D.P. Genel Başkan Yardımcısı Cevat Önder, Ankara'dan gidip üç gün içinde 24 toplantı yapıp, onlara cevap vermiştir..

Şimdi Mutlu Menderes, Nahit Menteşe'nin ve İsmet Sezgin'in yanındadır. Ağabeyisi Yüksel Menderes'in cenazesine dahi gelmeyen Demirel'in yanındadır.

the intra-party democracy regarding going into the disintegration process of the DticP with the establishment of 1<sup>st</sup> NF government:

We gathered the group. We discuss whether we'll join National Front Government or not. ... We were 42 persons from the rest. 22 people voted not against joining the NF. Now I would like to get your attention to something. Seven people who voted not to join resigned on the following day together with two people who voted to join. In their justifications of resignation "As they prevented us from joining the NF, we resigned" (Dağı&Uğur 2009: 372)

According to Bozbeyli, Bilgiç told another MP that he would not be a Minister if they would be a coalition partner, so he did not declare his aim to enter the government. Bozbeyli claimed that he had not given a Ministry duty to Bilgiç in Ürgüplü government which could not be established (Dağı & Uğur 2009: 372).

After the resignation of the Bilgiç group, Bozbeyli claimed that they had lost quantitatively; but not qualitatively. Also, he accused the Dissidents that they were affected by out of party ideas and did not bother about the DticP and its ideals (Bozbeyli 1976: 243).

Sir, as you have expressed, it is the Democratic Party that has been most damaged in material and quantity terms in this depression period. I especially emphasize the material and quantity. We have not been exposed to loss of trust in Democratic Party, issues undertaken by DP to the favor of nation and dignity except for this material loss. Yet, the greatest damage has been given to the DP in material and quantity terms. We are already in a certain gradual loss since the 1973 elections. Two of our fellow members left after the 1973 elections. We had expelled these people. Later on, three of our fellow members who quit joined the RPP. Our friends, as described and defined by His Excellency Mr. President, are in the parliament in a floating and mobile way (Bozbeyli 1976: 241).<sup>43</sup> I had said «Dear Friends, the Democratic Party was reborn today. Now we do not have any car, any nanny, any nursemaid. We will raise our own party with our own hands and develop it» (Bozbeyli 1976: 246).<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Beyefendi ifade ettiğiniz gibi, gerçekten bu bunalım döneminde, maddî ve adedî plânda en çok zarara uğrayan Demokratik Parti olmuştur. Özellikle maddî ve adedi plânda diyorum. Demokratik Parti davasına inanç, DP'nin millete taahhüt ettiği hususlarda ve bu maddî vara dışında bir haysiyet kaybına uğramış değiliz. Âmâ maddi ve adedi ölçüde en büyük zarar DP'ye geldi. Zaten 1973 seçimlerinden beri biz tedricen bazı kayıplar içine girdik. 1973 seçimlerinden sonra iki arkadaşımız ayrılmıştı. Bu arkadaşlarımızı biz ihraç etmiştik. O zaman ayrılan arkadaşlarımızdan üç tanesi bilahare olmaksızın üzere CHP'ye geçtiler. Diğer arkadaşlarımız da Sayın Cumhurbaşkanımızın tarif ve tavsif ettiği ölçü içinde yüzer ve gezer halde parlamantedo bulunmaktadırlar.

<sup>44</sup> «Arkadaşlarım Demokratik Parti bugün yeniden doğmuştur. Artık bizim arabamız yok, lalamız yok, dadımız yok. Artık kendi partimizi kendi ellerimizle büyüteceğiz kendi ellerimizle geliştireceğiz» demiştim.

My observation as the Chairperson is that these latest breakups have made us stronger, made our organization more determined and embracing the party objectives. That is what I observe (Bozbeyli 1976: 247).<sup>45</sup>

Bozbeyli claimed that the front government that depended on some swinging votes would resign in a short time (Bozbeyli 1976: 258).

### **3.6. 1977 Elections and the Democratic Party's Single MP**

The elections held on June 5, 1977 ended up as a disaster for the Democratic Party, which gained only 1.9 percent of the votes. However, there were some winners of the game: The first NF government helped the NMP to increase its votes in 1977 elections and its patronage relations. Despite the failure to rule alone, two major parties got higher votes in 1977 elections than 1973. The NMP was the only minor party that got stronger than 1973 elections, the NSP had lesser votes; but the DticP was swept from the political scene by gaining only one seat (Tachau & Heper 1983: 24). The vote increase in 1977 for the NMP was not enough to make the party a mass and system party because the party did not affect larger constituent body with its program, which offered nothing more than anti-communism (Çınar & Arıkan 2002: 28).

The fractions within the bourgeoisie were not satisfied by the economic policies of the first NF government; but the partisans of the NMP who took enough positions within the state were content. The NMP used its privilege for increasing its partisanship in headmasterships in secondary schools of Anatolia, secret service and police despite its critically small number of seats, actually three (Keyder 1979: 39).

In 1977 elections, the RPP gained 41 percent of the votes and 47 percent of the seats; however this remarkable electoral success did not lead in having majority to form a government like the JP's coalition one (Tachau 2000: 136).

---

<sup>45</sup> Benim Genel Başkan olarak müşahadem şu ki, bu son ayrılmalar bizi daha güçlü hale getirmiştir, teşkilâtımızı daha kârarlı, davasına daha çok sahip hale getirmiştik Müşahadem odur.

Because of the 1977 election results, Bozbeyli resigned from the Chairmanship of the DticP on May 6, 1978 and Faruk Sükan proceeded to the Chairmanship of the party. The last congress hold on December 18, 1978 witnessed quarrels and preparations to return to the Justice Party (Dağı & Uğur 2009: 380).

The Second National Front government was formed again under the leadership of Demirel with the NSP and the NMP; but it lost majority because of the resignation of some JP MPs. The dissident MPs and Faruk Sükan were assigned as the Ministers in Ecevit government (Özbudun 1995: 235).

### **3.6.1. Ecevit Government in 1978**

The 1978 RPP government was established with the Justice Party dissidents and Faruk Sükan and out of government support of RRP (Republican Trust Party). During that period, the NMP partisans increased violence in the streets because of losing their places in state apparatus. Increased violence and economic difficulties hardened the RPP government's journey (Keyder 1979: 40).

A toll of four people a day forced Ecevit to declare the martial law. The bourgeoisie wanted the violence to stop; but not because of their European connections, through the fascist movement. Ecevit was viewed as tolerant to terrorism in the country (Demirel 2003b: 258).

The Ecevit government experienced dismissal of many military students from the army because of the political activities and escape of Mehmet Ali Ağca from the prison which led to Martial Law in December 1978 (Demirel 2003b: 259).

Faruk Sükan, Vice-Chairman of the Democratic Party, even sent a letter to Fahri Korutürk claiming that the Ecevit government hoped to be a balanced government; but criticized that Ecevit made concessions to anarchists and communists, which made to fight against anarchy impossible (Özbudun 2000: 38).

Your Excellency Mr. President,

As within the knowledge of your Highness, a great majority of the recommendations with respect to the “Internal and Foreign Security of State” and “Basic Issues” passed at the National Security Council have not proceeded to implementation and execution stage, and the recommendations taken with regard to the following have only remained as theoretical wishes;

- a) Fight with anarchic formations, terror and murder organizations aimed at overthrowing the National and Country integrity, State Authority and Public Order,
- b) Empowering the Turkish Armed Forces and addressing to the urgent needs of our National Defense,
- c) Empowering the Authority and Law Enforcement Agencies, restructuring and modernization of them,
- d) Security Courts,
- e) Political and Economic stability,
- f) Smuggling and especially weapons smuggling.

Likewise, most of the precautions necessary to be taken by the Commanders of Martial Law and those in charge, the Government, Ministries and the Authority at the Martial Law Coordination Meetings against the climbing up anarchic events despite the great efforts exerted in order to ensure that the Martial Law, which is in effect for eight months, achieves its goal, and peace, order and security is established across the country have not been fulfilled though being insisted upon. Thus, the Martial Law Authorities have been put in difficult positions (Kutay 1985a: 264).<sup>46</sup>

Sükan declared that he had to resign from the government because of the presence of “unnational” Minister, because of the corrupt Ministers, inability to solve the economic problems of the country; so proposed for a new government (Kutay 1985a: 267-9).

The Second National Front government was brought down with interpellation when 11 MPs resigned from the JP on December 31, 1977. Bilgiç also claimed that

---

<sup>46</sup> Sayın Cumhurbaşkanım,

Yüksek malûmları bulunduğu üzere Millî Güvenlik Kurulunda «Devletin İç ve Dış Güvenliği» ve «Temel Meseleleri» ile ilgili alınan tavsiye kararlarının çok büyük çoğunluğu uygulama ve icra safhasına intikâl etmemiştir;

- a) Ülke ve Millet bütünlüğünü, Devlet Otoritesini, Kamu Düzenini yıkmayı amaçlayan anarşi yuvaları, tedhiş ve cinayet teşkilâtlarıyla mücadele,
- b) Türk Silâhlı Kuvvetlerinin güçlendirilmesi ve Millî Savunmamızın acil ihtiyaçlarının karşılanması,
- c) İdarenin ve Kolluk Kuvvetlerinin güçlendirilmesi, yeniden düzenlenmesi ve modernizasyonu,
- d) Güvenlik Mahkemeleri,
- e) Siyasî ve Ekonomik istikrar,
- f) Kaçakçılık ve özellikle silâh kaçakçılığı, gibi konularda alınmış bulunan tavsiye kararları nazari temenniler halinde kalmıştır.

Aynı şekilde sekiz aydan beri uygulanan Sıkıyönetimin amacına ulaşması, Yurtta huzur, güvenlik ve asayişin sağlanması yolundaki üstün gayretlerine rağmen, tırmanan anarşik olaylar karşısında Sıkıyönetim Eşgüdüm Toplantılarında Sıkıyönetim Komutanları ve sorumluları tarafından Hükümet, Bakanlıklar ve İdarece alınması zorunlu görülen önlemlerin pekçoğu ısrarlara rağmen yerine getirilmemiştir. Bu yüzden Sıkıyönetim Makamları zor durumlara düşürülmüştür.

“Ministry Bargain” (bakanlık pazarlığı) occurred in the establishment of the 1978 Ecevit government, not in their first NF government (Bilgiç 2007: 255).

The government had started to shake apart because Oğuz Atalay; deputy from Konya, Mete Tan; deputy from Afyon, Enver Akoav; deputy from Sivas, Cemalettin İnkaya; senator from Balıkesir, Orhan Alp and Mustafa Kılıç; deputies from Ankara, Hasan Korkut; deputy from Kırklareli, Ahmet Karaaslan; deputy from Malatya, Tuncay Mataracı; deputy from Rize, and Hilmi İşgüzar; deputy from Sinop submitted their resignation from the JP and began the negotiations for government with Bülent Ecevit; the Chairperson of the RPP at Florya Güneş Motel. Ecevit had obtained the support of Turhan Feyzioğlu; chairperson of RRP and Faruk Sükan of the DticP for the government he would form. When these deputies resigned from the JP, the government, which barely achieved a vote of confidence with only 222 votes, fell on December 31, 1977 with a motion of censure. Ecevit formed its government by means of granting positions of ministers to those quitted the JP and supported by independent deputies and got the vote of confidence on January 17, 1978. (This was a bargain for ministries) This was not the establishment of 1<sup>st</sup> NF in 1975 (Bilgiç 2007: 255).<sup>47</sup>

Sükan explained his participation in 1978 Ecevit government as acting for the sake of country’s welfare without limits (Kutay 1985a: 36). Despite his ideological difference from RPP and absence of his own party group, he was encouraged to take part in the government and Sükan explained that he might not be offered a place in the government and Vice Prime Ministry just because of his only vote (Kutay 1985a: 36). After these short-lived governments, the general attitude of the society’s interest groups was that only the RPP-JP government would address to the seriousness of the conditions of the country (Demirel 2003b: 263).

---

<sup>47</sup> Hükümet sallanmaya başlamıştı. Çünkü Konya Milletvekili Oğuz Atalay, Afyon Milletvekili Mete Tan, Güneş Öngüt, Sivas Milletvekili Enver Akova, Balıkesir Senatörü Cemalettin İnkaya, Ankara Milletvekili Orhan Alp ve Mustafa Kılıç, Kırklareli Milletvekili Hasan Korkut, Malatya Milletvekili Ahmet Karaaslan, Rize Milletvekili Tuncay Mataracı, Sinop Milletvekili Hilmi İşgüzar AP'den istifa ederek CHP Genel Başkanı Bülent Ecevit'le Florya Güneş Model'de hükümet pazarlıklarına başlamışlardı. Ecevit'in kuracağı hükümete CGP Genel Başkanı Turhan Feyzioğlu ve DP'den Faruk Sükan'da destek oluyordu. Bu arkadaşlar AP'den istifa edince, zaten 222 oyla ucuna güvenoyu almış olan hükümet, 31 Aralık 1977'de gensoru ile düşürüldü. Ecevit, AP'den istifa edenlere de bakanlık vererek bağımsızlarla destekli hükümetini kurdu ve 17 Ocak 1978'de güvenoyu aldı. (Bakanlık pazarlığı bu idi.) 1975 te 1. ci MC'nin kuruluşu değildi.

## CHAPTER IV

### IDEOLOGICAL STANDPOINT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

“As it is known every border is a relationship; its inside and outside determine the difference between us and them”<sup>48</sup>

#### 4.1. Nationalism of the Democratic Party

Nationalism understanding within the right wing always fluctuated since Republican period, and especially in the period of ideological polarization. Nationalists and State authority had to give answers to questions such as “who are we in fact?” and “how should we be?”. To define the Democratic Party’s ideology, nationalism was an important component as far as the period’s definition was “milliyetçi-mukaddesatçı” instead of Turkish Islamic synthesis. Nationalism according to Bora (2002: 15) should describe a peculiarity to the society even if superiority of the nation could not be achieved. National identity should have overrated characteristics, at least to distinguish it from other nations. Nationalism was a tabula rasa for all ideologies -including left wing- that hegemonic power was achieved via nationalism as it could embed into different ideological components.

Attributes of national character were seen as genetic codes like liberationism (bağımsızlıkçılık) and eternal love of the nation (ezeli milletperverlik). However, liberationism was defeated by the nationalist discourse of “love of nation”. Moreover, the DticP was against understanding of nationalism as only economical;

---

<sup>48</sup> “Çünkü bilindiği üzere bir ilişkidir her sınır; içerisi ile dışarı, biz ve onlar arasındaki farkı belirler. p. 32 Zeynep B. Sayın, 1997, Filoloji ve İslâm: Yeni Bir Kültürel Okumaya Doğru, *Birikim*, 95 (Mart), pp. 31-36.

spiritual development was important for nationalism. Equalizing civilization with development enabled centre right which could appeal to intelligence world of the public, to satisfy the public with populist policies and protect it from excessive practices of private sector (Bozbeyli 1976: 73). It meant that development was sufficient for the welfare of the country to the extent that prosperity was within the limits which were set differently by the DticP than the Democrat Party and the Justice Party. Kemalist tradition also understood nationalism in a developmentalist way; “Demir ağla örmek” continued with the JP’s “taking water to the waterless villages, peasants”. Both Menderes & Demirel were nationalist-populists transforming nationalism to economic development “hope” but neither unlike the DticP and Bozbeyli had cared about the inequalities in development.

We are nationalists. We are proud of this clear feature of ours. We respect the national, historical and moral values. We do not hold the view that material development is sufficient for the human, for the nation. We believe in the necessity of spiritual and cultural development as well “Cevat Önder” (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 15).<sup>49</sup>

The nationalism in conservative tendencies of petty bourgeoisie enlarged the nationalism of the DticP to the fertile and inaccurate areas of “moral and cultural development”. Restricting nationalism to foster the economic well-being of the masses decreased the ideological effectiveness of the nationalist discourse. Although the JP had conservative and nationalist tendencies, the party did not hesitate to emphasize industrialization which created social-economic problems for petty bourgeoisie who had religious and spiritual sentiments. Secular nationalism was not meaningful for masses, so religious representation should be taken into account. The party saw industrial development as a solution to the main problems of the country (Demirel 2004b: 275). The nationalist conservative intelligentsia at times saw this development as a means to emphasize the deficit of ideology of the party. The DP also developed a more spiritual and religious nationalism which was different from the Republican People’s Party.

Only some romantic nationalists were against the developmentalism of nationalism. In fact, this model of nationalism began to fade away when the economy reached to

---

<sup>49</sup> “Biz milliyetçiyiz. Bu mümeyyiz vasfımızla iftihar ederiz. Tefrikacı değiliz. Milli, tarihi ve manevi değerlere saygılıyız. İnsan için, millet için maddi kalkınmanın yeterli olduğuna kani değiliz. Manevi ve kültürel kalkınmanın da zaruretine inanıyoruz”.

saturation and when the left-right wing polarization was gaining tension. From 1965 on, the JP began to declare the importance they gave to national unity (Dodd 1969: 144), which signaled the beginning of change in the understanding of nationalism of the party. Also, the DticP was formed in the process of economic cooperative model that did not satisfy the workers or the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie had an internal struggle and claimed that the economic deterioration affected them the most. Also, workers, being affected by the conjecture, demanded more rights. So, the nationalist interpretation of economics was not included in the agenda of the DticP; they rather would like to open the economy to international markets and criticize especially Technocrat governments for implementing “nationalization” of economic resources similar to the RPP’s economy programme.

Despite the economic understanding of loving the “sacred land”, the party shared the common ideological representation of nationalism with other right wing parties. Shaping the idea of nation around a sacred “love of us” led to the secularization of sacredness as the nation should be saved from being a hollow representation. In this way, the nation ascended as a self-evident value in the discourses of the DticP as in all the right-wing discourses (Bora 2009a: 59). The assumption that being “Turkish” was a value in itself is meaningful to show the change in Turkish nationalism.

At the other pole of right wing nationalism, there was the National Order Party-National Salvation Party that demanded the cultural rights of “periphery” against “bureaucratic center” which was semi in semi outside the DP tradition (İnsel 2002: 773). The DticP tried to effect different nationalist discourse between the JP and the National Salvation Party, which reproduced the conservative axis of nationalism.

We will spend efforts oriented at ensuring our culture, being the outcome and fruit of thousands of years of suffering, worries and struggles of our ancestors, to improve and get matured in line and accordance with the circumstances of our times and requirements of the civilization yields to works that will revive and enliven this civilization instead of merely being a repetition and imitation of western cultures. To this end, the necessary acts and activities will be performed and the institutions will be established (Demokratik Parti Program: 63).<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Ecdadımızın binlerce yıllık mihnet ve gayretlerinin mahsulü olan kültürümüzün zamanımızın, şartlarına ve medeniyetin icaplarına uygun bir şekilde gelişmesini ve olgunlaşmasını sağlamak batı medeniyetine dahil kültürlerden birinin tekrarı ve taklidi olma yerine, bu medeniyete yeni renk katacak eserlerin doğmasına çalışılacaktır. Bunu temin için gerekli faaliyetlerde bulunulacak ve müesseseler kurulacaktır.

However, the DticP continued the enemy view of nationalism. As discussed by Alper & Göral (2003: 585) as the idea of a social Darwinist view of history, paranoid nationalism which was based on the idea that the nation was surrounded by enemies all around, is argued that nations should always be ready for war and protect their cultures”. It further assumed that differentiation within the nation was out of consideration.

“Us-essentialist” (biz özcü) nationalism, which becomes systemized and settled down as “otherization” form, feels compelled to develop a distinctive “other” concept (Bora 2009a: 82). In this logic, the continuous quest for an enemy should not be considered as needless.

This state which was founded by Turkish nation has been dominant and strong on Turkish land for 9 centuries. There are various contradictions of interest with contiguous states that encompass 4 sides of our country. If today these contiguous countries can not solve the contradictions as wished, it’s not for the sake of Turkish nation (Demokratik Parti’nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977).

National traumas are critical for the sake of mass’s remembrance of “others”. These were not just for the sake of definitional understanding of enemy; but also psychological conditioning. (Açıklık 2002: 135)

Take a look to the political history fed by the culture and civilization criteria of the Turk. The tradition and thought of the Turk has always fostered the will to found a state with pure patterns and motifs, and warranted the survival and continuity of the state. This result is the work and production of justice, virtue and merit. Those who do not fancy the cultural and civilization heritage of the Turkey have turned the politics into bravura on slippery floors by making use of swift tricks and cheats of the obsolete and ratty Byzantium that they admire. This game, in which you are also in all along, will not continue. You will fall down!.. “Ömer Lütfi Hocaoğlu” (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 30/a).<sup>51</sup>

Through out the conditioning of masses, warrior characteristic of Turkish nation should be underlined. As Altınay & Bora (2002: 141) concludes, Turkish nationalist

---

<sup>51</sup> Türk’ün kültür ve medeniyet ölçüleri ile beslenen siyasi tarihine bakınız. Türk geleneği ve Türk düşüncesi saf motifleri ile daima devlet kurma iradesini beslemiş ve devletin bekasını sağlamıştır. Bu sonuç adaletin, ahlakın ve faziletin eseridir. Türkün kültür ve medeniyet mirasını beğenmeyenler hayran oldukları köhne Bizansın ince hilelerini kullanarak siyaseti kaypak zemin üzerinde marifet gösterileri haline getirmiştir. Sizin de öteden beri içinde bulunduğunuz bu oyun devam etmeyecektir. Düşeceksiniz!..

ideology has used military material which has the potential to provoke national hatred.

Our Party acknowledges and accepts National Defense not only as a military issue, but also as the fulfillment of duties applying onto each individual of our nation and the entire state organization and utilization of the national values and facilities to this end for the protection and preservation of the independency of the Republic of Turkey, national and territorial integrity, national honor, dignity and pride, our international rights and the peace (Demokratik parti Programı: 101).<sup>52</sup>

This paranoia about “National Defence” constructed the past, future and its relations with neighbors based on “other nations” (Millas 2002: 193).

It is blindness and negligence not to be aware of and know the planned and sordid desires behind the plots and schemes of destructing the Turkish State. Such sordid plots directed towards Turkey, the only and single freedomist, and democratic country located in the key point of the Middle East where the blocks clash and full of perils for the world peace, can only be prevented the real possessors of the beloved fatherland (Dr. Faruk Sükan'ın Demokratik Parti Grubu Adına Yaptığı Konuşma, 72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 191).<sup>53</sup>

Primarily the DP, after that the DticP which can be considered as a follow-up of the JP with anti-communistic arguments of 1960-1980 conjuncture, described “patriotism” as protecting one’s native land against internal and external threats. In this conjuncture of polarization, it began to use the slogans “Powerful State” and “Nationalist Turkey” by giving up the relative liberal attitude that it had in 60s. It did not fail to provoke the nationalist heroism to which it had been distant before, it excused –to say the least- the nationalist violence legitimized by anti-communism. It set the demand for powerful administration, which was always adopted, to a discourse that was connected with connotations of nationalist-conservative state myth (Bora 2009b: 506). The DticP rejected the communist ideology as far as the communist ideology was a threat to capitalism and free enterprise.

---

<sup>52</sup> Partimiz Milli Savunmayı sadece bir askeri mesele olarak değil, Türkiye Cumhuriyetinin bağımsızlığını, millet ve ülke bütünlüğünü, milli şeref ve haysiyeti, uluslararası haklarımızı ve barışı koruma hususunda milletimizin her ferdine ve devlet teşkilatının bütününe şamil görevlerin ifası ve memleket değer ve imkanlarının bu istikamette kullanılması olarak kabul eder.

<sup>53</sup> Türk Devletini yıkma tertiplerinin arkasındaki hesaplı ve menfur emelleri bilmemek ve düşünmemek gaflettir. Blokların çarpıştığı, dünya sülhu için tehlikelerle dolu Orta Doğu'nun kilit noktasında hürriyetçi, demokratik nizamın tek hakimi Türkiye'ye müteveccih menfur tertipleri ancak bu aziz vatanın gerçek sahipleri önleyebilir.

Communism was also a threat to the homogenous totality of the society. Beriş (2005: 400) quotes that although Turkish nationalism sees a homogeneous whole whose differences are dissolved in a pot within the frame of official ideology of the Republic, it can wrap itself up in varied images because of its eclectic and pragmatical features. For example, the DticP converted Turkish nationalism into an anti-communist Turkish-Islamic idea articulating conservatism (Bozbeyli 1976: 144):

Communism would abolish religious beliefs, freedom of faith and the entire spiritual and national values...<sup>54</sup>

In the DP period, the nationalism of official ideology was changing; nationalism itself was not so independent as the next period. It was represented through other ideologies and the effect of Kemalist nationalism continued. However, the period of 1960-1980 witnessed the polarization of right wing-left wing dichotomy. A hegemonic power struggle within the nationalist ideology took place our questions such as what was Turkish nationalism, what was the nation and what were its components.

Another negation of communism was that communism was against the “national goals” (Millas 2002: 193) which became “fetish” for nationalist view. Cold War period stigmatized communism as constructive element of “security problem”, which was critically supported by USA (Altınay & Bora 2002: 152). So, anti-communist parties welcomed the Martial Law just after 1971 Memorandum.

... that the Turkish Army prove its loyalty to national values, national self-esteem and pride, national democracy and law before the world public opinion. Indeed, the attitudes and practices of the authorities of martial law indicate the fact that communist activities have taken aim at the existence of our republic and national integrity has been solidly diagnosed. Appropriate precautions gradually and step-by-step being realized for this diagnosis unfolds the identity of the Turkish Military as the one being the unconquerable fortress of the ideal of Turkish nationalism (25.5.1971 tarihinde Sıkıyönetimin iki ay daha uzatılması münasebetiyle, D.P. Millet Meclisi Grubu Başkanvekili Hasan Korkmazcan T.B.M.M.'de yaptığı konuşma, 72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 195).<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Komünizm, ... dini inançları, ibadet hürriyetini ve topyekûn manevi ve milli değerlerimizi tahrip edecektir.

<sup>55</sup> ... Türk Ordusunun milli değerlere, milli haysiyete, milli demokrasiye ve hukuka bağlılığını, dünya kamuoyu önünde bir kere daha tescil ettirmesidir. Gerçekten, sıkıyönetim makamlarının tutum ve icraatı, komünist faaliyetlerin cumhuriyetimizin varlığına ve millet bütünlüğümüze yöneldiği gerçeğinin sağlam bir şekilde teşhis edildiğini göstermektedir. Bu teşhise uygun tedbirlerin adım adım

Various pressures and constraints of international communism has been a threat for the continuity of our state. Even certain functions such as ensuring the life and property safety of the classical state understanding are not out of order. The respect and love for the state accumulated and formed through the ages in the national conscience is day by day getting weak (Demokratik Parti Divanının Tebliği (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 137).<sup>56</sup>

Right wing ideologies established the nationalist discourse against communism in the period. Belge (2002: 184) claims that during identity construction process, “enemy” is more successful than the object itself. Even the Constitution which is the most important law of the country should demand anti-communism.

Absolute and final measures must be taken in order to protect and keep safe the Turkish Republic, described as a “nationalist, democratic, secular and social state governed by the rule of law” in our Constitution, and liberal democratic order against the deviant and lunatic ideological interpretations, imaginations and plans targeting alter and destruct them. Express and comprehensive legal provisions should be adopted in a way disabling the abuse of rights and freedoms stipulated in our Constitution.

b) There is need for legal provisions that will definitely preclude the construction, inculcations and plots directed towards altering and removal of the indivisible integrity of the state with its territory and nation (72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 206).<sup>57</sup>

The political atmosphere of the period was highly fragmented as Szyliowicz (1966: 481) explains;

These attacks were not slow in coming the debate deteriorated rapidly, for although the constitution forbade the promulgation of extremist doctrines, supporters of both the extreme left and the extreme right were active. For a while it looked as though riots and assault would mar the course of the Türkiye Komünizm Mücadele Derneği (Turkish Society for the Struggle against Communism), an extreme rightist organization founded in 1963, and having many AP members in its ranks. On several occasions, TKMD adherents attempted to sabotage meetings held by TIP.

---

gerçekleştirilmekte olması, Türk Ordusunun, Türk milliyetçiliği ülküsünün fetedilmez kalesi hüviyetini yeniden gözler önüne sermiştir.

<sup>56</sup> Milletlerarası komünizmin çeşitli zorlamaları devletimizin bekasını tehdit etmektedir. Klasik devlet anlayışının, can ve mal emniyetini sağlamak gibi belirli fonksiyonları dahi işleyemez hale gelmiştir. Milli vicdanda asırların kurduğu devlet saygısı ve devlet mehabeti her geçen gün zaafa uğramaktadır.

<sup>57</sup> Anayasamızda “Milliyetçi demokratik laik ve sosyal bir hukuk devleti” olarak nitelendirilen Türkiye Cumhuriyetini ve hürriyetçi demokratik nizamı tebdil ve tahribe yönelen sapık ideolojik yorum ve tasavvurlardan koruyucu kesin tedbirler alınmalıdır. Anayasamızın bahsettiği hak ve hürriyetlerin suistimaline imkan vermiyen sarıh hükümler getirilmelidir.

b) Devletimizin Ülkesi ve Milletiyle bölünmezliği esasını değiştirmeye ve ortadan kaldırmaya matuf; tefsir, telkin ve tertipleri kesinlikle önleyici hükümlere ihtiyaç vardır. “Ferruh Bozbeyli'nin Anayasa Değişikliği İle İlgili Beyanatı”

Nevertheless, throughout the election, demagogy was prevalent. The air was filled with such rightist charges as “Those of the right are Muslims, those of the left, infidels,” “Communism will be crushed,” “The struggle against Communism begins.” Some AP candidates accused the CHP of being communist or, more moderately, stated that the CHP was leading to communism.

Interestingly, the DticP could take a stand against every kind of “internationalization” and not only against communism, by transiting more its discourse: “Ecevit is “Socialist Internationalist” and Demirel is “Capitalist Internationalist” (Demokratik Parti’nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977). However, Demirel declared that the “Soviet threat” would conquer the country if the votes were fragmented within right wing parties and the JP did not rule. The negation of Demirel’s nationalism was not successful as far as Demirel acquired the image of the defender of right wing.

Being against all kinds of internationalization, the DticP criminalized all kinds of Western culture and demands for “national” to be established against the bureaucratic center (İnsel 2002: 773).

We believe in and are convinced to base the efforts of improving, developing and uplifting our nation upon our national culture. We are in the opinion that essential precautions should be put into realization in order to maintain and improve our national culture in compliance with the character of Turkish history and in line with the course of history.

We are opposed to generalization and dissemination of foreign ideologies under the “Culture.” We hold the view that there must be an official institution to examine, develop and disseminate our national culture and character (Demokratik Parti Programı: 18).<sup>58</sup>

Against the internalization of the culture and to find the genuine “national” one, national state should recommend new psycho-social and national ideals; so that legitimation and identification with nationalist values should be achieved (Açıkel 2002: 118). Identification with nationalist values would rehabilitate the mass to accept the sovereign’s rule (Lindisfarne 2002: 202).

The goal of our National Education Policy is to raise and bring up well-behaved and good citizens who accept to share happiness and sorrow, belief

---

<sup>58</sup> Milletimizi ilerletme, geliştirme ve kalkındırma gayretlerini milli kültürümüze dayamak lüzumuna kaniyiz. Milli kültürümüze, Türk tarihinin karakterine uygun ve tarihin akışı istikametinde muhafaza ve geliştirmek için gerekli tedbirlerin alınması inancındayız. Yabancı ideolojilerin "Kültür" adı altında yayılmasına karşıyız. Milli kültür ve karakterimizi inceliyecek, geliştirecek ve yayacak resmi bir teşekkülün lüzumuna kaniyiz.

and hope; to unite as an indivisible whole around the national consciousness and ideals; get and inspiration from the Turkish nationalism in their lifestyle and actions; sincerely believe the freedom of thought, and the science as its most precious product, and who have a sense of duty and responsibility (Demokratik Parti Program: 57).<sup>59</sup>

Nationalism viewed the ultimate aim of the society as protecting the homogeneity within the geographic borders (Alpkaya 2002: 156). Thus, geographic borders became the psychological borders of the nationalist mind.

The foundation of our national defense policy is based upon nationally all-out defense and joint defense with our allies in conformity with today's political and strategic circumstances and unique geo-political and strategic conditions of Turkey (Demokratik Parti Programı: 101).<sup>60</sup>

Within the psychological and geographical borders, nationalization made individuals to purify and also to have higher moral references (Açıklık 2002: 136). In this way, children would be raised in the national education system that would rehabilitate for the sake of not falling into the gap of "dangerous ideologies". The nation would unify the citizens under one typology, so that discrimination and assimilation would be possible (Lindisfarne 2002: 203).

e) Facilities and opportunities to enable the citizens to make the most of education and culture will be established and made available. Indiscipline and anarchy of values surrounding the young generations will be precluded. Utmost care and attention will be paid to bringing up the youth having spiritual and intellectual discipline and conscious of National ideals (Demokratik Parti Program: 58).

Any and all sorts of measures will be taken to make teaching a profession trusted and respected by the whole society; a profession with good financial means and spiritual credit, and a profession that will *generalize and protect national unity* (Demokratik Parti Program: 62, my emphasis).<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Milli Eğitim Politikamızın gayesi, sevinç ve kederde, inanç ve ümitte ortak olmayı, milli şuur ve idealler etrafında bölünmez bir bütün halinde birleşmeyi kabul eden; yaşayış ve hareketlerinde Türk milliyetçiliğinden hız ve ilham alan; fikir hürriyetine ve onun en değerli mahsulü olan ilme samimiyetle inanan araştırmacı, müteşebbis, vazife şuuruna ve sorumluluk duygusuna sahip, ahlaklı ve karakterli vatandaşlar yetiştirmektedir.

<sup>60</sup> Milli savunma politikamızın temeli, zamanımızın siyasi ve stratejik şartları ile Türkiye'nin özel jeopolitik ve stratejik şartlarına uygun, milletçe topyekün savunma ve müttefiklerimizle ortak savunma esasına dayanır.

<sup>61</sup> e) Vatandaşların eğitim ve kültür nimetlerinden istifade imkanları hazırlanacaktır. Genç nesilleri saran disiplinsizlik ve değerler anarşisi önlenecektir. Ruhi ve fikri disipline ve Milli mefkûre şuuruna sahip gençlerin yetiştirilmesine azami itina gösterilecektir. (Demokratik Parti Program: 58). Öğretmenliğin, bütün toplumun itimat ve saygı duyduğu, maddi imkanları ve manevi itibarı yerinde, *milli beraberliği yayıcı ve koruyucu* bir meslek haline getirilmesi için her türlü tedbir alınacaktır.

The nationalist interpretation of left-right antagonism divided the society into two camps: leftists that wanted to abolish nation-state and its nation's values and nationalists that supported free/democratic regime. Depending on this interpretation, Demirel chose to use the term nationalist rather than rightist. There might be two reasons as the rightist had negative interpretations in intellectuals' stratum such as to be the supporter of America and latter was that "nationalist" might likely to mean more to the masses than the "rightist". Also, Bozbeyli emphasized nationalism; but he did not stop to use the word "rightist" especially because he contented that "leftists define everything, even the right wing". He was the first right wing politician in right wing politics to propose a right wing doctrine, which was "Democratic Right".

The DticP's nationalism was defined by criticizing the JP; but at the same time it was not dramatically different from the JP. They both set the limits of nationalism with State and Nation. As Alpkaya (2002: 157) writes about nationalist ideology, nationalism of the Democratic Party was reproduced by making reference to country, Nation or Folk, sovereignty or liberty.

However, the DticP tried to differentiate itself from the JP's non-ideologicalness. Nationalist intelligentsia also accepted that nationalist idea was not a rich source for right wing politicians (Bora 2002: 17). So, unlike the DP-JP tradition, the DticP shared a nationalist discourse with the intellectuals. The party tried to distinguish its own nationalist ideological representation from the Justice Party and insisted to refer to the Democrat Party.

We are deeply committed to the philosophy and ideal that turned into politics with the Justice Party since the J.P. is the continuance of national democratic movement started in 1946 in terms of belief, formation and method. (46 Milletvekilinin Red Oyu'nun Nedenleri Hakkında Yaptıkları İlk Açıklama (13.2.1970) 72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 38).<sup>62</sup>

DticP criticized the JP for its non-nationalist aims for politics:

There are some circles trying to make the JP a colorless and dull party. We want the implementation of the JP program and by-laws faithful to the texts and soul by educated, honest and experienced hands. Politics is not an occupation not a goal for us; on the contrary, it is merely an opportunity and

---

<sup>62</sup> Biz Adalet Partisi ile siyaset haline gelen felsefe ve mefküreye bağlıyız. Çünkü, A.P. inanç, yapı ve metod bakımından 1946'da başlayan milli demokratik hareketin devamıdır.

means to serve more to the nation. Therefore, we believe in the necessary existence of moral and ethical values and sincerity in the foundation and basis of politics “Cevat Önder” (72’ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti: 15).<sup>63</sup>

According to Karpat (1982: 368), during the DP period, nationalism was the moment that economic liberalism, traditionalism, and religion, and the ideology of the economic and social status quo were in collaboration and consensus. Thus, religious sentiments or ethnic definitions were not dominant in its nationalism; the DP demanded nationalist ideas more and abused them to reach to the masses through the organizations like “Nationalists’ Association” and “Turkish Society for the Struggle against Communism”. The peak of the nationalist abuse of the DP against opposition parties and all other groups in opposition was “Motherland Front”, which was a mass radical nationalist organization all over the country (Çavdar 1983a: 2074). In the 1970s, “Idealist Hearths” whose connections with the NMP were known, was used as a fascist paramilitary force of parties in power. The anti-Western attitude was also a reflection of such kind of abuse of nationalism:

The immediate cause of this anti-Western, and especially anti-American, feeling was the economic assistance Turkey was receiving, which supposedly enabled the Democrats, according to the opposition, to perpetuate themselves in power. This assistance also enhanced the power of the new middle class, as mentioned before, and brought about the eclipse of the former ruling bureaucratic-intellectual groups. Anti-Western feelings were expressed through the old familiar claim that foreigners were taking over the country and running it (Karpat 1964: 71).

The nationalism of the JP did not directly break up with the Kemalist tradition. Despite the convergence of the JP’s nationalism to a more radical and fascist manner during Türkeş’s leadership of the Republican Peasants’ Nation Party (CKMP) and the Nationalist Movement Party (Demirel 2004b: 198), the party was closer to the Republican liberal understanding of nationalism. However, during 1970s, political antagonism built the dichotomy between nationalism and left. Despite Demirel’s reluctance about ethno-cultural definition of nation, he used nationalism and “national-spiritual values” to legitimize his discourse (Bora 2005b: 565). The radicalization of the nationalist discourse in this period was characterized as an anti-

---

<sup>63</sup> AP, renksiz, ruhsuz bir parti haline sokulmak istenmektedir. Biz AP programının ve tüzüğünün metnine ve ruhuna sadık bir tatbikatın, bilgili, namuslu ve tecrübeli eller vasıtasıyla yapılmasını istiyoruz. Politika, bizim için bir meslek veya gaye değil, millete daha fazla hizmet etmek imkan ve vasıtasıdır. Bu sebeple politikanın temelinde ahlakiliğin ve samimiyetin bulunmasının zaruretine inanıyoruz.

communist stand and arose from this point. In 1970s, the DticP and all other right wing parties had reached a consensus about the communist threat. While the right wing was highly fragmented in the parliament, the left wing was polarized into illegal organizations. The right wing parties recommended the coming together of the right wing; especially Bozbeyli and the DticP warned that the total right wing vote in Turkey signified that the Turkish nation wanted all right wing parties to form a coalition government. The DticP claimed that they did not form coalition with the RPP as far as the RPP was not a rightist party and criticized the NSP on this basis.

#### **4.2. Conservatism of the Democratic Party**

Beginning with Bora's (2009a: 53) definition of conservatism, it is a modern stand/mentality; also it is a perception/mentality which changes by time, it is always renewed as parallel to the progress of modernism. The right discourse with all versions within centre and out of centre gained a frame with the spiritual comment of Republican Revolution whose general mental map started to take shape in 30s (İrem 2003: 107). The conservative interpretation is a revisionist thought in favor of modernization and Westernization, but against materialism; in favor of Republic and Kemalism, but against its radical and Jacobean form, in favor of secularism but against the version that rejected explicitly religious symbols and values (Mert 2003: 314). In fact, these dilemmas always stood in the centre of the interpretation of the centre right parties, the Democrat Party, the Justice Party and the Democratic Party. In the subsection below (4.2), we discuss how the DticP became a conservative commentator; but not a polarized conservative of the period. As Bora (2009a: 39) discusses that every identity is a difference, peculiarity; and this difference is identified and depicted in comparison with anything else than itself; so DticP's conservatism was able to "discover" itself through the negation of contemporaries.

The DticP which claimed to be rightist and at the same time relied on spiritual values and religious sentiments had to be analyzed in the framework of conservatism. To understand conservative stand of the DticP, one has to discuss it with reference to the DP and the JP. Beginning with the DP, the spiritual comments of right wing have been on the political scene since the Republican Revolution. So, Kemalist regime

should be decoded and encoded again according to the principles of conservatism in order to establish a conservative interpretation. The DP was a bridge between religious masses and the State so that conservative demands had the chance to reach “Western” Republican regime. The supporters of the DP had different labels like nationalist, nationalist-conservative, spiritualist, religionist or lover of homeland (memleketçi), Easternist (Doğucu) (Bora 2009a: 54). The DticP shared the desire to represent the real authentic identity of Turkish society and such ideas anticipated Turkish Islamic synthesis.

If we do not desire to see, one day, the bayonets of the Red Army soldiers under our noses, if we do not want to be crashed by the Russian tanks in our own lands, let us come together, stand unite and fight with communism. If we do want to keep alive, dignify our grand nation, Islam, Koran and advance; let us get united against evil powers as a single fist gathering around the nationalists. Let us abandon blind partisanship and button the lips of enemies of the Turks and Islam (Tokat Declaration<sup>64, 65</sup>).

Turkish Islamic synthesis emerges in the fields that conservative populism is performed. It can convert public into a homogeneous whole with emphasis on conservatism and the reality of nation is constructed when real values of the nation are put forward.

The difference between “the ones who are “kul” of Allah and the ones who are “kul” of M.Ali Pasha” increases the number of people applauding to power of M.Ali Pasha. However, first principle is to be kul of Allah, a reputable member of Turkish nation (Bozbeyli 1976: 114).

The elites on whom populism depended might be the Kemalist elites for ex-DP memory or Demirel. The image of the JP in the eyes of urban and educated masses was an elitist view that encapsulated religious-traditional mentality as unscientific, not eligible to administration, enemy to their lifestyle, peasant, not modern, uncivilized and far from independence ideals of Republic (Demirel 2004b: 91). Until the National Salvation Party and the Nationalist Movement Party were established, the congregation of all nationalist-conservative labels was stigmatized to the JP. For

---

<sup>64</sup> The public declaration named “Büyük Türk Milleti Uyan! Milliyetçiler Ediyor Feveran: Tokat milliyetçi ve sağduyu sahibi siyasi partilerin ortak bildirisidir” was signed by the RRP, the JP, the NMP and the DticP.

<sup>65</sup> Bir gün Kızılordu askerlerinin süngülerini burnumuzun dibinde görmek istemiyorsak, kendi topraklarımızda Rus tankları altında ezilmek istemiyorsak, birleşip, komünizme karşı mücadele edelim. Yüce milletimizi, İslamı, Kur’anı yaşatmak, yüceltmek, yükselmek istiyorsak milliyetçilerin etrafında toplanarak tek yumruk halinde şer güçlerin karşısında birlik olalım. Katı parteciliği bırakarak Türk ve İslam düşmanlarının ağızlarına kilit vuralım.

the supporters and the opposition, the JP was the only address for the representation of conservatism. Demirel was successful in being conservative populist in the sense of talking to the mass with their dialect and world view, which is *common sense*.

From this point of view, the relationship of the DticP with conservatism will be examined. Hamit Emrah Beriş (2005: 389) claims that it is difficult to define Turkish right-wing on different ideologies, because these ideologies form different fault lines. Conservatism and the conservative stand of the party should be discussed keeping in mind this presupposition: was the DticP the representative of centre-right and with what its conservatism was articulated?

It is commonly believed in centre-right that the public is vulnerable to be abused and the right way can only be found by the help of Islam and nationalism. According to the claim of Taşkın (2007: 71), while nation and community were converted into a passive mass by being alienated from high political activities, which “essentialist” party would represent this better created a conflict in to which politics of right-wing. In this sense, the discussion was about the extent that nationalist and conservative factors would be effective in the discourses of right wing parties.

While articulating different components of right wing ideology such as conservatism & nationalism, right wing politics distinguish historical and political objects. So, conservative subject cleans out distinguishes the traditions that will be protected while rewriting history. For example while transition to multi-party political life was a value that should be protected for the DticP, 27 May 1960 was always remembered with its unfair acts to the DP.

The difficulty in determining the concept of conservatism is because of tendency to merge with every kind of ideology. While Bora (2009a: 58) tries to settle conservatism on a ground, he counts Religion, State, Authority and in parallel with these, Community (Cemaat), Nation, Tradition and history.

The DticP intended to bring both the “Spirit of 1946” and the Party itself into the political stage that the DticP delivered. The Spirit of 46 was exalted by itself through the ethos of all the values mentioned above.

While the Spirit of 1946, Bright faces of May 14 Democracy Day got dark sometimes, again hand in hand, again all together we set out, we dashed away their tears, steepened bent heads. The fate made us take part in a struggle of honour on the way to democracy after ten years. We are in the same belief and spirit this time, we will fly like a flag across the homeland with the same enthusiasm and desire (Demokratik Parti Eyüp İlçesi 1. Kongre Faaliyet Raporu 1971).

The Spirit of 46 was therefore a conservative call which turned to the axis in which Turkish public and democracy said “I’m here” by the representing the tradition. 1946 tradition was conservatively defined and they were the survivor of this tradition.

“Flashback-remembrance” is not only an escape from today; at the same time, it is required for power and political practices (Açikel 1996: 167). In this sense, the beginning of history the DticP was transition to multi-party life which was constantly repeated in their discourses. History is a tautological source of illumination for all the themes and values of conservatism (Bora 2009a: 60). But the coup d’état of 1960 formed the political stage that gave life for the idea of the DticP. The oppressed who intended to call this ghost back were the real owners of the right; the DticP reached to the point “in which the DticP was founded by the representatives of the Spirit of 1946, which is a golden page in the Turkish democratic history again” (Demokratik Parti Eyüp İlçesi 1. Kongre Faaliyet Raporu 1971). In this sense, we see reflexions of an instrumental perceptions of the DP.

The DP changed the Westernist understanding of the Republican People’s Party to a more conservative and religiously sentimental version. This version of conservatism was controlled and regulated by the State itself and at the same time left areas of opportunity to the public. Conservatism as political action was thus normalized and kept within the borders of State. The reactions of the conservative discourse against Republic were legalized and democratized (Mert 2003: 315).

Karpat (1964: 62) believes that the change of power from the RPP to the DP with modern and participative elections realized the legacy of Islamic tradition to popular will. But conservative concepts of authority and order continued to survive. As the population became the electorate, they developed Islam to more adaptable standards.

Islam melted in the pot of national will which was in fact the first real representation of centre right. It was felt that the DP managed to provide people with access to the state through the realization of tradition of religion. Demirel (2004b: 160) said that the DP neither aimed at understanding etatism or secularism in a more “social” way nor totally rejected them. The idea of –for example- development went hand in hand with the principles of Republic in the policies of the DP. So, conservative voters’ religious ideals were transformed into demands for development, which was the reason for normalization process. However, the DticP who claimed to be the heirs to the DP, tried to move this process backward. Because of the period’s increasing polarization and the presence of many representatives in right wing, the DticP tended to interpret secularism view in a more conservative and anti-Republican manner.

For conservative voters, the nation has to gain a meaning through and address religious and traditional attitudes. In conservative mentality, the Nation is another narrative of the meaning and importance attributed to the Community; just like the Community, it represents a transcendental and holy historical bond and a secure support for atomized social relations (Bora 2009a: 59). So the elements of tradition should be active for the sake of society. The JP seemed to be the protector of these elements, which included avoiding libertinism and drugs, distress of family values, publicly acceptable behaviors of women, and respect for religious symbols. The DticP criticized Demirel and the JP for not respecting these bonds which the society relied upon. For example, after the establishment of the 1<sup>st</sup> National Front government, the DticP published a newsletter and wrote about the non-fasting of Demirel during Ramadan, night life of a MP from the NSP, and the negative attitude of Türkeş about reciting azan in Arabic.

Bora&Erdoğan (2003: 636) write about Demirel that Demirel established the link with the common people by talking to them with the dialect of Isparta; in short, simple, descriptive and question-answer formatted sentences, showing that he shared the pure feelings and the mentality of the public. These questions-answers in the form of monologue were an effective way of calling to common sense because it included of an assumption of 'common feeling' and empathy. Demirel identified this 'common sense' mostly with the world view of small manufacturer, peasant, craftsman, artisan; in the word of Gramsci "the philosophy of crowds by themselves"

(Ives 2004: 41). On the contrary, Bozbeyli seemed to be unable to establish a populist discourse. Bozbeyli was more likely to resemble an elitist, naïve gentleman which erased the “common sense” feeling (Parti Liderlerinin Ruh Halleri 1975: 125).

The DticP’s attempt to keep the ideal of the DP alive resembled a reactionist which insisted on “yesterday” (Argın 2003: 472). But change was inevitable to conserve the power of conservatism, to adapt nostalgia to the moment and preserve it for a while –success in the elections of 1973- and it was reminded that there was the possibility of “doing harm to the sacred” (Çiğdem 1997: 33) if change is feared.

The Islamists’ ideological representation was successfully accomplished by the DP and the JP, which both did not have a definite and concrete program; but just defined secularism principle more flexibly and themselves against the left wing (Oruç 2009: 706). This change that DP and the JP adapted to their common ideology did not mean refusal of Republican secularism and the national state, restoration of Sultanate and Caliphate instead of Republic, return to the Arabic Alphabet, to open dervish lodges or to give a legal status to the religious orders in short, return to the old regime (Demirel 2004b: 160). Mostly it is argumentative discourse to present the RPP as an absolute break from the traditions to enable to define themselves as protectors of that tradition. Also, the DP or the JP did not change the stand of the State in foreign relations. Foreign policy in the axis of USA which had been started by the RPP was maintained. Dependence on NATO and integration with European Economic Community were unquestioned political aims of the right.

Both Demirel and Menderes were the conservative modernizers of the Turkish society who were more successful than single party period in modernization; they did not forcefully implement laws to force them away from their religious or traditional norms. They were also more akin to the heart of the politics than Islamists or nationalists. Islamism and nationalism had concrete and sticky “other” conceptualization that restricted them to the homogeneous nation and/or Islam (Taşkın 2009: 459). Centre right would avoid the normative language that may correspond to these movements and this was a vital choice for its hegemonic position.

Similarly, the DticP was quiet ‘soft’ on international affairs. They wanted to stay within the borders of the State. They usually claimed that they were against all polarizing movements. However, they had to take a stand that would differentiate them from the others –first of all- the JP from which they had broken away. This let them to more openly consider conservative policies in order to distinguish themselves from others.

#### **4.2.1. National Spiritual Values**

The spiritual and national values which were non-systematized and devoid of certain definition, played an important role in remaking the Democratic Party discourse out of that of Justice Party’s and shaping it according to the 1970s’ rightist tendencies. These values would be formed according to religion, nationalism, conservatism and in contrast to ‘enemy’ ideologies. The crucial point about these values for the DticP was that they signified the important points for their social project. The key element for the party’s spiritual and national values would be “authenticity”, which would hopefully lead public to attend to their ideology. As a result, the spiritual and national values of the DticP focused on family, morality and the Western cultural dilemma.

The rightist tradition, which enjoyed popular support -at an extent that was not perhaps expected even by the core cadres- as a result of the reaction to single party rule, was in a position of “putting together” its criticisms aimed at Republican project in a short period of time. Because of the non-ideologicalness of the centre right, the criticism of the RPP were obscure and inconsistent. The opposition could not be a structured alternative to Republican project; it was rather the negation of the policies of the RPP in a pragmatist sense that voiced the common sense of the people (Demirel 2004b: 159). So, the opposition against the RPP took the shape of stress on spiritual and national values.

The Democrat Party’s emphasis on the re-interpretation of secular nationalism leads it to accept the past of Islam/Ottoman for Turkish Nation within the national/spiritual values (Demirel 2004b: 204). The support base of the DP was ready to accept this

more “authentic” understanding of nationalism which contained spiritual motifs, religion and tradition. In fact, the DP appealed to masses in the sense that the public was sharply against the loss of the spiritual and national values due to the project of Westernizer elites (Göka & Göral & Güney 2003: 307). Despite the similarity of the DP elites and the RPP elites, the DP tried to handle the Westernist secularism by using spiritual values as a negotiation tool with the public. In fact, the DP would be the Westernizer of the masses who was ready if its values are protected. It was successful in voicing these spiritual values and at the same time making Westernization appealing to masses.

The bourgeoisie, provincial gentry, recent immigrants to the city and peasants understood conservatism as protecting some characteristics of traditional morality which had religious content (or rather which was legitimized by reference to religion) (Demirel 2004b: 175). Although the meaning or content of these values were not ascertained, it accepted the cliché of taking the technology of West, but protecting our national sacred values; the West had surpassed only in the fields of science and technology; but it could not fill the spiritual needs of humans. Consequently, the only thing to take from the Westerns was science and technology. It was necessary not to break off with Turkish-Islamic values and traditions. The JP’s programme expressed that the party was “reformist” and “loyal and respectful to the beliefs and spiritual values”. It can be concluded that the development would be accomplished within the borders that these values allowed.

The discourse included little more than the clichés that religion was not an obstacle for modernization, dependence on national and spiritual values was the precondition of development and Japanese development was realizing by taking only science from the West. A member of both the JP and the DtiP; Turgut, maintained that the West was “science to some extent, technique to some extent, law to some extent, freedom to some extent, even material to some extent” and stated that the distinguishing differential feature of the West was the belief in creating one’s own fate by oneself. According to Turgut, the style of Western thought and life could not be easily appropriated most countries, Turkey with its geographical location could be realized East-West synthesis by taking the positive aspects of both (Demirel 2004b: 173). Ali Fuat Başgil (1960: 106) who was an important figure in the JP and even the

candidate of the party for Presidential elections, repeated the cliché that “Western culture cannot fill the spiritual gap within the human”. He also exaggerated the cliché by claiming that “Turkish-Islamic civilization is superior to the Western civilization in some fields”.

Demirel as a pragmatist leader did not make such concrete declarations about the moral and national values; but used them as a part of negation or “otherization” process. There was consensus within the material and spiritual parts that material *pathos (duygulanım)* and the contractual structure that assured “Western civilization is not irreligiousness or immorality, idleness or libertinism” (Demirel 2005b: 581). Demirel would affirm the voter base of the Justice Party who behaved in daily life without internalizing Republican values but with a reaction to Republican elite that meant to try to erase the spiritual-moral values of society. Spiritual values in the conceptualization of centre-right wing -especially in the JP- de-emphasized the Islam as far as it would cause problems.

In conservatism, there is a sense of unique things that are lost in the speed of change (Bora&Onaran 2003: 236). This gives it the duty of a necromancer who tries to resurrect the past. Remedy to the present situation which caused the society lose its essence was hidden in the discourse of the party. The Dtp which supposed that family was the smallest cell of the nation searched for different ways to bring the lost uniqueness back.

National discipline and security of family should be taken into account as family life is in a big shock in today’s conditions. That silent solidarity and strong safety, *that old mysterious and magical life* which ties everyone to the home, prudence, mildness, compassion of mother under the protective wing of the father are destroyed. The feelings such as being content with what the child has, respect and truth given by such a life to the child, disappeared and left its place for desire to get away from home and greediness coming from the street. This condition created a psychological situation which housewives feel insecurity, restlessness and are worried about tomorrow. The role of giving certainty for tomorrow to housewife and make her gain *her old holy position* back is very important in the continuation of national discipline and conservation of existence of Turkish society. In this sense, as the Democratic Party proposal, an insurance system which is cheap, simple and quickly processing and which will insure housewives against illness, accident and death of their husbands will be brought to render them certain about their futures and enable them to make their duties at peace (Demokratik Parti 946 Hareketinin Mana ve Felsefesi Etrafında Elele 1973). (highlights are mine).

Conservatives tried to solve the problematic condition of the tradition existing under modernity remembering “the glory of the national past” (Taşkın 2007: 36). The glorification of the past hid the impossibility of revival of the “essence” which was always rallied.

Peace of great many bayrams has been sprinkled to this land since the day on which the Beloved Anatolian land was united with our crescent until today and blessing of great many bayrams pervaded our souls. First blessing was presented to lonely souls for whom there were not anybody to pray. Turkish-Islamic belief is this... This belief was there in front of Istanbul city walls, in Kanjiza, in Dumlupınar and Plevne. And as long as this belief exists, Turkish-Islamic existence will be for ever and ever. Belief in unity... Firstly, belief in the uniqueness of Allah, then belief in the unity of homeland and nation... A belief poem that surrounds our whole existence with its ghazi, martyr; dying, rest... (Bozbeyli 1976: 20<sup>66</sup>).

As far as there was a general attitude of conservative to blame Western culture for all evils, the DticP shared this with a double discourse towards Western culture. One of the important mottos of conservatism was to adapt development and technology to the existing essence, without changing its morality. While the DticP members also preached that they would imitate the Western culture in the models of economic progress, especially in liberal economic models, they exemplified conservative populism by talking about Turkish culture and “common sense”, and the “infallible conscience of Turkish people”.

Anti-Westernism of conservatives seemed to voice the masses’ spiritual and religious values to gain popular support. The relationship established through conservatives’ “popular consciousness” with reasonable demagogy of the public as a populist hegemonic power (Bora& Erdoğan 2003: 635) was related to the DticP’s belief in “courtesy and effort which we are sure that our beloved prudential nation will show along with a vast infallible common sense” (Demokratik Parti’nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977).

---

<sup>66</sup> Aziz Anadolu toprakları, hilalimizin koynuna girdiği günden bu güne kadar, bu topraklara bin bir bayramın huzuru serpilmiş ve ruhlarmıza bin bir bayramın duası sinmiştir. İlk dua, dua edeni kalmamış kimsesiz ruhlara armağan edilmiştir. Türk-İslam inancı işte budur... İstanbul surlarının önünde bu inanç, Kanije’de bu inanç, Plevne ve Dumlupınar’da bu inanç vardır. Ve bu inanç var oldukça Türk İslam varlığı ebediyete kadardır. Birlik inancı... Önce Allah’ın birliğine, sonra vatanın ve milletin birliğine olan inanç... Öleniyle, kalanıyla; şehidiyle, gazisiyle tüm varlığımızı saran bir inanç manzumesi...

After 1970, the ‘other’ conceptualization was not Westernizer secularist elites but leftist/socialist movements that became the real enemy of authentic/traditional values of the Turkish society that would be protected through nationalism. In that sense, nationalism acquired the nationalist/spiritual values which form the concept of “us” (Demirel 2005b: 548). Anti-Westernism of right wing ideology was even reached to a point of symbolic standpoint of anti-communism for right wing that was conceptualized through out the 1960-1980. Through out the 1970s which the DticP was active, the ambiguous role of the spiritual and national values played important part in the discourses of the party also; because the threat of communism sharpened the right wing, especially more conservative right wing approach that was the DticP to explain itself.

#### **4.2.2. Ideas about Religion**

Mert (2003: 314) critically argues that the concept of ‘conservatism’ is not used sufficiently in Turkey when political movements and discourses are evaluated. The right wing politics –as the background- is shaped around the concepts of Islamism and nationalism. The Democrat Party is important for not ‘adding’ new innovations but for opening new space for conservative politics and thought. Conservatives search the transcendental values of the nation in the ‘sea’ of Islam cosmology (Bora 2009a: 35). The meaning of nation cannot exclude Islam. Religion is critical enough to understand the dichotomy between the discourses of the Justice Party and the DticP; the DticP was more keen on religion than the JP. On the other hand, there are common points of the DticP and the DP.

Religion occupies a central place in the vision of social order of the right-wing. The DP- JP- DticP tradition criticized superstitions and did not want religious norms to control all fields of life. Yet, it was ready to grant that religious values played an important role in ensuring the social order as well as giving meaning to the world of the individual (Demirel 2004b: 183). In right wing mentality, it was also important to fix the corrupt order through religion in lay people’s mind; it used religion to create reaction against any oppositional movement by declaring it as the opponent of

religious and traditional values. The DticP was labeled as the Exremists within the JP demanded more rigid attitude about religion than the Justice Party:

«Secularism» has to do with administration. The government may be secular, but not the individual and society. The society and individuals comprising the society have a religion. They have a worldview and moral understanding constituted according to that religion (Teklif Ediyoruz Anayasa Değişiklikleri: 15).<sup>67</sup>

For conservatism, religion is a pragmatic component. Religion will change in modern circumstances and could be reformed. Religion for conservatism is not precious for the sake of itself rather for the sake of stabilization of the society and of Authority (Bora 2009a: 58). So, for conservatism religious bonds and rituals of religion are more ‘sacred’ than being religious.

With the DP, the state started to invest in religion more and more systematically in every sense (Bora 2009a: 125); because religion and religious institutions were an elusive tool for communication and interaction (Çavdar 1983a: 2073). These and its liberal structure enabled the DP to be the alternative that gave confidence and hope to the public (Göka&Göral&Güney 2003: 307). The DP was seen as ‘liberal’ in the sense of allowing the religious activities of the society. As the ‘periphery’ party that had religious sensibilities –at least respecting them-, the DP was successful against the Republican People’s Party of bureaucratic ‘centre’.

The first legislative action of the DP was to allow reciting the ezan in Arabic. This was an important compromise made to masses and religious circles that kept those masses under their influence. The criticism and reaction of the RPP and intellectuals about this policy helped the DP to disrupt the dialogue of these groups with masses; clearly this was the key point that *complaining to the nation* achieved (Çavdar 1983a: 2068). The DticP also complained to the nation that Türkeş could not be a partner of a nationalist or rightist coalition since he had been against the Arabic reciting of the ezan in the DP period. He was also criticized for being more religious only after the expulsion of the Atsız group from the party.

---

<sup>67</sup> «Laiklik» devlet idaresinde bahis konusudur. Devlet laik olabilir, ama fert ve cemiyet laik olamaz. Cemiyetin ve onu meydana getiren fertlerin bir dini vardır. O dine göre teşekkül etmiş bir dünya görüşleri ve ahlak anlayışları vardır.

If we look at the initial formation period of the JP, about religion and Kemalist regime attitude there were different polars. The group that had no direct reaction to Kemalist regime and Westernization project, and the group that took references from Islam related to political and social life and were hard to accept the Republican life had both participation in the party (Demirel 2004b: 51). However, it is critical to note that at the Chairman Selection of the JP after Gümüşpala, there were two candidates namely Süleyman Demirel and Sadettin Bilgiç. Against Bilgiç, who represented the religiosity and conservative tendencies more than his rival Demirel, was not elected to the Chairmanship which explained the general stand of the party over religious issues. The party elites –including the out of party intellectuals and the important figures of the DticP- supported Demirel against a conservative candidate; that would not be able to congregate the overall right wing tendencies in the 1960s before the fragmentation of politics in the next decade.

To be sure, as there were not religious political parties, before the National Salvation Party right wing solution showed the JP as the lesser of two evils. When the NSP was established, it was not able to take the support of religious orders as they did not give it chance of coming to power (Demirel 2004b: 52). The JP did not turn down these groups, claimed that “We do not understand secularism as opposition to religion, disrespect to religion or irreligiousness. The state being secular does not mean to break off the relations of the citizens with religion. Every citizen should be free to exercise the religious rituals and religion to which he belongs”.

It can be claimed that the DticP would have been likely to take the advantage of conservative polarization in the context of fragmentation of politics. Also, in Democratic Programme converting conservative stand with the tradition of the DP made it one of fundamental discourses of the DticP.

To our party, freedom of conscience and religious belief and thought are natural and sacred rights of people like other freedoms. We do not consider secularism as disrespect to religion or as atheism. That the government is secular does not mean that people should cut their ties with the religion, or put pressure upon each other either. Each citizen is free to practice their religious duties and obligations and prayers of their religions. We believe that

the religion should not interfere with the state affairs and should not be abused for personal and political goals (Demokratik Parti Program: 17).<sup>68</sup>

The JP's policies of increasing the number of Religious Vocational Secondary Schools and High Schools, encouraging Koran Courses and Higher Institutes of Islam also satisfied religious groups. In addition, the number of the clergy was increased, which was also one of the goals of the DticP.

Just like the NSP instrumentalized religion, the JP appealed to ordinary people's religious feelings through "equalizing being Muslim to being supporter of the JP" (Demirel 2004b: 192). Of course, they were criticized by the Kemalist elite who used the cliché of "making religion an instrument of politics". The RPP elites humiliated the JP's voter base as 'peasant' and its success at the polls as primarily a result of its "reckless and demagogic exploitation" of the religious feelings of ignorant people (Sherwood 1967: 58). It can not be concluded that peasant population's political choices were just the result of this; but it is certain that the JP made religious demagoguery with the purpose of protecting its own line in political struggle.

Kemalist elite was unsuccessful in explaining the secularism to the masses (Demirel 2004b: 182); however the DP and the JP defined secularism within the limits of the state and the public. This secularism would not shake the world of ordinary people and not ask them to abandon religious norms. The conservatism and the relations of Demirel with conservative groups dramatically changed from 1960 to 1970s. Demirel -just like Menderes- used ideological mobilizations as a last solution when centre right leadership could not provide enough mobilization with economic populism or the resources for distribution as a tool of patronage was about to dry up in times of crisis (Alper&Göral 2003: 584).

---

<sup>68</sup> Partimize göre vicdan ve dini inanç ve kanaat hürriyeti; diğer hürriyetler gibi, insanların tabii ve mukaddes hakkıdır. Laikliği din aleyhtarlığı; dine saygısızlık ve dinsizlik şeklinde anlamıyoruz. Devletin laik olması vatandaşların dinleri ile alakalarını kesmeleri olmadığı gibi birbirlerine karşı baskıda bulunmaları da demek değildir. Her vatandaş mensup olduğu dinin vecibelerini ifada ve ibadet şekillerini icrada serbesttir. Dinin devlet işlerine müdahale etmemesi ve dinin şahsi ve siyasi emellere alet edilmemesi lüzumuna inanıyoruz.

The concept of Spirituality which comes up as a result of moral and religious interaction of conservatism, functionalizes the dogmatic sides of religion by softening for moral dimension which is more practical in historical sense (Öğün 1997: 125). Öğün explains that conservatism had no problem with secularization of the state, therefore;

“There has never been such a period in which the religion was used as an instrument in policy, abuse of religion and trade of it were done and even so much malignity was done to our great religion, Islam as today (Demokratik Parti'nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977).

In fact, what made conservative worry was disintegration of the state from religion ethically as religion-politics relationship was drawn at moral and social level; actually so the party promised to be “a government comprised of people suitable for rules of man of the administration and the state, moral principles and the sense of virtue of our nation” (Demokratik Parti 946 Hareketinin Mana ve Felsefesi Etrafında Elele 1973). At the moments when charisma becomes a routine, selected elites and nationalist conservative intellectuals who are the real and organic components of the nation take the place of great leaders (Taşkın 2007: 39); because “Everyone has a duty in the service of the nation, but responsibility and duty of intellectual person are greater” (Bozbeyleli 1976: 118<sup>69</sup>).

#### **4.2.3. The National Salvation Party and the Democratic Party**

In this section, we conduct a comparison of the National Salvation Party, the Democrat Party, the Justice Party and the Democratic Party on the basis of the religion. The NSP is taken into account in determining the conservatism of the DticP's ideology because the DticP lied in between the non-ideologicalness of the JP and the harshness of the NSP's religious ideas. Conservative point of view started to play a role in the government of the DP. Religious and conservative ideas which could not find place to itself in one party period due to the official ideology, became the populist voice of the period of the DP that did not have a different programme from the Republican People's Party. Landowners, farmers, craftsmen, workers and traders were represented against the Westernized elites of the RPP; so the connection

---

<sup>69</sup> Millet hizmetinde herkesin görevi vardır, fakat aydın kişinin görevi ve sorumluluğu daha büyüktür.

between masses and the party was a populist link that the DP was activated against the RPP.

After 1960 Coup D'état, the JP was chosen for right wing solution by conservative voters. As the right wing began to disintegrate into smaller parties, the NSP drew the lines more clearly for religious beliefs and its ideological representation. Therefore, by the 1971 Memorandum, ideological transformation of religion and Islamist intelligentsia had become an important fact for understanding the period.

The NSP was a neo-Islamic party whose major concern was the partial re-traditionalization of Turkish culture along Islamic precepts. However, it placed this concern within a modern context by emphasizing rapid industrialization... The road to world leadership for Turkey, therefore, had to pass through the abandonment of reliance on the West both in cultural and economic terms. The "National Outlook" (Milli Görüş), as the NSP called its ideology, promised a country which would be fully industrialized through economic cooperation with the Muslim world, the prerequisite of which was the return to Islam as the basis of social organization (Toprak 1988: 125).

The NSP criticism was very important for the DticP because the party compared and contrasted itself with the NSP. The main argument of the DticP against the NSP was about their abuse of the religious sentiments which they saw as against the principles of secularism. The DticP criticized the NSP because of forming coalitions with not only right wing parties under the National Front governments; but also with the explicitly left of center, RPP. The RPP-NSP coalition was an argument for the DticP; they claimed they had not participated in it although it was proposed. And the participation of the NSP to this coalition was criticized as betrayal of conservative principles. According to the DticP, the NSP was not truly conservative as far as they passed an amnesty law which also covered the "anarchists, terrorists; enemies of *the Last Turkish-Islamist State*".

The difference of the DticP and the NSP was their respective class bases and the weight of religion in their discourses. The DticP had also worries related to clergy and religious schools. The NSP touched on religion with a sharper emphasis than the DticP. Although such sharpness resulted in the closure of the National Order Party that was founded first, it satisfied the expectations of voters. This enabled the NSP to have contacts with the petty bourgeoisie which was moving away from the DticP; since it could not meet the expectations of the petty bourgeoisie. Çiğdem

(1997: 49) claims that parties like the National Order Party in order to meet the expectations of this class, stressed a technocratic policy based on “the heavy industry” instead of reflecting Turkish conservatism. Ögün (2003: 579) mentions the existence of property based understanding which was parallel to liberalism in Turkish conservatism until 1980s. This understanding supported by the mixed economy separated culture and technique as it tried to prevent irreparable effects of technique over culture. Having less protective commend over Westernization without interrupting the limits of nation state about religion, the DticP’s take on religious issues remained more integrated to the system.

The place of the religion in a political project was to tarnish the ones who gained economic power and left small industrialists weak as bad (immoral, infidel) religiously. Capitalism which developed irregularly caused a regression not only in the sense of economy but also in status. As development of capitalism and increase in “immorality” resulted from adaptation to the Western systems; hostility to the west and religious motifs were articulated (Yücekök 1983: 137). This religious opposition was first found in the NOP which defined itself more clearly with religious emphases and then in the NSP. But when the DticP acquired a conservative discourse, it stayed in the limits defined by the state.

There was indecisiveness and swinging between “fear of Islam” in which regressive side of the religion was stressed and the fascination with the ‘cement function’ religion. In fact, the DP and the JP successfully employed religion in their discourses. As anti-communist right wing politicians, they embodied the tension between Republic and the religious public. The DP remained as a legacy for the DticP when it came to religion; but they thought that Islam would lose with Masonic Demirel.

Turkish conservatism tried to fill the gap created by the political impotency at the early Republican period, with a cultural aggressiveness in the following periods. The depth of conservative thought would leave its place to a strict rightism and anti-communism (Çiğdem 2003: 15). The economic grounds of change were reflected in the cultural arena. Being powerless led these groups to define themselves in culturally strong terms. For example; the NOP and then the NSP defined themselves

in religious terms. The DticP also suggested the importance of religion for the society:

We should know that the people who are undressed from our spiritual and national values try to be able to speak authoritatively about the fate of nation and have begun to give the news of *red tomorrows* (Bozbeyli 1976: 21<sup>70</sup>). (highlight is mine)

Of course, religion also exists in the reality of nation. A nation cannot be without religion. Nationalism is to see the nation and homeland in unity and solidarity and to reach the future with this belief (Bozbeyli 1976: 23<sup>71</sup>).

It can be argued that the reason for the acceleration of religious emphasis of parties after 1971 Memorandum was the tremendous effect of left-wing movements and the rise of the RPP as the first party in elections. The DP and also the JP in 1960s used religious connotations as a populist discourse; but continued to remain in the framework of Republican secularism. 1970s highly fragmented atmosphere in right wing politics witnessed the DticP's ambition to present itself as the most conservative among right wing parties. They exposed 'unreligious' acts of the NSP members to stress their 'fake' piety.

Suggested improvements clergy were also efforts for connection with the social groups that it tried to represent. It is also possible to see this connection, which was established with *common sense* in Gramscian terminology, in disintegration of the party from another powerful party. Equalizing themselves to disadvantaged position of clerks is the *moment* where conservatism was articulated to populism (Bora& Erdoğan 2003: 635). The attempts to increase the social status and financial position of clergy could be considered as a conservative populist vessel.

Our party believes that the place and importance of religious schooling is great in the spiritual development of the nation. In this sense, establishment of new institutions which will educate qualified religious clerks and mighty religious scholars and development of the existing ones will be provided. In this matter, the existing and some rashly-formed threats will be destroyed and the middle part of Islamic Divinity Students High-Schools will be opened. The misery of substitute imams whose number has approached 15.000 will be eased and they will be taken into paid staff. The necessary importance will be given to Koran courses (Demokratik Parti 946 Hareketinin Mana ve Felsefesi Etrafında Elele 1973).

---

<sup>70</sup> Manevi ve milli değerlerimizden soyulmuş ve yabancılaşmış kimselerin millet kaderinde söz sahibi olmaya çalıştıkları ve kızıl yarınların müjdesini vermeye başladıklarını bilmeliyiz.

<sup>71</sup> Millet gerçeğinin içinde elbette din de vardır. Dinsiz millet olamaz...Milliyetçilik, vatani ve milleti birlik ve bütünlük içinde görmek ve bu inançla geleceğe uzanmaktır.

Despite all these attempts, the NSP continued to represent conservative masses. In addition, when it came to the end of 1960s, as Shaw (1976: 428) claims, the JP had difficulty in reconciling between conservative religious rural masses and the modern professional ones.<sup>72</sup> In a sense, the relations of the petty-bourgeois and pious citizens and big bourgeoisie, which the JP tried to represent were problematic. This enabled the DticP's representation of the religious rural or provincial petty bourgeoisie.

The problem of conservatives with modernism was not a reaction to it, but an attempt to contain it. The DP and the JP were the modernizers of religion and tradition. They elevated the power of these conservative groups as the latter took a larger part in economic activities and religion became less marginalized during their periods.

The DticP could not be the representative of all conservative voters. However, Necmeddin Erbakan who founded the NOP and was the Chairmanship of Union of Chambers could not organize of the opposition as he could not represent all groups who created conflict in the JP. He actually represented only small urban traders and manufacturers.

As also discussed by Cizre (2005: 101), it was seen that while the NSP could take all political rent where small retailers, traders and craftsmen felt cultural alienation and economic burden; the DticP was not efficient in the spokespersonship of the conservatism of such groups and in the representation of petty bourgeoisie.

#### **4.2.4. Nationalist-Conservatism of the Democratic Party**

The absence of orthodoxy in nationalist-conservatism is because of its tendency to articulate characteristics of any component that is possible unless it is the "enemy" of right wing. Nationalist residue is used to create nostalgia, expressed with

---

<sup>72</sup> In a research about religious petty bourgeoisie and their ideas about the political system; 82% of the members in religious organizations in Kocaeli were petty-bourgeoisie origin. It was expressed in most of the answers to the questions asked to the participants that foreign ideas, the imitation of West worsened the state and the homeland could only develop thanks to harsh, virtuous and courageous leaders. It was interpreted from the research that the petty bourgeoisie members were angry against the 1970s capitalism and its effects on them (Yücekök 1971: 189).

conservatives' concern about the erosion of nostalgia (Beriş 2005: 391). If national values can penetrate political memories by being articulated with spiritual values, they would be in collaboration with religious sentiments in order to construct a nationalist-conservative base.

In fact, both nationalism and conservatism were represented as a part of ideological mixture in right wing so that they would be rehabilitated and not gain hegemonic power by themselves. This synthesis of nationalism and conservatism had also an economic component which the DP and the JP justified. The developmental approach was included in the nationalist-populist discourse as the economic understanding of the synthesis. However, this economic approach did not find a place in the Democratic Party as they did not take part in governments to implement their policies. Rather, they depended on history, community and tradition. Islamism, being in conformity with the State, could become State Conservatism so that the State would be able to establish the nationalist-conservative discourse. Nationalism combined with conservatism was adapted to the line of nationalist-spiritualist whenever nationalist-conservatism had a more radical overtone.

The reference of "ancestry" which always finds a place for itself in the nationalist-conservative discourse is its backbone. Bringing nationalism which is a secular ideology into the mental world with religious motifs has led masses and the intellectual world to meet (Taşkın 2007: 31). Conservatives understood probably best that an aesthetical and nostalgic attitude for a lost tradition encapsulates the image of the tradition rather than the tradition itself (Çiğdem 1997: 45).

Our party sees our culture, which constitutes the most precious treasury and which is the product of efforts and service of our ancestries for thousands of years, as the poem of all the values which made the nation gain personality. In this respect, development and protection of our National culture which is the poem of spiritual and national values in accordance with the terms of time are the requirement of our nation (Demokratik Parti 946 Hareketinin Mana ve Felsefesi Etrafında Elele 1973).

As tradition played a vital role in revitalizing the conservative stand, the state with its role in politics and society was at the center of many political approaches as well as nationalist-conservative discourse. The role of the state at the top of the hierarchy in the eyes of the community not only assured conservatism but also enabled it to be

united with nationalism (Taşkın 2003: 382). The state was instrumentalized in the sense of reducing political activity of “Great Nation” to nationalist and conservative elites. The ideological cultural power of left wing was problematized also within the DticP unlike other right wing parties. The critique of “left wing defining the right wing” by Bozbeyli was instrumentalized to oppose the hegemonic power of the left-wing (Taşkın 2003: 389). The power of leftist intelligentsia in academia conveyed the importance of narrative of the right by that only “our ones” worry about the survival of the state.

Nationalist conservative elites -whether in politics or academics- wanted to gain hegemonic power. So, it has to be noticed that choosing “We are the future whose root is in the past” of Yahya Kemal as motto of National Culture Foundation of Turkey (Türkiye Milli Kültür Vakfı) presided by Bozbeyli was not accidental. This motto symbolized conservative-nationalist residue’s production phase which coincided with Turkish-Islamic synthesis’s foundations years.

Turkish-Islamic synthesis was an important ideal for the DticP which stayed out of the governments of National Front. The DP and the JP did not connect with the conservative-nationalist intellectuals until they could use the populist power and patronage relations. As the DticP did not come to power, they were intellectualized and established a more concrete conservative-nationalist discourse. The most important reason of this was that this synthesis acted as a cement against the left-wing. The emphasis of nationalist conservative intelligentsia on cultural development and its continuation (Taşkın 2007: 62) became a strong source of anti-communism in the DticP. In contrast to the left-wing which tried to transform the nation “into a mob that takes the bread out of each other’s mouth”, there was an emphasis on spiritual and national values that were alien to the left-wing.

Besides the moments in which the conservative axis could be analyzed, Çiğdem (1997: 32) describes conservatism as a situation, highlighting a style of thought to prevent it from being perceived as an ideology. While conservatism showed itself sometimes as a personality trait related to spirituality in the speeches of speakers of the DticP, sometimes it became socialized by being converted into a moral attitude. As conservatism could be attributed a moral stand point, the DticP rulers likened

themselves to Islamic heroes within the political context. During the political struggle of the DticP and Bozbeyli mentioning “torture of Bilal Al-Habeshi, who accepted Islam first, in the hot desert by Pagans” (Demokratik Parti’nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977) delivered the side which called on “the transcendental world” (Argın 2003: 472) of conservatism and hoped for help from it. Bozbeyli reminded the Nation’s dependence on religion against cruelty of “the ones who don’t belong to the nation”. The “torture” metaphor included was supported by the alleged control of the JP by the Masonic cadres; and the ‘torture’ of religion in the sense of electing the ones who were not truly pious.

Conservatism as complementary of rightist ideologies would become concrete in the form of defence of the tradition; it was based on rejecting every kind of change that targeted the world of tradition. It contained an emphasis on organic, authentic society and humans with a stable essence (Çiğdem 1997: 35); socialness of the tradition should be transformed into a personal feature in order to transfer it to the masses. Therefore, conservatism which was suppressed in the presence of local historicism and universalism, tried to find an exit by developing concepts such as *science, knowledge and wisdom*: “right hand which was the symbol of virtue, determination, faithfulness, the sign of the DP” according to the DticP (Demokratik Parti’nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977). Conservatives mobilized an age-old world of wisdom which went beyond individual histories and was grounded usually with universalism as antidote in the presence of unpredictable flourishing of traditions (Öğün 1997: 123). “If Demirel has facilities, we have our belief, Allah; we trust in the common sense of the Turkish nation” (Demokratik Parti’nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977).

Çiğdem (1997: 45) rightly points out that “Turkish conservatism is a conservatism which has to “create” instead of deciding what will protect it; in addition, it is possible to say that representation of conservatism holds conservatives in as a sheltering harbour to avoid all “the others”.

There is a possibility to describe the transformation experienced by the DticP of disintegration process by the distinction made by Argın (2003: 476) between idealist conservatism and realist conservatism. The realist conservative becomes conformist

to be able to take place in the existing political conjuncture; consequently he pays less attention to political ideals and brings modernism to the definition of tradition. In this way, it can be claimed that Bilgiç and his group preferred “politization” with their return to the JP and were being driven away from their ideals such as the Spirit of 46 and the tradition. However, Bozbeyli’s naive relationship (Demirel 2003a: 575) with politics made him idealist conservative by pushing him to “suprapolitics”.

### **4.3. Democracy and National Will**

#### **4.3.1. National Will Conceptualization of the Party**

Perceiving the society as a homogenous whole, nationhood is built upon the grounds of the relations of a nation with other nations. This populist discourse includes nation’s essential characteristics as good, right, beautiful. So, “national will” explains that there is not such need to protect the individual from his own state, the state and majority rule should not be limited in any case and should not interrupt the national will (Demirel 2005a: 502). “A leader (başbuğ) who is the beloved -the public will be at the head of this democracy-, every view opposing to “the Father of the Nation” will be squeezed mercilessly on account of the fact that it brings threat to the holy existence of the public (Eroğul 2003: 226)”. Because of this, the national will is the collection of all *powers* and the powers are deliberately assigned and passed to the authority. As the authority represents the majority as the nation can not be limited against the nation’s desire, right wing politicians felt that they ruled according to National Will (Bora 2005a: 502).

The perception of the nation as a collective but single entity was recognized by the Democratic Party especially after 1973 elections. Before the election, they had thought they would be chosen against the Justice Party. But the results showed that they just increased the fragmentation of the JP votes. This also did not satisfy the DticP cadre; as the national will did not come out as the DticP victory. After the elections, Bozbeyli assigned a role for all right wing parties: “the nation did not assign duty for a single party; we need a coalition” of the right wing that took 67 percent of the votes. The national will thus was equalized with the right wing.

As Demirel described, the motto “Escaping from the will of nation is the same thing with escaping from the nation”, placed “national sovereignty” and national will in the centre of centre right wing. These slogans conceptualized the Jacobean other that did not respect these values and fixed these codes as the ultimate representative values of the people (Bora &Canefe 2002: 645).

As far as it was an important standpoint for all right wing politics since the Democrat Party directed against the bureaucratic elite of the Republican People’s Party, the concept of national will was a crucial trivet for the DticP. The role of the DP, as the umbrella party for the groups against the RPP was continued by the JP. The opposition to RPP with alliance of military between 1960 and 1970 was articulated as the opposition against communism and leftist movements; this right wing alliance was acquired despite polarization of ideologies and fragmentation of politics. This articulation was achieved by economic liberalism, religious sensitivities and spiritual values (Karpat 1982: 375) and nationalism all under the name of national will and it became the core argument for both the DP and the JP. The DticP aimed also to be the representative of the national will by disregarding the JP and being the new DP.

#### **4.3.2. Fundamental Rights and Liberties Understanding of the Party**

The Democrat Party was demanding about the right/liberties since 1946. Especially when it was new and in opposition, it blamed the Republican People’s Party for unjust and illiberal activities. However, they were not “liberal”; as such they did not have the promise of expanding the rights of workers and others; also they limited every activity of the opposition party, the RPP, even to the point of not letting the opposition party broadcast from the radio before elections. Sarıbay (1991: 126-7) points out how liberal attitude of the DP declined when economical problems rose. For the sake of the economic development, democracy lost its power. The Democratic Party also declared their desire to support liberal Trade Union; but they were against “the anarchist acts of leftist groups”. This equalized stand about the allocation of rights/liberties was shared by the DticP as well.

Ülman & Tachau (1965: 159) suggests that in 1946 Turkish politics experienced a dramatic change with direct election of members of parliament, together with the formation of parties outside the RPP; but most importantly the change from an attitude of begging the government to “the one” making active demands on the government. In fact, leaving behind the discussion of the policies of the DP whether they were proper to basic rights and liberties, the DP was important for opening up the multi-party period. The right wing tradition did not continue this liberal attitude; and stopped at the election level for fundamental rights/liberties. The DticP regularly demanded “respect for the elections” which showed their obsession with the elections; they could not find anything more clearly liberal than elections.

Two principles that symbolized the programme of the DP were liberalism and democracy. Liberalism was defended in terms of both economy and social life. It was understood from the programme articles that the spirit of a private entrepreneurship in which property would be used as basis against etatism would be supported. Likewise, The DticP criticized the “nationalization” of the economy at its period and supported the dependence of the economy on private entrepreneurship. On the other hand, the DP envisioned a development based on agriculture. Both parties instrumentalized rights & liberties for economic liberalism.

Despite the general tendency to attribute all the limitations or borders of fundamental rights/liberties to national will, the Justice Party differentiated their attitude from the DP with a more liberal understanding against opposition by telling that even majorities could not harm “the essence of rights” (Demirel 2005b: 551). Demirel was more liberal after the Coup D’état and 1961 Constitution as army was against the DP tradition and 1961 Constitution restricted the sovereign’s rule with other bodies; however after 1971 when right wing got fragmented and leftist movements rose, his party switched the discourse to “Nationalist, Strong Turkey”. The DticP was established at this period when the 1961 Constitution was being openly criticized by the right wing for not letting authority to rule and rescue the country. At this point, the DticP did not have demands about the fundamental rights/liberties; instead the party’s main focus was amnesty of ex-Democrats’ political rights which were expected to strengthen its ties with ex-Democrats.

While the DticP preferred to address to the principle of fundamental rights and freedoms in that limited framework, it also asked for “an amnesty of the press with the exception of the ones who instigate hostility to the regime and destruction of the state” (Demokratik Parti 946 Hareketinin Mana ve Felsefesi Etrafinda Elele 1973). This tradition used double-discourse about the concept of rights/liberties as the JP also denied the freedom or liberties for the left wing, “there is not such as the right to abolish the state or freedom to restrict freedom” according to Demirel.

This double discourse was also seen in conservatism, conservatism did not become democratic because of concern for civic values. Rather it acquired a democratic content whenever it could link democracy to *majoritarianism* (Öğün 2003: 568).

In this thought, conservatism could rasp the “extremeness” of both state and civil society. Moral majorities could directly interrupt the unwanted actions of the state. The DP tradition and conservatism could reach a consensus and act together in the framework of moralist democracy. Moralist democracy in the tradition of the DP line had conservative tendencies that lacked libertarianism. The tradition that never accepted that state could do wrong constantly disturbed the liberal outlook of the DP about fundamental rights and liberties. Bozbeyli also explained that the State could not do wrong; with rightful administrators, it would always work in harmony efficiently.

The JP demanded fundamental rights and liberties especially at the establishment period as they were the representative of the DP, the victim of Coup D'état (Demirel 2004b: 240). The DticP since the outset declared their importance. However, political rights and liberties issue was consistently in the agenda of neither the JP nor the DticP when the problem was about the ‘politically opposite ones’. There was not an explicit rejection when an illiberal practice did not touch them. The double standard about the subject of rights/liberties continued to be exercised on socialist and leftist ideologies although they asked for fair trial, petition right, extortive rights of the nation during the discussion of the rights of the members of the DP. In fact, the DticP criticized the NSP since it could reach an agreement with the RPP on the basis of amnesty for “revolutionary, communist, anarchist, activist” or “the ones who used the autonomy of the universities and freedom of science for brain washing”

(Kutay 1985b: 234). For them, this was betrayal of the right-wing. In general, despite the expansion of democratic rights because of 1961 Constitution, Turkey became a security state against communism (and against even social democratic opposition) in the 1970s (Bozarslan 2009: 376).

The JP emphasized limits of freedom of thought especially when it came to the activities against Republican regime. As they stated in the declaration of 1969 election, the 1961 Constitution “did not accept the struggle against the fundamental order of the state and see political struggle only within the frame of these fundamental principles”. The declaration of 1973 Elections explained their stand more clearly: the Turkish constitution was not “open to take Turkish society to communism or fascism” and it did not recognize “the freedom of propaganda to destroy freedom” (Demirel 2004b: 243). Eliminating legal clauses limiting liberties did not interest the right-wing. Moreover, a less permissive constitution was preferred by them (Özel & Sarıkaya 2005: 463). In the Constitutional Amendments brochure of the DticP, they explained that they were the only party which took these amendments into its program. Having the same attitude with the JP, they criticized the RPP for not letting the constitution be changed. They found the bicameral system needless and also they thought that the Constitution left little authority to the Parliament.

In fact, the constituencies of neither the JP (Demirel 2004b: 253) nor the DticP had such desires from their party. The social base of the parties contained large landowners and small manufacturers and peasants, new migrants to the city, a developing faction of bourgeoisie, provincial small retailers and craftsmen; these groups would not expect expansion of political rights and liberties. In contrast, the DP’s intellectual supporters had demanded the enlargement of the fundamental rights/liberties and supported the DP against the RPP. As Dodd (1969: 141) states, JP’s rightist inclination stemmed not from authoritarianism, but from liberalism, which was freedom especially for the new rising commercial and industrial middle classes and for ‘traditional’ landowners’ religious interests.

The hesitant attitude of the JP about fundamental rights/liberties and its stress on majoritarian democracy had clear connections with national will (Demirel 2004). If

national will opened the doors for the rule of the DP-JP line, then majoritarian democracy was equalized to national will. The limitations of national will in relation to fundamental rights/liberties were not defined clearly in order to leave a large room of maneuver. For example, they did not approve the 1961 Constitution as it limited the strong execution power (Tunçay 1983: 2096). The Senate, Constitutional Court and other bodies were criticized because they saw them as a reflection of distrust towards the governments that were elected by national will. Despite their lack of parliamentary majority, the DticP also demanded the exercise of National Will through elected ones, which meant the limitation of the non-governmental powers in the executive.

#### **4.3.3. Democracy Notion of the Party**

The notion of democracy of the Democratic Party was the point that they were articulated to the discourse of the Democrat Party and the starting point for their criticisms of the Justice Party. Generally, elections had the most important place within their democracy understanding. According to Eroğul (2003: 279) formal democracy understanding of the DP only entailed voting once in every four years. However, despite the inactivity of politics of the voter base during these four years, “the vote” started to be meaningful with the DP’s coming into power in Turkey and at the same time this meant that “Turkish citizen also become meaningful” (Demirel 2004b: 220). Voting within the multiparty rather than single party context gained a more democratic dimension a part of the national will concept. The first competitive elections led the common person to express himself/herself politically and were a revolution in his/her minds (Karpaz 1962: 305).

The method of presenting the project of alternative ‘Nation’ was attributing the reform to the nation and carrying nation's values to political power within the slogan of the DP, which is 'Enough! right to speak is of the nation!' (Mert 2003: 314). This slogan included representation of the nation’s fundamental rights/liberties; but the DP conflicted with liberals as the liberals did not conform to the collectivist understanding of national will. The national will was the triumph of the mass against the elitists who did not see them as capable. In Eroğul’s (2003: 228) quotation from

Aydemir, it was pointed out that who was against this movement would be smashed like an ant before the national will. The DticP's sign was the "right hand" to symbolize the DP's gesture that the undemocratic, unjust acts of the elites would be stopped. This was a desire to hegemonize its own politics.

Their attitude about democracy and national will dramatically changed since the DP's opposition years. Sarıbay (1991: 125) discusses their criticisms about the gendarmerie, shortage of goods, taxes when they were in opposition; they activated democracy as the mediator of the public in the sense that they would not need anything to handle about the policies but democracy would be rooted in daily life. The DticP wanted to re-establish the DP's system in which the mass would directly give political duties to them as the representatives and the party should form the majority to rule in the parliament.

The belief in the superiority of the appointed over the elected should be dissolved in favour of the nation in the name of the nation with the concept of moral democracy (Taşkın 2007: 90). The DticP invited the political organizations different from them and "alien to national will", to democracy "as long as they are faithful to the rules of the Republic and the constitution; they should accept to come with the consent of the public and go with the will of the public" (Demokratik Parti'nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977). In this sense, it was a state-nation equation as the will of nation was indivisible in a mystical way. "Discrediting the precious sons of the nation with the coup d'état and then non-delivery of political rights" again were threatened to be "imprisoned in the conscience of the nation". Elections were so sacred since 1950; because when the nation voted for the parties, they delegated all their political rights to these parties and political participation according to the DP-JP tradition was restricted just to the elections. Because in the "classless" society of national will, the dichotomy was between supporters of the national will and "enemies of national will", who were the RPP for the DP, the RPP and communism for the JP and the DticP. Criticisms of the opposition and intellectuals were neglected as the parties took the support of the masses every four years of elections (Ahmad 2003: 108-9). The DticP's opposition was also directed against the JP in that they were the rivals fighting for the same constituent body; they were the unreal and dishonest representatives of the DP memorial who had betrayed to it.

The national will of the DP was vague a liberal-conservative discourse which can be described as “the public who want to live its religion” or “being opposed to social engineering”. The conceptualization as “the public who want to live its religion” with the national will, broke the alliance of nationalism with secularism (Sunar 1983: 2082). This outlook did not exclude the piety from nationalism and opened the way for nationalist-conservatism which was also maintained by the DticP in terms of this alliance. However, the DticP declared its nationalist-conservative stand more openly than the DP. It is possible to explain it with the different time periods of the two parties.

The state-nation equation was constituted with the reference of Republican system. Similar to the election system, Republican system was also the outcome of National Will.

We believe in the indispensability of principles of National Sovereignty as the foundation of our national existence, and of the Republic as a form of state. National Sovereignty is the manifestation of national will (Demokratik Parti Programı: 13).<sup>73</sup>

Reducing the idea of democracy to the concept of national will and filling it with the issue of amnesty for former Democrats which was the main discourse of the DticP, showed the representative mentality behind populist concepts of the party.

We accept that the equality under the law is as a requirement of the Law State stipulated by the Constitutional Order and that in such an order no person or group could have any privileges over the other. In the light of this opinion and principle, we find depriving people of certain rights such as right to be elected of some people who were involved in political incidents that occurred in the past contrary to the overall principles of the modern law state and principle of equality before law, and necessarily believe that the provisions to that end in our legislation must be annulled (Demokratik Parti Programı: 15).<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Milli varlığımızın temeli olan Milli Hakimiyet esaslarının ve devlet şekli olarak Cumhuriyetin vazgeçilmezliğine inanıyoruz. Milli Hakimiyet, milli iradenin tezahürüdür.

<sup>74</sup> Kanun önünde eşitliği, Anayasa Nizamının öngördüğü Hukuk Devletinin gereği olarak kabul ediyor; böyle bir nizamda her hangi bir şahsın veya zümrenin bir imtiyaza sahip olamayacağına inanıyoruz. Bu görüşün ve esasın ışığı altında geçmişte vuku bulan siyasi olaylar dolayısıyla bu olayların içinde bulunmuş olan şahısların, seçilme hakkı gibi bazı haklardan mahrum bırakılmalarını modern hukuk devletinin genel prensiplerine ve kanun karşısında eşitlik prensibine aykırı buluyor ve mevzuatımızda mevcut bu istikametteki hükümlerin kaldırılması zaruretine inanıyoruz.

Description of National will which was one of the fundamental arguments of the DticP was limited with sharp ideologies or doctrines such as Liberalism and Pan-Islamism its ambiguousness was protected. It was a form of mentality which was sometimes the real protector of status quo “in the name of Nation” and sometimes as conflicting with it (Taşkın 2007: 84). On the other hand, national will always confirmed “being one of us”, which was an emphasis of conservative populism. As Menderes and especially Demirel gained popular support through unmediated relations with the masses and they touched on the “ordinary man”’s issues, religious and spiritual values, base price of wheat etc. Anti-intellectualism was conducted to the audience by making reference to abstract concepts of *common sense*.

The representative tradition of the DP continued in the JP: despite the minority that did not accept the capability of Turkish nation to choose their true, authentic representative, they would be able to be represented by the JP according to the wishes of the Turkish nation. The attempt to transform the –consciousness- of the public reflected the distrust of these elites for the public. National will would develop the country economically and also protect the state and the nation from communism; because in a society where people trusted their state to carry the national will on, they would not be deceived by communism. The DticP leader also claimed that the leftists who tried to “awaken” the masses could not be literate or knowledgeable like the masses they tried to teach.

The national will which was not participatory but only vote based was criticized by the opposition; but according to the JP the participation should not be by the masses themselves. It was enough to select the representatives who were not alienated from them. The masses would have access to the governing authority as long as the national will was not interrupted by non-parliamentary forces. The separation of powers minimized the national will and resulted in rejecting the majority’s decisions. The abolishment of bicameral system and autonomous bodies were attributed to people’s desires, which became the main concern of the JP and the DticP.

Different interests would be reconciled in terms of erasing “small class differences”. Although Demirel accepted the reality of class in Turkey unlike the DP, he presented the JP as supra class by claiming that it was not based on a certain class, but the

Turkish nation which was comprised of peasants, farmers, workers, craftsmen and traders. But the DticP equalized the JP leader with the RPP for his support of big bourgeoisie and his Masonic relations, calling him part of “capitalist international” while Ecevit was “communist international”.

It is worth questioning how a party in the tradition of right-wing who did not have majority in the Parliament could arrive at the equation of majority-national will. “Elevating the nation over sacred values” (Demirel 2005b: 582) as the source of populist stand conveyed how the DticP positioned the public, in their discourse. As intrinsic values of the nation included religious values, “the minorities” that included “Socialist Internationalists, Bilderberg, secret chambers and international organizations” (Demokratik Parti’nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977) who were hostile to the nation were the real enemies of manifestation of national will. The dominant strand proceeded to stop the opponents of national will “in the name of the nation”. However, it was the conception of the DticP that -because of the national will- they were the natural and authentic representatives of the nation. The national will conceptualization was emphasized more by DticP as a follower of the DP than the JP, as the DticP needed the claim of being the new- DP; the JP had closed the era and become a new party on its own.

Although Demirel described national will as non-classness, he tried to reflect on the dichotomy between Republican state elites –military or civil- and the masses. The republican elites were a burden over the nation, were not keen to understand the beliefs or desires of the mass, and also could not be “national”. As they could not be the representative of the nation, the JP should be promoted as the real, authentic alternative. This seemed to be true especially after the 1977 elections in which even Bozbeyli could not be elected; the JP increased its votes relative to 1973 while erasing the DticP. Bozbeyli claimed in an interview that Turkish nation did not want them, as it sided with the powerful, but not with the honest, right one which showed in the end their non-approval by the National Will that they had tried to depend on.

The model of national will would be remembered on the subject of amnesty of the former the DP members. Obtaining political rights, representation of the rights of the group that was claimed to be the “real” representative of homogeneous whole and

representative of the nation would be “coming into existence of will” of the public represented.

“Denial of political rights (right to elect and be elected) from some Turkish citizens and enshrining this in the Constitution is a strangeness which is not seen in any of civilized, free and democratic countries and in their Constitutions (hand by hand around the philosophy and meaning of the Democratic Party 946 movement 1973).

It will be deceptive to think that the DticP saw the citizen as the agent as a continuation of the tradition of national will (Bora 2005a: 498). The nation could exist as long as they were represented and they could take part in the political scene as long as they used their right to vote.

The authority or responsibility delegated to the rulers according to elections by the masses could not be questioned for four years. The elections were the only time to announce the will of the masses. As Erdoğan & Üstüner (2005: 658) put it briefly “The DP tradition (the DP and JP populisms) identified democracy with “national will” and “the regime of majority”.”

Parliamentary power was important because it gave power to political parties so that the state could be democratic; but the goal was not to use state’s power democratically. National will not only legitimized using power over the masses but also limited the power of all oppositions to the DP-JP line (Bora 2005b: 558).

As also mentioned by Açıkel (1996: 172), symbolical selectiveness and configuration of history according to their own inclinations was an indispensable habit of Turkish centre-right. For example the repressive and authoritarian tendency of the DP especially at the end of 1950s had no place in this interpretation of history. Instead, drawing inspiration from the ‘spirit of 46’ of “real” democrats was always a part of the discourse of the DticP.

Taking a stand against the claim of civilizing public showed how anti-intellectualism and anti-doctrinalism of centre right wing merged in (Öğün 1997: 108).

Despite anti-intellectualism, ‘publicly traded companies’ were fictionalised as a result of hegemonic struggle in discourses to adapt the democratic left wing and “people’s houses” of Ecevit to “the democratic right”. The DP and the JP did not try to be intellectual unlike the DticP that was never a partner in any government and therefore had more intellectual worries than them. The other two parties established close relations with right wing ideologists only when their populist policies could not be implemented.

Although there was “civil commotion and national power union represented by majority of Turks who are faithful to their religion and faith, lover of freedom, who have the spiritual wealth and can not be deceived by bluffer threats, factitious promises of communism and among whom even the most illiterate is more rightminded, foreseeing, reasonable than the leftist who sees himself as the most learned man” (Bozbeyli 1976: 48<sup>75</sup>), he could not desist from saying that “Rightists will describe the right-wing. The rightist politician, the rightist writer, the rightist artist will have, weave and define his own idea” (Bozbeyli 1976: 29<sup>76</sup>). The desire to make the right superior to the left academia was hidden in the connection of rightist governments with intelligentsia although the connection continued to be weak. The DP, the JP and the DticP thought that society would not fall into the trap of the communism if it developed economically and spiritually.

#### **4.3.4. Populism of the Party**

The Democratic Party did not (or could not) participate in the coalition governments and thus could not have vehicles of populism. It can be argued that the cadre of the party tried to establish a form of right wing populism with the masses; but a clientelist relation with masses could not be maintained, which ended in 1977 elections’ terrible results for the DticP.

---

<sup>75</sup> ... Bütün sol propogandalara, aşağılama gayretlerine, yalanlarına rağmen, komünizmin düzme vaatlerine blöfçü tehditlerine kanmamış korkmamış manevi zenginliğe sahip hak ve hürriyetlerine aşık dinine ve imanına sadık ve en okumamışının bilen allâme geçinen solcudan daha mantıklı, ileri görüşlü, sağ duyulu Türk çoğunluğunun temsil ettiği milli güç birliği ve halk hareketidir.

<sup>76</sup> Sağcı politikacı, sağcı yazar, sağcı sanatkâr kendi fikrini tarif edecek, dokuyacak ve ona sahip olacaktır.

Populism was articulated to the ideologies of different groups like nationalist-conservative radicalists, social democrats and the army despite the divergence in their fundamental ideological choices (Bora & Canefe 2002: 662). Populists may share the common characteristic of having a basic dichotomy of the minority that was cunning, sinful, daemonic but was very powerful and the crowded mass –the public- that was hardworking, good, right (Demirel 2004b: 127). Believing in the people had also democratic connotations. Besides this dichotomy, the charismatic leader had to have direct relations with the masses without an intermediary, and should communicate with the audience in simple daily parlance involving anti-elitism and anti-intellectualism.

“Ordinary man” was articulated to be the protector of national culture and spiritual religious values in the framework of nationalist-conservative populism. The language that he used –even slang - was the rise of *ordinary public man* against the corruption of Westernized, cosmopolitan elites. The ‘ordinary man’ was categorized as part of the conceptualization of identity of national/religious values. In that was national populism came across cultural racism; he became a representative of authenticity of national quintessence (Bora & Canefe 2002: 654). Populism flourished in the fertile field of Republican People’s Party period, which was blamed for not “giving say to the nation” or for elitist civilization projects. Democrat Party populism was re-shaped according to the same starting point.

Populism in the period of DP was monopolized by the DP with the service (“hizmet”- clientalism) and also the symbolization of nationalist-conservative discourse in gestures of ideology (Bora & Canefe 2002: 647). The patronage that was dominant in that period, satisfied the sectors in upward mobility. This was a two-way street in which the DP won the elections and these sectors got articulated to the economic life (Yılmaz 2009: 493). In fact, populism was an independent element rather than being articulated to some ideology. This was the beginning of a period in which right wing parties would be successful.

The integration of the mass electorate to national political life produced two consequences. First, government came to affect more intensely the life of every citizen, the distributive and the redistributive functions of government received increasing emphasis while the prevalence of the extractive function

began to decline. Second, as an outcome of the first point, they became more interested in national political life and came to identify themselves more closely with national political institutions of which political parties were the main example. In this context, the economic policies of the DP which we have with a critical eye, were highly instrumental in building the citizen political system linkages, and promoting the integration of masses into national politics (Turan 1988: 82).

The DP followed the populist ideology through political participation of the masses, directed to their wishes, longing and support by making it no longer an elitist historical project (Sunar 1983: 2081). The party organization at the local level, knowing their regions very well, increased their “knowledge” about the masses and gave clues for the construction of a populist discourse so that the landlords participated in the success of their party (Dodd 1969: 44). Establishing the patronage relations at the local level was not a crucial task of the central party elites; rather they would be more helpful in describing “the need” for patronage relations. The head of local organizations was Sadettin Bilgiç who was known as an experienced organizer; when he broke up with the DticP, the party partially lost its link with the local organizations.

Sunar (1983: 2081) does not evaluate the success of the DP on the basis of class-relations. Different groups of society who had economic problems, supported the DP’s politics to defeat the prosperous, secular and civilized elite.

Yet, Tachau (2000: 130-131) points out the 1950 elections did not bring about the abolishment of the central elite:

It would be an error, however, to interpret the 1950 election simply as a one-dimensional political victory of the countryside over the urban based national elite. While it did mark the entry of the hitherto politically inert peasantry onto the national political stage, the character of the political elite at the center of the system did not change dramatically. In essence, the DP, which dominated the scene during the 1950s, differed from its predecessor and opponent principally in that it relied on the support of rural and other peripheral voters rather than the traditional power and prestige of the state-based civil and military bureaucracy.

The right wing political tradition was fed from a populism which prompted the ambition of being ‘first class citizen’ on a great scale (Mert 2007: 168). Demirel (2004b: 168) also argues that the adventure of the JP was seen as the struggle to hold

the ordinary people who were shoved, despised and dominated in esteem. The party pragmatized victimization in every sense by elevating the ordinary man to the status “master of nation” and in reminding the public that their voice which was the DP was stopped by the elites as a result of coup d’état.

The DticP at the establishment period had been thought to represent the petty bourgeoisie which was out of reach of the JP. In fact, the DticP in a populist way addressed the economically less powerful and “morally more powerful” petty bourgeoisie. Yet, the National Salvation Party was close to this constituency body and could reach them more easily.

Elite definition of the right wing was indeed against a certain group within the ruling elite. To put it another way, the JP was not against the “powerful state” which would have hierarchical structure. Within the populisms of the JP and the DP, the JP was more paternalist-statist, giving much importance to the state and social order – “national unity and solidarity”. In fact, other characteristics of populism were stronger in the JP than the DP which could be evaluated as the ossifying of the tradition: the service (“hizmet”) was more articulated to a populist discourse by the JP (Bora 2005b: 574).

The Democrat Party was more likely to be authoritarian than the Justice Party because of its RPP experience in the past. However, Demirel established his relation with in the framework of a ‘race for service’ (hizmet yarışı). Both parties tried to integrate these clientalist relations to the discourse of religion: “service to the public means service to God”. The DticP could not establish such relations with the masses, which was the crucial point for the political journey of the DticP. The minor parties like the DticP, the National Salvation Party (in 1973 elections had nearly same number of seats as the DticP) and the Nationalist Movement Party (1973 elections had only 3 MPs) established clientelist relations in the coalitions. As they became members of the coalitions, they were able to put their militants and constituency to bureaucratic posts. Critically, this increased their re-election chances and decreased resignations from the party. The DticP without participation to any of the governments between the years of 1971 and 1975, lost in 1975 some MPs to the First NF Government, which started the disintegration process.

#### 4.3.5. The Party's Ideas about State

The sense attributed by the Democratic Party to the state as an organic entity swung (Öğün 1997: 115) between the concepts of “rights, freedoms” and “unity.” “We, the supporters of the Democratic Party, say state at first. We say right, we say justice, we say Honor. We see protecting integrity of Nation and homeland on which we walk as key issue” (Demokratik Parti'nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977) as seen from this dichotomy, as well as being provider of fundamental rights and freedoms of the state, it comes forward that unity was a more important inducement for survival of the state.

Here lied state values and the paternalistic idea that collaborated to form the entire national will in the body of the State. The paternalistic approach that the state should not have a bad image and the existing system could not be bad, had a place in the DticP's language with the idea that “There is no need to change the order to get rid of sufferings of social problems. To implement the order honestly and fairly is enough” (Bozbeyli 1976: 31<sup>77</sup>). The Justice Party made special reference to the equivalence of the state and the nation which was a legacy of the Democrat Party and might be a survival of the Ottoman tradition not to criticize the Sultan but blame his entourage. The State as a transcendental entity should govern its people and the people would be guarded by the state. The State-people equation was established at this moment and the representation function of the state was transformed into the “people for the sake of the State”.

The “true” democracy of the DP was not built upon the principles of rights/liberties of the individual, but upon economic liberties. The DP claimed that individuals were not accorded their rights and liberties in Turkey in the single-party period. They indicated that the state acted arbitrarily and such arbitrary actions resulted in the expansion of state authority and this created insecurity among citizens (Tökin 1965: 79). Desiring to erase the negative effects of the state, they indicated especially the

---

<sup>77</sup> “Sosyal problemlerin çilesinden kurtulmak için düzen deęiřtirmeye de lüzum yoktur. Düzeni namusluca ve dürüstçe uygulamak yeter”

economic sphere. The DticP did not want the overt control of the state over economy; they asked for the decrease of taxes on private enterprises and were against nationalization. Without state's intervention, private sector and free enterprise would flourish and they would increase job prospects and provide safe working conditions according to these parties.

#### **4.4. Views on the Military**

It has been assumed that there was not an ideological divergence between the programmes of the Democratic Party and the Justice Party. But considering the relationship with the army, as also mentioned by Cizre (2005: 65), the JP did not follow the Democrat Party line especially at the beginning of 1960s with its two-sided relation with the army. The DticP made this approach part of its discourse more smoothly at the beginning of 1970s during which relations between the army and the centre right were reformed. Despite the fact that the founding cadre of the DticP had claimed to continue the ideal of the DP, the old antagonism between the DP and the military was replaced by animosity towards the left which enabled the DticP to have good relations with the military.

The military in Turkish political tradition has not been just the defender of country against external forces; but also they were “responsible” for progressive activities and “assigned” to spread the reforms to the country.

...Indeed the Turkish armed forces are broadly representative of the society as a whole. They are not dominated or controlled by any particular social group or political force. They are strongly committed to the legacy of Atatürk and to a modern, national, secular, republican state... They display, however, certain ambivalent attitudes towards democracy, characteristic of the military in other developing nations. In the elitist tradition described above, they tend to see themselves as the true guardians of the national interest, as opposed "partial" interests represented by political parties. They also consider themselves the protectors of national unity that, in their opinion, is often endangered by the divisive actions of political parties (Özbudun 1988: 40).

As reflecting the general attitude of the society, according to its own definition the military should be free of personal class and party interests. This attitude helped them to present themselves above classes. They accepted that their activities or

policies should not be advantageous or disadvantageous for any particular group in society. As such, the military seemed to address the common goal. So the military's direct interventions in politics in Turkey in 1960-1961, 1971-1973, and 1980-1983 were claimed to be done for protecting the secular-democratic state in Turkey (Heper & Güney 2000: 636).

This strengthened the belief that the military was above politics and in all military interventions politicians were blamed for not making use of democracy well (Heper & Itzkowitz-Shiffrinson 2005: 240). Democracy according to the military's belief was Republican reforms and whenever civilian politics contradicted with them, they intervened to 'fix'.

Considering the fact that in the history of the Republic (1923 to the present) civilians were able to subordinate the military fully for only brief periods, one may surmise that the problem is not only indirectly related to democratic credentials or quality of the leadership, but has deeper roots. The sense of powerlessness vis-a-vis the military which permeates the *Weltanschauung* of the civilian world seems to be the key factor (Demirel 2004a: 128).

Menderes had assessed the military in terms of advantages and disadvantages for his rule (Karpat 1988: 138). As a Republican politician, he admired the historical role of the military; but economically, he wanted to decrease the role of the military because of its increasing weight in the budget and unwelcoming attitude for new economic groups. But for the DticP in 1970s, military expenses did not seem to be too much as the military had a more "normalizing" function during these years.

After the 1960 Coup D'état, the JP was sanctioned for sharing the ideology of its predecessor, the DP. So, the JP had to play a double discourse game by stressing their link with the DP to the voters and telling the army that it was a new party. Although it tried to provide amnesty for ex-Democrats, they had to maintain a balanced relationship with the military.

The 'Extremists' within the JP, who later established the DticP, were seen as threats by the army and their leader was not elected to the Chairmanship of the JP. Sadettin Bilgiç, whose brother had been a MP of DP and other brother had been fired from the university after the 1960 Coup D'état, was not welcomed by the army. After the

1971 Memorandum the socialist/communist movements were seen as a new threat and this led to a consensus between the JP -also the DticP- and the military.

Although the JP itself was also a victim of the intervention of 1971, it did not refrain from supporting the regime that repressed leftist groups (Demirel 2004b: 247). Neither the JP nor the DticP differentiated between various left groups, and they were silent as they were handled very heavy-handedly by the commandships of Martial Law. The DticP believed that the legal left (the RPP) was guilty in the sense that they supported anarchist, illegal left.

As it is mentioned before, the JP and the army began to develop healthy relations after the 1971 Memorandum. The elites reached a consensus in the sense of protecting the state from ‘anarchism’ and communism. The DticP, however, was anxious that the JP would also abuse the military intervention as the military intervened during their government and would appeal to the public as victims. In this new era, JP sharpened its anti-communist discourse and made no distinction between socialist/communist left and democratic left. What is significant was that the Republican State, which had been depicted earlier as a Westernizing apparatus that oppressed the pious masses in the control of Zionist/mason who oppressed the ones for years, became “the last Turkish state” when it encountered with the threat of communism (Demirel 2009: 441). Increasingly polarized parliamentary and civil politics gave way to the belief that military was helpful in maintaining the “democratic” order.

As we have seen, the main cause of the consensus between right wing parties and the military was anti-communism shared by them. The military’s supra-party and class approach was against communism. Thus, anti-communism was an important factor in the politics of all right wing parties, including the DticP.

#### **4.5. Views on Anti-Communism**

After 1970s, Turkish right’s general representative value became anti-communism. The Democratic Party was one of the cold war period’s right wing political parties

believing that the threat of communism surpassed the consideration of fundamental rights/liberties.

The centre right which encapsulated Turkish nationalism and Islamist movement under its wings until 1970s, considered all working class consciousness as dangerous as the workers could incline to develop class interests and support class movements (Laçiner 2009: 23). But this process was inevitable as far as industrialization process reached a peak during early 1970s.

Moreover, provincial conservatism that accepted Republican national identity by only covering it with religious identity, was traumatized by the communism fear (Bozarslan 2009: 376). The tribal leaders and the internal tension strategy that the Justice Party successfully implemented because of partisanry of center right, radicalized this provincial conservative youth and lead to uncontrollable levels.<sup>78</sup> The DticP which had come to the scene to represent the provincial petty bourgeoisie reflected their daily life in its anti-communist discourses. They continued to believe that small town connections would be a safeguard against communism.

Bozbeyli, Bilgiç and Demirel constantly made all reference to their rural and petty bourgeoisie family ties and histories. This enabled them to connect themselves with the people and distinguish themselves from the leftists. The leftists were thought to be members of upper class families; so they were too alienated from the society to understand the nation and its demands. At the same time, the leftist movements were also criminalized because of their “connections” in the world. According to Ertekin (2002: 374), anti-communism of the period became massive ceremony through the common belief of “Soviet threat”, after it allegedly wanted a military base in the Straits after Second World War.

According to the DticP, the “Soviet threat” increased the tension to a level that the Turkish State could not resist; so foreign policy should depend on an alliance with “free and democratic West”. Demirel (2004b: 69) argues that the image of “Soviet conquest of Turkey” was a real source of fear for many people.

---

<sup>78</sup> The event that the anti-communism reached to its peak in 1969 has been remembered as “Bloody Sunday”.

Besides the voters, the Democrat Party and the JP shared the discourse of importance of wealth and property. They negated the socialist and communist movements also in the sense of affirmation of free enterprise (Bora 2005b: 572). Demirel continued the Americanist line of the DP that had been established within the frame of Soviet/communist threat. The DticP supporting private enterprise and less control of the State over economy, proposed a kind of cooperation in which companies should accept the people as shareholders and partners. The DticP explained this policy as a solution against the risk of the people being deceived by communism.

In 1970s, the Justice Party thought that it began to lose segments of the right wing voters it tried to represent. For not losing this voter mass and also to strengthen right wing alliance, common points among the right wing should be reminded to the public (Demirel 2004b: 68). Thus, the opposition that might be the result of socio-economic and political tensions was tamed by the opposition to communism. The threat was symbolized as against the “religion, nation and its values” and fragmentation of votes of the JP for the NMP (Nationalist Movement Party), the NSP (National Salvation Party) and the DticP would be dangerous unless the JP ruled. This approach was successful as the “threat” of the RPP came forward with 1973 elections. In 1973 elections, the RPP became the first party in the elections and this increased the consolidation of right wing votes under the umbrella of the JP in 1977 elections.

The anti-communist approach of the JP also helped it to manage its relations with the army. The party and civil-military bureaucracy converged around the threat to Kemalist regime (Demirel 2004b: 69). The legitimacy of the JP was provided by congregating all the forces against common enemy, communism. Demirel had been mentioning since second half of 1960s the efforts of “international communism to establish world domination” and saw that as the main reason of instability in Turkey. This line of thought was maintained by triggering after 1973. Even before the regime of March 12 ended, Demirel declared that “the JP is anticommunist and nationalist. This is one of our sharpest characteristics” (Demirel 2009: 441). Demirel now found a new “other” after 27 May. However, the DticP tried to continue 27 May debate as it depended on the support of Bayar and ex-Democrats. The right

wing, as the DticP also accepted, had to gather all its power against communism. However, the most anti-communist inclinations of the right wing were represented in the National Front governments which the DticP did not participate. So the DticP could not play a role against communism.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION**

The nationalist conservative ideology in Turkey has been a mixture of several ideological components including religious sentiments, conservatism and liberalism. The Democrat Party transformed Republican secular nationalism into a more 'lenient' version that could address masses. The Justice Party claimed to be the representative of the masses through a nationalism that encapsulated promises of economic development and developmental ideology in itself. Meanwhile, the rightwing ideology struggled to define nationalism and decide on what to include or exclude. Nationalism was articulated to conservatism, which helped conservatism stay within the borders of the state. This symbiotic relationship of nationalism and conservatism enabled nationalism reach masses and conservatism not to jeopardize the state's limits. Until the establishment of the National Salvation Party, the JP continued to be the representative power of conservative constituencies. The fragmentation of conservative mass occurred with the emergence of the Democratic Party. Until the fragmentation of that constituency, the line of the DP and the JP motivated the conservative population for legal politics and elevated their political status.

The criticism of the RPP period was the first point of stress of the centre-right tradition. This negation, which was devoid of concrete arguments, increased the presence of 'spiritual national values' within the nationalist-conservative discourse. The DP and the JP implemented value-dependent policies that led to religious populism which the DticP tried to represent through the religious schools issue. Western culture and communism have been the 'others' of the tradition.

The most important concept of the right wing in Turkey was national will. The national will was the sum of all political will of the masses expressed through elections. National Will was seen as the supreme power so that when the citizens elected the administrators, they would give them all political rights. The concept of national will also helped the rightwing politicians to divide the society into two: the “nation” and those “against the nation”.

The fundamental rights/liberties were not of much concern to ordinary rightwing citizens; rather their main motivation was seen as being “first class citizens”. For the centre-right, this issue was a demagogic point of political discourse against the rivals. The centre-right did not maintain a liberal attitude when they became the hegemonic power; the rights/liberties issues did not affect them unless they were in opposition. But when the DP was in opposition against the RPP rule, they had criticized the latter for its anti-democratic rule. The JP was against the “abuse” of fundamental rights/liberties; they welcomed the 1971 constitutional amendments as they criticized the ‘too liberal’ attitude of 1961 Constitution.

Even during the earlier periods of the JP, the party members were not a homogenous group. Rather, some believed that the JP was the watchman for politics until the DP could get its political rights back; others wanted to fill the gap of the DP in political arena. The party, as a centre-right wing organization bringing different ideological approaches together, included moderate rightists as well as ultranationalists and religious traditionalists.

Until Gümüşpala’s death, the party handled these differences without serious problems. The 27 May issues as pressure on the JP by the military as they became the heirs to the DP, the amnesty of ex-DP members and the survival of the Justice Party itself were the main aims during that period. After Gümüşpala, Demirel was elected as the Chairman of the Party against the candidacy of Sadettin Bilgiç. Sadettin Bilgiç lost against Demirel despite his more conservative and nationalistic tendencies, because it was argued that he would take revenge from the May 27 Front; a move that would worsen the relationship with the army and lead to the closure of the party.

During the late 1960s, the Justice Party wanted to form a new identity aside from that of the anti-May 27 Front. It was not a clearcut break from the old links that connected the JP to the DP; but the ex-Democrat's economic preference of supporting traditional landowners began to be discredited in this period. Instead, Demirel chose to work with technocrats for a new model of economic policy.

The JP represented entrepreneurs, landowners and businessmen. However, the alliance within the bourgeoisie, at the end of 1960s, ended as big bourgeoisie started to have a larger share of economic growth. The JP's increasing tendency to represent the big bourgeoisie caused a crack within the party come into surface at the end of 1960s. The system that was designed to support the big bourgeoisie worsened the conditions for the small bourgeoisie. The DticP can be analyzed as the product of this shift of interest of the JP. The disintegration between the interests of small and big bourgeoisie took place in the debates of 1970 budget for which the 72's group voted negatively. The JP's attitude change towards the bourgeoisie could be used by the DticP to be representative of craftsmen and artisans; but this was more likely which desired to become the achieved by the National Salvation Party. Big industrialists wanted to obtain more profit by lowest prices and this deteriorated the conditions of craftsmen; also the credits taken by the petty bourgeoisie decreased in that period. The elections of 1969 witnessed the change of policies by the JP which had kept these interest groups together until that time. This led to the fragmentation of the JP after the elections. Moreover, the 1969 elections saw the lowest rate of participation because Bayar influenced his constituency as the ex-Democrats political rights were not in the agenda of the JP.

Together with amnesty for ex-Democrats, the 'Extremists' demanded the abolition of rule of Moderates –in their terminology "Yeminliler"- within the Justice Party. Demirel's tendency to break the old relations with the DP and support the big bourgeoisie revealed tensions within the party which had been present since the establishment and but strengthened after Demirel's election to the Chairmanship.

The 72's group drew attention to themselves, when a MP from the JP submitted a motion restricting the long discussions to twenty minutes as they were supposedly interrupting the Parliament's work. On February 11, 1970, the 46 members of the

opposition group used dissenting votes for the budget of their own party. This was the breaking point for intra-party opposition and the DticP was established on December 18, 1970 by sixty-nine founders under the leadership of Ferruh Bozbeyli, and Yüksel Menderes and Sadettin Bilgiç as vice presidents.

Politics in the 1970s was dramatically different from that during the 1960s as single party governments could not be established and the political system got fragmented. The presence of many parties and their representation within the Parliament increased ideological tensions for reaching the masses. The parties crystallized their ideological positions to attach the voters to their parties and so that made their change of votes more difficult and costly.

Because of the election system and thus the inability of the major parties to gain majority within the parliament, the minor parties had the bargaining power in order to form the governments. The small lifespans of the governments showed that forming governments and not policy making became the main aim. As minor and ideologically polarized parties entered the governments, their increased role in politics helped them to polarize politics and the streets. Moreover, these parties, despite their small number of seats, gained overt power in patronage relations by placing their partisans into the bureaucracy.

The DticP was against the 1971 Memorandum as it interrupted the civil government. However, they were grateful to the military as it stopped ‘anarchism’ and restored the authority of the State. They even claimed that it was a hope for the masses for a strong and peaceful state. The Memorandum brought martial law and constitutional amendments which were supported by the DticP and by all right wing parties. The DticP argued that they were the only party whose party program consisted a promise for constitutional amendments. The 1961 Constitution was criticized on the basis of its fragmentation of authority to different bodies; the DticP claimed that it resulted in inefficiency of administration and gave way to ‘anarchist’ movements.

Regarding the constitutional amendments, the DticP proposed more authoritarian and conservative-nationalist changes and they even proposed to abolish the entire 1961 Constitution. They were critical about the liberties/rights issue in the 1961

Constitution since it would open the way for the “dangerous, harmful anarchist acts”. They desired to define the “secularism” article more clearly as a step to conservative populism. But the main reason for their disapproval of the Constitution was its “chaotic” administrative characteristics. They would rather demand a Constitution which would help to rule without the “interruptions” of different bodies. They also demanded Amnesty for the political rights of the ex-Democrats which became their main emphasis.

With the 1971 Memorandum, military shook hands with the Justice Party and with the cadre of the DticP. The Democrat Party which was the history of both parties, made them targets of military intervention and military had been suspicious of them until that point in time. But in the 1970s, the military’s attitude vis-à-vis politics was transformed into a demand for a strong and anti-communist Turkey.

After the Memorandum and the removal of the Demirel government, new governments based on technocrats and different parties in the Parliament were established. Bozbeyli proposed that the governments should depend on the Parliament, pointing out the inappropriateness of governments devoid of party support. Supra-party governments, according to Bozbeyli, were not genuinely parliamentary. Although the parties in the Parliament provided the members of the governments and voted for them, they did not support them afterwards. He also claimed that the inconsistency of the ideologies of the parties that formed the government would lead to problems. Thus, the two Erim governments were neither supported by the DticP nor included any members of the party.

After these governments, the DticP decided to participate in the government led by Suat Hayri Ürgüplü. The cabinet would include three ministers from the DticP group; but this government was rejected by the President as it was not in line with the Memorandum’s principles; and it allegedly included members who were against the 1971 Military Intervention. However, Bozbeyli believed that the only reason for the cabinet’s rejection was their party’s presence within the cabinet.

The 1973 Elections were critical for the DticP as it would be the first elections after their break from the JP. In the elections, the JP got the worst results since its

establishment and its votes got fragmented to minor rightwing parties. The DticP, having 11.9 percent of votes, gained 45 seats; but as Bozbeyli claimed, this result did not satisfy the members and searched for other alternatives. Bilgiç analyzed in a different manner that they (the breakaway group) were supported by the public as the votes for the JP decreased after they left.

The DticP's vote pattern showed that they could get support from the entire country, something that signaled their rivalry with the JP. After the 1973 elections, the RPP-NSP government was formed and the most important success of this coalition was the 'Cyprus Victory' in 1974. The DticP congratulated the government for this event but attributed this success to the military. Bozbeyli criticized the government for abolishing the 141<sup>st</sup> and 142<sup>nd</sup> articles of the penal code and also for the amnesty as it would help the activities of the leftists.

Following the results of 1973 elections and the electoral success of the RPP, Bozbeyli proposed that all rightwing parties should come together and form a coalition government since the total vote of the right wing parties was 67 percent as the output of the National Will. Otherwise, the RPP would form the government and rightwing parties would be responsible for it. They declared that they did not form government with the RPP on the basis of their rightist inclinations.

Meanwhile, the RPP-NSP government was dissolved and Ecevit declared that they left the government as the DticP promised them to be the partner of another coalition. The Cyprus issue popularized Ecevit and Ecevit wanted to transform it into votes. Despite the agreement on the subject of early elections, the RPP-DticP government could not be established because of the time of the early elections.

Then, all rightwing party leaders congregated for the National Front governments; but according to Bozbeyli, they were left aside of the government and declared that the DticP would not enter the government. After the formation of first NF government, Bozbeyli criticized the partners of the government for not being rightists. Bozbeyli reminded that Türkeş was from the May 27 Front and against the ideals of the DP, and therefore against rightism. The NSP was criticized for its

flexibility as they could form governments either with the RPP or with rightwing parties.

The first NF government was formed after the Nines' resignation from the DticP. The dissidents by the leadership of Bilgiç declared that they had left the DticP as the party in general decided not to enter the NF coalition despite their voting for the participation of the DticP in the government. However, Bozbeyli claimed that they had the poll for or against entering the coalition. Seven MPs from nine Dissidents voted against despite their statement to the press. Later, Bozbeyli learned that Bilgiç acted like that as he would not be Minister within the coalition with the DticP. This crack from the party increased the sense victimization which had been present since the establishment. The victimization of the DticP by the abolishment of the heritage of the Democrat Party symbolized their leave from the Justice Party. They reminded the Democrat Party and pointed out degeneration of the Justice Party. As such they romanticized politics as purification from the evil.

In the 1977 elections, the DticP had very poor results, gaining only one seat from Konya; even the Chairman of the Party could not be elected. So, Bozbeyli resigned from the party leadership and the cadre continued to dissolve. The second NF government was abolished when 11 MPs resigned from the JP. After it, in Ecevit government, Faruk Sükan, the only MP of the DticP, participated in the government as minister without portfolio. However, Sükan resigned from the government as he would not work with "non-national" ministers and sent a letter to the President to explain that Ecevit could not solve problems as he was tolerant to anarchists and communists. While Bilgiç claimed that the establishment of Ecevit government was a result of ministry bargain unlike the NF governments, Sükan declared that he was not assigned as minister for Ecevit government for only one vote, but he had entered to the government for the sake of the country.

Nationalism of the period could be embedded into different ideologies and had an indispensable place especially within rightwing ideology throughout. The DticP, in contrast to the tradition of the DP and the JP, defined nationalism not just on the basis of the economic development but emphasized spiritual nationalism. Rather than describing nationalism in terms of profit, they tended to support a more

“egalitarian” economic division within the public. In this vein, their understanding of nationalism differed from the DP and the JP whose nationalisms were rooted in Republican nationalism. This outlook stemmed from the petty bourgeoisie which considered the economic development of big bourgeoisie as lack of piety and deterioration of morality. This led to a more conservative interpretation of nationalism in the context of the DticP and the NSP.

Sharing the alarmism of the centre-right, the DticP was alarmed against the perceived internal and external threats, which strengthened their nationalist discourse through the rejection of communism and communists within the country. As cold-war rightwing politicians, they transformed the motherland into “Strong Turkey” in their discourses.

Anti-Westernism was swinging between nationalism and conservatism at the time. The DticP demanded spirituality against the “materiality” of the Western culture; according to this, the Westernized elites could not be part of the “Nation”. This antagonism of bureaucracy vs. periphery was maintained by presenting an image of the leftist with doctrines but without “true, genuine” information about the masses.

Demirel chose the word “nationalist” to describe their political stand at that period because of negative connotations of the term “rightist”. However, Bozbeyli was the first rightwing politician to form a doctrinal notion about rightwing ideology as “democratic right”. Thus, the DticP wanted to establish a more substantial ideological stance; the nationalist intelligentsia of the period was critical about the non-ideological approach of the JP. However, nationalism was important for all parties of the period.

The DticP stood between the polarized form of conservatism of the NSP and the ideological ambiguity of the JP. Its conservatism included spiritual-national values and religion, which have been on the political stage since the Democrat Party. The DticP as encapsulating the heritage of the Democrat Party tried to represent this conservative attitude.

The conservative tradition managed to have a place in rightwing ideology through its legalization by becoming state conservatism. Besides this, as an intellectual topic, conservatives should find and even create the things to conserve, protect. In other words, conservatives made their way to the present time's politics from the past; in this case it was the DP. The idealized picture of the Democrat Party enabled the DticP to distance itself from the JP and also had a concrete, successful memory to give hope for the future. However, critically different than the Democrat Party which "normalized" conservatism and tried to keep it within the borders of the state, the DticP tried to define it in a more anti-Republican way and more rigidly, there were more candidates to represent conservatism now.

The DticP, trying to represent the conservative petty bourgeoisie, criticized and exposed the non-conservative acts of the rival rightwing parties, in order to appeal to the masses. They romanticized the conservative family unit for its rehabilitative function of the society. The DticP underlined the family, women, morality and Western culture dilemma to describe the spiritual-national values. However, its conservative populism did not go as far as the NSP which even forced borders of legality.

The concept of spiritual-national values was critical for the DticP as far as it suggested all rightwing notions, which were nationalism, religiosity, conservatism and enemy definition. These values would help the DticP to define and explain their "authenticity" which was needed to differentiate the DticP mainly from the JP. The clichés of "religion is not an obstacle for development" and "taking the Western technology, but not their values" were critical for spiritual-national values as defined by the DticP. They –just like the rightwing in general- depended on these values, as the latter were both 'authentic' enough to appeal to masses, and abstract enough to be filled in by the politicians. Moreover, agitation and demagogic explanations devoid of science or intellectuality would help this since intellectualization of spiritual-national values would become awkward for these values.

Religion as one of the components of conservatism occupied a central place for the DticP, more critically than the Justice Party. In general, the centre right parties attributed a centrality to religion for social order, but they did not want it to control

the entire society. The rightwing politician was anxious about the degeneration of the masses and their falling into the “traps of harmful ideologies”. Thus, religion would help sustain the order by preventing that. The DticP cadre was more religion-dependent than the rest of the Justice Party as they have been labeled as Extremists within the latter. The JP had established populist links with the masses through religious policies regarding education and Imams. But the DticP cadre reflected the demands of the more religious, provincial groups that wanted less secular policies. Religion became one of the important discourses against NF governments’ as the DticP criticized the members of the coalitions on the basis of absence of piety as nationalism could not be separated from the religion.

At the beginning of 1970s, the Justice Party’s choice to represent the big bourgeoisie against the petty bourgeoisie degraded the status of the latter both economically and socially. As they could not capitalize; they would rather depend on their cultural capital (Yücekök 1983:137). So, this representation gap was tried to be exploited by both the NSP and the DticP. In the 1973 elections, the DticP seemed to succeed in this endeavor; but 1977 elections showed that the JP recollected its votes from the minor parties that have represented the losing petty bourgeoisie as these classes could articulate to capitalist classes.

In fact, the DticP could be seen as within the limits of nationalist-conservative ideological mixture which could replace one another or become one unit. As they did not become part of any coalition governments, they could not make policies based on this ideological formation; rather they depended on tradition, history and community of a conceptual level. Since Bozbeyli desired to overcome the intellectual hegemonic power of the left he problematized the definition of rightism and its ingredients. He argued that the right should not be described by leftwing intelligentsia but by rightwing ideologists. Against the “fierce” and materialist left, the right was supposed to appeal to “the emotional world of the masses”. The nationalist-conservative ideological fluidity also surfaced when same cadre could find place in different parties of rightwing and when the rightwing parties embraced the nationalist-conservative ideology with different mixtures components and emphases.

Based on Argın's (2003: 476) definition of idealist and realist conservatism, the 9 who resigned from the party to support the first NF government, were realist conservative for preferring their political interests while Bozbeyli with his naïve attitude chose to be idealist conservative, promoting the ideal of "spirit of 46" and ending up in *suprapolitics*.

The notion of democracy within the DP-JP- DticP tradition was based on majoritarian democracy. The Democrat Party which had been supported by the intellectuals of the period because of its more democratic inclinations, ruled in an authoritarian manner. The DticP did not remind these acts of the DP; rather relied on the DP's experience of the first competitive elections in Turkish political life. Just like the DP's democracy connotation about stopping the Gendarmerie's oppression; the DticP's emblem was the right hand symbolizing "democracy against the oppression of the elites".

In this vein, democracy was reduced to elections that would be carried out once every four years. After citizens elected the parliament, they would be devoid of all political rights until the next elections. Constitutional bodies and the Senate were seen as impediments for realization of democracy which was equalized with the national will.

The DticP, unlike other rightwing parties, could not get associated with "true and real" democracy which was realized through the vessels of patronage since they did not become part of any government. The conservative and nationalist populist discourse of the DticP could not become concrete in the eyes of the masses unless the party could provide populist vessels for its constituency. The DP had successfully implemented populism thanks to the RPP administration and also established clientelist relations. The patronage networks in the DP period had helped mobilize the masses upwards so that the relation between the masses and the party could be formed. The Justice Party continued this line and the DticP members were a part of it until their depart. As they could not participate into a coalition government and form patronage relations just like the NSP and NMP, the party began to dissolve. In my contention, due to the lack of such routes, the petty bourgeoisie representation was out of reach of the DticP.

The DticP's attitude to the state encountered the dilemma of national unity and the rights/liberties and as a result, it emphasized the former against the latter. Despite the party's preference for less state control on economy, the state continued to be seen as the indispensable authority. The party seemed to equate the State and the nation as the State would rule according to its citizens and the citizen should obey the rules of the State.

The relation of the party vis-a-vis the military is important as far as the military has been one of the most important forces within Turkish politics. The coup d'état of 1960 which removed the DP affected the first years of the Justice Party in such a way that they had to have a follow a double discourse. One of them reminded the public that they were the heirs to "Aegean Democrats"; but at the same time they should explain the military that they would not continue the DP line. The 'Extremists' group within the JP which founded the DticP, was labeled as tough against the military. However, after the establishment of the DticP, despite the absence of an amnesty for former Democrats, the party had good relations with the army because of the 1971 Memorandum's harsh attitude to the leftists and constitutional amendments that took place afterwards.

Since anticommunism at the period became the common ground for all right wing parties (Ertekin 2002: 374); the DticP which wanted to occupy an authentic place within the rightwing had to emphasize it as well. The anti-communism of the rightwing politicians stemmed from the communist desire to abolish private property and private enterprise; meanwhile at the constituency level, masses were against communism since it would allegedly abolish religion, spirituality and social values. Especially after the 1973 elections, anti-communism helped the rightwing parties to form NF governments against the perceived threat of communism. Bozbeyli declared the importance of forming rightwing governments, but his resistance to the leadership of Demirel in the coalition prevented him from joining such governments.

To conclude, this thesis analyzed the DticP in comparison to the DP and the JP, taking into account the period before the establishment of the party. The party, which was more ideological than other right wing parties, had an authentic place in

Turkish politics. Secondly, the DticP's non participation to governments can be considered as one of the factors that brought along their disintegration. In my opinion, the party became more ideologically oriented than other right wing parties especially because of its non-participation in the governments. They also had to stress the conservative stand of the right wing more than the JP from which they had separated. Their conservatism, however, was unlike the NSP's as they were closer to a form of state conservatism and remained within the borders of an official secularism.

## REFERENCES

Açıkel, Fethi, 1996, “Kutsal Mazlumluğun” Psikopatolojisi, *Toplum ve Bilim*, Vol. 70 (Güz), pp.153-198.

Açıkel, Fethi, 2002, Devletin Manevi Şahsiyeti ve Ulusun Pedagojisi, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp. 117-139, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Açıkel, Fethi, 2006, Entegratif Toplum ve Muarızları: 'Merkez-çevre' Paradigması Üzerine Eleştirel Notlar, *Toplum ve Bilim*, Vol. 105, pp. 30-69.

Ahmad, Feroz, 1977, *The Turkish Experiment in Democracy: 1950-1975*, C.Hurst & Company: London.

Ahmad, Feroz, 2003, *Turkey: Quest for Identity*, Oneworld Publications: Oxford, England.

Akarlı, Engin Deniz, 1975, The State as a Socio-cultural phenomenon and political participation in Turkey, pp.135-155, eds. Engin D. Akarlı & Gabriel Ben-Dor, in *Political Participation in Turkey: historical background and present problems*, Bogaziçi University Publications: İstanbul.

Alper, Emin & Göral, Özgür Sevgi, 2003, Aydınlar Ocağı, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakarlık, pp.583-9, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Alpkaya, Gökçen T., 2002, “Türk Dış Politikası”nda Milliyetçilik, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp.155- 167, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Altınay, Ayşe Gül & Bora, Tanıl, 2002, Ordu, Militarizm ve Milliyetçilik, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp. 179- 192, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Arat, Yeşim, 2008, Süleyman Demirel, pp.101-120, eds. Metin Heper and Sabri Sayarı, in *Türkiye’de Liderler ve Demokrasi*, Kitap Yayınevi: İstanbul.

Argın, Şükrü, 2003, Nurettin Topçu'nun Ümitsiz İhya Arzusu ya da Siyasetin 'Taşra'sında Taşranın Siyasetini Tahayyül Etmek, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakarlık , pp. 465- 489, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Başgil, Ali Fuat, 1960, *İlmin Işığında Günün Meseleleri*, Yağmur Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bektaş, Arsev, 1993, *Demokratikleşme Sürecinde Liderler Oligarşisi, CHP ve AP (1961-1980)*, Bağlam Yayınları: İstanbul.

Belge, Murat, 2002, Türkiye'de Zenofobi ve Milliyetçilik, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp. 179- 192, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Beriş, Hamit Emrah, 2005, Türk Sağı ve Liberalizm: Bir Fay Haritası Çıkarma Denemesi, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Liberalizm, pp. 389- 415, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bianchi, Robert, 1984, *Interest Groups and Political Development in Turkey*, Princeton University Press: New Jersey.

Bilgiç, Sadettin, 2007, *Hatıralarım*, Akasya Kitap: Ankara.

Bora, Tanıl, 2002, Sunuş, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp. 15- 22, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bora, Tanıl, 2005a, Menderes, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Liberalizm, pp. 482- 507, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bora, Tanıl, 2005b, Demirel, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Liberalizm, pp. 550-577, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bora, Tanıl, 2009a, *Türk Sağının Üç Hali*, Birikim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bora, Tanıl, 2009b, Süleyman Demirel, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 9, Dönemler ve Zihniyetler, pp. 502- 514, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bora, Tanıl & Canefe, Nergis, 2002, Türkiye’de Popülist Milliyetçilik, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp. 635- 662, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bora, Tanıl & Erdoğan, Necmi, 2003, “Biz Anadolu’nun Bağı Yanık Çocukları...”: Muhafazakar Populizm, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakarlık, pp. 632- 644, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bora, Tanıl & Onaran, Burak, 2003, Nostalji ve Muhafazakârlık: “Mâzi Cenneti”, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakarlık, pp. 234- 260, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bozarlan, Hamit, 2009, Türkiye’de Siyasi Şiddetin Fikri Kaynakları, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 9, Dönemler ve Zihniyetler, pp. 370- 385, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bozbeyli, Ferruh, 1976, *Demokratik Sağ*, Dergah Yayınları: İstanbul.

Bozbeyli, Ferruh, 2000, *Alaca Siyaset: Siyasi Hikayeler*, Babıali Kültür Yayıncılığı: İstanbul.

Can, Kemal, 2002, Ülkücü Hareketin İdeolojisi, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp. 663- 685, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Cizre-Sakallıoğlu, Ümit, 1993, *AP-Ordu İlişkileri: Bir İnkilemin Anatomisi*, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Cizre-Sakallıoğlu, Ümit, 1997, The Anatomy of the Turkish Military's Political Autonomy, *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (Jan.), pp. 151-166.

Cizre, Ümit, 2005, *Muktedirlerin Siyaseti: Merkez Sağ-Ordu-İslamcılık*, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Çarkoğlu, Ali, 1998, The Turkish Party System in Transition: Party Performance and Agenda Change, *Political Studies*, Vol 46, pp. 544-571.

Çavdar, Tevfik, 1983a, Demokrat Parti, in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol 8, pp. 2060- 2075, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Çavdar, Tevfik, 1983b, Adalet Partisi, in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol 8, pp. 2089- 2101, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Çınar, Alev & Arıkan, Burak, 2002, The Nationalist Action Party: Representing the State, The Nation or the Nationalists, pp.25-40, eds. Barry M. Rubin & Metin Heper, in *Political Parties in Turkey*, London: Frank Cass, March.

Çiğdem, Ahmet, 1997, Muhafazakârlık Üzerine, *Toplum ve Bilim*, Vol. 74 (Güz), pp.32-51.

Çiğdem, Ahmet, 2003, Sunuş, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakarlık, pp. 13- 19, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Dağı, İhsan & Uğur, Fatih, 2009, *Yalnız Demokrat: Ferruh Bozbeyli Kitabı*, Timaş Yayınları: İstanbul.

Demirel, Tanel, 2003a, Ferruh Bozbeyli, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakarlık, pp. 570- 575, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Demirel, Tanel, 2003b, The Turkish Military's Decision to Intervene: 12 September 1980, *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol. 29, No. 2, Winter, pp.253-280.

Demirel, Tanel, 2004a, Soldiers and Civilians: The Dilemma of Turkish Democracy, *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol 40, No,1, January, pp. 127-150.

Demirel, Tanel, 2004b, *Adalet Partisi: İdeoloji ve Politika*, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Demirel, Tanel, 2005a, Demokrat Parti ve Liberalizm, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasal Düşünce*, Vol 7, Liberalizm, pp. 480-529, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Demirel, Tanel, 2005b, Adalet Partisi ve Liberalizm, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasal Düşünce*, Vol 7, Liberalizm, pp. 548-583, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Demirel, Tanel, 2005c, Lessons of Military Regimes and Democracy: The Turkish Case in a Comparative Perspective, *Armed Forces and Society*, Vol 31, no 2, Winter, pp. 245-271.

Demirel, Tanel, 2009, 1946-1980 Döneminde Sol ve Sağ, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 9, Dönemler ve Zihniyetler, pp. 413- 450, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Dodd, C.H., 1969, *Politics and Government in Turkey*, Manchester University Press: Great Britain.

Dodd, C.H., 1990, *The Crisis of Turkish Democracy*, The Eothen Press: Beverley.

Erdoğan, Necmi & Üstüner, Fahriye, 2005, 1990'larda "Siyaset Sonrası" Söylemler ve Demokrasi, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Liberalizm, pp. 658-666, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Ergüder, Üstün, 1988, Post-1980 Parties and Politics in Turkey, pp.113- 145, ed. Ergun Ozbudun, in *Perspectives on Democracy in Turkey*, Turkish Political Science Association: Ankara.

Eroğul, Cem, 2003, *Demokrat Parti: Tarihi ve İdeolojisi*, İmge Kitabevi Yayınları: Ankara.

Ertekin, Orhangazi, 2002, Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp. 345-387, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Geyikdağı, M.Yaşar, 1984, *Political Parties in Turkey: The Role of Islam*. Preager: New York.

Göka, Erol & Göral, F.Sevinç & Güney, Çetin, 2003, Bir Hayat İnsanı Olarak Türk Muhafazakârı ve Kaygan Siyasal Tercihi, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakarlık, pp. 302-313, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Gökçeli, Raşit & Tekeli, İlhan, 1976, 1973- 1975 Seçimlerinde Oy Davranışlarının Kentsel Kademelere Göre Farklılaşması, pp.533-576, ed. Siyasî İlimler Türk Derneği, in *Kanun-u Esasının 100. Yılı Sempozyumu*, Ajans- Türk Gazetecilik ve Matbaacılık Sanayii: Ankara.

Harris, George S., 1988, The Role of the Military in Turkey in the 1980s: Guardians or Decision-makers?, pp.177- 200, eds. Metin Heper and Ahmet Evin, in *State, Democracy and the Military: Turkey in the 1980s*, Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, New York.

Harris, George, 2008, Celal Bayar, pp. 55- 76, eds. Metin Heper and Sabri Sayarı, in *Türkiye’de Liderler ve Demokrasi*, Kitap Yayınevi: İstanbul.

Heper, Metin, 1992, The ‘Strong State’ and Democracy: The Turkish Case in Comparative and Historical Perspective, pp. 142-164, ed. S.N.Eisenstadt, in *Democracy and Modernity*, Leiden, Netherlands.

Heper, Metin & Itzkowitz-Shiffrinson, Joshua R., 2005, Civil-Military Relations In Israel And Turkey, *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Winter), pp.231-248.

Heper, Metin & Güney, Aylin, 2000, *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol. 26, No. 4, Summer, pp. 635-657.

Heper, Metin, 2008, Sonuç, pp.247-273, eds. Metin Heper and Sabri Sayarı, in *Türkiye’de Liderler ve Demokrasi*, Kitap Yayınevi: İstanbul.

Hyland, M., 1970, Crisis at the Polls: Turkey’s 1969 Elections, *Middle East Journal*, Vol 24, pp.1-16.

Ismael, Tareq Y., 2001, *Middle East Politics Today: Government and Civil Society*, University Press of Florida: USA.

Ives, Peter, 2004, Gramsci’s Politics of Language: Engaging the Bakhtin Circle and the Frankfurt School, University of Toronto Press: Canada.

İnsel, Ahmet, 2002, Milliyetçilik ve Kalkınmacılık, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp. 763-776, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

İrem, Nazım, 2003, 'Bir Değişim Siyaseti Olarak Türkiye'de Cumhuriyetçi Muhafazakârlık': Temel Kavramlar Üzerine Değerlendirmeler, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakârlık, pp. 105- 117, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Kalaycıoğlu, Ersin, 2001, Turkish Democracy: Patronage versus Governance, *Turkish Studies*, Vol 2, No 1 (Spring), pp.54-70.

Kalaycıođlu, Ersin, 2005, *Turkish Dynamics: Bridge Across Troubled Lands*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

Karpat, Kemal H., 1962, Recent Political Developments in Turkey and Their Social Background, *International Affairs* (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-), Vol. 38, No. 3 (Jul.), pp. 304-323.

Karpat, Kemal H., 1964, Society, Economics, and Politics in Contemporary Turkey, *World Politics*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Oct.), pp. 50-74.

Karpat, Kemal H., 1982, Introduction to Political and Social Thought in Turkey, pp. 365-377, ed. Kemal H. Karpat, in *Political and Social Thought in the Contemporary Middle East*, Praeger: New York.

Karpat, Kemal H., 1988, Military Interventions: Army-Civilian Relations in Turkey Before and After 1980, pp. 137- 158, eds. Metin Heper and Ahmet Evin, in *State, Democracy and the Military: Turkey in the 1980s*, Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, New York.

Keyder, Çađlar, 1979, The Political Economy of Turkish Democracy, *New Left Review*, Vol. 115 (May-June), pp.3-44.

Kıvanç, Akın, 1978, *Demokratik Parti Olayı*, Kor Reklam Yayını.

Kutay, Cemal, 1985a, *Dr.Faruk Sükan: İhanetten Kurtuluş*, Aliođlu Yayınevi: İstanbul.

Kutay, Cemal, 1985b, *Dr.Faruk Sükan: İhanetin Mirası*, Aliođlu Yayınevi: İstanbul.

Laçiner, Ömer, 2009, Sunuş, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 9, Dönemler ve Zihniyetler, pp. 15- 38, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Lindisfarne, Nancy, 2002, Ayrıksıcılık, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp. 202-225, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Mert, Nuray, 2003, Muhafazakârlık ve Laiklik, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakârlık, pp. 314- 345, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Mert, Nuray, 2007, *Merkez Sağın Kısa Tarihi*, Selis Kitaplar: İstanbul.

Millas, Herkül, 2002, Milli Türk Kimliği ve 'Öteki' (Yunan), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 4, Milliyetçilik, pp. 193-201, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Oruç, Zülküf, 2009, Geçmişten Günümüze Millî Türk Talebe Birliği, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 9, Dönemler ve Zihniyetler, pp. 703- 709, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Öğün, Süleyman Seyfi, 1997, Türk Muhafazakârlığının Kültür Kökleri ve Peyami Safa'nın Muhafazakâr Yanılgısı, *Toplum ve Bilim*, Vol 74 (Güz), pp.102- 152.

Öğün, Süleyman Seyfi, 2003, Türk Muhafazakârlığının Kültürel Politik Kökleri, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakârlık, pp. 539-582, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Özbudun, Ergun, 1988, Development of Democratic Government in Turkey: Crises, Interruptions and reequilibrations, pp.1-58, eds.Ergun Özbudun, in *Perspectives on Democracy in Turkey*, Turkish Political Science Association: Ankara.

Özbudun, Ergun, 1995, Turkey: Crises, Interruptions and Reequilibrations, pp. 219-263, eds. Larry Diamond, Juan J.Linz & Seymour Martin Lipset, in *Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy*, Lynne Rienner Publishers: London.

Özbudun, Ergun, 2000, *Contemporary Turkish Politics*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner.

Özbudun, Ergun & Tachau, Frank, 1975, Social Change and Electoral Behavior in Turkey: Toward a 'Critical Realignment'?, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Oct.), pp. 460-480.

Özdalga, Elizabeth, 2008, Necmettin Erbakan, pp. 143- 165, eds. Metin Heper and Sabri Sayarı, in *Türkiye'de Liderler ve Demokrasi*, Kitap Yayınevi: İstanbul.

Özel, Soli & Sarıkaya, Ali, 2005, Türkiye'de Liberalizm'in Prangaları, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 7, Liberalizm, pp. 452-472, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

*Parti Liderlerinin Ruh Halleri*, 1975, Umur Kitapçılık: İstanbul.

Sarıbay, Ali Yaşar, 1991, The Democratic Party, 1946-1960, pp. 119-133, eds. Metin Heper and Jacob M.Landau, in *Political Parties and Democracy in Turkey*, I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd: London.

Sayarı, Sabri, 1976, Aspects of Party Organization in Turkey, *Middle East Journal*, Vol 30, 2 (Spring), pp. 187-199.

Sayın, Zeynep B., 1997, Filoloji ve İslâm: Yeni Bir Kültürel Okumaya Doğru, *Birikim*, Vol 95 (Mart), pp. 31-36.

Sencer, Muzaffer, 1971, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partilerin Sosyal Temelleri*, Geçiş Yayınları: İstanbul.

Shaw, S.J., 1976, *History of The Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Cambridge University Press.

Sherwood, W.B., 1967, The Rise of the Justice Party in Turkey, *World Politics*, Vol 20, pp. 54-65.

Sunar, İlkay, 1983, Demokrat Parti ve Popülizm, in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 8, pp. 2076- 2086, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Szyliowicz, Joseph S., 1966, The Turkish Elections: 1965, *Middle East Journal*, Vol 20:4 (Autumn), pp.473-494.

Tachau, Frank and Jo.D.Good, Mary, 1973, The Anatomy of Political and Social Change: Turkish Parties, Parliaments and Elections, *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp.551-573.

Tachau Frank and Heper, Metin, 1983, The State, Politics, and the Military in Turkey, *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (Oct.), pp. 17-33.

Tachau Frank, 2000, Turkish political parties and elections: Half a century of multiparty democracy, *Turkish Studies*, Vol 1:1, pp.128-148.

Taşkın, Yüksel, 2003, Muhafazakâr Bir Proje Olarak Türk-İslâm Sentezi, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 5, Muhafazakarlık, pp. 381-401, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Taşkın, Yüksel, 2007, *Anti-Komunizmden Küreselleşme Karşıtlığına: Milliyetçi Muhafazakar Entelijansiya*, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Taşkın, Yüksel, 2009, Türkiye’de Sağcılık: Bir Kavramın Yerleşme Tarihini Anlamak..., *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 9, Dönemler ve Zihniyetler, pp. 451- 473, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

The General Directorate of Press and Information of Turkish Republic, 1975, *The Political Structure of Turkey*, Department of Publications, Research and Documentation: Ankara.

Toprak, Binnaz, 1988, The State, Politics, and Religion in Turkey, pp. 119- 136, eds. Metin Heper and Evin Ahmet, in *State, Democracy and the Military: Turkey in the 1980s*, Walter de Gruyter & Co.: Berlin.

Tosun, Tanju, 1999, *Türk Parti Sisteminde Merkez Sağ ve Merkez Solda Parçalanma*, Boyut Kitapları: İstanbul.

Tökin, F. H., 1965, *Türkiye’de siyasi partiler ve siyasi düşüncenin gelişmesi 1839-1965*, Elif Yayınları: İstanbul.

Tunçay, Mete, 1983, Adalet Partisi, in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol 8, p. 2096, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Turan, İlder, 1988, Stages of Political Development in the Turkish Republic, pp.61-112, ed. Ergun Özbudun, in *Perspectives on Democracy in Turkey*, Turkish Political Science Association: Ankara.

Ülman, A. Haluk & Tachau, Frank, 1965, Turkish Politics: The Attempt to Reconcile Rapid Modernization with Democracy, *Middle East Journal*, Vol 19:2 (Spring), p.153-168.

Yılmaz, Feridun, 2009, Türk Sağ ve Ekonomi Fikri, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol 9, Dönemler ve Zihniyetler, pp. 474- 496, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Yücekök, A.N., 1971, Türkiye’de Örgütlenmiş Dinin Sosyo Ekonomik Tabanı, 1946-68, SBF Yayını: Ankara.

Yücekök, A.N., 1983, *Siyaset Sosyolojisi Açısından Türkiye’de Parlamantonun Evrimi*, Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları: Ankara.

## **Party Documents**

72'ler Hareketi ve Demokratik Parti, Demokratik Parti.

Adalet Partisi V. Büyük Kongresi Raporlar, 21 Ekim 1970.

Adalet Partisi Genel Başkanı ve Başbakan Süleyman Demirel'in A.P. Beşinci Büyük Kongresini Açış Konuşması, Ankara, 21 Ekim 1970.

Anayasa İslahatı ve Demokratik Parti 1973.

AP Bakırköy 6. Kongresi, 30 Temmuz 1972.

AP Politikasında Genel Görüşler, AP Genel Merkez Yayınları, 1969.

Büyük Türk Milleti Uyan! Milliyetçiler Ediyor Feveran: Tokat milliyetçi ve sağduyu sahibi siyasi partilerin ortak bildirisidir.

Demokratik Parti 946 Hareketinin Mana ve Felsefesi Etrafında Elele 1973.

D. P. Demokratik Parti Birinci Büyük Kongresi Raporlar 16 ve 17 Aralık 1972, 1973.

Demokratik Parti Eyüp İlçesi 1. Kongre Faaliyet Raporu 1971.

Demokratik Parti İstanbul 1. İl Kongresi 4 Temmuz 1971

Demokratik Parti Programı.

Ferruh Bozbeyleli Demokratik Parti Birinci Büyük Kongresini Açış Konuşması (16 Aralık 1972), 1973.

N. Talu Hükümeti Programı hakkında Ferruh Bozbeyleli'nin Millet Meclisinde Yaptığı Konuşma 24 Nisan 1973.

Demokratik Parti'nin 1977 Seçimleri Radyo Konuşmaları 1977.

Sıkı Yönetim ve Demokratik Parti'nin Görüşü, Demokratik Parti 1972.

Siyasi Ölüler Müzesi, 1977.

Teklif Ediyoruz, Anayasa Değişiklikleri, Demokratik Parti.

## Tez Fotokopisi İzin Formu

### TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

#####

#### ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### YAZARIN

Soyadı : Ateş  
Adı : Gülbin Ayşığı  
Bölümü : Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi

**TEZİN ADI** (İngilizce) : Representing Centre-Right Or Conservative Right? The Case Of The Democratic Party In Turkey, 1970- 1980

**TEZİN TÜRÜ** : Yüksek Lisans  Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınmaz.

#### **TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ:**

#####