

A POLITICAL ECONOMIC ACCOUNT FOR SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN  
TURKEY DURING THE 1990'S

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

BY

TAYLAN KURT

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

OCTOBER 2017

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz  
Director

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

---

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata  
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.

---

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Prof. Dr. Fethi Açikel (ANKARA ÜNİ, SBKY)

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata (METU, ADM)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayça Ergun (METU, SOC)

---

---

---

**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.**

Name, Last name: Taylan Kurt

Signature :

## ABSTRACT

### A POLITICAL ECONOMIC ACCOUNT FOR SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN TURKEY DURING THE 1990'S

Kurt, Taylan

M.S., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata

October 2017, 106 pages

This thesis aims to evaluate the crisis of Turkey's social democracy, whose ideological orientation has been evaluated within history of the Republican People's Party, during the 1990's. Throughout the thesis, historical evolution of social democracy until the end of 20<sup>th</sup> century both in Europe and Turkey according to reconciliation of labor and capital is examined. Besides the transformation of Turkey's social democracy by consideration of change in production and class relations during the neoliberal era; particularly the discourse and policies of the Social Democratic People's Party will be on the scope. Apart from factionalism and ideological struggles, reasons behind the crisis of Turkey's social democracy during the 1990's will be reinterpreted in accordance with reconciliation of labor and capital against the rise of neoliberalism and, externalization of relations between the state and society.

**Keywords:** Political economy, social democracy in Turkey, the Social Democratic People's Party

## ÖZ

### 1990'LAR TÜRKİYE'SİNDE SOSYAL DEMOKRASİNİN EKONOMİ POLİTİĞİ

Kurt, Taylan

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata

Ekim 2017, 106 sayfa

Bu tez, düşünsel gelişimi Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi tarihi içerisinde tartışılan Türkiye sosyal demokrasisinin 1990'larda yaşadığı krizin politik iktisadi değerlendirmesini yapmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu analiz süresince gerek Avrupa gerekse Türkiye sosyal demokrasisinin savaş sonrası dönemdeki tarihsel dönüşümü emek ve sermaye arasında sağlamaya çalıştığı uzlaşma üzerinden değerlendirilecektir. Üretim ve sınıfsal ilişkilerdeki değişimi gözeterek, Türkiye'de sosyal demokrat hareketin neoliberal dönemdeki dönüşümünün yanında; özellikle, Sosyal Demokrat Halkçı Parti'nin 1980 sonrası demokratikleşme mücadelesi üzerinde durulacaktır. Parti içerisindeki hizipleşmelerin ve ideolojik tartışmaların dışında; sosyal demokratların 1990'larda karşılaştığı krizin ardında yatan nedenler sosyal demokratların neoliberalizmin yükselişi karşısında emek-sermaye uzlaşmasını sürdürme çabası ve devlet-toplum arasındaki ilişkileri dışsallaştırması üzerinden yeniden anlamlandırılmaya çalışılacaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Politik iktisat, Türkiye'de sosyal demokrasi, Sosyal Demokrat Halkçı Parti

To My Uncle Harun Kurt...

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are so many valuable people to thank for encouraging and helping me during my thesis. First of all, I would like to express my genuine gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata for her endless patience and guidance. It was a great pleasure for me to work with a person who have the deepest experience and knowledge like her. I am also thankful to the members of my thesis committee, Prof. Dr. Fethi Açıkel and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayça Ergun for their invaluable contributions and criticism. Furthermore, I wish to thank all instructors I had chance to take their lectures during both my undergraduate and graduate academic terms.

Secondly; It was a chance for me to be student of Aykut Mert Yakut who is a hardworking and disciplined person and beyond, I am very thankful to him being more than an instructor for me with a great patience. I would like to thank my friends Sarp Sök and Zeki Oğulcan Şengül. They were very supportive of me with their opinions and positive thoughts from the moment I decided to make an academic career. I could be very hard process, without their support and belief. In addition, I would like to thank Didem Okyay, Ahmet Buğra Çetinel and Serkan Kocabaş, who are my friends with me since the beginning of university life for their meaningful friendship. They are very successful and knowledgeable people around me who I really like to be around them. I owe my gratitude to Mustafa Taylan Özbay and Fırat Güvez for being next to me in all good or bad occasions from childhood to the graduate school. I grow up with them and their effect on being the person who I am today cannot be denied. At last but not least, my dear friends Şeref Kağan Kandemir, Gözde Şen, Emirhan Erdoğan and Güneş Uzunoğlu are deserving a respectful appreciation. Those are the people, who always support me till the end of my study with patience and, sharing the best and worst moments with me confronting all of them in an inclusionary manner.

Finally, my family, my mother Müjde Kurt and my Father Tuncer Kurt are worthy of the considerable thanks for their infinite support and patience. Above all, I would like to express my deepest gratefulness to my girlfriend Aslı Özahi. To feel her love

and kindness is the greatest chance in my life. She has been the person to whom I completed whole hardest duties in the world. Without patience and trust of my best friend, I could not finish this thesis, like lots of thing in my life.

I solemnly dedicate my thesis to my dear uncle Harun Kurt, who is the pioneer of my family's enlightenment. With his sense of just and responsibility, he raised my father with diligence and; I'm indebted to him for that. If he could not be influenced by Ecevit and could not enter an active political life in the Republican People's Party; I would have no chance to develop an academic interest on social democracy.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
ÖZ .....	v
DEDICATION .....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. SOCIAL DEMOCRACY: RECONCILIATION BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL .....	5
2.1 The Evolution of Social Democracy .....	7
2.1.1 British Socialism and Fabian Society .....	12
2.1.2 Social Democracy of Sweden .....	15
2.1.3 Revisionism Debate and German Socialism .....	19
2.1.3.1 Karl Kautsky: Organized Proletariat and Democracy ...	22
2.1.3.2 Eduard Bernstein: Revisionism and Criticism on Marxism.....	25
2.1.3.3 German Socialism after the First World War.....	30
2.2 Social Democracy From Keynesianism To Neoliberal Policies .....	31
2.2.1 Conceptualization of Market and Democracy during the Keynesian Era .....	33
2.2.2 Neoliberal Order and the Surrender of Social Democracy .....	37
2.3 Conclusion .....	40
3. SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN TURKEY AND ITS CRISIS .....	43
3.1 The Emergence Of Social Democracy Within The RPP Tradition....	45
3.1.1 Politic and Economic Background for the 1960's .....	45

3.1.2 The First Step for Turkey's Social Democracy: Left of Center .	47
3.1.2.1 Principles of Left of Centre .....	51
3.2 Neoliberal Hegemony and Transformation of Turkey's	
Social Democracy .....	53
3.2.1 Politic and Economic Background for the 1980's .....	53
3.2.2 Social Democracy after the Coup of September 12th and	
Its Crisis.....	56
3.2.2.1 The Social Democracy Party and The Social	
Democratic Populist Party: Reconstruction of Turkey's	
Social Democracy?.....	57
3.2.2.2 Factionalism and Ideological Disputes in Turkey's	
Social Democracy durign the 1990's.....	61
3.2.3 Conclusion.....	63
3.3 The Crisis of Turkey's Social Democracy within the Stateand	
Civil Society Relations .....	65
3.3.1 The Turkish State and Civil Society .....	66
3.3.2 Conceptualization of the Turkish State by Turkey's	
Social Democrats.....	68
3.3.2.1 The Early Republican Period as the	
Historical Background for Turkey's Social Democracy .....	68
3.3.2.2 Democratization Issue within the State-Civil	
Society Dichotomy .....	72
3.3.3 Conclusion.....	77
4. CONCLUSION .....	80
REFERENCES.....	83
APPENDICES	
A. Turkish Summary / Tükçe Özet .....	94
B. Tez Fotokopisi İzin Formu .....	106

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADAV	Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeitverein
DİSK	Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions
DLP	The Democratic Left Party
DP	The Democrat Party
EIB	European Investment Bank
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IDA	International Development Association
IMF	The International Monetary Fund
ISI	Import Substitution Industrialization
JP	The Justice Party
KPD	The Communist Party of Germany
LO	The Swedish Trade Union Confederation
MESS	Metal Goods Employers' Union
MP	The Motherland Party
NDP	The Nationalist Democracy Party
NSC	National Security Council
PP	The Populist Party
RPP	The Republican People's Party
SAF	The Confederation of Swedish Employers
SAP	The Swedish Social Democratic Party
SAP	Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei Deutschlands
SDAP	Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei
SDP	The Social Democracy Party
SDPP	The Social Democratic Populist Party
SPD	Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands
TPP	The True Path Party
TÜSİAD	The establishment of Turkish Industrialists' and Businessman's Association
US	United States
USPD	The Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany

WB

The World Bank

WPT

The Workers Party

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Social democracy has been one of primary topics in the Turkish political science literature. Yet, apart from discussions which have evaluated ideological aspects and world-wide experiences of the social democratic movement, Turkey's social democracy had been considered within history of the RPP (The Republican People's Party). While the RPP's relations with the state and the nature of social democracy in the party had been evaluated; two particular periods; left of center movement during the 1960's and democratization struggle of the SDP (The Social Democracy Party) and the SDPP (The Social Democratic Populist Party) after the coup of Semper 12<sup>th</sup> in 1980 had been represented as the centrepieces of Turkey's social democracy. However, it is also possible to reinterpret social democratic tradition of Turkey according to international reconstruction of the market and its impact on relations between the state, market and society in Turkey. Within the scope of left of center and, the SDP and the SDPP; social democracy of Turkey had been progressed due to change in production and class relations during the 1960's and the 1980's.

First of all, the rise of industrialization in Turkey with import-substitution development strategy altered power relations between agrarian-commercial and industrial bourgeoisie in the 1960's. While industrial bourgeoisie strengthened its power as a consequence of its strong relations with the state; urbanization was accelerated and working class started to organize against consequences of capitalism. Ideals of the Left were spread around the society and; left of center movement emerged under these circumstances. After the struggle of traditionalist and reformist sides of the RPP, Ecevit succeeded to dominate the RPP administration. During the 1970's, he offered people who suffered from consequences of industrialization, development projects and constructed a discourse which highly emphasized democracy. Therefore, notions like freedom, equality, solidarity and superiority of labor entered the RPP's agenda and, social democracy was started to be considered

as a political strategy in Turkey. Secondly, the coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> in 1980 influenced whole political movements. Under the control of structural adjustment programs, the state-society relations had been reconstructed by export-led growth model. After the collapse of expansionary policies which reconciled labor and capital until the 1970's; the hegemony of neoliberal policies and authoritarian form of the state became main issues of this period. While both national and international capital increased its power against labor, social democrats reorganized within the SDPP and; democratization and socio-economic inequalities were on scope of Turkey's social democrats. Meantime, they succeeded to respond demands of large segments in the society which were disturbed by neoliberal policies and undemocratic conditions of Turkey and; therefore, increased their political support at the end of the decade. However, during the 1990's, it has been asserted that in addition to struggle between factions and discussion about turning to the RPP tradition, due to its governance policies in its coalition governments, the SDPP lost its political support and merged into RPP in 1995. This process has been called as "the crisis of Turkey's social democracy".

In this thesis, apart from explanations which were based on political turmoil, struggle between factions and the scope of the RPP tradition; the crisis of Turkey's social democracy will be examined. For the reconsideration of Turkey's social democracy within the scope of its crisis during the 1990's; first of all, the evolution of social democratic tradition will be examined from the perspective of political economy. From the separation of social democracy and revolutionary Marxism to neoliberal era; conceptualization of capitalist production relations and democracy by social democrats will be represented. In addition to the criticism of social democracy in neoliberal times; universal aspects of social democracy will be argued, throughout different national examples. After then, from the 1960's to 1990's, according to transformation of production and class relations in Turkey, the evolution of Turkey will be questioned. By referring arguments of crucial political figures of Turkey's social democracy and publications of its political organizations, arguments about social democracy and the state-society relations will be criticized to recognize reasons behind and the crisis of Turkey's social democracy during the 1990's. The general aim of this thesis is the reinterpretation the crisis of social democratic

tradition of Turkey by considering the political economic count of social democracy and, conceptualization of state-society relations within Turkey's social democracy, under social and economic circumstances of neoliberal era.

During the second chapter of the thesis, throughout the examination of three specific country examples - Great Britain, Sweden and Germany - and references on the Fabian society, Swedish labor movement, arguments of Karl Kautsky and Eduard Bernstein; crucial aspects for the historical evolution of social democracy will be represented. Social democratic movement will be evaluated according to international reconstruction of market and its class character throughout implementation of Keynesian policies and neoliberal era. By referring these three different national experiences and social democracy during the post-war period; it is remarked that reconciliation of labor and capital is the main determinant factor for the evolution of social democracy. After the collapse of welfare state policies, the acknowledgement of neoliberal order and adaptation of more market-friendly policies by social democrats will be questioned.

The third chapter focuses on relations between the state, market and society respectively for two particular periods of Turkey's social democracy: left of center during the 1960's and democratization struggle of the SDP and the SDPP after the coup of September 12<sup>th</sup>. The emergence, evaluation and ideological formation of Turkey's social democracy are clarified with transformation of production relations and class conflicts in Turkey. It is argued that throughout the transition from import-substitution industrialization to export-led growth model, reconciliation of labor and capital was also main determinant for the progress of Turkey's social democracy. Hence, against the rise of neoliberalism and its impacts on both economic and social sphere, the crisis of Turkey's social democracy during the 1990's will be reinterpreted according to socio-economic circumstances and approaches to capitalist production relations and democracy by social democrats of Turkey.

The fourth chapter gives direct references on writings of Turkey's social democrats and publications of their political organizations to argue conceptualization of the state-society relations by Turkey's social democrats. In addition to arguments about capitalist relations and democratization issue, throughout the conceptualization of the

state and civil society relations, the loss of political support for the SDPP during the 1990's will be examined. After arguing debates about the Turkish state, throughout references on the early Republican period and democratization issue by Turkey's social democrats, consideration of the state as an independent subject and externalization of its relations with society will be problematized.

The last chapter concludes remarks about reasons behind the crisis of Turkey's social democracy during the 1990's. Criticisms on Turkey's social democracy against neoliberal order after the 1970's will be summarized. Arguments about capitalist production relations and democracy by social democrats of Turkey and, their evaluations for relations between the state and civil society are concluded.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **SOCIAL DEMOCRACY: RECONCILIATION BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL**

Social democracy has been represented as an ideology which indicates reformist socialist tradition. It has been prevalent organization of workers under democratic capitalism (Przeworski, 1986, p. 1). That means both acceptance of the authority and ownership structures of capitalism and; implementation of reforms to increase economic efficiency and to reduce inequality (Glyn, 2001, p. 2). It was built on a belief in the primacy of politics and communitarianism and; represented a non-Marxist vision of socialism (Berman, 2006, p. 6). In that sense, for emancipation of workers, social democracy has been, generally, idealized as an alternative way in which capitalist production relations were acknowledged as an instrument to escalate wealth and prosperity and; democracy was perceived as a concept which compensates consequences of capitalism. As long as social democracy has been analysed and conceptualized from that perspective, two main tendencies stand out. First of all, social democracy which aimed the compensation of capitalism's consequences through parliamentary reforms has been periodized and categorized according to its choices between capitalism and labor. It has been examined according to its ideological changes throughout different periods and, divided into different stages such as revolutionary, reformist, traditional and new social democracy (Bailey, 2009, p. 3). At that point, the rise of welfare state policies and hegemony of the New Right with neoliberal policies have been depicted as two important turning points in the history of social democracy. For each stage, different concepts have been called as social democracy's centrepieces. For example, as an influence of Keynesian and welfare state policies equality, full employment and fair redistribution can be figured out as main concepts of social democracy. However, with the rise of neoliberal policies, consequences of welfare states were accepted and compromise between market and the state was emphasized (Glyn, 2001, pp. 2-7).

Secondly, in spite of the representation of an ideological unity for social democracy around freedom, equality, solidarity, both social democratic tradition and its main principles have been, generally, exemplified according to particular national experiences. While universal principles of it have been identified, some specific western-European countries like Britain, Sweden, Germany and France have been represented as main examples for the evolution of social democracy. Without cohesion, social democracy has also been theocratized with contributions of social democrat figures of these countries. In addition to that success or failure of social democrat policies has been issued by just referring to European historical development. Beyond European social democratic tradition, evolution of social democracy out of Europe has been noticed.

According to these arguments, it should be remarked that social democratic movement ensued, as a result of contradiction between labour and capital in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Changes in global economy, its relations with the state and, changes in class structure have been decisive on the evolution of social democratic movements. Yet, although struggle of working class and ideological formation of socialist thought had been driving force of it; social democracy has been defined as reconciliation between labor and capital due to its criticism on Marxism, acknowledgement parliamentary democracy and class alliances. As long as social democracy had implied this reconciliation, conceptualization of it was based on governance policies and phenomenon of sovereign powers of its time. Hence, throughout both Keynesian era and neoliberal hegemony with New Right, according to its political choices, there were two different social democratic movements. During the golden age of capitalism; social democracy which implied strong desire for communal solidarity, succeeded to consolidate its legitimacy through practical economic suggestions and the correlation between political mobilization of masses and the welfare state. The state was perceived as a mechanism which both legitimizes capitalist production relations and provided wealth of society. However, as long as the role of the state was minimized due to the rise of neoliberal hegemony and the consolidation between the labor and capital was violated; social democracy could not maintain its reconciliation mission. Principles and alternative policy suggestions of social democracy was conceptualized from a different perspective. Social democrats

became more market friendly and obligated to neoliberal policies. On the other hand, despite references on different periods, country examples and thoughts of political figures; some principles have been universalized as integral parts of social democracy's ideological unity –freedom, equality and solidarity. Boundaries of universal social democracy have been defined according to just historical development of Western European countries with specific examples of countries like Germany, France and Sweden. Therefore, whether social democracy is universal or domestic ideology becomes a controversial issue. Consideration of it has been restricted with the highest stages of capitalism and to discuss social democracy for countries which has different material and historical development apart from Europe becomes a problematic issue.

During that chapter, firstly, the evolution of social democracy will be expressed with emphasis on relations between the state, market and society throughout three specific country examples: the Great Britain, Sweden and Germany. Also, with direct references to important social democratic figures of these countries, a different framework would like to be drawn for main principles of social democracy. Periodization and conceptualization of it have been reinterpreted from a different perspective. Secondly, social democracy during Keynesian and neoliberal era will be evaluated. In addition to achievements of it, the reconciliation of capital and labor by social democracy will be argued in the context of the crisis of capitalism during the 1970's. Finally, apart from general analysis, arguments about principles and universality of social democracy will be summarized.

### **1.1. The Evolution of Social Democracy**

During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, capitalist mode of production was extended through establishment of mechanized industry. Sectors like textile and metallurgy was spread over the Europe and industrial development accentuated end of primarily agricultural production overwhelmingly in rural societies (Beaud, 2001, p. 93). While mechanization reached its full capacity, levels of production increased dramatically. Four countries –Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States- accounted for two-thirds and three-fifths of the world's industrial production (Beaud, 2001, p. 93). Within a national economy, central wealth-creating dynamic more strongly imposed

itself abroad and national political economies came to form foundations of both world economy and financial orders broadly. Gold standard was started to be implemented. Thus, maintaining fixed exchange rate, consolidating monetary arrangements and improving credit-worthiness became important aims for monetary policy (Langley, 2002 & Germain, 1997). During that process, especially in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Great Britain had the leading position with 73 percentage share of industrial growth (Beaud, 2001: 94). London-centered credit practices which dominated world finance, supported capital intensive industrial production (Langley, 2002). Trade in services, revenue from maritime transport, profits, interests and dividends received from abroad allowed the positive British balance of payments in the second half of the century. Meantime, Great Britain intended territorial expansion and increased its influence in West and South Africa (Beaud, 2001, pp. 109-111). Developments in national markets were also followed by imperial expansions during that period.

Inevitably, the rise of capitalist mode of production around Europe led the transformation of relations between the state, market and society. Firstly, liberalism strengthened its hegemony over politic, economic and social life. It was believed that market would adjust itself and market conditions should also be determinant in political area. Except to prevent dishonest things, governmental action would be restricted (Beaud, 2001, p. 87). Secondly, capitalism created its natural order of the economy. By theories of classical economic thought, theory of value and marginalist revolution constructed scientific bases for the Industrial Revolution and interest of bourgeoisie. Production was defined as increasing the value and distribution of produced wealth was based upon wages. The law of supply and demand was also represented as the equilibrium among landowners, owners of capital and, laborers (Beaud, 2001, pp. 87-91). Thirdly, both bourgeois and working class of Europe had been reshaped. Men who had previously been traders and merchants became manufacturers. Through transformation of countryside or through immigration, labor force was employed with the intention of extracting maximum, under misery and unbearable conditions (Beaud, 2001, p. 92). Except Great Britain, bourgeoisie still needed alliances with petty bourgeoisie, peasantry, landed nobility or the state. Capitalist industrialization developed on the basis of severe exploitation of the

working masses (Beaud, 2001, pp. 102-107). Consequently, in urban areas the conflict between workers and capitalists became more apparent and; social relations were separated from political sphere and put under the direct control of capital. Nation state determined and maintained social order by implementing its legal and institutional framework. Sustainability of capitalist property relations were provided, while workers were exploited by capitals (Wood, 2003).

As long as relations between the state, market and society had been transformed; socialist movement was also inevitably reshaped itself. Power relations between productive forces in both social and economic fields determined the development of socialist movement at the turn of the century. Counter to devastating impacts of capitalism, there were lots of efforts to maintain old trade structures, workers' associations and secret societies. Workers gathered in groups forming around newspapers, cooperatives, in a city or neighborhood and relief societies (Beaud, 2001, p. 114). Strikes, riots and social upheavals expanded around Europe. Universal suffrage and trade unionism became important factors that should be taken into account by British bourgeoisie. Right to strike was recognized. Trade unionism expanded and social democratic movement also started to be organized in political era (Beaud, 2001, p. 116). It should be indicated that although prosperity of capitalist development was interrupted with the great depression in 1873, capitalism succeeded to adjust itself for changing conditions in production. Capital concentrated on cartels, trusts and monopolies and; finance-capital ensued as a reality (Beaud, 2001, p. 162). Nevertheless, before the 20<sup>th</sup> century, longer and stronger strikes broke out. Workers' organizations -trade unions, work exchanges, mutual insurance companies and parties- remained their development (Beaud, 2001, pp. 145-147).

Furthermore, socialist thought strengthened its position. In spite of distinct differences in their arguments, Owen, Proudhon, Saint-Simon and Fourier were important figures for the spread of social and economic equality in society. Owen realized the collectivist society. He intended to end capitalism peacefully and replace it by a co-operative common wealth (Vaizey, 1971, pp. 22-24). Saint-Simon believed that socialist pre-occupation can be traced with social sciences. He proposed to find a universal science of mankind to plan its own future (Vaizey, 1971, p. 29). Besides, Fourier asserted that human nature is unchangeable and given right social

organization, men can co-operate in ways which led to harmony rather than to strife (Vaizey, 1971, p. 29). Proudhon who had organic view of society believed that property is theft. There is no one way to salvation and, the family structure can create a diversity which would be part of the richness of living (Vaizey, 1971, p. 30).

Yet, particularly, in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century socialist thought was theorized by Karl Marx. Under the light of classical economic thought, German idealism and French socialism, Marx tried to investigate capitalist mode of production and contradictions of it. His criticisms opened a new page for socialist thought. Arguments about capitalism and strategies of socialist movement had been discussed around his theories. Historical materialism and labor theory of value are two important dynamics for Marxist criticism. Firstly, in *The German Ideology* (Marx & Engels, *The German Ideology*, 1998, pp. 47-48), the production of material life itself was called as the first historical act. It was asserted that any conception of history, including the history of capitalism, has to observe this fundamental act. Relations of different nations depend upon the extent of the development of its productive forces, the division of labor and internal intercourse (Marx & Engels, *The German Ideology*, 1998, p. 38). History of humanity must always be studied and treated in relation to the history of industry and exchange (Marx & Engels, *The German Ideology*, 1998, p. 49). However, as it is being criticized in *The Communist Manifesto* (Marx & Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, 2008, pp. 78-79), his predecessors, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen and others, perceived class relations, especially, proletariat as the spectacle of a class without any historical initiative or any independent political movement. They rejected all political and revolutionary actions. The development of class antagonism keeps even pace with the development of industry did not offer to them material conditions for emancipation of proletariat. Secondly, in *the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (Marx & Engels, 1988, p. 122), it was criticized that the original unity of capital and labor has been represented as the unity of capitalists and workers by classical economists. Contradictions between these two classes have meant as a contingent event and it explained with external factors. The true purpose of production was gestated as the sum-total of annual saving, rather than how many workers were maintained by a given capital. However, production produces the man in the role of commodity

(Marx & Engels, 1988, pp. 86-87). Labor's realization is its objectification and; the substance of value is living labor that commanded by capital for the purpose of exploitation (Marx & Engels, 1988, p. 71; Bonefeld, 1995). "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." (Marx & Engels, 1988, p. 33). The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie. If proletariat organize itself as a class and sweep away old conditions of productions by force, it will also sweep away classes generally (Marx & Engels, 1988, pp. 65-66).

Thereby, Marxist analysis dominated ideological side of socialist movement and, revolutionary tendencies strengthened its position. Yet, meanwhile, as a reaction of the dominance of revolutionary tendencies, social democracy started to separate itself from revolutionary Marxism, especially, at the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Ideological struggle between revisionists and revolutionists strengthened and; under the lack of any ideological unity and political leadership one question became the main determinant of separation: How to achieve a socialist society? Although emancipation of working class was still one of the main purposes, three points are explanatory to understand how social democracy separated itself from revolutionary ideas and became a distinct ideology at the turn of the century. First of all, Marxist analysis was challenged. Revolutionary methods, proletariat dictatorship, Hegelian dialectic and Marxist theory of value were questioned. Humanitarian and moral aspects were tried to be emphasized within Marxism. The transition from revolutionary to evolutionary methods was acknowledged throughout revisionism debates. Secondly, political representation of working class through parliamentary democracy was represented as primary way of social democracy to hold the power. Henceforth, European social democratic parties struggled for both workers' rights and universal suffrage. They revitalized their party programs and made decisions according to rivalry in elections. Representation in the parliament and political campaign became the major aim for social democrats. Therefore, thirdly, alliance with other classes became an important issue for social democrat parties because of representation in the parliament. Social democrats also tried to respond to demands of other social groups, especially middle classes, for sustaining majority and coming to the power. Rather than to be the party of a distinct class, social democratic parties

became parties of whole people, during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Consequently, after the separation of revisionist and revolutionary ideas, these three points - criticisms on Marxism, acknowledgement of parliamentary democracy and class alliances – determined the way of social democracy to reach goals of socialist society. For emancipation of workers, social democrats started to struggle within capitalist production relations and bourgeoisie democracy and; by controlling the power of the state, they had tried to increase the wealth of masses with economic and social reforms. Freedom, equality, solidarity had been consolidated with independent institutions which were in favor of wage earners. While capitalist production relations were acknowledged as the source of wealth and prosperity, democracy became the main principle to compensate consequences of capitalism. With regard to this perspective, three specific country examples will be mentioned below –England, Sweden and Germany- to represent evolution of social democracy until the post-war reconstruction period.

### **1.1.1. British Socialism and Fabian Society**

The uncontrollable rise and devastating effects of capitalism had never influenced any other country more than British society. During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Great Britain had the leading position in capitalist development, not only with industrial but also its financial domination around the world. In such a case, in addition to many attempts by workers for their emancipation, socialist revival was primarily a middle class phenomenon in Great Britain and; particularly, the Fabian Society which was found in 1884, had the greatest impact on British socialism. It is possible to express that there was no clear distinction between the Fabians and other socialist groups in Britain. Their members were, again, from middle classes and it was a heterogeneous society (Adelman, 1996, pp. 6-7). Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells were key figures of the society. They represented characteristic English socialist doctrine (Vaizey, 1971, p. 60). The English liberal-utilitarian tradition and strong tincture of Marxist conception of historical change were two important aspects that influenced their thoughts (Adelman, 1996, p. 7). They examined capitalist relations and consequences of unjust and inefficient society (Adelman, 1996, pp. 7-8). Their ultimate aim was the reconstruction of society in accordance with highest

moral possibilities (Adelman, 1996, pp. 6-7). According to them, socialism is a moral issue;

...For since in gambling the many must lose in order that the few may win; since dishonesty is mere shadow-grasping where everyone is dishonest; and since inequality is bitter to all except the highest, and miserably lonely for him, men come greatly to desire that these capricious gifts of Nature might be intercepted by some agency having the power and the good-will to distribute them justly according to the labor done by each in the collective search for them. This desire is Socialism; and, as a means to its fulfilment, Socialists have devised communes, kingdoms, principalities, churches, manors, and finally, when all these had succumbed to the old gambling spirit, the Social Democratic State, which yet remains to be tried (Shaw, 1909, pp. 1-2).

Notably, for Fabian socialism, the main problem of capitalism was the lack of planning and inefficiency. Municipalities were considered as the main work of production. It was believed that poverty can be eliminated with a system of social security and medical care. Unemployment can be solved by a systematic program of public investment (Vaizey, 1971, pp. 60-61). That is to say, Fabian socialism meant state and municipal socialism (Adelman, 1996, p. 8).

The general failure to realize the extent to which our unconscious Socialism has already proceeded –a failure which causes much time and labor to be wasted in uttering and elaborating on paper the most ludicrously unpractical anti-Socialistic demonstrations of the impossibility of matters of daily occurrence- is due to the fact that few know anything of local administration outside their own town. It is the municipalities which have done most to “socialize” our industrial life; and the municipal history of the century is yet unwritten (Shaw, 1909, p. 45).

Rather than a historical phenomenon which considers class antagonisms and relations between productive forces; construction of socialism was appraised as a technical issue. Firstly, in their philosophy, to analyze social situations in great detail, to predict their future and to suggest remedies and changes were so important. Scientific investigation of social phenomena was viewed as the way to achieve socialism (Vaizey, 1971, pp. 62-63). The major role of the society was defined as socialist fact-finding and fact-dispensing body, through lectures, discussions and research. Instead of being an independent socialist party, they intended to be realized easily by permeation (Adelman, 1996, pp. 8-9). Secondly, they thought that rather

than the inevitability of revolution, inevitability of gradualness is the fact of life. Painless and effective transition to socialism is possible with rational and factual socialist arguments (Adelman, 1996, p. 8). In their conceptualization, socialism during the past one hundred years was the irresistible progress of democracy.

...Socialists as well as Individualists, realize that important organic changes can only be (1) democratic, and thus acceptable to a majority of the people, and prepared for in the minds of all; (2) gradual, and thus causing no dislocation, however rapid may be the rate of progress; (3) not regarded as immoral by the mass of the people, and thus not subjectively demoralizing to them; and (4) in this country at any rate, constitutional and peaceful (Shaw, 1909, p. 30).

Administrative arrangements and bureaucratic tradition was so crucial for the Fabians' thought. Whole aspects of social life were tried to be controlled by elected representative bodies. Ideological issues were regarded less important than building of bureaucratic machinery (Vaizey, 1971, p. 64). They acknowledged that socialism is the rational way to organize a modern society (Vaizey, 1971, p. 70).

... A democratic State cannot become a *Social*-Democratic State unless it has in every centre of population a local governing body as thoroughly democratic in its constitution as the central Parliament. This matter is also well in train. In 1888 a Government avowedly reactionary passed a Local Government Bill which effected a distinct advance towards the democratic municipality. It was furthermore a Bill with no single aspect of finality anywhere about it. Local Self-Government remains prominent within the sphere of practical politics. When it is achieved, the democratic State will have the machinery for Socialism (Shaw, 1909, pp. 170-171).

Consequently, there are two points to explain, how the Fabian Society defined the way of reaching socialist goals. Firstly, rather than revolutionary methods, Fabians intended to permeate society through scientific investigation of social phenomena. Contrary to Marxist criticism, class conflicts and material relations between productive forces were not comprehended as a part of their scientific investigations. Within socialist movement, proletariat was not conceived as an essential subject for political struggle and there were no strong linkages with labor organizations and trade unions. Politics was just conceived as a technical issue. Secondly, for Fabians, rational transformation of society through socialism was comprehended with elected representative bodies. From the beginning, they did not aim to destruct and go

beyond the bourgeoisie democracy. Fabians insisted on the primacy parliamentary democracy; therefore, they chiefly concentrated on the power of bureaucratic machinery, like the effectiveness of municipalities. For important democratic changes, they considered the general acceptance and morality of the whole people. Beyond class-based politics, thirdly, Fabians focused on permeation to be realized and they opened to alliances with other classes for coming to power.

### **1.1.2. Social Democracy of Sweden**

During the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Swedish political system was comprised of monarchial and representative bodies. While political power held by conservatives and big land owners, the king had impressive powers. He could appointed the government, call new elections and; he had right of initiative and veto. Yet, suffrage was restricted. Workers and small peasants did not have the right to vote because of their income and property qualifications (Berman, 1998, pp. 40-41). Meanwhile industrialization was contributed by the state. Corresponding to an active intervention of the state in iron industry, Swedish agriculture had transformed. A large agricultural proletariat had arisen (Berman, 1998, p. 42). During the 1890's, new businesses were founded in engineering, power, clothing, pulp and paper. Urbanization expanded. A new venture capital market was created and commercial banks started to play an important role in industrial development (Schön, 2012, pp. 134-135). As a result of rise in wages, new working class gained a stronger position. Entire momentum shifted towards working class, capitalists and industrial towns in Sweden (Schön, 2012, p. 138) but, still, anti-democratic and anti-socialist sentiments of conservatives were also consolidated. People became more dependent on the market and; as a result of rapid industrialization at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, class conflicts became more apparent. Notably, ideological evolution of Swedish social democracy can be investigated throughout programs of labor organizations, thoughts of their leaders and political parties' organized struggle against liberals. Although the early Swedish labor movement was dominated by liberals, struggles of many workers who agitated for independent and radical labor organizations were main dynamic for the Swedish social democracy (Berman, 1998, p. 44).

First of all, program of the Sweden Social Democrat Labor Union was the first political program of the Swedish social democracy. In 1882, it was written by August Palm who was the leader of the union and contributed social democratic movement by newspapers, *Folkviljan* and *Social-Demokraten* (Özdalga H. , 2001, p. 13). Throughout the program, labor was described as the main source of the wealth and culture. Although workers were explicitly responsible for the emancipation of labor, struggle of social democracy was open to all peasants, civil servants, artisans who were in favor of changing present system (Özdalga H. , 2001, pp. 13-14). Secondly, The Social Democracy Association which was established in 1884 was the core of political struggle of the Swedish social democracy. Under that association, in spite of their different ideological positions, new leaders who provided new ideas into labor movement came to prominence. Among them, conspicuous ones were Axel Danielsson, Fredrik Sterky and Hjalmar Branting (Özdalga H. , 2001, p. 14). As it was stated;

At the outset, Branting, Sterky, and Danielsson represented three different currents within the young Social Democratic movement: Sterky, a revolutionary, argued that participation with the existing regime was justified for propaganda purposes only; Danielsson was also a radical but was more willing than Sterky to explore different courses of action; and Branting was an optimist, committed to moderation and a parliamentary strategy (Berman, 1998, p. 46).

In time, Branting became the central figure for Swedish social democratic movement. In 1886, he gave the first real programmatic speech of Swedish social democracy. He declared his adherence to a Marxist worldview. However, according to him, socialism was revolutionary but in principle (Özdalga H. , 2001, p. 21). Reforms were necessary both to improve the contemporary position of workers and to prepare the way for the future socialist society (Berman, 1998, p. 44). Branting also examined the development of capitalism in Sweden and, concluded that labors should be organized themselves within trade unions and political parties. Trade unions and political parties of social democratic movement acted coordinately. Becoming a political organization was so urgent to come into power and transition to socialism. Workers could organize strongly against capitalism in a short time (Özdalga H. , 2001, p. 19). Thirdly, by the lead of the Socials Democracy

Association which included approximately seventy associations like workers' club and trade union; the SAP (The Swedish Social Democratic Party) was established in 1889 (Özdalga H. , 2001, p. 21). At the beginning, there were serious discussions between supporters of Branting and Danielsson about the revolutionary feature of the SAP. Marxism and transition to socialism were main topics within party discussions and congress. Although the party began to place increasing emphasis on finding a way to bring about democratization, bourgeoisie parliamentary democracy and alliance with bourgeoisie parties were rejected at the 1891 *Norrköping* party congress (Özdalga H. , 2001, p. 23). However, in the 1897, the SAP needed a program of its own. Branting and Denielsson,

...were given the task of writing the first distinctively Swedish Social Democratic program. This document announced that the SAP “differentiated itself from other political parties... [in that] it wanted to completely transform the economic organization of bourgeois society and carry out the social emancipation of the working class. Despite the radical language, however, many have commented on the significant reformist tendencies inherent in the program “was for its time a revisionist program before revisionism” (Berman, 1998, p. 47).

That program was so decisive for the conceptualization of social democracy by Swedish social democrats and how Swedish social democracy defined the way of socialism. It was said that capitalism forces workers to organize around trade unions and; the struggle should be carried out with them. Beyond contradictions between workers and capitalists, in the new structure of the society, the existence of middle classes should also be underlined. It was said that consequences of capitalism will be end until emancipation of workers (Özdalga H. , 2001, pp. 28-29). It can be argued that foundation of the SAP preserved essentials of Marxism to understand changes in class society. However, rather than a methodology or a historical and economic necessity, it was just an abstract view of a better and more just world. Humanist and idealist elements of Marxism were adopted (Berman, 1998, p. 49). Marxism provided only abstract guidelines for their actions. The SAP developed its own plans in that respect (Berman, 1998, p. 50). On the way to socialism, reforms were recognized as the remedy to improve material resources of the working class and the need for their well-being and preparation for the future socialist society (Berman, 1998, p. 52).

Parliamentary democracy was also an essential value since the establishment of the SAP. Universal suffrage was their most consistent demand. The goal of the party was to increase its power in the Swedish parliament and; they expected to take over the control of the state (Berman, 1998, p. 58). Parliamentarism and the achievement of democracy was necessity for socialist goals (Berman, 1998, pp. 55-56). Moreover, The SAP was not justified as just the workers' party, but also people's party. They tried to create a coherent strategy for reaching out to social groups outside the industrial working class. The party had close contacts with progressive elements of the middle class. They accepted alliances with left-wing elements of liberals for coming to power (Berman, 1998, p. 57). Most problematic social groups, peasantry was also at the scope of the SAP for alliance (Berman, 1998, pp. 59-60).

In addition to institutional development of Swedish social democratic movement, the importance of trade unionism should also be underlined. It can be expressed that social democracy of Sweden had also been revitalized by the struggle of organized labor movements. In 1898, the LO (The Swedish Trade Union Confederation), which represented the 45 percent of total working population, was established (Jones, 1976, p. 58). It was the confederation of blue collar workers of industry and service operations with workers of agriculture. Improvements in working conditions, rise in wages, the efficiency of Swedish industry and, also, advanced democracy were main issues for the LO (Jones, 1976, p. 63). Meanwhile, centralized aspects of Swedish unions tended to increase. The confederation had the right of being represented and to make proposals during the negotiations in collective agreements (Jones, 1976, p. 61). On the other hand, employers believed that their production was interrupted for political reasons. Trade associations moved to a more defensive position and; they established the SAF (The Confederation of Swedish Employers) in 1902 (Jones, 1976, p. 78). Significantly, the conflict between both workers and employers had been remained by the negotiation between workers' and employers' institutions. Both collective and individual industry agreements were negotiated directly between the LO and the SAF until the 1950's (Jones, 1976, pp. 79-80). They could keep a tight hold on wage negotiations and keep their constituent members very much in line (Jones, 1976, pp. 80-81). Notably, like the SAP, the LO struggled beyond the emancipation of workers. It could negotiate with employers for a socialist future. The

strong coordination in both institutional and ideological level with the SAP affected Swedish labor movement. For transitioning to the socialist society, they mainly focused on improvements in workers' material conditions and; the way of social democracy had investigated through a democratic struggle, with legal institutional institutions and the parliament. Although due to increasing influence of capitalism, trade unions struggled for both their rights and democracy.

### **1.1.3. Revisionism Debate and German Socialism**

Unification of Germany was completed with the new German institution of 1871. The balance between monarchism, popular democracy, and federalism was consolidated with Bismarckian system. The government consisted of an executive; a federal council, the Bundesrat, and; a national parliament, the Reichstag (Berman, 1998, pp. 67-68). Meantime, the emperor was the controller of foreign policy, a war-making authority and commander of the military. He had indirect control on political system. The chancellor who could be appointed and dismissed by the emperor, needed to assemble parliamentary majorities for each legislative initiative and it was almost impossible (Berman, 1998, pp. 68-69). Also, from 1872 to 1890 increase in industrial production was over the 100 percentage. Under export oriented industrial production and governmental incentive, investments both in Europe and colonies led to the rise of capitalism in Germany. While capitalism was getting stronger, monopolization had risen (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, p. 56). Urbanization, increase in population, housing shortage became important problems. Social structure had also been changed. Working class had expanded between 1887 and 1914. Trade unions that were affected negatively from anti-socialist laws between 1878 and 1890, revived (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, p. 57). Social democratic movement of Germany had been reshaped under these circumstances.

First of all, political and ideological separations had decisive role on German social democracy from the second quarter of the 19th century. The first important workers' association, *Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein (ADAV)* was established in 1863 by Ferdinand Lassalle (Berman, 1998, p. 72). After the establishment of the ADAV, workers' movement broke its strong relations with liberal movement and started to organize independently. In 1863 Leipzig Congress, it was explicitly stated that for

universal, equal and direct suffrage which bring the abolition of class conflicts; peaceful and legal struggle should be aimed. Thus, political power should be held and, the state should also be democratized. Lassalle stressed that emancipation of workers can be carried out with supports of the state. Struggle for democracy cannot be separated from unity of the nation (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, pp. 14-15). On the contrary, by leadership of August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht some opponents started to emphasize theoretical issues (Berman, 1998, p. 73). Legal struggle and democratization of the state were also highly criticized by orthodox Marxists. As a result, after the Eisenach Program of 1869, disagreement about the equivalent of democracy and socialism resulted with the establishment of *Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei* (SDAP) (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, p. 34). Many socialists who were disillusioned with nationalist and pro-Prussian policies of Lassalle's successors, joined the SDAP (Berman, 1998, p. 72). That separation revised whole practical issues and ideological discussions about how to reach the goals of socialist society.

Secondly, as a reflection of political and economic consequences, political programs of German social democracy reflected ideological struggle within it and, formalized the structure of social democracy. At the beginning of the 1870's, due to reactionary policies of Bismarck, the unification of Germany and economic crisis; contradictions between the ADAV and the SDAP were moderated. They were aware of that working-class vote played right into the hands of reactionaries. They held a unity congress at Gotha in 1875 and they formed a single party *Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei Deutschlands* (SAP) (Berman, 1998, p. 73 & Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, s. 23). "The final program adopted by the congress at Gotha contained a mixture of Lassallean and Marxist elements, calling for the establishment of a free state and a socialist society, the breaking of the iron law of wages through the abolition of the wage system, and the end of social and political inequality." (Berman, 1998, p. 73). Meanwhile, the Gotha Program was criticized by Marx. He argued that;

Between capitalist and communist society there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. Now the program does not deal with the future state of communist society. Its political demands contain nothing beyond the old democratic litany familiar to all: universal suffrage,

direct legislation, popular rights, a people's militia, etc. They are a mere echo of the bourgeois People's party, of the League of Peace and Freedom. They are all demands which, insofar as they are not exaggerated in fantastic presentation, have already been realized. Only the state to which they belong does not lie within the borders of the German Empire, but in Switzerland, the United States, etc. This sort of "state of the future" is a present-day state, although existing outside the "framework" of the German Empire (Marx, 2009, pp. 23-24).

Free State and the abolition of the wage system, which were essential points of the Gotha Program, were also criticized. According to Marx,

... Nevertheless, the different states of the different civilized countries, in spite of their motley diversity of form, all have this in common: that they are based on modern bourgeois society, only one more or less capitalistically developed. They have, therefore, also certain essential characteristics in common. In this sense, it is possible to speak of the "present-day state" in contrast with the future, in which its present root, bourgeois society, will have died off (Marx, 2009, p. 23).

And,

So, in future, the German Workers' party has got to believe in Lassalle's "iron law of wages"! That this may not be lost, the nonsense is perpetrated of speaking of the "abolition of the wage system" (it should read: system of wage labor), "together with the iron law of wages". If I abolish wage labor, then naturally I abolish its laws also, whether they are of "iron" or sponge. But Lassalle's attack on wage labor turns almost solely on this so-called law. In order, therefore, to prove that Lassalle's sect has conquered, the "wage system" must be abolished "together with the iron law of wages" and not without it (Marx, 2009, p. 17).

During the 1880's, lots of people who were excluded by the state and dominant powers organized around hundreds of workers' organization. Concurrently, the SAP which was regarded as bourgeoisie party by Marx, concentrated on parliamentary works against anti-socialist law and consequences of capitalism. They responded demands of workers and; therefore, the party expanded its electorate power during the decade. In the February 1890 elections, the SAP received nearly 20 percentages of the votes. Political acquisitions followed that success. Contradictory effects of anti-socialist law were realized and it was abolished (Berman, 1998, p. 74). At the same year, the SAP changed its name as *Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands*

(SPD). They decided to prepare a program which considers Marx's criticisms on the Gotha Program (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, p. 35). Under the institutionalization of theorists and practitioners, the SPD's new Erfurt program was adopted in 1891 (Berman, 1998, p. 75). There were two central parts of the Erfurt Program. The first part was written by Karl Kautsky who was one of the main figures of German socialism and; analyzed consequences of economic development for proletariat. Conversion of capitalist property into common property and socialist production were viewed as the solution for working class. The second part was written by Eduard Bernstein, who was the father of revisionism, underlined universal suffrage for all elections, compensation for elected officials, liberalization of labor laws, graduated income and property taxes. It should also be stressed that these reforms were also supported by progressive liberals (Berman, 1998, pp. 75-76). Erfurt Program was a response to both the Gotha program and change in socio-economic life in Germany. Both revolutionary and reformist ideas were balanced. Despite that comprehensive program, it was not prevented from the contradiction between reformists, centralists and radicals. There was no coherence between party's program and ideological discussions within it. There was no effort to link certain reforms to the party's ultimate goals (Berman, 1998, p. 78). At that point, especially, writings of Kautsky and Bernstein became the most important references for the evolution of social democracy, not only for Germany but also for whole socialist tradition.

#### **1.1.3.1. Karl Kautsky: Organized Proletariat and Democracy**

Kautsky was strongly reliant on Marxism, in his theoretical works. Ideas of Marx and Engels were transmitted into a party program by contributions of him. He believed that Marxism is the only theory and method for the analysis of social phenomena and; economic development was the main determinant of the socialist society. After scientific explanations of main social problems, he focused on duties of socialist program (Berman, 1998, p. 77; Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, p. 39). I would like to argue that his ideas about the establishment of socialist society and especially the role of democracy in the social democratic movement differentiated Kautsky from other socialists of his era. Despite his strong dependence into Marxism, these two contributions by Kautsky are so crucial for social democracy becoming a distinct ideology and reference for even today's social democratic movement. Under the lack

of theoretical coherence, Kautsky might be called as one of main theoreticians of social democracy.

Firstly, according to Kautsky, there are two pre-requisites for the establishment of socialism. These are the will for the socialism that was created by the great industry and; the maturity of the proletariat. Corresponding to the development of large industry, number of producer increases compared with the number of proletarians and, to organize producers socially become difficult. At that point, the proletariat is not only responsible for the establishment of socialism, but also for the use the capacity of material conditions for socialism (Kautsky, 1964, pp. 13-15). As long as industry grows, working class becomes the most numerous class and they can organize production for their own needs. “They establish trade-unions that seek to set limits to the absolutism of employers and to gain influence on the production process. They elect deputies to the representative bodies of local communities and states, who there strive to force through reforms, to gain acceptance of laws protecting workers, to re-shape the enterprises owned by the state and by local communities into model enterprises, and to constantly increase the number of such enterprises” (Kautsky, 2007, p. 21). Hence, organized proletariat was represented as the main subject for the establishment of socialist society. He asserted that;

It is becoming ever clearer that a revolution is still possible only as a proletarian revolution; that is impossible as long as the organized proletariat is not a power that is great and solidly united enough to carry along with itself, under favorable conditions, the majority of the nation. If it is true, on the one hand, that only the proletariat is a revolutionary class in the nation, then, on the other hand, it follows that any collapse of the existing regime, be it moral, financial, or military in nature, will imply the bankruptcy of all the bourgeois parties, who have all become responsible for this regime. It follows also that the only regime that can succeed the existing one in such a case is a proletarian one (Kautsky, 2007, p. 4).

In addition to the strong emphasis on the role of proletariat for transitioning to socialism, any coalition between a proletarian party and a bourgeois coalition was also problematized. While reformists perceived the peaceful growth into socialism as the growth in strength of the two antagonistic elements: capital and labor, Kautsky’s representation of organized labor movement and growing into socialism are quite different from both reformists and Orthodox Marxists. It was expressed that;

A socialist cannot share the illusion of the reconciliation of classes and of social peace. Indeed, he is a socialist precisely because he does not share this illusion. He knows that not a chimerical reconciliation, but only the abolition of social classes can establish social peace. If, however, he has lost faith in the revolution, then nothing remains for him but the expectation of the peaceful and imperceptible elimination of social classes through economic progress, through the growth in size and strength of the working class, which gradually absorbs the other classes. That is the theory of growing into socialist society (Kautsky, 2007, p. 20).

Secondly, according to Kautsky, class antagonism is antagonisms of volition. That is the contradiction between the capitalists' and workers' will. "The forms it assumes and the intensity with which it expresses itself then depend, for certain individuals, classes, and nations, etc., on their recognition of the given conditions of life, which are, when they engender in two classes an antagonistic will, also conditions of conflict" (Kautsky, 2007, p. 32). However, throughout antagonism, proletariat was not aware of its power. Apart from organized activity, the other factor that increased the proletariat's strength was the struggle for the control of parliament (Kautsky, 2007, p. 35). He believed that it does not mean just material advantages,

..., but chiefly through the fact that the propertyless, heretofore intimidated, and hopeless popular masses saw here a force enter upon the scene that boldly did battle with all the ruling powers, that won victory after victory, and yet was nothing other than an organization of these very propertyless masses (Kautsky, 2007, p. 35).

Especially, in his writings after the World War I; the effectiveness of parliamentarism, strikes, demonstrations and all other ways for the emancipation of workers were associated with the effectiveness of the democratic institutions. He believed that in all places where democracy has been established, social revolution of the proletariat is possible with peaceful, economic, legal and moral means (Kautsky, 1964: 37-38). Meanwhile, his thoughts about class alliances had transformed. In 1918, he explicitly stated that a party does not mean a class, rather it represents class interests. "If a class attains power, and finds that it cannot keep it by its own strength, it seeks for allies." (Kautsky, 1964, p. 31). "Parties and classes are therefore not necessarily coterminous." (Kautsky, 1964, p. 32). In that manner, Kautsky stated that,

The Social Democratic Party is a revolutionary party, but not a party that makes revolutions. We know that our goals can be reached only through a revolution; however, we also know that it lies just as little in our power to make this revolution as it lies in the power of our opponents to prevent it. Thus, it does not even occur to us to want to foment a revolution or to prepare the conditions for one. And since the revolution cannot be made by us at will, we also cannot say anything at all about when, under which conditions, and in which forms it will occur. (Kautsky, 2007, pp. 41-42).

In short, according to him, modern socialism is also democratic organization of society, rather than just social organization of production (Kautsky, 1964, p. 6). While emancipation of proletariat was directly associated with democracy, the control of parliament was also emphasized. The strength of working class was directed into peaceful ways to come into power. Kautsky was aware of that democracy cannot remove class antagonisms. However, according to him, the proletarian democratic method of conducting is less dramatic. It requires a smaller measure of sacrifice, rather than revolutionary methods (Kautsky, 1964, pp. 36-37). “The more democracy tends to shorten the working day, the greater the sum of leisure at the disposal of the proletariat, the more it is enabled to combine devotion to large problems with attention to necessary detail. And the impulse thereto is not lacking” (Kautsky, 1964, pp. 39-40). As a democratic social organization, working class refrains to altering the system. Under democracy, consequences of capitalism became more acute and; workers can struggle more organized (Kautsky, 1964, p. 40). Therefore, proletariat changes its economic and social conditions throughout an organized struggle with democratic institutions. Until the democratic state of proletariat grows, it is very difficult for capitalists to manipulate the emancipation of workers (Kautsky, 1964, p. 9).

#### **1.1.3.2. Eduard Bernstein: Revisionism and Criticism on Marxism**

Particularly, social democracy was, entirely, separated itself from socialism and; revisionism became the irreplaceable part of it, after the significant contributions of Eduard Bernstein. Bernstein had an active role in politics, beyond being a theoretician. By the lead of him, revisionism debates were spread through SPD’s publications and; after the 1899 Hannover and the 1901 Lübeck congresses, three separated camps were emerged within the SPD: revisionists, people on the centre and

revisionists (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, p. 47). He was the most influential figure for transition of the SPD to the party of whole people. If the SPD aimed to involve both blue and white collar workers in rural and urban areas after 1921 Görlitz Program, that was the direct impact of him (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, pp. 48-49). Nonetheless, I would like to also argue that there are two important impacts of Bernstein on social democratic movement. One of them is the reinterpretation of socialism within revisionism debates. Bernstein focused on universal citizenship, rather than the emancipation of proletariat. According to him, socialism is not a dictatorship of a class or a party. It was idealized as the system in which democracy is applied systematically in whole aspects of social life and, inequalities are demolished (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, p. 51). The other one is the disengagement of social democracy from Marxism with his systematic criticisms on it. Bernstein argued that Marxist economic theories and the view of history are fallacious. Socialism is not inevitable and; rather, ethical and moral considerations should be stressed in the struggle for a better society (Berman, 1998, p. 82). It can be underlined that after Bernstein, evolutionary methods consolidated its power within the social democratic movement. As well as practical benefits of social democratic movement, he adjusted ideological orientation of the SPD. Beyond the impact on his era, his criticism of Marxism also became the guide of social democrats against Marxism even in the 21st century.

Firstly, as it was stated by Bernstein (1996, p. 66) in a lecture for the Student Association for Social Studies in Amsterdam, the name of 'revisionist' has been given to them by their opponents. Before Bernstein, Alfred Nossig and Bruno Schönlanke had already mentioned about revisionism. There was strong defiance against them. Especially, his essays in *Neue Zeit*, which was the official theoretical journal of German social democracy, were strongly criticized by social democrats because of the denial of the final goal of socialism. In 1898, in series of essays entitled "Problems of Socialism", he explicitly stated that "What is commonly called the final goal of socialism is nothing to me, but the movement is everything." (Bernstein, 1996, p. 67). After that, ideological struggle within social democratic movement escalated with essays of Rosa Luxemburg "Reform or Revolution" and Karl Kautsky "Bernstein and the Social Democratic Program". While revisionists were rebuked for challenging the party's principles and program, in 1903 Dresden

Party congress; revisionism was viewed as an attack on Marxism (Berman, 1998, pp. 82-83). It was declared that revisionists undermine class conflicts and; therefore, the SPD will become a bourgeoisie party (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, p. 55). Despite strong opposition, Bernstein said that;

...The interpretation of Marx's theory I am presenting here has indeed appeared to many socialists as an abandonment of the final goal of socialism. And in a certain sense, this is actually the case, for, as I see it, Marx's theory itself demolished any idea of a "final goal". Any social theory based on the evolutionary principle must abandon the notion of a final goal, because human society must continue to change. There are undoubtedly edifying aims and guideposts, but there can be no final goal. Even that which at times might be viewed as a "final goal" must not be conjured up a priori; rather it should be left to the practical struggles of the movement (Bernstein, 1996, p. 73).

He identified how socialism should be considered and what are socialist affairs, apart from revolutionary Marxists.

... we revisionists can better appreciate what is commonly called 'contemporary socialist affairs' and it is this that sets us apart from orthodox socialists. Focusing on current problems, then, is no longer simply a matter of preparing workers for the great collapse of capitalism but an authentic and important process of foundation building. It includes a higher regard for the value of parliamentarism with respect to its positive legislative results. We are not interested in mere parliamentary agitation but in the passage of laws conducive to the most profound sort of institutional and economic change. As soon as one discards the idea of a "great breakdown," one can pay more attention to real developments, like socialist activities on a municipal level, the social importance of unions as vehicles for enhancing economic life, and the expansion of workers' consumer cooperatives (Bernstein, 1996, p. 78).

Furthermore, Bernstein's realization of socialism was so different. According to him, working class demanded the democratization of the state. The labor movement which pervaded the society led to the blurring class distinctions throughout the rational control of economic life was prompted by them (Bernstein, 1996, p. 156). He regarded the relevance of the largest class in society –proletariat- and its allies for the socialist transformation (Bernstein, 1996, p. 157). In that matter, while he was summarizing the definition of socialism, he stated that;

... Understanding the tendencies and tasks of the working class requires neither a nostalgic picture of the past nor the construction of a future utopia.

We are all free to paint a bright picture of the future; the movement, however, does not draw its power and goals from fantasy but from real class needs and the real foundations of social life. Real needs are formalized as demands, and the sum these demands, their theoretical content, represents true socialism. It leads to an efficient collective economy and ultimately to a gradual manifestation of solidarity in all segments of society - the realization of social union (Bernstein, 1996, p. 157).

Remarkably, since Bernstein insisted on the denial of “final goal”, historical materialism and Hegelian dialectic; ideological orientation of social democracy started to gain eclectic character, even at beginning of the 20th century. While social democracy had broken its relations with Marxism, for practical purposes; one of the crucial aspects of the social democracy was the concordance between theory and practice, anymore.

The purely economic causes create, first of all, only a disposition for the reception of certain ideas, but how these then arise and spread and what form they take depends on the participation of a whole range of influences. We do historical materialism more harm than good if, from the outset, we superciliously reject as eclecticism any accentuation of influences other than those of a purely economic nature and any consideration of economic factors other than the techniques of production and their predicted development. Eclecticism –selecting from different explanations and ways of dealing with phenomena- is often only the natural reaction against the doctrinaire desire to derive everything from one thing and to treat everything according to one and the same method. Whenever this desire gets out of hand, eclecticism breaks through again and again with elemental force. It is the rebellion of sober reason against the inbuilt tendency of every doctrine to confine thought in a straitjacket (Bernstein, 1993, p. 18).

Secondly, beyond the strict importance of economic causes, Bernstein concluded that Marxism is a contradictory ideology. It is the combination of two streams. From revolutionaries, he took the conception of workers’ political struggle for emancipation and; from socialists; he took the investigation of into the economic and social preconditions for the emancipation. However, that combination was the subordination of the specifically socialist element to the politically radical social-revolutionary element (Bernstein, 1993, p. 41). Marxism was blamed for ignoring changing circumstances. Hegelian dialectic and Blanquism were considered as main problematic issues of it. After detailed analysis of writings of Engels and Marx, he

asserted that dialectic that was inherited from Hegel was reason of the contradiction of Marxism.

... However, this ambivalence, so utterly out of character for Engels, was ultimately rooted in the dialectic taken over from Hegel. Its 'yes, no and no, yes' instead of 'yes, yes and no, no', its antagonisms flowing into the one another, its transformation of quantity into quality, and all such other dialectical delights, time and again got in the way of a proper assessment of the significance of observed changes. If the original scheme of development constructed by Hegel was to be maintained, then either reality would have to be reinterpreted or all real proportion would have to be ignored in measuring the road to the desired goal. Hence the contradiction: painstaking precision befitting the busy industry of genius in investigating the economic structure of society goes hand in hand with an almost incredible neglect of the most palpable facts; the very same theory that takes the determining influence of economics on power as its starting point concludes with a truly miraculous belief in the creative power of force, and the theoretical elevation of socialism into a science is so frequently 'transformed' into the subordination of any claim to scientific status to a preconceived tendency (Bernstein, 1993, pp. 34-35).

According to Bernstein, the final point that Marx and Engels arrived was the Blanquism that is the theory of the immeasurable creative power of revolutionary political force and its manifestation, revolutionary expropriation (Bernstein, 1993, p. 38). Marxism lacked not only more comprehensive theoretical perspective to consider practical needs of socialist movement; but also, tended to violence and revolutionary upheaval, under the influence of Blanquism. That was one of the most essential arguments of social democrats for the separation themselves from the socialist movement. That was one of the reasons behind solving problems with parliamentary democracy and searching for political alliances with bourgeoisie or other social groups. Moreover, whole Marxist literature, especially writings of Marx and Engels; were blamed to be Blanquist from the beginning; because, Marxist represented Blanquists as the really proletarian party. Therefore,

The requirements of modern economic life were totally disregarded, and the relative strengths of classes and their state of development were completely overlooked. Yet proletarian terrorism-which given the state of things in Germany could only manifest itself as such destructively and, therefore, from the first day when it was set to work in the specified fashion against bourgeois democracy its effect was inevitably politically and economically reactionary –was extolled as a miraculous force which was to propel the

conditions of production to that level of development perceived as the precondition for the socialist transformation of the society (Bernstein, 1993, p. 40).

In brief, arguments of Bernstein were based on two points. The first one was the denial of final goal of socialism. Hence, the gap between theory and practice was emphasized. The second one was the denial of Marxist analysis of economic and social issues and accusations on Hegelian dialectic and Blanquism. In that context, it can be remarked that Bernstein's arguments cannot be considered apart from his conceptualization of socialism. "Movement is everything" but, socialism should not be considered as a scientific movement, entirely. Because,

Science demands a full consideration of all established experience and knowledge, rejecting arbitrariness in its deductive method. In fulfilling its task to yield law like regularities, science acts with unyielding severity. But with regard to the final causes of the phenomena in question and the end result of particular developments, genuine scientists remain agnostic, rejecting theoretical closure and opting instead for a continuous inclusion of new facts that would correct and expand their theories. As its guiding purpose, science acknowledges nothing but cognition (Bernstein, 1996, p. 99).

It depends on cognition and, it is a movement that is guided by interests as its noble motivation. Yet, at that point, beyond exclusive personal or economic self-interests, moral and idealistic interests were underlined (Bernstein, 1996, p. 95). Socialism that was the transformation of capitalist society into a collectively organized economy could not be an act predetermined by theory (Bernstein, 1996, s. 95).

### **1.1.3.3. German Socialism after the First World War**

Significantly, debates about the First World War within the SPD were certain turning points for the separation of social democracy from socialism. In 1914, after acknowledgement of war reparations at the Reichstag, the SPD was criticized as supporting imperial foreign policy of the state for social and political gains. Therefore, by the lead of Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring and Clara Zetkin who are against decisions of SPD and Germany for the First World War established Spartacus League (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, p. 63). After many expulsions of opponents against the war, it was followed by the establishment of the USPD (The Independent Social

Democratic Party of Germany) in 1917 and the KPD (The Communist Party of Germany) (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, pp. 68-73). In spite of the success in 1919 and 1920 elections for the left, throughout Weimar Republic, there was no coherence between opponents against the SPD. While most of voters who are, workers turned parties, which proposed radical solutions, the SPD focused on a policy which covered demands of middle classes (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, pp. 74-76). In 1921 Gorlitz Program that was mainly based on principles of democracy, the discourse of socialism was changed. Lassallean free state and socialist society turned back to the program and transition to socialist society was defined through democracy and plurality (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, pp. 88-89). In 1925 Heidelberg Program, in spite of being the reinterpretation of Erfurt program, moral and ethical issues were also emphasized. The state was redefined as a tool that can be dominated and reorganized by the support of masses (Kavukçuoğlu, 2003, pp. 106-107).

Consequently, by contributions of centralists and revisionists; criticisms on Marxism, strong emphasis on the parliamentary democracy and class alliances for the construction of socialist society reshaped both ideological and practical orientations of social democratic parties, not only in Germany but also in lots of European social democratic parties. Beyond theoretical issues, the SPD gave prominence to practical issues. Throughout peaceful methods, the parliament was conceived as the way to reach socialist society. Moral and ethical aspects of Marxism were emphasized. Rather than the emancipation of proletariat, they intended to construct socialist society by the mass support of society and; democracy and compromise became the integral part of social democracy.

## **1.2.Social Democracy from Keynesianism to Neoliberal Policies**

As it was stated by Wood (2003) the nation state provides sustainability and predictability by supplying and elaborating legal and institutional framework to sustain the property relations of capitalism. Also, the national reconstruction could take place only within the framework of international reconstruction and; class character of it was determined by the global context (Clarke, 2001). In that respect, after the First World War, industrial concentration increased in many forms and; the role of the state widened with large public works projects and development in

indirect wages (Beaud, 2001, p. 208). Each great power concentrated on their national objectives: American prosperity, pound, the franc and the recovery of German power (Beaud, 2001, p. 208); while the struggle for foreign markets became fiercer (Beaud, 2001, p. 175). Hence, besides political and economic changes, class structure was also transformed. Alongside peasantry, the petty and middle bourgeoisie and the working class; the new class, techno-bourgeoisie was developing (Beaud, 2001, p. 208). After the industrial revolution, the society institutionalized in Western Europe was the expression universalism which was represented as the natural ideology of bourgeoisie and bourgeois legal norms established the universal status of individuals. Hence, class antagonisms and contradictions between interests of capital and labor were ignored (Przeworski, 1986, p. 21).

On the other hand, for interpretation of changes in global financial system and its impacts on social democratic tradition during the post-war period, two points are so crucial. The first one was being of an anchor which defines the value of money. As a result of the implementation of the gold standard, the value of paper currency was ensured and; under fixed exchange rate regime, it was believed that market would adjust itself. The second one was the hegemonic power of the United States on the global financial system. Although there was no hegemonic power on international trade and global finance, until the Second World War; New York took its place as the world's principal center at the end of the war (Panitch & Gindin, 2004, p. 46). By the heading of these two points, it can be argued that the post-war order was directly embedded capitalist relations within a political and social regulatory framework (Panitch & Gindin, 2004, p. 49). A new social formation which was called as monopoly capitalism emerged. It was defined according to relations between multinational companies, the state, internationalization, alliance between military and industry, and media (Dowd, 2008, p. 188). Behind rapid growth of industry and rising consumerism in post-war period, American finance had the leading position. Within the New Deal regulations, United States deepened its markets at home and expanded abroad (Panitch & Gindin, 2004, p. 52). A multinational consensus of western state and societal forces around liberalization of world trade was created with the establishment of fixed exchange rate pegged to the US dollar (Langley, 2002). Rules of the Bretton Woods System and its institutions like the IMF (The

International Monetary Fund) and the WB (The World Bank) allowed more flexibility in national adjustments. Hence, American state could intervene in the European reconstruction and made the post-war economic boom possible (Panitch & Gindin, 2004, p. 51). As long as productivity advanced, organizing work was systemized and workers' mobilization for production was widened after the Second World War; the highest growth rates were attained since the middle of 19th century, (Beaud, 2001, p. 217). State had the role to sustain credit expansion. Therefore the cost of prosperity was socialized and; consolidation of labor with capital was remained during the golden age of capitalism.

### **1.2.1. Conceptualization of Market and Democracy during the Keynesian Era**

Social democrats captured electoral power throughout the Europe at the turn of the century. The SPD was the largest party in Germany in 1890. In 1907, Finnish Social Democrats won the plurality with 37 percent. The Austrian Social Democrats won the plurality of 40.8 percent in 1919. In the two successive elections of 1914, Swedish social democrats increased its shares to 30.1 and 36.4 percentage. Share of The Norwegian Labor Party reached 32.1 percent in 1915 (Przeworski, 1986, pp. 18-19). Especially with the First World War, they abandoned their suspicions of bourgeoisie parties and organizations and; supported their states which they had intended to destroy (Berman, 2006, p. 96). As long as the democratic wave had spread across the Europe, social democrats acknowledged embracing a whole new vision for the left, rather than tinkering with orthodoxy (Berman, 2006, p. 97). They tried to create an alternative against liberalism and Soviet communism by using the state to destroy market's destructive and anarchic potential (Berman, 2006, p. 15). Rather hoping the demise of market or worshipping it; they believed that the state should and could control the market without destroying it (Berman, 2006, p. 16). Particularly, while social democracy implied the strong desire for communal solidarity and collective goods (Berman, 2006, p. 16), and aimed to transition to the parliamentary democracy, social democrats also faced with economic problems. Due to devastating impacts of the Great Depression in 1929, challenge of devising an economic program became one of main issue for the strategy of socialization (Berman, 1998, p. 7). Hence, during the period between wars, European social democrats aimed to compensate demands of people who did not want to return to bad

days of the 1930's. At the same time, as it was stated by Sassoon (Sassoon, 2010, p. 140), everyone was in favor of state intervention and structural reforms and the spirit of the time was on the side of social reformism. The state had been conceived as the responsible for welfare and; the Left in Europe was the best alternative to implement social reforms for people who wanted better health care and job security (Sassoon, 2010, pp. 138-139). Against the rise of capitalism and its social consequences, social democratic movements constructed its legitimacy through the correlation between political mobilization of masses and the welfare state. Yet, meantime stabilization and legitimization of capitalism through the power of state and improving social conditions of population was still the inescapable dilemma of both socialist and social democratic movement (Sassoon, 2010, p. 138).

Social democrats granted that the postwar order implied the revision of relations between the state, market and society (Berman, 2006, p. 200). According to that, remarkably, the state became the guardian of society rather than the economy, and economic imperatives were often forced to take back seat to social ones (Berman, 2006, p. 178). "Unchecked markets were now viewed as dangerous; social interests were now viewed as trumping private prerogatives." (Berman, 2006, p. 17). Besides the acknowledgement of Keynesian and welfare state policies; the state was perceived as a mechanism that can manage capitalism and protect society from its consequences (Berman, 2006, p. 181). At that point, the accomplishment of social democrats was reconciliation of a well-functioning capitalist system, democracy and social stability for common and public interests (Berman, 2006, p. 201). While social democracy had spread around Europe, social democratic principles and policies were acknowledged across the continent as the foundation of Europe's postwar settlement (Berman, 2006, p. 200).

Economic policies of social democratic movement provide significant comprehension for its investigation during the post-war period. Especially, after social and economic consequences of the Great Depression, social democrats defined the way of reaching social democratic goals through economic policies. In that context, arguments of a Swedish social democrat, Ernst Wigforss, were so crucial. He tried to find alternative ways for using existing resources effectively without injuring wages (Berman, 1998, p. 165). He problematized capitalism and its crisis

due to waste of productive resources and; therefore, lowering demand and standard of living (Berman, 1998, p. 165). Controlling the power of the state to organize and control market was main part of economic programs. In addition to that putting forward a positive socialist politics, which convincing people for creating an order as well as bourgeoisie parties and easing people's burdens, was their primary aim (Berman, 1998, p. 168). Social democrats formulated their practical suggestions and realized their ideas to secure the best for all working people (Berman, 1998, pp. 168-169). Meantime in Germany, a new economic strategy which was called as "organized capitalism" was formulated by Rudolf Hilferding. According to him, important gains for working class can also be made within bourgeoisie capitalist society; therefore, conquering the power of the state was so crucial (Berman, 1998, p. 184). Trade unions were also tried to design social democracy. By using the levers of the power, they intended to improve lives of the masses for more organized and just economy (Berman, 1998, p. 190).

Consequently, as it was stated by Sandbrook (Sandbrook, Edelman, Heller, & Teichman, 2007, p. 14), during the post-war era, Western European model of social democracy underpinned mixed economy with extensive public sector and state regulation. Equality and justice were pursued through high redistributive taxes and comprehensive welfare state. Full employment was aimed through Keynesian demand-side management and; maintenance the alliance between social democratic parties and centralized labor movement was perceived as the protector of worker's interests. To produce growth and wealth and; acts of social democrats had been shaped according to vast majority of people who suffering from injustices and dislocation of capitalism (Berman, 2006, p. 210) and; democracy was seen as best means of attaining their objectives (Berman, 2006, p. 204).

However, firstly, it can be remarked that revisionists acknowledged that workers were not a majority and needed alliances for the realization of electoral victory (Przeworski, 1986, p. 25). To obtain parliamentary majority, they preferred to administer the system with introduction of some reforms to obtain majority, rather than pursuing socialist objectives (Przeworski, 1986, p. 34). Hence, corresponding to universal bourgeoisie's ideological framework, workers were identified as individuals, rather than a class. As long as politics were perceived from the

dimension of individual-nation, rather than in terms of class; social democratic parties were no longer different from other parties; (Przeworski, 1986, p. 28). During the economic boom of the post-war period, it was also acknowledged that “Society is not helpless against the whims of the capitalist market, the economy can be controlled, and welfare of citizens can be continually enhanced by the active role of the state.” (Przeworski, 1986, p. 36). “Having made the commitment to maintain private property of the means of production, to assure efficiency, and to mitigate distributional effects, social democracy ceased to be a reformist movement.” (Przeworski, 1986, p. 40). Hence, besides the desire for communal solidarity and collective goods (Berman, 2006, p. 16), as it was stated by Donald Sassoon (2010, pp. 196-197), social democrats of Europe became defender of the growth model of Western capitalism,

...which provided sought-after consumer goods and the necessary surplus with which to pay for the welfare state; they supported the Atlanticist international order, thus demarcating themselves from authoritarian forms of socialism in the East; they endorsed the liberal-democratic organization of the state, which provided the political conditions for their obtaining a parliamentary victory and/or participation in governmental power; they upheld the prevailing form of the family, with its peculiar division of labour, because it seemed best suited to existing conditions and was not overtly challenged by anyone (Sassoon, 2010, pp. 196-197).

Secondly, social democratic had to transform the raw material of class structure and, reformism is the vehicle for this (Esping-Andersen, 1985, p. 38). As long as social democrats accepted parliament as their battleground during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, they also acknowledged broader class alliances and; therefore, they had to influence government policy. Their ability to construct class solidarity was constrained by its capacity to influence public policy (Esping-Andersen, 1985, pp. 10-11). In other words, it was implied that beyond class based explanations, depending upon the sort of policy and theory, reforms and improvements can be revolutionary or not (Esping-Andersen, 1985, p. 9). The crucial thing for social democracy was the transformation of the state by expanding social democratic community (Esping-Andersen, 1985, p. 38). Hence, without international reconstruction and its impacts on relations between the state, market and society; social democracy had been evaluated as a technical issue under the light of welfare state policies. Due to worker’s need for social

resources and economic efficiency of social policy; parliamentary reformism and emphasis on social policy -parliamentary class mobilization- were perceived as dominant strategy for social democracy (Esping-Andersen, 1989, p. 13). In social democratic welfare regime, all strata and classes are incorporated under one universal insurance system. Social democratic state promotes an equality of highest standards (Esping-Andersen, 1989, p. 26).

### **1.2.2. Neoliberal Order and the Surrender of Social Democracy**

In the 1960's, corresponding to expansionary economic policies, big multinational companies and organized labor increased prices as opposed to the logic of market. Expansionary policies that stimulated the income and profitability slowed down the growth with overproduction. Rise in indebtedness increased fragilities and consolidation between labor and the market was violated (Dowd, 2008, p. 220). Against fall in economic growth, low profit rates, increased unemployment and unsustainability in real wages; economic policy was dominated by the concerns of financial sectors. These situations reshaped social and economic factors from various aspects. First of all, instead of big multinational companies, supranational ones became dominant in industry. As long as welfare state policies lost its importance, the state focused on the sake of these supranational companies and financial activities (Dowd, 2008, p. 222). After the collapse of Bretton Woods System, an alternative monetary arrangement based on the US dollar was required under the lack of a monetary anchor (Lapavitsas, 2009). Central banks were tasked to control inflation and government was managed to control its capital. While the sphere of circulation was separated from the sphere of production; the state was regarded as controller of prices, quantities and cross-border flows of capital and manager of the risk (Lapavitsas, 2009). That was followed by the transformation in class structure. While class of owners hold property turned to financial assets, a larger managerial class' profits turned to the form of wages and salaries. Household consumption and savings were facilitated in banking system and other financial institutions (Lapavitsas, 2009). Secondly, as the hegemonic power of its time US consolidated its power by preserving its access to global resources and re-establishing confidence in dollar. Through the development of secondary markets, US spread its financial innovations internationally and run its economy without large reserves (Panitch &

Gindin, 2004, p. 62). By liberalizing its financial markets, US sustained the dollar as an international currency and made US government securities seem as good as gold (Panitch & Gindin, 2004, p. 63). Therefore, under these circumstances, neoliberal policies removed controls on financial markets, downsized the role of the state, ended full employment and weakened the social security institutions, labor unions and keepings in labor markets. Privatizations, free trade, export-led growth, irregularities in labor market and macroeconomic austerities became norm with “Washington Consensus” (Palley, 2005, p. 25). In addition to the efficient way to allocate resources, the optimum context to achieve human freedom was also offered by neoliberalism. Competitive capitalism was perceived as the necessary base for capitalist democracy against the totalitarianism of the left (Munck, 2005, p. 65). Civil society was a terrain between the state and economy and; from NGO’s to trade unions; all non-state actors were encouraged to rein the state (Munck, 2005, p. 66).

Throughout the representation of social democracy as the particular subject of Keynesian and welfare policies, capitalist production relations were acknowledged as an instrument to escalate wealth and prosperity and; democracy was perceived as a concept which compensates consequences of capitalism. However, while production relations had changed and consolidation between labor and capital was violated during the neoliberal era; Keynesian policies could not respond combination of high inflations, stagnation and unemployment. Due to growing deficits, higher taxation was required to maintain welfare state (Sandbrook, Edelman, Heller, & Teichman, 2007, p. 14). Therefore, as long as consolidation of labor with capital which had been maintained with socialization of prosperity was violated; social democrats acknowledged that their role was remedial rather than transformational. They became more market-friendly through the combination of privatization, shifting delivery of some services to private providers and supporting free trade agreements. Equality was interpreted as more in the way of equality of opportunity and less in the way of equality of outcome through redistribution income. The state was still had to mitigate social exclusion. Yet, they lost their links with organized labor (Sandbrook, Edelman, Heller, & Teichman, 2007, p. 15).

It is also possible to reconsider the social democratic movement in neoliberal times according to “The Third Way” which offered an alternative way for social democrats

to remedy consequences of neoliberal policies. It was the project that argued both capitalist and socialist policies and explained failures of both market and state policies.

Third way politics is not a continuation of neoliberalism, but an alternative political philosophy to it. Social democrats, as I shall emphasize below, need to overcome some of their worries and fears about markets. But the neoliberal idea that markets should almost everywhere stand in place of public goods is ridiculous. Neoliberalism is a deeply flawed approach to politics, because it supposes that no responsibility needs to be taken for the social consequences of market-based decisions. Markets can't even function without a social and ethical framework –which they themselves cannot provide. Neither trickle-down effects, nor a minimal welfare state, are able to provide the social goods that a decent society must involve... (Giddens, 2000, pp. 32-33).

That criticism on neoliberalism was followed by emphasis on opportunities of market and consequences of the state. However, that was the clear ignorance of contradictions between capital and labor.

...Yet it won't do, as writers from the old left suggest, merely to counterpose the state to markets. Markets do not always increase inequality, but can sometimes be the means of overcoming it. Moreover, while active government is needed to promote egalitarian policies, the left has to learn to recognize that the state itself can produce inequality, as well as having other counter-productive effects on individuals' lives –even when it is recognizably democratic and motivated by good intentions. Even in its most developed forms, the welfare state was never an unalloyed good. All welfare states create problems of dependency, moral hazard, bureaucracy, interest-group formation and fraud (Giddens, 2000, pp. 32-33).

Therefore, in main principles of the Third Way policies, contradictions between the left and right was ignored. The power was distributed between government, economy and communities of civil society. Beyond class based politics, the balance between them was aimed. In its new social contract, equality was identified according to citizenship. It intends to maximize equality of opportunity. Meantime, welfare state's old project of exclusion mechanisms should be left. Also, the Third Way directly supports globalization. The old left was accused of being isolationist (Giddens, 2000, pp. 50-54).

### **1.3. Conclusion**

As it was tried to be explained throughout three different nation examples, decision on how to achieve socialist society; within the scope of criticisms on Marxism, choice of parliamentary democracy and class alliances, is the main determinant for the evolution of social democracy during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. After the rejection of revolutionary methods and proletariat dictatorship; class antagonism was also out of the scope. Along with bourgeoisie economic and social principles, socialist society was idealized with the prosperity of whole people. While social democracy was represented organization of workers to hold power under democratic capitalism, classes were defined as communities. Capitalist production relations were perceived as a crucial tool for producing growth and; it was reconciled with democracy and social stability. As long as parliamentary democracy became integral part for the solution of capitalism's consequences, the way of reaching socialist goals had been redefined as a technical and administrative issue. Moral and ethical aspects of socialism were accentuated throughout peaceful and democratic methods. Henceforth, electoral success became the primary target to expand social democratic community.

It is possible to reinterpret political choices of social democracy during the Keynesian era and the neoliberal hegemony; throughout their analysis on international reconstruction and its impacts on the transformation of the state-society relations. Especially after the Second World War, by the lead of American finance and monopoly capitalism, there was a multinational consensus between the state and social forces around the liberalization of world trade. As a result of Bretton Woods System and its institutions, more flexible national adjustments and high growth rates allowed socialization of prosperity; therefore, contradiction between labor and capital was reconciled. Meantime; the political power of social democracy around Europe was perceived as the constituent subject of the post-war order. The ability to control the state as a mechanism to consolidate the balance between consequences of capitalism and welfare of society was idealized as the main success of social democracy during the golden age of capitalism. It offered an alternative way for consequences of capitalism and its crises through practical suggestions. Keynesian demand-side management gave important chance for social democrats to pursue

equality and justice for improving social conditions of masses. However, while production relations had changed and consolidation between labor and capital was violated during the neoliberal era; social democrats could not react against the uncontrollable rise of the market. As long as barriers on neoliberal policies were abolished and the control of the state was minimized; social democracy which referred the active role of the state to control capitalist market and to enhance welfare of citizens (Przeworski, 1986, p. 36), could not sustain the balance between the state and market. As a result of the acknowledgement of capitalist production relations and democracy as mechanisms for reaching socialist goals; social democracy, whose legitimacy was based on Keynesian policies, could not create any alternative policies against social and economic problems of capitalism during the neoliberal era. Governments of the Left faced with succumbing to remorseless pressures to accept orthodox policies. They implemented policies for priorities of the 1970's: inflation control, limitation of overall tax burdens, labor market deregulations (Glyn, 2001, p. 20). Therefore, while workers were identified as individuals rather than class and social democratic policies targeted to expand social democratic community (Esping-Andersen, 1985, p. 38), social democrats became supporter of neoliberal policies, although freedom, equality and solidarity were in their agendas.

Furthermore, for each experience; Great Britain, Sweden and Germany; emergence of social democracy was a response to economic and social realities in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Capitalism and its socio-economic consequences were main determinants of political decision of social democratic movements. At the same time, notably, each social democratic movement were emerged and evolved differently in accordance with their national economic and social circumstances. For example, in Great Britain, as a result of middle-class character of its socialist movement; social democracy was conceived as a middle-class phenomenon and transition to socialism was problematized as a technical issue by Fabian Society. Beyond power relations between capital and labor, scientific investigation of society was put into the center. Transition to socialism was realized with the control and management of bureaucratic machinery. In Sweden, labor movement and its organizations had the leading role for the development of social democracy. Swedish social democracy emerged directly within the struggle of labor unions. Ideological and organizational

unity between political organizations of social democrats and the struggle of labor movements was the main characteristic of Swedish social democracy. As opposed to unity in Sweden, theoretical discussions divided social democratic movements into three camps in Germany. Ideological struggle between radicals, centralists and revisionists specified the main feature of German social democracy. Although how to reach socialist society again was the main problematic issue; the gap between theory and practice was the main issue beyond that ideological struggle and; it directly affected the political decisions of the SPD. Therefore, arguments and explanations about the universality of social democracy can be problematized.

Although freedom, equality and solidarity are represented as main features of social democracy; it is undermined that principles of social democratic movement have been defined just considering the historical development of western European countries. Within the definition of universal social democracy and its principles, its evolution in periphery becomes a problematic issue. At that point, against the divergent sequencing of industrialization, democratization, and social citizenship in developed countries; for developing countries, it was emphasized that in the context of heterogeneous and differentiated class structure; class compromises predate before a productive capitalism (Sandbrook, Edelman, Heller, & Teichman, 2007, p. 19). Thus, industrialization and its impact on social and political life are questioned for the evaluation of social democracy in developing countries. However, beyond assumptions of capitalism and liberal democratic state, social democracy should be conceived as a historical phenomenon. In developing countries, international reconstruction and its impacts on relations between the state, market and society should be examined. In Turkey, emergence and evolution of social democracy should not be conceived part from that perspective.

## CHAPTER III

### SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN TURKEY AND ITS CRISIS

In Turkey, social democracy has been generally conceptualized according to political struggles of the RPP (The Republican People's Party), the SDP (The Social Democracy Party) and, its successor, the SDPP (The Social Democratic Populist Party). In that respect, two periods might be represented as particular experiences of social democracy in Turkey; "left of center" movement within the RPP which arose during the 1960's and, examination of social democracy with direct references on European tradition within the SDP and the SDPP. Firstly, "left of center" of the RPP and then "democratic-left" movements by the head of Bülent Ecevit has been accepted as the initial stage of social democracy in Turkey due to its emphasis on substructure revolutions and defending rights of particular classes –workers, small peasants and middle classes (Atılğan, 2015, p. 578). In addition to that, party programs of these movements covered land reform, social justice, economic development, democratic etatism, education and secularism and; succeeded to respond needs of wage earners during the 1970's (Tachau, 1991). Secondly, after the 1980 coup d'état, the SDP and the SDPP were idealized as main parties which embraced social democracy. They were primary organizations for the support of democratization in Turkey during the 1980's. It pledged to ease democratization process of Turkey by removing barriers of fundamental rights and freedoms and; support social rights of salaried workers against inequalities (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 259).

As it was discussed in the first chapter, social democracy is a historical phenomenon. International reconstruction of market and its impacts on relations between the state, market and society is primary determinant on each national experience of social democracy. In that context, while change in production and class relations during the 1960's and 1980's affected both social and economic circumstances of Turkey; Turkey's social democracy significantly progressed and, created alternative policies

to respond needs of working masses throughout these two particular periods. However, at the same time why European social democratic tradition had not been evolved in Turkey has been questioned vis-à-vis disparate historical evaluation of Turkey's and European social democracy. Like the consideration of social democracy in developing countries; late industrialization, the lack of an organized labor movement and a democratic tradition have been represented as crucial points for the evaluation of Turkish social democracy. Especially during the 1990's, within the scope of turning to the RPP tradition, modernization attempts within the early Republican period, representation of bureaucratic-elitist tradition and statist policies had been evaluated as main problematic issues of Turkey's social democracy. On the one hand, for the evaluation of European sense of 'universal' social democracy, these have been represented as main obstacles. On the other hand, these have been acknowledged as domestic features of Turkey's social democracy. Yet, this time, it has been examined according to political rivalries between factions within social democratic parties and its political choices for election victories.

However, besides these specific historical conditions; it is also possible to reexamine emergence and evolution of social democracy in Turkey according to impacts of politic and economic circumstances on political and ideological decisions of Turkey's social democrats. Even in Turkey, social democracy has been based on criticisms on Marxist tradition and choices of parliamentary democracy and class alliances. It can be remarked that Turkey's social democracy has also been discussed within an alternative political strategy for becoming power, through peaceful and democratic methods. Electoral successes and expanding social democratic community are also primary targets of Turkey's social democracy. Due to the emphasis on parliamentary democracy and class alliances, social democracy has also been perceived as a technical issue and, class solidarity has been tried to be enhanced throughout public policies. Parliamentary reformism and implementation of social policies became dominant strategy of Turkey's social democracy. Despite the significance of modernization and democratization issues, from the 1960's to 1990's, Turkey's social democracy can also be reinterpreted according to its conceptualization of capitalist production relations and democracy. During that chapter, by consideration of change in production relations in Turkey and its class character, social democracy of Turkey will be evaluated throughout the examination

of the center-left movement within the RPP and; democratization of factions within the SDP and the SDPP after the 1980. Especially, the crisis of Turkish social democracy in the 1990's will be on the scope.

## **2.2. The Emergence of Turkey's Social Democracy within the RPP Tradition**

### **2.2.1. Politic and Economic Background for the 1960's**

On 27 May 1960, the officers seized the power to set up an above-party administration, hold free elections and hand back political power to the winning party. The group that held the power, the National Unity Committee, announced the task of preparing a new constitution (Ahmad, 1977, p. 161). This new constitution, first of all, aimed to restrain the power of the DP (The Democrat Party). Senate of Republic was established as a second parliament. Therefore, the power of ruling party was controlled and; to prevent from single-party system, proportional representation was introduced. Secondly, by establishment of the Constitutional Court, independence of jurisdiction, universities, and mass media organizations was guaranteed. Fundamental rights and freedoms were added to the constitution. (Zürcher, 2014, p. 356). However, although holding a free election supervised by an impartial administration was the main purpose, creation of the 1961 constitution act transformed the coup into a revolution. The political power turned to a material force representing personal power and ambition and class interests (Ahmad, 1977, p. 162). That was the recreation of the state and social institutions as well as political authority and legal government (Ahmad, 1977, p. 163). Freedom of thought, expression, association and publication were guaranteed and; social and economic rights were promised by the constitution. Yet, significantly, the state was given the right to plan economic development for social justice, until it was forced to give away (Ahmad, 1977, p. 187). At that point, it should be emphasized that historical importance of the 27 May coup d'état can be evaluated according to needs of the transformation from agricultural-commercial to industrial capital accumulation (Savran, 2004, p. 23). Reestablishment of planning and transition from liberal foreign trade regime to protectionism guaranteed support of the state to inward-looking industrialization model which started at the end of the 1950's (Savran, 2004, p. 24).

Production and distribution relations within Turkey during the 1960's were formalized by the ISI (Import-Substitution Industrialization). Distribution of sources was dominated by consumption preferences of urbanized and provincial bourgeoisie (Boratav, 2012, pp. 118-119). Planning was the most important phenomenon of its time. Yet, despite establishment of the State Planning Organization; industrialization had been remained with production of durable consumer goods for internal market, by the lead of private sector. While government invested in big sectors like iron-steel, petroleum chemical industry and other intermediary goods; production in industries like textile, food and durable consumer goods like radio, refrigerator, washing machine and automobile were maintained by private sector (Pamuk, 2014, p. 236). Contrary to expectations from import-substitution industrialization, the share of import in the GDP increased; because, the development in production of investment goods got behind the intermediary goods (Boratav, 2012, p. 120). Until the mid-1970's, high growth rates of GDP could be sustained with foreign resources. Short and long term credits, foreign aids and remittances sustained foreign trade deficit until the 1970's (Boratav, 2012, p. 122). Particularly, two points are so crucial for the political economy of Turkey during post-war reconstruction period. First of all, as long as expansionary and populist policies both in urban and rural side remained; long-term interests of sovereign block and short-term interests of masses were reconciled. Wages were perceived as a factor that stimulates demand. (Boratav, 2012, p. 123). Right to strike, increase in bargaining power, loose employment policies of the Government Business Enterprises and progressive employment policies were also a reflection of populist policies. Economic growth could be transferred to masses with the rise in real wages. It should be in remind that changes in income distribution was determined by accidental distribution relations between class struggle and the balance between sovereign block (Boratav, 2012, p. 126). Secondly, as it was stated by Keyder (2013, p. 186) the ISI was not independent production method from Keynesian regulations in the core countries. Though Turkey's industrial sector was protecting from international competition, foreign direct investments were so prevalent and there was no separation between foreign and national capital during that period. It should be remind that the ISI was a coherent strategy for international capital. Following the structural transformation after the Second World War, change in import orientation from consumption goods

to industrial goods in developing countries was not a hindrance for the development of world economy (Keyder, 2013, p. 187).

As a result of these economic and social circumstances, class structure in Turkey had also been changed. Firstly, due to strong ties with the state and foreign capital and, engagement with trade and industry; the 1960's was the golden age of Turkish bourgeoisie (Atılğan, 2015, p. 524). As a result of import prohibitions and high tariffs; they benefited from high prices in the internal market. Credits from international institutions like EIB, IBRD and IDA was transferred into private sector. Big bourgeoisie like Koç and Sabancı worked as the agencies of international companies of the US (Atılğan, 2015, pp. 524-526). While bourgeoisie appreciated its profits throughout conglomerates, Turkish bourgeoisie also increased its hegemonic power with its civil society organizations. The Economic Development Foundation and the Turkish Confederation of Employer Associations were established during that period (Atılğan, 2015, pp. 527-528). Secondly, working class increased quantitatively and expanded its influence over the society (Atılğan, 2015, p. 529). As long as urbanization increased and capital accumulation rose; working class became more apparent. During 1960's, working class reached the capability to open a sphere in political arena. Apart from the state and capital; they succeeded to organize independently. In that context, establishment of the WPT (The Workers' Party of Turkey) and the Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions were so crucial. Throughout strikes and meeting like Saraçhane Meeting in 1961, Kavel Protest in 1963, and Berec Factory Strike in 1964; workers opened a new way to support their rights and status both in constitutional and legal status. Furthermore, they built a new discourse against capitalist relations within Turkey (Atılğan, 2015, p. 532). The 1961 Constitution Act was an important step for the construction of a democratic and legitimate political environment during the 1960's. Hence each class and layer could develop and support its ideology.

### **2.2.2. The First Step for Turkey's Social Democracy: Left of Center**

After the coup of May 27<sup>th</sup>, the legacy of officers was threatened even at the beginning of the 1961. Firstly, the new constitution was approved by 61.7 percent against 38.3 percent of total votes, in referendum. This vote share was not high as much as expected by officers (Zürcher, 2014, p. 357). Secondly, in the first election after the

coup, 1961 general election while the RPP won 36.7 percent of total votes; successors of the DP, the JP (The Justice Party) followed the RPP by 34.4 percent of vote shares. These were the reflection of political struggle between agrarian-commercial and industrial bourgeoisie at the beginning of the decade. Henceforth, until the 1965, by the lead of the RPP, Turkey had been ruled by coalition governments. Yet, meantime, due to significant growth of industrial capitalist relations; a new political consciousness that stressed contradictions between capital and labor had arisen during the 1960's. Intellectual layers which were separated between capital and labor had developed. As a result of the rise in urbanization, demographic character of big cities had reshaped. While socialist ideals became more apparent among newcomers of urban places, others became militarized to restrain them. Therefore, ideals that hindered social contradictions with themes like the supreme of the state and national unity were disrupted (Atılgan, 2015, p. 602). In that context, particularly, 1965 general election was the turning point for this period. Against the JP's 52.9 percent of vote shares, The RPP won 28.7 percent of votes and; other parties could not exceed 7 percent (Zürcher, 2014, p. 363). In spite of 2.97 percent of votes, the WTP gained 15 seats in the parliament, by the help of proportional representation. Thus, besides the victory of the DP tradition after the coup of May 27th, socialist ideals gained to chance to be represented in the parliament. Significantly, the JP won the 1965 general election; because, apart from its predecessor, the DP; industrial bourgeoisie was also one of main components within the JP's program. That was a political project of commercial and industrial bourgeoisie which comprised liberals, conservatives, nationalists and even secular sides of the society (Atılgan, 2015, p. 580). As long as constitutional, legal and political aspects of the inward-looking capital accumulation had been supported by the 1961 constitutional act; the JP became political leader within sovereign block (Atılgan, 2015, p. 601). On the other hand, the WTP was at the center of opposition against both internal and external appropriation mechanisms. The Left in Turkey had been organized around the WTP (Atılgan, 2015, p. 602). Additionally, Kemalist intellectuals who were influenced by Marxism discussed socialism as a development program within Yön-Devrim movement (Atılgan, 2015, p. 574). National Democratic Revolution movement analyzed class structure of Turkey and adapted strategies of Comintern to become power (Atılgan, 2015, p. 575).

Emergence and evolution of Turkey's social democracy was directly related with transformation of production and social relations and, appearance of consequences of capitalism and class conflict during the 1960's. The RPP which was the primary subject of Turkey's social democracy had already adopted planned development project due to the transition to inward-looking policies at the end of the 1950's. Against anti-democratic and liberal policies of the DP; the RPP started to support planning, strike and contract right for workers, the right to establish professional associations and trade unions for civil servants and expansion of social insurance within election bulletin in 1957 (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 92). In 1959, the Manifesto of Primary Targets of the RPP underlined social injustice and declared the recognition of social rights (Kömürcü, 2010, pp. 93-94). Planned economy, redistribution of income and social rights were main phenomena of the 1960's. In 1963, during its coalition government, the RPP also reorganized labor market according to requirements of new capital accumulation model with Trade Union Act No: 274 and, Collective Labor Agreement, Strike and Lockout Act No: 275 (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 103). These reorganizations on labor market were represented as the success of Minister of Labor, Bülent Ecevit. Nonetheless, that was a reflection of transformation from agrarian-commercial to industrial capital accumulation model (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 103). Moreover, organizational and ideological structure of the RPP which was inherited from the single-party period was not appropriate for the politics of the 1960's. At the end of the 1950's, due to economic problems and especially the 1958 devaluation, people lived in urban areas started to react against the government and social consequences. Change within the RPP's organizational and ideological structure was required; however, this situation led to clash within the party between traditionalist and reformist sides. To response demands of the society or to maintain traditionalist line were two choices for the RPP at the beginning of the decade (Emre, 2013, pp. 78-79) and; under the light of these two choices, social democracy was idealized and discussed as an ideology and a party strategy.

In the summer of 1965, İsmet İnönü used "left of center" to define ideological position of the RPP and; discussions about objectives for the 1965 General Elections started. According to İnönü, the agenda of "left of center" was determined by economic development, financial reforms, land reform and national oil and; it was associated the statist tradition within the RPP (Emre, 2013, pp. 87-88). Policies of the

Left and the Right were two main determinants for “left of center”. On the one hand class conflicts became more apparent and labor movement got stronger and the WPT could response demands of workers better than the RPP. Yön-Devrim and National Democratic Revolution movements had dominated the left in Turkey. On the other hand, by using religious sensitivities, the JP charged the RPP with supporting communist movements. “Left of center” was represented as a shield against these two sides, before the 1965 general elections (Emre, 2013, pp. 88-89). Therefore social democracy was started to be discussed as a political strategy in Turkey. Yet, the RPP perceived and implemented social democracy as a populist strategy. Political choices between the Left and the Right specified the emergence of social democracy in Turkey.

Especially after the defeat in 1965 general election, discussions about “left of center” deepened the clash between conservative and reformist sides of the party. Conservatives, Turhan Feyzioglu, Cokun Kırca, Emin Paksüt, Orhan Öztrak; concluded that the strong emphasis on “left of center” associated the RPP with the radical Left. Hence, the party lost votes. On the contrary, for the defeat in elections, by leadership of Ecevit, reformists expressed that majority of the party did not act according to “left of center” (Kömürcü, 2010, pp. 121-122). Henceforth, it is possible to determine two turning points for during the Turkey’s social democracy. First of all, in 1966, the struggle between these two groups accelerated at the 18<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the RPP. Ecevit was elected as General Secretary and; the RPP explicitly declared its position on the left. Organizational structure of the party had also been changed in that direction and; four years later, Ecevit strengthened his position in the 20<sup>th</sup> General Assembly (Kömürcü, 2010, pp. 126-127). The rise of Ecevit as a strong political figure signaled the domination of reformist group within the RPP. The RPP was transformed into a party which idealized independent and democratic social organizations for economic development and social justice. (Kömürcü, 2010, pp. 126-127). Second point was the political tension between İsmet İnönü and Ecevit. After the 1971 Turkish military memorandum, Ecevit criticized İnönü because of his support to Erim government. He resigned from the secretary general in 1971 and; one year later he was elected as general presidency (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 138). Hence, Ecevit revised identity and ideological position of the RPP within political, economic and social circumstances of Turkey (Kömürcü, 2010, p.

139). The symbolic ideological rupture of Ecevit from İnönü resulted with transition from “left of center” to “democratic-left”. The discourse of the RPP was radicalized. Beyond slogans of the RPP during the 1960’s, new projects were represented and; the party exactly determined social groups whose demands were responded (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 137). In its 23<sup>th</sup> General Assembly, “democratic-left” was clarified as rapid development, humanitarian order, social justice and national independence. In addition to the six arrows of the RPP; freedom, equality, solidarity and superiority of labor were added to the program (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 140). The RPP, therefore, increased its vote share during the 1970’s. In 1973 General and Local Elections, the party gained 33.3 and 37.4 percent vote shares, respectively. In 1975 the early Senate and Parliamentary Elections the RPP’s vote share increased to 43.4 percent. Then the party held 41.4 percent of vote shares in the 1977 General Elections (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 147).

#### **2.2.2.1. Principles of Left of Centre**

“Left of center” was conceived as a wall between communist and reactionary movements of the 1960’s. It idealized a society with social justice and equity; however, it was also a reaction against socialist ideals. Due to its undemocratic character in economic, politic and social areas, strict borders were set against the radical left. In return, freedom of thought, choice and property were represented as main deficiencies against it (Ecevit, 2009, p. 90). The radical left was also accused of postponing the wealth of people for future generations and; it was conceived as an obstacle against popular sovereignty (Ecevit, 2009, p. 90). In that context, democracy was the essential aspect of “left of center” and the interrelationship between the state and society was main determinant for the development of democracy. Due to public interest; freedoms of enterprise, right to own property and equality in opportunity were required for the future of democratic society (Ecevit, 2009, p. 31). Within boundaries of public interest and social justice, democracy was idealized in an opposite position against dictatorship of both the state and wealth of minority. Furthermore according to Ecevit (Ecevit, 2009, p. 13) people who stand on “left of center” were progressive, revolutionist and reformist. Within their understanding of humanity and populism, they intend rapidly change in economic, social and cultural institutions to increase material and mental power of society. “Left of center”

supported advantages of masses against small interest groups (Ecevit, 2009, p. 13). Abolition of the class conflicts was realized through just and equal distribution of wealth. Beyond the abolition of market structure or the dictatorship of one class, institutional transformation in the light of social justice and security was perceived as main objective for the power of “left of center”.

“Left of center” represented a development program which was aimed weakening feudal relations, reorganizing the social structure according to Western model and overcoming consequences of industrialization. This development program was formulized with direct references on historical development of Turkey. Development of democracy, social transformation and reforms were investigated within the Turkish history (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 131). It was expressed that in spite of its deficiencies, a democratic tradition and notion of justice and equity has been within the Turkish history. There was no class conflict and class mobility within Turkish history; hence, any Turk cannot acknowledge privileges of someone over the society. Traditionally, Turkish society has been against both the dictatorship of the state and wealth of minority (Ecevit, 2009, p. 39). Atatürk’s revolutions were critical for the preparation of democratic transformation of the society. Revolutionary steps on the base were possible in multi-party system and freedoms of the 1961 constitution (Ecevit, 2015, pp. 39-40). In that context, “left of center” was a constitutional movement. By reforms, the 1961 constitution should be expanded in social and economic sphere beyond its political sphere. Therefore, ‘social state’ could transform into a “social democratic” state (Ecevit, 2009, pp. 42-43).

In consequence, transition from agricultural-commercial to industrial capital accumulation, deepening contradiction between capital and labor, consequences of urbanization and, rise of the Left prepared required conditions for first steps of Turkey’s social democracy. Thanks to freedoms of the 1961 constitution, during the 1960’s social groups could develop and support their ideals. Throughout the ISI, growth in economy could be transferred to masses. Hence, as a result of expansionary and populist policies contradictions between capital and labor had already been reconciled during that period. Under these circumstances, Turkey’s social democracy developed new projects and succeeded to respond to notions such as social justice, equality, solidarity and labor; besides its development strategy

which was introduced by considering industrial transformation and its impact on society. It gained significant political support by the leadership of Ecevit during the 1970's. On the other hand, after the 1965 general election, the clash between traditionalist and reformist sides of the RPP led to the consideration of social democracy according to constituent ideals of the Republic. "Left of center" had been issued within the context of whether the rupture from the RPP tradition or not. However, as the emergence of social democracy in Turkey, "left of center" can be reexamined corresponding to its conceptualization of capitalist production relations and democracy. It can be remarked that "left of center" was conceived and developed as a populist strategy against threats from the Left and the Right. As a response to influences of the Cold War, the socialist Left was specifically marginalized and it was blamed for postponing the wealth of society. As long as public interests were considered, "left of center" accepted property relations of capitalist production system and especially emphasized freedoms of enterprise and right to own property for the future of democratic society. Democratic organization of society was also idealized as a wall against socialist and communist movements is another crucial topic for "left of center". Democracy implied an opposite position against the dictatorship of both the state and wealth of minority. Social, economic and cultural transformation of Turkey on institutional level was aimed rapidly throughout reforms. Besides identification of expanding social democratic community as one of primary targets, a classless society was idealized for the democratic development of the society throughout fair and equal distribution of wealth and consolidation of social justice and security by "left of center". Like its European counterparts, Turkey's social democracy constructed its legitimacy through the reconciliation between capital and labor during the 1960's.

### **2.3. Neoliberal Hegemony and Transformation of Turkey's Social Democracy**

#### **2.3.1. Politic and Economic Background for the 1980's**

During the 1970's, foreign trade regime was based on fixed exchange rate regime and foreign exchange controls (Boratav, 2012, p. 127). Relatively rapid industrialization of Turkey had been sustained with internal savings and remittances (Pamuk, 2014, p. 256). However, the development process which was based on chronic foreign deficits faced with the stagnancy in export (Boratav, 2012, p. 128),

problems with balance of payments and devaluations at the end of the decade (Pamuk, 2014, pp. 240-241). While foreign exchange restrictions determined boundaries of the economic growth, the lack of foreign resources resulted with economic stagnation. Export in industrial goods started at the mid-1970; therefore, foreign exchange deficits increased and there was deficiency in credit channels (Boratav, 2012, p. 135). In addition to pressures for deregulation in foreign trade system and devaluations throughout the IMF; the response of Turkey to global crisis in the 1970's was just postponing economic and social consequences (Boratav, 2012, p. 128). Though remittances and convertible deposit were used as a mechanism which compensated these problems; at the end of the decade, the crisis was inevitable (Boratav, 2012, p. 135). Expansionary policies led growth and current account deficits. Foreign capital and external borrowing had been used to support current account deficits. Thus, macroeconomic policies were still determined at national level (Yeldan, 2013, p. 37). Yet, the rise in unemployment, distorted fiscal system and high current account deficits significantly showed the end of import-substitution industrialization (Ozan, 2015, p. 665).

The crisis influenced both dependent classes and capital owners in Turkey. On the one hand, the absence of consumer goods and high inflation affected urban working classes. In spite of purchases in agricultural goods by the state, farmers and peasants also faced with direct consequences of the crisis. On the other hand, for capital owners, the main point was still the rise in capital accumulation. Conflict in collective contracts and rise in strikes signaled the new phase for labor-capital conflict in a new social formation (Ozan, 2015, p. 665). Firstly, during the 1970's incentives and lending opportunities transformed commercial activities into industrial production. Bourgeoisie strengthened its power and started to consolidate class consciousness. The establishment of TÜSİAD (The Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association) and the rise of conglomerate represented both bourgeoisie's class consciousness and attractiveness in political sphere (Ozan, 2015, pp. 667-668). Secondly, this period also witnessed the rise of politicized and militant working class, conversely. Especially after 1974, number of workers and trade unions increased. DİSK (The Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions) expanded its organization and impacts on political sphere with "class and mass unionism" (Ozan, 2015, p. 669). Workers had been organized in sectors which were dominated

by domestic and foreign industrial capital like durable consumer goods, automobile industry and iron-steel. In addition to unionization and collective contract; they also struggled for decrease in working hours, rise in wages. At the end of the decade, the 1977 Great Strike, the strike of MESS (The Metal Goods Employers' Union) in 1978 and 1980 were the most powerful actions of working class (Ozan, 2015, pp. 671-672).

IMF directed policies at the end of the 1970's secured Turkey's further integration into the world capitalist system (Tünay, 1993). In that context, the medium-term design of the external financing was complemented with the Stabilization Program in January 24, 1980 which represented a fundamental realignment of Turkey's economic policy (Wolf, 1987, p. 99). Liberalized trade and payment regime, removal of controls over State Economic Enterprises and restoration of macroeconomic balance were three major components of this program (Krueger & Turan, 1993). That meant emphasis on market mechanisms, competition, private initiative and indirect government incentives schemes; the replacement of inward-oriented development strategy with substantial increase in exports and gradual import liberalization and; lowering of barriers to foreign direct investment (Wolf, 1987, p. 99). That was an ordinary structural adjustment program which was composed of strengthening internal and international capital against labor (Boratav, 2012, p. 148) and; the 12 September 1980 coup d'état was the result of these circumstances. The Stabilization Program responded demands of capital owners but Demirel government did not have enough capacity for the sustainability of that anti-labor program (Boratav, 2012, p. 148). Against contradictions between labor and capital, the 1980 military takeover was an important step to establish a new hegemony in favor of capital owners. That was an attempt to establish a new hegemonic strategy which accompanied the restructuring of the state with putting an end to class based politics. In line with the New Right thinking, strong state was conceived as the political guarantor of economic individualism (Yalman, 2009, p. 308). After 1980, due to the change in production relations and the transformation of the state; national economy and accumulation strategies were opened to impacts of foreign capital and international financial system (Yeldan, 2013, p. 37). The coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> and its impacts during the 1980's can be conceived as the possibility of constructing new

class hegemony under authoritarian form of the state by means of an ideology which extolled the market (Yalman, 2009, p. 312).

### **2.3.2. Social Democracy after the Coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> and Its Crisis**

The coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> conceived the civil politics as the main instability component of politics. Until the general election in November 1983, the radical reconstruction of political and legal system was realized by the National Security Council (NSC) (Ahmad, 1993, s. 181-183) which declared its mission as to restore democracy in a reasonable period (Saraçoğlu, 2015, s. 782). The Council suspended constitution, dissolved the parliament, closed down political parties, detained their leaders and suspended all professional associations and confederations of trade unions (Ahmad, 1993, s. 182). Whole political and ideological activity was seen as threat and; the coup intended to destroy the left and to punish right politics, specifically (Saraçoğlu, 2015, s. 781-782). Two years later after the coup, 80 thousands people were in jails and 30 thousands of them were still waiting for trial. During prosecutions and in jails; torture was prevalent and; the coup turned to an important chance for the suppression of opposition (Zürcher, 2014, pp. 403-404). That was the process in which political parties of the left and the extreme right were excluded from the political process (Ahmad, 1993, s. 183). On the other hand, with the new 1982 constitution, the position of executive power was strengthened. Freedom of press and the right of unionism and strike were banned. Fundamental right and freedoms were restricted (Zürcher, 2014, p. 405). The constitution was the reversal of constitutional acts in 1960 (Ahmad, 1993, s. 187) and; ruled out any legal action against orders and decisions signed by the president (Zürcher, 2014, p. 405). The army represented itself as the agent and guarantor of this process. While reestablishment of the State Security Court controlled any social opposition (Saraçoğlu, 2015, s. 785); the new parties law gave the NSC the power of veto any founding members without giving any explanation (Ahmad, 1993, s. 188). Hence, the army consolidated enough political power by the coup to easily respond needs of capital at the turn of the decade. With the implementation of neoliberal policies, barriers against the integration process of Turkey into the international markets were removed. After the 1983, by the leadership of the MP (The Motherland Party), a low wage economy was revitalized by suppressing the labor movement which covered

whole wage earners and agricultural producers (Öngen, 2004, p. 83). Furthermore, for reproduction of the new class hegemony in social sphere, ideological apparatuses of the state were revitalized in line with anti-communist and conservative ideas. The state remained its hegemony with the Turkish-Islamic Synthesis which was based on the mix of Atatürkism, Turkist nationalism and Islam (Saraçoğlu, 2015, s. 786). Atatürkism was represented for the consolidation of the coup's legitimacy. Turkist nationalism and Islam also aimed expansion of Sunni Islam around the social life (Saraçoğlu, 2015, s. 786-787).

The coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> reshaped whole political life of Turkey. Either democracy or rights of the labor were violated. Political parties were under the full control of the army and; socio-economic life was reconstructed by the governance of the coup. Henceforth, democratization, fundamental rights and freedoms and, socio economic inequalities became crucial issues and; the evaluation of social democracy in Turkey had been reshaped within the scope of reorganization as a political party with or without the RPP tradition (Ergül, 1995, p. 141). Ecevit resigned from the presidency of the RPP in 1980, as a reaction against decisions of the NSC (Yıldız, 1996, s. 1268). He offered alternative organization models and dissociated himself from the RPP tradition in the process (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 224). Yet, meanwhile there were many attempts to establish new social democratic organizations by Necdet Uğur, İsmail Hakkı Birler, Çağlar Kırçak, İsmail Cem and 9's movement (Ergül, 1995, pp. 160-164). For the reconstruction of a new social democratic tradition of Turkey, ideological orientation of social democracy had been argued as an issue which was whether the emphasis on labor and strong relations with trade unions or, insisting on the mission of the RPP as the founder of the state (Bora, 2007). In addition to the controversies about of the heritage of the RPP tradition, political rivalries between factions mostly determined the agenda of Turkey's social democracy.

### **2.3.2.1. The Social Democracy Party and The Social Democratic Populist Party: Reconstruction of Turkey's Social Democracy?**

At the beginning of 1983, establishment of political parties was allowed for general elections in November. Yet, just three political parties were allowed to participate in the 1983 general election. These were the NDP (The Nationalist Democracy Party),

the MP (The Motherland Party) and the PP (The Populist Party) (Zürcher, 2014, pp. 406-407). In that context, the PP was established for the representation of social democrats of Turkey under the control of the NSC. Politicians, who stood on the center and center-right wings of the RPP, participated in the PP. Although the party reached 30.46 percent vote shares in the 1983 general election, the success in vote share of the PP was directly related with the heritage of the RPP and; the party was also criticized because of its soft opposition (Yıldız, 1996, s. 1268). On the other hand, Erdal İnönü and his friends attempted to establish “a real social democratic party”: the SDP (The Social Democracy Party). Though the NSC did not allow the SDP to enter 1983 general election; in the 1984 local elections, the SDP was the second party with 23.4 percent of vote shares (Yıldız, 1996, s. 1268-1269). The party succeeded to compensate the weakness of the PP. Henceforth, the main opposition against the power was organized around the SDP, rather than the PP. Yet, the SDP was not represented in the parliament. Among both party members and public opinion, unionization of Turkey’s social democrats had been discussed according to their strong ties in the RPP (İnönü, 1998, pp. 292-293). Due to subsequent negotiations between two parties, the PP and the SDP signed merger protocol in 1985. After structural changes in its statute, program and emblem, the PP changed its name as the Social Democratic Populist Party (SDPP) and then; the SDP participated in the SDPP (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 248).

Social democratic reorganization of the SDP was restricted by the law of political parties. Its relations with trade unions, trade associations, cooperative societies and other organizations were also banned by the constitution (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 233). Yet, meantime, the SDP identified itself significantly as the party of labor. In its program, economic and social development had been prioritized. The party aimed to accelerate the democratization process after the coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> and, to change economic, social and cultural conditions behind social and economic inequalities (Kömürcü, 2010, pp. 238-240). In its statute, it was explicitly declared that the SDP aimed to reach contemporary civilization level within libertarian, pluralistic and the vision of social law state. Besides principles of Atatürk, human rights and rule of law were emphasized (SODEP, 1983, p. 1). The SDP was the legal way to organize against the coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> and provided relatively attractive discussions platform about historical and social structure of Turkey (Bora, 2007).

The party, therefore, responded demands of people who were suppressed by both authoritarian form of the state and its neoliberal policies.

After the merger protocol in 1985, principles and ideological stances of the SDP were directly transitioned to the program of the SDPP. It is possible to mention about an ideological and practical continuity between these two parties of Turkey's social democracy. First of all, in the SDPP'S program, it was declared that individuals should be kept from every economic, social and cultural pressure. There should be no any difference among people for the use of fundamental rights and freedoms (SHP, 1985, p. 9) and; labor was idealized as the most important element for solidarity and equity in the society (SHP, 1985, p. 10). Furthermore, democratization was interpreted as one of the main objectives of the program. It was perceived as the management of the people by the people and for the people (SHP, 1985, p. 10). Accordingly, mechanisms of the state should be rearranged from this point of view. Rather than centralist approaches; local governances, trade unions and associations were emphasized within the SDPP's democratic governance (SHP, 1985, p. 11). Secondly, independence of Turkey was associated with economic autonomy. Improvements in productive forces of the country were interpreted as a necessity for both improvement in labor and international competition (SHP, 1985, p. 29). In that context, the party acknowledged the free market and its beneficiaries. It was believed that free market has many functions to direct factors of production and consumption practices (SHP, 1985, p. 17). Against repercussions of it, institutional arrangements which are directed by the state and, a participatory and democratic national planning were conceived as a solution. For the productivity of Turkey's economy, the SDPP defined different tasks and functions for the state, private sector and cooperatives (SHP, 1985, p. 18). According to its planned social market economy, market mechanism can be restricted for equal distribution of wealth and protecting producers from unfair competition (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 294). Thirdly, the six arrows of the RPP were conceived as primary guide of the party to reach individual and social improvements (SHP, 1985, p. 13). These six principles were reinterpreted according to democratization of society and equal distribution of wealth. For example, apart from its implication in the early Republican period, statism offered democratic and participatory planning within mixed economy. Populism implied political participation of economically weakness parts of the society. The SDPP's

revolutionary side referred anti-imperialist feature and remained constantly renewing attitude of the War of Independence (SHP, 1985, pp. 14-15). Therefore, the party consolidated strong relations with social organization and; its program and policies were reshaped according to consequences of neoliberal policies and violation of democracy during the 1980's. While the Turkish state and production relations in Turkey were being transformed; the SDPP considered the interest of wage-earners in both public and private sectors and, the progressives of the enlightened and free-thinkers of the Turkish intelligentsia (Mango, 1991). As a result of its strong clientele networks, the party represented ethnic and religious groups that feel threatened by the policies of conservative right, at local level (Ayata, 1993).

In 1987, political bans were removed. Ecevit, Demirel, Türkeş and Baykal returned the active politics. That was a new period for the SDPP (Yıldız, 1996, s. 1269). By the leadership of Ecevit, the DLP (The Democratic Left Party) was also an important opponent for the SDPP. Democratization, supporting fundamental rights and freedoms, rule of law and, mixed economy without the weight of centralist approaches were in the DLP's program (Hanoğlu, 1996, s. 1275). It is possible to express that there is no significant differences between programs of the DLP and the SDPP. Nevertheless, the SDPP, which had 24.75 percent vote shares in 1987 early elections, became the leading party with 28.7 percent vote shares in 1989 local elections (Yıldız, 1996, s. 1269). Meanwhile, the DLP, which had 8.5 percent votes share in 1987 early elections, gained 9 percent vote shares in 1989 local elections (Hanoğlu, 1996, s. 1273-1274). Against populist policies of the MP and consequences of neoliberal policies, the SDPP was the strongest alternative within Turkey's social democracy. The SDPP can be interpreted as the umbrella organization of whole people who struggled for democracy (Kömürcü, 2010, pp. 259-260). As a result of its dynamic relations with social organizations, the party responded needs of disadvantaged groups of the society. People met with social democracy and it had been discussed as an important chance for the democratization of Turkey, until the end of the decade.

### **2.3.2.2. Factionalism and Ideological Disputes in Turkey's Social Democracy**

#### **During the 1990's**

As it was stated by Ergül (2000, p. 183), there were three factions within the SDPP. The first faction acted accordingly with Erdal İnönü. In spite of the lack of a strong base; Fikri Sağlar, Turan Beyazıt, Onur Kumbaracıbaşı, Ekrem Kangal, Erol Ağagil were in that group. By the leadership of Deniz Baykal, the second faction, which was the strongest one, represented the tradition came from the RPP. The third faction was called as “the left wing”. In addition to the leadership of Fehmi Işıklar and Abdullah Baştürk; deputies from the southeastern part of Turkey and politicians like Seyfettin Gürsel, Asaf Savaş Akat, Ercan Karakaş, Aydın Güven Gürkan and Ertuğrul Günay were also close that group. First of all, the main struggle between factions was between the left-wing and the group of Deniz Baykal. Turning to the RPP tradition or not was the main contradiction between them (Ergül, 2000, p. 183). From the perspective of Baykal and his friend the priority was on coming to the power by support of whole society, beyond ideological principles and supporting distinct social groups (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 332). On the contrary, the left wing emphasized fundamental right and freedoms, social justice and supporting disadvantaged groups (Kömürcü, 2010, p. 334). Indeed each faction did not deny heritage and achievements of the RPP. Yet issues like bureaucratic state tradition, laicism and nationalism had been identified as main problems between them. Secondly, relating with the struggle between the left-wing and the group of Baykal, the Kurdish question deepened the clash within the party. The discussion was about considering the Kurdish issue whether as a socio-economic or an ethnic problem. Though social democrats of Turkey had been generally conceived it as a social and economic problem; that difference turned to a process in which the left-wing was eliminated. After the 1987 general election, due to their statements about Kurdish free speech and minority statue of Kurds Turgut Atalay, member of Central Decision Board and; Mehmet Eren, deputy of the SDPP had been highly criticized. Atalay was suspended from the party for two years and Eren was referred to the group disciplinary board (Ergül, 2000, pp. 192-194). Afterwards, due to their participation to the Kurdish Conference in Paris, seven deputies were again suspended from the party in 1989 (Ergül, 2000, p. 255). That decision also resulted with resigns of thirteen members of

the SDPP. They stated that the SDPP cannot truly support democracy against the coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> (Ergül, 2000, p. 256).

Especially after the 1991 general elections, throughout its coalition government with the TPP (The True Path Party); criticisms on the SDPP increased due to factionalism within the party. It was believed that due to political failures such as struggle within factions, unsuccessful policies, weakening relations with trade unions, failures in governance of municipalities and unsuccessful policies during its power; the SDPP lost its power over the society and, its strong relations with social organizations were eroded. From the resign of Baykal and his followers to reestablish the RPP in 1991 to the merge of the SDPP into the RPP in 1995; it was explicitly acknowledged that SDPP turned to the RPP tradition and, the emphasis on social democratic principles had been weakened. Henceforth, social democracy in Turkey has been evaluated again under the hegemony of the RPP. Hence, social democrats of Turkey could not remain election victories and this situation represented as the crisis of Turkey's social democracy.

However, circumstances of the 1980's were related with Turkey's integration into the world system through structural adjustment programs. Especially, after the coup of the September 12<sup>th</sup>, implementation of a new hegemonic strategy which was based on strengthening the market by authorization of the state reshaped whole political aspects of Turkey. As a result of anti-labor economic program of the coup, the conflict between labor and capital escalated more and people from large segments of the society reacted against undemocratic implementations of the NSC. During that process, while civil politics were perceived as the main threat, social democrats of Turkey succeeded to construct strong ties with different social groups, throughout the strong emphasis on democracy and socio-economic inequalities within its discourse. On the other hand, social democrats acknowledged beneficiaries of the free market and defined different functions to improve production and consumption practices. The thing that guaranteed the equal and just society was realized with the coordination between the state, private sector and cooperatives. Social democrats perceived democracy as an essential notion for both problems in fundamental rights and freedoms after the coup and controlling the market to compensate its consequences. The planned social market economy of the SDPP aimed to protect

both consumers and producers. However, the 1990's was the period in which impacts of foreign capital and international financial system became fiercer. While the role of the state was minimized and was authorized for expanding the market which increased its hegemonic power over households, Turkey's social democracy realized a just and equal society throughout market mechanism and the control of the state. Hence, like its European counterparts, as long as they intended to transform the society through expanding its social democratic community, they acknowledged the hegemony of neoliberal policies. To provide efficiency of the market with just and equal competition became the aim of Turkey's social democracy (SHP, 1991). While the party guaranteed an economic environment for capital owners by promising new industrialization and investment schemes before the 1991 general election, it also suggested remedying problems in income distribution in favor of workers, civil servants, peasants and artisans (SHP, 1991). Incentives of government were directed to support new industrial initiatives. Throughout its coalition governments, primary motivation of Turkey's social democrats was constitutional amendments. The SDPP significantly struggled for to widen political participation (Kömürçü, 2010, p. 406). Yet, meantime they could not create alternative policies against neoliberal hegemony and started to converge with center-Right parties (Kömürçü, 2010, p. 417). Even, they accepted privatization within programs during its coalition and; therefore, the party lost its strong ties with wage earners.

## **2.4 Conclusion**

Specific historical conditions of Turkey - late industrialization, the lack of an organized labor movement and a democratic tradition – and emergence of social democracy within the party, which was founder of the Republic, have been represented as main obstacles for the evaluation of social democracy in Turkey. However, as it was stated by Bora (2001), “left of center”, “democratic left” movements and; its successor, social democratic tradition in the SDP and the SDPP cannot be conceived as distinct examples according to historical function of social democracy. During the 1960's and 1970's, they represented alternative political movements against radical left and socialist movement with their socio-politic measures. In addition to the dependence on the strong state tradition; they also tried to implement the left with welfare state policies, under the influence of the cold-war

era, (Bora, 2001). Economic and social policies of Turkey's social democratic tradition took measures for reproduction of economic, social and cultural aspects of capitalism to expand and rationalize it. Political participation, expansion of rights and democratization within Turkey's social democracy had been evaluated from that perspective (Bora, 2001). After the coup of September 12<sup>th</sup>, social democrats of Turkey desired to undertake transition to democracy after authoritarian regime (Bora, 2001). People who were suppressed under undemocratic circumstances of the coup supported the SDPP. However, after the coalition government with the TPP, they served for the normalization of another form of authoritarian governance (Bora, 2001).

For each particular examples of Turkey's social democracy, under the influence of change in production relations and its class character, reconciliation of capital and labor had directed political and ideological choices of Turkey's social democracy. Social democratic organization of Turkey conceived capitalist production relations as the source of wealth and prosperity. Democracy was considered as a notion that compensates social and economic consequences of capitalism. During the 1960's and 1970's in which interests of sovereign block masses were reconciled, Turkey's social democrats could respond demands of working population. Throughout populist and expansionary policies, it was possible to realize just and equal society with market mechanism and the control of the state. However, after the coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> new class hegemony had been constructed under authoritarian form of the state within social and economic circumstances of neoliberal era. New structural programs strengthened capital against labor and, international financial system increased its impact on accumulation strategies of Turkey. At that point, Turkey's social democrats still tried to expand social democratic community with market mechanism. As long as it tried to reconcile labor and capital, against social and economic consequences of neoliberalism; they acknowledged and implemented neoliberal policies during the 1990's. Therefore, its strong ties with working population had been eroded and lost its political power throughout the decade. Apart from factionalism and fails in elections result, the crisis of the Turkey's social democracy can also be considered from that perspective.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE CRISIS OF TURKEY'S SOCIAL DEMOCRACY: THE STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY RELATIONS

While the state had been transformed to encourage capital owners to invest by implementing supply-side policies and, civil society was also defined as a space between the state and market; social democrats still aimed to reach socialist society through the expansion of social democratic community by controlling the state. Consequently, after the collapse of Keynesian policies, social democracy started to define its role as remedial of market-friendly policies and; its strong ties with working masses were eroded. At that point, in addition to the reconciliation of capital and labor as the main determinant for the progress of social democracy, examination of how social democracy conceived relations between the state, market and society is also required. It can be argued that social democracy has conceived social relations separately from the state formation and; social democratic policies have been constructed on the state-society dichotomy. The crisis of social democracy both in Europe and Turkey can also be reinterpreted from that perspective.

In that context; during the 1990's, social democrats of Turkey identified their ideological and political position by giving references to dichotomies like modernization-tradition, pluralism-elitism and militarism-democracy in Turkish political history. Intellectuals of Turkey denied the ideological power of class and social struggle and; defined boundaries of Turkish social democracy around the nation-state, the quality of democracy and the relation between civil society and identity (Kahraman, 2002; Laçiner, 2000). Meantime, figures of social democratic politics debated about the topics like social reforms, strong organization, intervention of the military, industrialization and decentralization (Özdalga, 2015; Cem, 2000; Akat, 2004; Çıngı, 2009). Hence due to the analysis of the state-society relations by social democrats of Turkey that was based on dichotomies like modernization-tradition and militarism-democracy, the history of Turkey is just conceived as the

struggle between bureaucratic elites and the society. As long as evaluation of rentier state, the rise of bourgeoisie and the rise in civil society were interpreted out of international reconstruction of market and transformation of the Turkish state during the neoliberal era; relations between the state and society were conceived as external relations. Transformation of the authoritarian state was considered apart from change in capitalist production; therefore, they also became more market-friendly and lost its significant support from wide range of society, during the 1990's.

During that chapter, firstly, I will discuss arguments about the conceptualization of the state and state-civil society relations in Turkey briefly. Then I will focus on references to Turkish state formation and state-civil society relations in Turkey throughout both writings of active political figures of the SDPP and party publications. Lastly, I will conclude remarks.

### **3.2. The Turkish State and Civil Society**

There have been many arguments about the state formation in Turkey. As the source and distributor of rents, the Turkish state is conceived as a place that can be dominated and controlled as a result of the struggle between military-administrative apparatus and communitarian networks (Adaman, 2014) and; public domain is seen as an instrumental arena to be exploited for private, selfish gains (Sunar, 1996). At the same time, as continuity from the Empire to the Republic, state institutions and bureaucracy were highly dependent to the ruling elite (Acemoğlu & Robinson, 2013). Except for ethnic and national identity, there was no change either in the internal class structure or in the form of integration into the capitalist world economy. After the victory of independence, the capitalist state that was already formed under colonial rule, transformed just into a nation-state (Gülalp, 1994). On the other hand, under the lack of dominant classes in the Ottoman history, connections between the state and social space are totally different from the modern European state-society relations (Arıcanlı & Thomas, 1994). As a result of the lack of intermediate structures (Mardin, 1969), the main confrontation in state-society relations was one dimensional and it has been considered from center-periphery analysis (Mardin, 1973). The state was extremely autonomous from the social base and could not correlate positively with the emergence of civil society (Kazancıgil, 1994).

Throughout these state-centered approaches, the state is identified as the system of institutions (Yalman, 2015, p. 76). It has been represented as both an observable object and an autonomous subject. While the state is conceived as an independent variable, it is also defined as a subject who can identify its goals and decide on their own interests (Yalman, 2015, p. 77). Therefore relations between the state and society or the state and economy are considered as external relations. Due to the fact that autonomy is associated directly with decision-making power of the state; new forms of the state is interpreted as different use of the state power (Yalman, 2015, p. 78). As a result, during the neoliberal era, dissociation between the state and economy is not related with specific to capitalism and, the state is not conceived as a form of capitalist social production relations (Yalman, 2015, p. 79). On the other hand, the center-periphery analysis ignored class relations to explain political projects (Dinler, 2009, p. 40). As long as the dichotomy between the state and society was accepted as the main dynamics; the history of Turkey is just conceived as the struggle between bureaucratic elites and the society. Despite the acknowledgement of institutional changes during transition from import-substitution industrialization to export-led growth model, the dominance of the state over the society was still emphasized. Hence to conceive dynamics behind observable institutional changes became problematical (Dinler, 2009, pp. 45-46). Because of the conceptualization of the state as an independent subject; evolution of rentier state, the rise of bourgeoisie and the rise in civil society were explained without the consideration of social relations. Whereas, while the society is the space of power relations that contain class conflicts and political oppression; the state is the sphere of social struggle (Dinler, 2009, p. 49).

In that context, I would like to argue that during the 1990's; both contestations and arguments of active political figures of Turkey's social democracy and, party documents of the SDPP represented that social democrats of Turkey evaluated social and economic circumstances of their times within the scope of state-centered explanations. Within social democracy in Turkey, there are no significant state theory discussions. Thus, due to the lack of particular references, when I try to analyze conceptualization of the state and civil society by social democrats of Turkey; throughout books of social democrats who engaged in state social democratic movement in Turkey and, publications of the SDPP, it can be observed

that references for the state-society relations are gathered on just two topics: the early republican period and democratization of Turkey.

### **3.3. Conceptualization of the Turkish State by Turkey's Social Democrats**

#### **3.3.1. The Early Republican Period as the Historical Background for Turkey's Social Democracy**

Against late industrialization, the lack of an organized labor movement and a democratic tradition which have been represented as main obstacles against the progress of Turkey's social democracy; there have been many attempts to create a strong background for the development of social democracy in Turkey. For the establishment of a long-lasting institutionalized social democratic tradition, roots of social democracy in Turkey have tried to be investigated in the establishment of the Republic, revolutions of the early republican period and Kemalist tradition. Apart from socio-economic heritage of the Ottoman Empire; the new republic and its principles are perceived as crucial developments for the establishment of a modern society. Abolishment of feudal relations by the domination of capitalist production relations and an industrialized society are interpreted as the guarantor of the modernization. Hence, Turkey's social democrats refer to early Republican period for the establishment of a long-lasting institutionalized social democratic tradition. Yet, beyond institutionalization of the coalition between commercial bourgeoisies, big land owners and new enlightened bureaucracy, the creation of capitalist nation state which was based on Muslim/Turkish identity and the position of Turkey in the integration of world capitalist market (Şener, 2015:197); the will of the Republic was idealized directly in figures and institutions of the early republican period. While democratization in the early Republican period and six arrows of the RPP had been idealized, the state and society were separated and conceived as external relations.

First of all, evaluation of the establishment of new republic was centered on the continuity-rupture discussion from the Ottoman tradition. On the one hand, it was asserted that there was continuity between the Empire and the Republic due to the bureaucratic tradition. On the other hand, because of the completing bourgeoisie revolution and implementation for the development of capitalism, a complete rupture from the Empire tradition was propounded (Savran, 2004, p. 20). Meantime, by

social democrats of Turkey, the establishment of republic was just clarified around the charismatic leadership of Atatürk and the National Independence War. Their analysis for the transition from the Empire to the Republic was based on an enlightenment issue; rather than evaluation of production and dependency relations within capitalist transformation. Social democrats of Turkey had evaluated the early Republican period as an era in which the six arrows of the RPP is idealized as the main principles of the social democracy. The state is conceived as the national unity.

Turkish Republic is a “nation state” which is one of the modern state forms. What is the meaning of nation state? Nation state means the state which is based on the “nation” unity. Nation is also a modern concept. So, rather than a concept in which emotional and historical aspects outweigh as it was accepted by majority, it was completely judicial concept. According to constitutional law, nation is a unity that is constituted by citizens. Without the discrimination between race, language, religion, social origin; a unity consisting of everyone who is dependent on the state is the citizenship. State is the case of that unity (Soysal, 1992, p. 26).

Soysal (1992, p. 26) perceived the nation state within the scope of unity. Yet, as a modern concept, nation was not idealized from a historical perspective. In other words, while the republic means the construction of a nation state rather than the multiethnic character of the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish state was defined as constitutive subject of the social formation. It is conceived as a structure which has its own logic and interests. In addition to that ideological formation of it was idealized as an ideological base for social democracy.

Our social democracy started with the National Liberation movement and establishment of the Republic. Although policies through democracy and equality were not implemented because of environment and serious economic situations after the revolution, the aim of establishment of the Turkish Republic was the creation of an environment in which sovereignty of nation will was recognized and, without any discrimination among citizens, to find solutions for the happiness of them (SHP Merkez Yürütme Kurulu, 1992).

Moreover,

By the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, while founders of the Republic of Turkey revealed aim of reaching the level of modern countries, we can say that their ideological framework that was adopted, is a distinctive form of social democracy. Neither capitalism and market economy nor the Marxist-communist lines were adopted with whole principles and institutions. The

thing that they tried to materialize is carrying out the Turkey with its people and institutions, into a modern level. Throughout that aim, they were finding different solutions up-to-date and implemented them (SHP Merkez Yürütme Kurulu, 1992).

Therefore, constituent power of the republic was tried to be characterized with social democratic features. The Republic was differentiated from other social democratic movements with whole achievements of its revolutions.

In Turkey, political line of social democracy or its political party had to take responsible for burden and assignment that have never been taken by other social democratic parties in the world. In front of the whole attempts for national independence, national sovereignty and national unity, destruction of feudal social order, in addition to land feudalism abolishment of belief feudalism, national industry, laicism, human rights and democracy, free person, organized society; there were social democrats and also today they are. In other countries around the world, although supporters of principles like free person, organized society, human rights and democracy, national independence and national sovereignty were at the liberal political line or bourgeoisie; in Turkey, all of them had to be implemented by the cadre who defined themselves as social democrat or democratic left (Altıntaş, 1994, pp. 93-94).

Secondly, under the light of these arguments, while establishment of the republic and its revolutions had been represented as initial stages of Turkish social democratic movement; the six arrows of the RPP, which entered the party program in the 1931 and was included into the constitution in the 1937, were also idealized as main principles that guide Turkey's social democracy. At that point, despite the attempt to construct a historical background for Turkish social democracy, historical analysis for the evaluation of the six arrows was not regarded. Further, although the six arrows which define ideological features of the new republic had been perceived as a guideline for the Turkish social democracy, from the 1930's onwards and; the SDPP was accused of not being the follower of them. It was one of the crucial topics which discussions for turning to the RPP tradition had been considered.

It was alleged that the six arrows in party program of the SDPP, which has taken 27 years republic ideology and, heritage of the RPP, cannot comply with social democratic principles which was aimed by the party and that opinion has not been answered within the SDPP. These principles that consist of the republic ideology, as far as its content in the past, throughout their today's interpretation can compensate Turkey's contemporary needs rather than to be incongruous (Sencer, 1992, p. 5).

As it was expressed by Talas (1994, p. 2), the 1931 party program of the RPP, which is the precursor of the social democratic programs in Turkey, was so crucial for the implementation of statism and populism in both economic and social field. At that point, statism refers supremacy of the state over the economy and, populism implies the priority of the national solidarity and interests over class interests. Therefore, apart from social struggle, the state was conceived as an institutional system. With institutional mechanisms of the state, social and economic field had been tried to reshape. As long as modern and industrialized societies had been considered as prerequisites of social democracy; social democrats of Turkey referred to statism and populism which aimed to the rationalization of economic and social life.

Populism is preparing conditions for freedom of religion and conscience by purifying the society from traditional and religious ideologies. Statism is the regulatory role of the state on economic and social sphere to overcome obstacles during the developing process and to make social rights more utilizable (Sencer, 1992, p. 5).

Furthermore, it was believed that from a dynamic perspective, the six arrows that is the objective for youth of Turkish Republic, should be evaluated according to current conditions. Again, it was highlighted that in Turkey, “nation-state” characterizes the nationalism in which people who is depended on the Turkish Republic as a citizen and share ideals of the republic, are regarded as Turk. Within that perspective, populism describes the certain and absolute sovereignty of people rather than a world in which sovereignty belongs to the God or people who act with the name of God (Ateş, 1992, p. 1). Statism is a necessity for both preventing from the consequences of market economy and to provide capital accumulation that is one of the crucial problems in the early Republican period (Ateş, 1992, p. 2).

Lastly, within a party document which explained historical background, platform, program, by laws and list of executive members of the SDPP, there organization of the state was defined.

The Social Democratic Populist Party believes in the need for the realization of a state based on the rule of law in its all dimensions which preserves democratic, social, and secular qualifications for the purpose of safeguarding the integrity and security of the country and of the nation, achieving the development of the society and achieving the welfare of the people (The Social Democratic Populist Party, 1986).

In that sense, the importance of public administration, which achieve consensus between citizens and the state, was indicated (The Social Democratic Populist Party, 1986). By the realization of rule of law; secularism and, especially, welfare state in which the state is the main responsible for social security services, were highly emphasized. By referring to Keynesian model and developments in social policies of European welfare states; in Turkey, social democracy was evaluated as the implementation of welfare state policies. Meantime, democratization of the state was emphasized and welfare state policies were identified by needs of Turkey. Therefore, Turkey's social democrats still tried to reconcile capital and labor. In spite of the dissociation between the state and economy during the neoliberal era, the state was idealized as a subject who has direct control over socio-economic measures. "Social" was conceptualized as a constitutional notion.

Social state is firstly responsible to take precautions for necessities of wide range of the society which are economically weaker. In decision making procedure of these precautions, that wide range of economically weaker part of the society should be participated and by the help of their governments, they will be the dynamics of these decisions and implications. Political regime of that formation is democracy. We say that the main way to put needs of the society forward is being social. So then, social state, if it is considered among these meanings, is so close to democratic state. When, both of them, social and democracy are gathered, "social state" arises (Talas, 1992, p. 2).

Moreover,

In Turkey, the entrance of the state into the constitution as "social" was materialized with the 1961 constitution. Yet, with changes on the constitution in the 1937, it is possible to assert that intention of the state with the addition of "populism", "statism" and "revolutionism" principles into the principles of the Turkish State, coincided with the definition of social state. When we look at definition of these three principles in both programs of today's the SDPP and the RPP, we conclude that our judgement does not contain any wrong meaning (Altıntaş, 1994, p. 93).

### **3.3.2. Democratization Issue within the State - Civil Society Dichotomy**

One of the controversial aspects for the evaluation of democracy in Turkey has been one dimensional relationship between social structures and the state (Arıcanlı & Thomas, 1994; Mardin, 1969). In that context, by direct references on transition period from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic, a continuity on

bureaucratic tradition has been underlined and; position of the person between tradition and modernity have been problematized (Keyder, 2013). Under the domination of center-periphery analysis, relations between the center which was comprised of complicated and sophisticated institutional orientation and, periphery which symbolized an opposition to urban life, the culture of palace and the ruling class have been considered. It was argued that secularizing policies of the modernization attempts by the center, the periphery is organized in and positioned itself around religious institutions (Mardin, 1973, p. 172). Hence, the democratization of Turkey has been discussed with the dichotomy between the extremely autonomous character of the state and the lack of civil society (Kazancıgil, 1994).

In that context, although social democrats of Turkey had been accused of having a symbiotic relationship with nation-state notion of the RPP, ignoring the transformation of globalization and therefore, conceptualizing the democracy within narrow sense (Kahraman, 2002, p. 187); especially after the coup of September 12<sup>th</sup>, they had undertaken the task of democratization. For main issues of Turkey during the 1990's such as the Kurdish issue and discussions about human rights, they remained the discourse which promised for the democratization of society. However, it can be argued that within claims of Turkey' social democrats for democratization; civil society was idealized as pure representation of democracy and; democratization was conceptualized according to the separation between the state and society. Their arguments for state-civil society and criticisms on nationalist-populist approaches of Turkey provide meaningful evaluations to examine the perception of Turkey's social democrats for the state and civil society relations.

During neoliberal era rather than ethnic and populist policies, civil citizenship and political liberalism were represented as the new perspective with globalism (Keyder, 2005, p. 35). Meantime, in Turkey, cultural policies of the Republic had been criticized within the scope of the lack of individualization of the citizenship and; social movements in neo-liberal era such as political Islam were tried to be materialized (Kahraman, 2002). Particularly, religion was represented as the discourse between ordinary people and the state (Mardin, 2005, p. 63). At that point, it can be argued that conceptualization of relations between civil society and the state

by social democrats of Turkey was not independent from that perspective. For example, Haluk Özdalga stated that (2015, p. 60) according to Platon and Hegel, the reason for the existence of the state, which considers its interests, is out of the society. In Hegel's argumentations, the state is embodiment of freedom; however, that is directly the totalitarian state ideology.

...But social democracy has exact opposite understanding from the state and statism conceptualization what was represented by Platon and Hegel. We want a state that is under the control of society, not a society that is under the control of the state. We want to free and strong society, not a society which is oppressed by the state. We want a society to be strong (Özdalga H. , 2015, p. 60).

Also, according to him, civil society is a popular notion for the Turkish left. It should be referred even in complicated philosophical analysis carefully; in colloquial speeches, it is materialized and used in operational meaning (Özdalga H. , 2015, pp. 61-62).

At that point, it should be indicated to a strange situation we have faced from time to time. If a person says that "I support civil society" and at the same time wants to the domination of the state in art and culture life, it is a contradictory attitude and is not so easy understandable (Özdalga H. , 2015, p. 62).

In his arguments, for the development of democracy, as the guarantee of political consensus, cultural consensus is considered as a necessity and; there should be certain attitude for freedom, quality, democracy and pluralism for the establishment of successful social democratic movement (Özdalga H. , 2015, p. 42). Despite totalitarian state ideology, free environment for cultural life should be provided for democracy and pluralism (Özdalga H. , 2015, p. 62). The same perception can also be pursued in arguments of Asaf Savaş Akat (2004). According to him, for the regeneration of social democracy in Turkey, relations between individuals and the state should be reorganized. New solutions should be found for development-welfare dichotomy (Akat, 2004, pp. 12-13). Philosophy of establishment and existence of Turkish state should be revolutionized; relations between individuals and the state should be redefined according to universal principles of social democracy (Akat, 2004, p. 29).

Demilitarization of the constitution is so important symbol. It signs the reverse of statist law and administration philosophy of the Turkish Republic which is based on the Ottoman Empire. To lead that transformation implies the most important turning point for the SDPP, in its history. Decisions that has made at that point specify other political choices and show the SDPP will be the party that supports principles of universal social democracy or not (Akat, 2004, pp. 29-30).

Throughout these arguments of Özdalga and Akat, the emphasis on civil society was reorganization of relations between individuals and the state according to the cultural consensus. Yet, at that point, as long as relations between the state and society had been externalized, both of them were considered apart from social struggle. The state is conceived apart from a historical concept which is determined by production relations. Therefore, circumstances of the social sphere were examined through dichotomies like modernization-tradition, pluralism-elitism and militarism-democracy. Against important issues of the 1990's such as the rise of Islamic movements, social democratic movement of Turkey had been tried to reinterpret as an issue within Turkish culture and tradition, beyond the scope of international reconstruction of market and its class character of it. For example, it was suggested that religion should be analyzed in detail and there should be an effective dialogue with it, except followers of Sharia (Özdalga H. , 2015, p. 65). According to laicism principle of the universal social democracy, it was underlined that restrictions on fundamental rights and freedoms, freedom of thought, expression and press should be materialized within the constitution and; therefore, the intervention of the state should be moved out of the religious sphere (Akat, 2004). As a result, for one of the obstacle to the development of social democracy, it was expressed that

We remind that the right of conscience requires the freedom of whole religious sects' activities, for Muslims or other religions. Religious sect is an institution of civil society like an association, club or political party. Prohibition on membership contradicts fundamental human rights (Akat, 2004, p. 23).

Relating to democratization discussions in addition to criticisms on intensive and absolute power of the central state, its establishment around the axis of militarist-bureaucratic tradition had also been evaluated as a contradiction of Turkey's social democracy (Kahraman, 2002, pp. 227-231). By social democrats of Turkey, the bureaucratic tradition and nationalist- populist approaches were also problematized.

Depending upon the center-periphery analysis, continuity of bureaucratic tradition from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic was alleged; therefore, anti-democratic character of the Turkish state formation was questioned. As long as Turkish social democracy had been associated with state leftism, elitism and bureaucratic leftism; it was believed that it will resemble contradictory and disunited political parties on the right (Cem, 2000, p. 19).

Above understandings and structures of the past, future of the Turkish social democracy cannot be established. Social democracy cannot be restricted among radical thesis -more leftist, more or less democrat- like extensions of centralist-bureaucratic understanding. Social democracy is, above all, to believe and rely on the people; an ideology of civil society against centralist-statist understanding, inclusion of people and institutions on decision in whole and possible fields (Cem, 2000, p. 20).

Populist approaches were also criticized.

Priority on industrialization and development resulted in the reflection of bureaucratic elitism of progressive cadres within party program, thesis and suggested policies. That program which is defined by developmentalist economic opinions ruptures from problems in daily life which are faced by masses... The biggest threat of abstract frame that was created by the convergence of developmentalism and bureaucratic elitism is getting closer to populism of a party that asserts itself as social democrat (Akat, 2004, p. 53).

During the 1990's, while international capital increased its impacts on national economy and contradiction between labor and capital were strengthened; social democrats of Turkey did not conceptualize the state-society relations according to capitalist social production relations. By just consideration of institutional changes, social democratic principles of Turkey were being seeking throughout whole Turkish history. While universality of Turkey's social democracy had been problematized; The RPP which was the follower of universal principles of social democracy, was considered as synthesis of the revolutionist past of the RPP and social democratic future of Turkey (Cem, 2000, p. 209).

Sources on history and ideology of tradition and culture that Social democratic movement in Turkey has benefited is at justice and equality principles of Islam, Mehmet II's tolerance and respect for science, inventiveness of Osman II and Mahmut II. It is at patriotism and courage of Nationalist Forces. It is at nationalism and independence of Atatürk. It is at

rationalism and passion for constructing democracy of İsmet İnönü. It at accumulation of universal and national values that had been provided by people who added their efforts and thoughts into the social democratic understands (Cem, 2011, p. 15).

Alternatively,

... Briefly, parties that were called “social democrat” could not shoulder universal norms of relevant ideology within Turkey. At that time; rising terror and problems that are faced with the European Union triggered a nationalist movement. That fact especially led to deviation of main opposition party from leftist principles (Çingı, 2009, p. 38).

According to these arguments, social democracy of Turkey is at the extension of modern, pro-Western and republican tradition since Tanzimat era (Çingı, 2009, p. 13). The problem of Turkey’s social democracy is the adaptation of universal principles of social democracy in the context of Turkey (Çingı, 2009, p. 38).

### **3.4. Conclusion**

In addition to the evaluation of Turkey’s social democracy with regard to the acknowledgement of neoliberal order and adaptation of more market-friendly; examination of the conceptualization of relations between the state and society can also provide significant insight for the crisis of Turkey’s social democracy during the 1990’s. In that context, under the influence of state-centered approaches, social democrats of Turkey conceived the state as a separate institutional organization from the society. While under the influence of neoliberal hegemony, the role of the state was minimized and social relations were reorganized in favor of capital owners; the state-society relations were reinterpreted with dichotomies like modernization-tradition and militarism-democracy. Turkey’s social democracy did not evaluate the state as a space of social struggles and different aspects of the state during the neoliberal era was not conceived according to change in production relations and its class character.

First of all, early Republican period can be perceived as the main reference point for the examination of the state-society conceptualization by Turkey’s social democrats. During the 1990’s, the leadership of Atatürk, National Independence War, revolutions and the six arrows of the new Republic were idealized main sources of Turkey’s social democracy. Revolutions of the Republic, abolishment of feudal

relations and establishment of industrialized society were perceived as preconditions of Turkey's social democracy. Throughout their arguments about republican period and their attempts to seek roots of Turkey's social democracy; the Turkish state had examined as a structure which has its own logic and can conceive its own interest and; was defined as constitutive subject of the social formation. In addition to reconciliation of capital and labor, during the 1990's; the state was idealized as a subject who has direct control over socio-economic circumstances. Secondly, in the axis of the state-society dichotomy, the dominance of the state over the society was acknowledged; therefore, the state-society relations had been externalized. As long as the society had been separated from power struggles; class contradiction which was strengthened with neoliberalism was undermined. Particular problems of Turkey during the 1990's were evaluated reinterpret as an issue within Turkish culture and tradition, rather than a result of capitalist production relations.

Therefore, the structure of Turkish state was conceived with on liberal individualistic state and state-centric approaches. Power and exploitation relations which are determined by conflict and struggle in the society have been overlooked; and, beyond how the state works, what kind of social relation is represented by the state cannot be answered (Hirsch, 2011, p. 20). The state was also fictionalized as an artificial formation or legal/corporate subject; therefore, whole conceptual frameworks in which social production relations are accepted as the main determinant, are ignored (Yalman, 2015, p. 79). Therefore, as long as social relations had been examined with dichotomies which was based on the struggle between bureaucratic elites and the society and, transformation of the state during the neoliberal era had been evaluated out of change in production and class relations; social democrats of Turkey still aimed to expand its social democratic community by controlling the state and therefore acknowledged neoliberal order and adopted more market friendly policies.

Whereas, "the (capitalist) state should not be regarded as an intrinsic entity: like 'capital', it is rather a relationship of forces, or more precisely the material condensation of such relationship among classes and class fractions, such as expressed within the State in a necessarily specific form" (Poulantzas, 2000, pp. 128-129). Especially within social democratic movements, while the state and dominant classes were considered as intrinsic entities; the state was idealized as an arbitrating

subject among social classes (Poulantzas, 2000, p. 131). On the other hand, it is not easy to define civil society simply as a distinct entity against the dominance of the state. In accordance with physical production relations, the thing that defines the state and, constitutes its organization and missions at the specific stage of the capitalist development is civil society (Carnoy, 2001, pp. 254-255). It was criticized that beyond the state-civil society dichotomy, the state which surrounds the civil society, contains both political and civil society (Carnoy, 2001, p. 260). In line with Gramsci's theories, in addition to the effects of political society on the state and society, civil society is also surrounded by economic and power relations and; that contradictory and unitary relation between them was explained as "integral state" (Hirsch, 2011, p. 41).

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

In Turkey, as long as social democratic movement has been considered within the RPP tradition and its relations with the state have been problematized; boundaries for the examination of Turkey's social democracy and its crisis during the 1990's have been restricted with issues such as political struggles within factions, unionization of social democratic parties and failures in elections. Due to specific historical conditions of Turkey such as late industrialization, the lack of an organized labor movement and a democratic tradition, the existence and progress of social democracy in Turkey has been questioned. However, throughout the thesis, it has been represented that it is also possible to reinterpret social democracy of Turkey from the perspective of politic economy. In addition to the criticism of social democracy after the collapse of welfare state system, two particular periods of Turkey's social democracy – left of center movement during the 1960's and democratization struggle of the SDP and the SDPP after the coup of September 12<sup>th</sup>- have been examined according transformation of relations between the state, market and society in Turkey. The crisis of Turkey's social democracy during the 1990's has been reevaluated according to responses of social democratic parties of Turkey against the rise of neoliberalism and, conceptualization of relations between the state and civil society by Turkey's social democrats.

First of all, although social democracy is the movement of labor against consequences of capitalist production relations; after particular discussions about how to reach a socialist society at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, social democracy separated itself from revolutionary ideas and reconciliation of capital and labor became main objective throughout the Keynesian and neoliberal era. Henceforth, social democracy had been conceptualized capitalist production relations as the source of wealth and prosperity and, democracy was conceived as the notion which compensated socio-economic consequences of it. Beyond revolutionary objectives,

by controlling the state, social democrats started to prefer to administer the system with the introduction of some reforms to obtain majority. Especially during the post-war period, throughout Keynesian demand-side management, social democrats succeeded to improve social conditions of masses. Under the stable monetary order and consolidation between labor and capital, they could pursue equity and justice for working classes. However, when the role of the state was minimized and the power of capital was strengthened over the labor during the neoliberal era; social democrats still intended to capture the power of the state and to control capitalism with reforms. Therefore, as long as social democracy had defined its role as the reconciliation of capital and labor, they acknowledged neoliberal order and adopted more market-friendly policies. Their strong relations with working masses were eroded and social democracy lost its widened political support during the neoliberal era.

Secondly, in Turkey, it is possible to assert that social democracy emerged and gained strong support during the 1960's as a reaction against socio-economic consequences of industrialization during the import-substitution development strategy. It was idealized as a shield against rise of the Left and reactionary movements; notions such as development, freedom, social justice and equality were added to social democratic movement of Turkey and it acknowledged the superiority of labor during the 1970's. While expansionary policies led to consolidation between labor and capital, Turkey's social democracy gained strong support, by the leadership of Ecevit. However, the coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> in the 1980 reconstructed whole political and social life of Turkey. Under the construction of neoliberal hegemony with authoritarian form of the state, Turkey's social democracy reorganized itself during the 1980's, within the scope of democratization and socio-economic inequalities. However, at that point, it should be express that the response of Turkey's social democracy neoliberal policies was not different from its European counterparts. As long as capitalist production relations and democracy had been conceptualized according to reconciliation of capital and labor and, to increase social democratic community had been idealized throughout just controlling the state; even Turkey's social democracy acknowledged neoliberal order and implemented more market-friendly policies. Therefore, Turkey's social democracy lost its support working masses during the 1990's. Apart from specific historical conditions of Turkey, factionalism and discussion about turning to the RPP tradition; from the

perspective of political economy, it is also possible to reinterpret the crisis of Turkey's social democracy according to changes in production and class relations.

Thirdly, in addition to arguments which have criticized social democratic tradition in Turkey during the 1990's due to the acknowledgement of neoliberal order; it is also possible to evaluate the crisis of Turkey's social democracy through its conceptualization of the state-society relations. If Turkey's social democracy lost its wide-range support among working masses, it can also be examined throughout their consideration about relations between the state and civil society. It can be argued that while civil society had been represented as an area which is a necessity for the rise of free market and against the totalitarian aspects of the Left during the neoliberal era, social democrats of Turkey adopted state-centric approaches and externalized relations between the state and civil society. Rather than explanations which consider the society according to power relations and understand the state as the sphere of social struggle; Turkey's social democracy interpreted neoliberal transformation of the state-society relations with dichotomies such as modernization-tradition and militarism-democracy. Therefore, as long as capitalist production relations and its class character had been undermined, particular variables which defined institutional changes in economic and social area were overlooked. Turkey's social democracy idealized just and equal society by acknowledged mechanisms which was transformed by neoliberalism. While social democrats of Turkey could not create alternative policies against neoliberal state and its economic and social transformation during the 1990's, its strong relations with different social groups were eroded and they faced with a political crisis.

## REFERENCES

- Acemođlu, D., & Robinson, J. (2013, February 14). *Institutional Continuities*. Retrieved from The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty, Why Nations Fail: <http://whynationfail.com/blog/2013/2/14/institutional-continuities.html>
- Adelman, P. (1996). *The Rise of the Labour Party 1880-1945*. New York: Routledge.
- Ahmad, F. (1977). *The Turkish Experiment in Democracy 1950-1975*. London: C.Hurst & Company.
- Ahmad, F. (1993). *The Making of Modern Turkey*. New York: Routledge.
- Akat, A. S. (2004). *Sosyal Demokrasi Gündemi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Akşin, S. (1994). Atatürk Döneminde Demokrasi. In S. M. Kurulu, *Sosyal Demokrasi Parti İçi Eğitim Projesi* (pp. 167-179).
- Altıntaş, M. (1994). Sosyal Devlet ve Sosyal Demokrasi. In S. M. Kurulu, *Sosyal Demokrasi Parti İçi Eğitim Projesi (PIEP)* (pp. 77-99).
- Arıcanlı, T., & Thomas, M. (1994, March). Sidestepping Capitalism: On the Ottoman Road to. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, pp. 25-48.
- Ateş, T. (1992, September 30). Altı Ok'un Düşündürdükleri. *Sosyal Demokrasi*, pp. 1-2.
- Atılğan, G. (2015). Sanayi Kapitalizminin Şafağında. In G. Atılğan, A. E. Aytekin, E. D. Ozan, C. Saraçođlu, M. Şener, A. Uslu, & M. Yeşilbağ, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Siyasal Hayat* (pp. 501-567). İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

- Ayata, A. (1993). Ideology, Social Bases, and Organizational Structure of the Post-1980. In A. Eralp, M. Tünay, & B. Yeşilada, *The Political and Socioeconomic Transformation of Turkey* (pp. 31-49). Westport: CT:Praeger.
- Bailey, D. (2009). *The political economy of European social democracy: a critical realist approach*. London: Routledge.
- Beaud, M. (2001). *A History of Capitalism: 1500-2000 new edition*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Berman, S. (1998). *The social democratic moment: ideas and politics in the making of*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Berman, S. (2006). *The Primacy of Politics Social Democracy and the Making of Europe's Twentieth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernstein, E. (1993). *The preconditions of socialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Bernstein, E. (1996). Revisionism in Social Democracy. In M. Steger (Ed.), *Selected Writings of Eduard Bernstein, 1900-1921* (pp. 66-81). New Jersey: Humanities Press.
- Bernstein, E. (1996). What is socialism? M. Steger içinde, *Selected Writings of Eduard Bernstein, 1900-1921* (s. 149-159). New Jersey: Humanities Press.
- Bobbio, N. (1979). Gramsci and the Conception of Civil Society. In C. Mouffe, *Gramsci* (pp. 21-48). London: Routledge & Keagan Paul.
- Bonefeld, W. (1995). Monetarism and Crisis. In W. Bonefeld, & J. Holloway, *Global Capital, National State and the Politics of Money* (pp. 35-68). New York: St.Martin's Press.

Bora, T. (2007, May 8). *SODEP'i ve Eski SHP'yi Rahmetle Anarken*. Retrieved from Birikim: [http://www.birikimdergisi.com/guncel-yazilar/159/sodep-i-ve-eski-shp-yi-rahmetle-anarken#.WbA\\_7chJY2w](http://www.birikimdergisi.com/guncel-yazilar/159/sodep-i-ve-eski-shp-yi-rahmetle-anarken#.WbA_7chJY2w)

Boratav, K. (2012). *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-2009*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Carnoy, M. (2001, March 25). Gramsci ve Devlet. *Praksis*, pp. 252-278.

Cem, İ. (2000). *Soldaki Arayış*. İstanbul: Can Yayınları.

Cem, İ. (2010). *Engeller ve Çözümler: Türkiye'de Sosyal Demokrasi*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Cem, İ. (2011). *Türkiye Üzerine (Araştırmalar)*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.

Clarke, S. (2001). Class Struggle and the Global Overaccumulation of Capital. In R. Westra, A. Zuege, R. Albritton, & M. Itoh (Eds.), *Phases of Capitalist Development, Booms, Crises and Globalizations* (pp. 76-92). Palgrave.

Çıngı, A. (2009). *Sora Sora Sosyal Demokrasi*. İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.

Dinler, D. (2009). Türkiye'de Güçlü Devlet Geleneği Tezinin Eleştirisi. *Praksis*, pp. 17-54.

Dowd, D. (2008). *Kapitalizm ve Kapitalizmin İktisadı: Eleştirel Bir Tarih*. (C. Gerçek, Trans.) İstanbul: Yordam Yayıncılık.

Ecevit, B. (2009). *Ortanın Solu*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Ecevit, B. (2015). *Atürük ve Devrimcilik*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

- Emre, Y. (2013). *CHP, Sosyal Demokrasi ve Sol: Türkiye'de Sosyal Demokrasinin Kuruluş Yılları (1960-1966)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Ergül, T. (1995). *Sosyal Demokraside Ayrışma Yılları (Sosyaldemokratların On Yılı)*. Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları.
- Ergül, T. (2000). *Sosyaldemokraside Bölüşme Yılları*. İstanbul: Gündoğan Yayınları.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1985). *Politics Against Markets: The Social Democratic Road to Power*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1989). The Three Political Economies of the Welfare State. *Canadian Review of Sociaology and Anthropology*.
- Fabian Society. (2004). *Fabiansim and the Empire: A Manifesto by the Fabian Society*. Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing, LLC.
- Germain, R. D. (1997). The Power of Cities and Their Limits: Principal Financial Centers and International Monetary Order. In R. D. Germain, *The International Organization of Credit* (pp. 33-74). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giddens, A. (2000). *The Third Way and Its Critics*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Glyn, A. (2001). Aspirations, Constraints, and Outcomes. In A. Glyn, *Social Democracy in Neoliberal Times: The Left and Economic Policy since 1980* (pp. 1-21). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gülalp, H. (1994, June). Capitalism and the Modern Nation-State: Rethinking the Creation of the. *The Journal of Historical Sociology*, pp. 155-176.

Gülalp, H. (2005). Türkiye'de Modernleşme Politikaları ve İslamcı Siyaset. In S. Bozdoğan, & R. Kasaba (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Modernleşme ve Ulusal Kimlik* (pp. 43-54). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Hanoğlu, N. (1996). Demokratik Sol Parti. *Yüzyıl Biterken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (s. 1272-1275). içinde İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Hirsch, J. (2011). *Materyalist Devlet Teorisi: Kapitalist Devletler Sisteminin Dönüşüm*. (L. Bakaç, Trans.) İstanbul: Alan Yayıncılık.

İnönü, E. (1998). *Anılar ve Düşünceler*. İstanbul: Yorum Kitapları.

Jessop, B. (2008). *Devlet teorisi: Kapitalist Devleti Yerine Oturtmak*. (A. Özcan, Trans.) Ankara: Epos Yayınları.

Jones, H. G. (1976). *Planning and productivity in Sweden*. London: Croom Helm.

Kahraman, H. B. (2002). *Sosyal Demokrasi Düşüncesi ve Türkiye Pratiği*. İstanbul: Sosyal Demokrasi Vakfı.

Kautsky, K. (1964). *The dictatorship of the proletariat*. (H. J. Stenning, Trans.) University of Michigan Press.

Kautsky, K. (2007). *The road to power: political reflections on growing into the revolution*. (J. H. Kautsky, Ed., & R. Meyer, Trans.) Alameda: Center for Socialist History.

Kavukçuoğlu, D. (2003). *Sosyal Demokraside Temel Eğilimler*. İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitapları.

Kazancıgil, A. (1994). High Stateness in a Muslim Society: The Case of Turkey. In M. Doğan, & A. Kazancıgil, *Comparing Nations Concepts, Strategies, Substance*. Wiley-Blackwell.

- Keyder, Ç. (2005). 1990'larda Türkiye'de Modernleşmenin Doğrultusu. In S. Bozdoğan, & R. Kasaba, *Türkiye'de Modernleşme ve Ulusal Kimlik* (pp. 29-43). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Keyder, Ç. (2013). *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kömürcü, D. (2010). *Türkiye'de Sosyal Demokrasi Arayışı: SODEP ve SHP Deneyimleri*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı.
- Krueger, A. O., & Turan, İ. (1993). The Politics and Economics of Turkish Policy Reforms in the 1980s. In R. Bates, & A. O. Krueger (Eds.), *Political and Economic Interactions in Economic Policy Reform*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Laçiner, Ö. (2000). Sol-sağ: Ebedi bir arayış dinamiği. In T. Bora (Ed.), *Yeni Bir Sol Tahayyül İçin*. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.
- Langley, P. (2002). From Amsterdam to London: the Dutch and British World Financial Orders. In P. Langley, *World financial Orders, An Historical International Political* (pp. 41-59). New York: Routledge.
- Lapavitsas, C. (2009). Financialised Capitalism: Crisis and Financial Expropriation. *Historical MAterialism*, s. 114-148.
- Mango, A. (1991). The Social Democratic Populist Party: 1983-1989. In M. Heper, & J. M. Landau (Eds.), *Political Parties and Democracy in Turkey* (pp. 170-188). London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.
- Mardin, Ş. (1969, June). Power, Civil Society and Culture in the Ottoman Empire. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, pp. 258-281.
- Mardin, Ş. (1973). Center-Periphery Relations: A Key to Turkish Politics? *Dedalus*, pp. 169-190.

- Mardin, Ş. (2005). *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Marx, K. (2009). *Critique of the Gotha Programme*. Dodo Press.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1988). *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1998). *The German Ideology*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1998). *The German ideology: including Theses on Feuerbach and introduction to The critique of political economy*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2008). *The Communist Manifesto*. London: Pluto Press.
- Munck, R. (2005). Neoliberalism and Politics, and the Politics of Neoliberalism. In A. Saad-Filho, & D. Johnston (Eds.), *Neoliberalism A Critical Reader* (pp. 60-70). London: Pluto Press.
- Ozan, E. D. (2015). İki Darbe Arasında Kriz Sarmalı. In G. Atılgan, A. E. Aytekin, E. D. Ozan, C. Sraçoğlu, M. Şener, A. Uslu, & M. Yeşilbağ, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Siyasal Hayat* (pp. 657-747). İstanbul: Yordam Yayınları.
- Öngen, T. (2004). Türkiye'de Siyasal Kriz ve Krize Müdahale Stratejileri: "Düşük Yoğunluklu Çatışma"dan "Düşük Yoğunluklu Uzlaşma" Rejimine. In N. Balkan, & S. Savran (Eds.), *Sürekli Kriz Politikaları Türkiye'de Sınıf, İdeoloji ve Devlet* (pp. 76-105). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Özbudun, E. (1997). Civil Society and Democratic Consolidation. In E. Özdalga, & S. Persson (Eds.), *Civil Society, Democracy and the Muslim World*. İstanbul: Swedish Research Institute.

Özdalga, E. (1997). *Civil Society and Its Enemies: Reflections on a Debate in the Light of*. E. Özdalga, & S. Persson (Dü) içinde, *Civil Society, Democracy and the Muslim World*. İstanbul: Swedish Research Institute.

Özdalga, H. (2001). *Sosyal demokrasinin kuruluşu*. Ankara: İmge.

Özdalga, H. (2015). *Çoğulcu Toplum ve Demokrasi*. Ankara: Bence Kitap.

Palley, T. I. (2005). From Keynesianism to Neoliberalism: Shifting Paradigms in Economics. In A. Saad-Filho, & D. Johnston (Eds.), *Neoliberalism A Critical Reader* (pp. 20-30). London: Pluto Press.

Pamuk, Ş. (2014). *Türkiye'nin 200 Yıllık İktisadi Tarihi*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Panitch, L., & Gindin, S. (2004). Global Capitalism and American Empire. *Socialist Register*.

Poulantzas, N. (1990). In R. Milliband, N. Poulantzas, & E. Laclau (Eds.), *Kapitalist Devlet Sorunu*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Poulantzas, N. (2000). *State, Power, Socialism*. London: Verso.

Przeworski, A. (1986). *Capitalism and Social Democracy*. Paris: Cambridge University Press.

Sandbrook, R., Edelman, M., Heller, P., & Teichman, J. (2007). *Social Democracy in the Global Periphery Origins, Challenges, Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saraçoğlu, C. (2015). Tank Paletleriyle Neoliberalizm. G. Atılın, A. E. AYTEKİN, E. D. OZAN, C. Saraçoğlu, M. ŞENER, A. USLU, & M. YEŞİLBAĞ içinde,

*Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Siyasal Hayat* (s. 747-871). İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Sassoon, D. (2010). *One Hundred Years of Socialism: The West European Left in the Twentieth Century*. London; New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers.

Savran, S. (2004). 20. Yüzyılın Politik Mirası. In N. Balkan, & S. Savran (Eds.), *Sürekli Kriz Politikaları Türkiye'de Sınıf, İdeoloji ve Devlet* (pp. 13-44). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Schön, L. (2012). *Economic History of Modern Sweden*. New York: Routledge.

Sencer, M. (1992, May 2). Altı Ok ve Sosyal Demokrasi. *Sosyal Demokrasi*, pp. 5-6.

Shaw, B. G. (1909). *Fabian Essays in Socialism*. Boston: The Ball publishing co.

SHP. (1985). Program (2 Kasım 1985 günü yapılan 1. Olağanüstü Kurultay'ca kabul edilmiştir). Ankara: Sosyal Demokrat Halkçı Parti.

SHP. (1991). *Yeni Bir Türkiye İçin İlk Hedefler*. Ankara: SHP.

SHP Merkez Yürütme Kurulu. (1992). Sosyal Demokrasi-Partiçi Eğitim 1. Ankara.

SODEP. (1983). *Tüzük (6. Haziran. 1983 günü Kurucular kurulunca onanmıştır)*. Ankara: Sosyal Demokrasi Partisi.

Soysal, M. (1992, May 2). Teori ve Pratik. *Sosyal Demokrasi*, p. 1.

Sunar, İ. (1996). State, Society and Democracy in Turkey. In V. Mastny, & C. R. Nation (Eds.), *Turkey Between East and West*. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Şener, M. (2015). Burjuva Uygarlığının Peşinde. In G. Atılğan, A. E. Aytekin, M. Şener, A. Uslu, E. D. Ozan, M. Yeşilbağ, & C. Saraçoğlu, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Siyasal Hayat*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.
- Tachau, F. (1991). The Republican People's Party: 1945-1980. In J. M. Landau, & M. Heper (Eds.), *Political Parties and Democracy in Turkey*. London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.
- Talas, C. (1992, June 3). Sosyal Devlet ve Sosyal Devlete Karşı Olmak. *Sosyal Demokrasi*, pp. 1-3.
- Talas, C. (1994). Türkiye'de Liberalcilik, Devletçilik ve Özelleştirme. In S. M. Kurulu, *Sosyal Demokrasi Parti İçi Eğitim Projesi (PIEP)* (pp. 1-15).
- The Social Democratic Populist Party. (1986). *Historical Background, Platform, Program, By Laws, List of Executive Members*. Ankara.
- Tünay, M. (1993). The Turkish New Right's Attempt at Hegemony. In A. Eralp, M. Tünay, & B. Yeşilada (Eds.), *The Political and Socioeconomic Transformation of Turkey* (pp. 11-30). Westport: Praeger.
- Vaizey, J. (1971). *Social democracy*. New York: Praeger.
- Wolf, P. (1987). *Stabilisation Policy and Structural Adjustment in Turkey, 1980-1985*. Berlin: German Development Institute.
- Wood, E. M. (2003). The Detachment of Economic Power. In E. M. Wood, *Empire of aCapital* (pp. 9-25). New York: Verso.
- Yalman, G. (2004). Türkiye'de Devlet ve Burjuvazi: Alternatif Bir Okuma Denemesi. In N. Balkan, & S. Savran (Eds.), *Sürekli Kriz Politikaları Türkiye'de Sınıf, İdeoloji ve Devlet* (pp. 44-76). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Yalman, G. (2009). *Transition to Neoliberalism: The Case of Turkey in the 1980's*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Yalman, G. (2015). Devlet. In G. Atılgan, & A. E. Aytekin (Eds.), *Siyaset Bilimi Kavramlar, İdeolojiler, Disiplinler Arası İlişkiler* (pp. 69-87). İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Yeldan, E. (2013). *Küreselleşme Sürecinde Türkiye Ekonomisi Bölüşüm, Birikim ve Büyüme*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Yıldız, Y. G. (1996). SHP-CHP. M. Belge, S. Gürsel, M. Tunçay, & B. Özükan (Dü) içinde, *Yüzyıl Biterken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (s. 1268-1271). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Zürcher, E. J. (2014). *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

#### 1990'LAR TÜRKİYE'SİNDE SOSYAL DEMOKRASİNİN EKONOMİ POLİTİĞİ

Bu tez, ideolojik referansları ve tarihsel gelişimi CHP (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi) tarihi içerisinde tartışılan Türkiye sosyal demokrasisinin, 1990'larda yaşadığı siyasi krizin politik iktisadını anlamlandırmaya çalışmaktadır. Özellikle 1960'larda ortanın solu hareketi ve 12 Eylül 1980 darbesi sonrasında SODEP (Sosyal Demokrasi Partisi) ve SHP'nin (Sosyaldemokrat Halkçı Parti) demokratikleşme üzerine verdiği mücadele üzerine durulurken; piyasa ilişkilerinin uluslararası düzlemde belirlenişi ve bunun Türkiye'de devlet, piyasa ve toplum arasındaki ilişkiler üzerindeki belirleyiciliği tartışılmaktadır. Öncelikle, farklı ulusal sosyal demokrasi deneyimleri ve sosyal demokrasiye dair geliştirilen argümanlar ışığında sosyal demokrasinin tarihsel dönüşümü üzerinde durulacaktır. Sermaye ilişkilerinin 20. yüzyılda yeniden yapılandırılması ve bunun sınıfsallık üzerindeki etkisini gözeterek savaş sonrası dönemde sosyal demokrasinin politik iktisadı ele alınacaktır. Sermaye ve emek arasında kurmaya çalıştığı uzlaşma üzerinden, sosyal demokrasinin neoliberal uygulamalar ile daha piyasa yanlısı politikalar benimsemesi konu edilecektir. Ardından Türkiye 'de sosyal demokrasinin ortaya çıkışı ve gelişimi, ithal ikameci sanayi sanayileşme politikalarından ihracata dayalı büyüme stratejisine geçerken üretim ilişkileri ve bunun toplumsal ilişkiler üzerindeki dönüştürücü etkisine dair tartışmalarla yeniden yorumlanacaktır. Bu noktada, Avrupa'da sosyal demokrasinin yaşadığı market yanlısı dönüşümde olduğu gibi, Türkiye sosyal demokrasisinin de sermaye emek arasında kurmaya çalıştığı uzlaşma problem edilecektir. Kapitalist üretim ilişkilerinin refah ve zenginliğin kaynağı, demokrasinin de kapitalizmin istenmeyen sonuçlarını telafi eden bir kavram olarak idealize edilmesinin bir sonucu olarak; 1990'lar boyunca, Türkiye sosyal demokrasisinin neoliberalizmin emek

karşıtı politikaları karşısında alternatif politikalar üretmediđi iddia edilecektir. Bu bağlamda, darbe sonrasında demokratikleşme ve eşitsizlikler üzerine kurulu politikaları ile elde ettiđi büyük toplumsal desteđi kaybettiđi ve bahsi geçen siyasi kriz ile karşı karşıya kaldıđı ileri sürülecektir. Bu tartışmaya ek olarak, Türkiye'deki sosyal demokratların yazıları ve sosyal demokrat örgütlerin metinleri incelenecektir. Türkiye sosyal demokrasisinin devlet-toplum ilişkilerini dışsallaştırarak incelemesinin, neoliberal dönemde devletin aldığı yeni biçimleri ve sermayenin emek üzerinde artan tahakkümünü üretim ilişkilerinden ve toplumsal açıklamalarından kopuk bir biçimde değerlendirmesinin de kaybedilen toplumsal desteđin ardında yatan diđer önemli faktörlerden olduđu üzerinde durulacaktır.

Sosyal demokrasi tarihsel olarak demokrasinin ve komüniteryanizmin öncelliđini, demokratik kapitalim dâhilinde işçi sınıfının birliđini ifade eder. Kapitalizmin mülkiyet ilişkilerinin kabulüne karşılık ona reformlarla müdahale ederek ekonomik verimliliđi artırmayı ve eşitsizliklere son vermeyi amaçlar. Böylece, sosyal demokrasi ve sosyal demokrasinin temel değerleri, farklı dönemlerde emek ve sermayenin uzlaşısını hedefleyerek geliştirdiđi söylem-politika ve dönemin ideolog ve politikacılarının fikirleri üzerinden anlamlandırılmıştır. Sosyal demokrasinin tarihsel gelişimine dair referansların Avrupa sosyal demokrasi üzerinde yoğunlaştıđı görülse de, her bir ulusal sosyal demokrasi deneyimi farklı üretim ilişkileri ve sınıfsal ilişkilerin sonucu olarak gerçekleşmiştir. Buna dayanarak özgürlük, eşitlik ve dayanışmanın sosyal demokrasinin evrensel değerleri olarak gösterilmesi problemliliği görülmektedir. Gelişmiş Avrupa ülkelerine atıflar üzerine kurulu evrensellik tartışması, farklı tarihsel dönüşümler geçiren ülkeler üzerinde tartışmalı hale gelmektedir.

Birinci Dünya Savaşı öncesindeki tartışmalara kadar sosyal demokrasi ve sosyalizm aynı anlama gelecek biçimde kullanılmaktadır. 19. yüzyılın ikinci yarısında endüstrideki hızlı dönüşüm ile sermaye birikimi dört büyük ülkede –Birleşik Krallık, Fransa, Almanya ve Amerika Birleşik Devletleri- yoğunlaşmış; ulusal ekonomiler, dünya ekonomisinin ve finansal aktivitelerin kuralları doğrultusunda şekillenmeye başlamıştır. Bu doğrultuda devlet, piyasa ve toplum arasındaki ilişkiler de dönüşüme uğramıştır. Piyasa kurallarının politik alandaki etkisini güçlendirmesine paralel olarak değer teorisi ve marjinalist devrim ile liberalizm gücünü artırmıştır. Ticari

faaliyetlerin yerini imalat alırken, işçi sınıfı zor ve katlanılmaz koşullarda çalışmaya zorlanmaktadır. Burjuvazi ve işçi sınıfı arasındaki çatışma daha belirgin hale gelirken sosyal ilişkiler kapitalist üretim ilişkilerinin kontrolünde şekillenmeye başlamıştır. Sosyal demokrat düşün, bu koşullar altında gelişim gösterirken işçi sınıfı da örgütlenip mücadeleye devam etmektedir. Tarihsel materyalizm ve emek-değer teorisi üzerinden sunduğu katkılar ile Karl Marx bu alandaki ideolojik tartışmaları domine eden isim olmuştur. Fakat bu noktada sosyalist topluma nasıl ulaşılacağı tartışmaları ile Birinci Dünya Savaşı öncesinde sosyal demokrasinin devrimci Marksizm'den tamamen ayrışarak kendine ayrı bir ideolojik alan yaratması önem arz etmektedir. Devrimci yoldan girilen mücadele, proletarya diktatörlüğü, Hegelyan diyalektik, Marksist teori eleştirilirken, Marksizm'in etik ve hümanist değerlerine vurgu yapılmaktadır. Sosyalist topluma işçi sınıfının parlamenter demokrasi üzerinden temsili ve sınıf ittifakları ile ulaşılacağı ifade edilmektedir. Marksizm'in reddi, parlamenter demokrasi ve sınıf ittifaklarına yapılan vurgu ile emek ve sermaye arasında uzlaşma hedefleyen sosyal demokrasi devletin demokratik yollardan kontrolü ile sosyalist topluma ulaşma iddiasındadır.

Bu bağlamda üç ulusal sosyal demokrasi deneyimi - Birleşik Krallık, İsveç ve Almanya – incelenmiştir. Birleşik Krallık 'ta sosyalizm bir orta-sınıf meselesidir. Fabian toplumu sosyal demokratik hareketin merkezi örgütü konumundadır. Sosyalizme geçiş teknik bir mesele olarak ele alınmış; emek ve sermaye arasındaki ilişki toplumsal meselelerin derinlemesine bilimsel araştırılması, bürokratik araçların kontrolü ve etkili kullanımı üzerinden değerlendirilmiştir. İsveç sosyal demokrasisinde işçi örgütlerinin örgütlü mücadelesi başrolde. İsveç'in sosyal demokrasi partisi SAP ve işçi örgütü LO arasındaki sıkı ilişki ile işçi ve işveren örgütleri arasındaki toplu sözleşme gibi meselelerdeki istişare süreçleri İsveç sosyal demokrasisinin istisnai özelliği olarak ön plana çıkmaktadır. Almanya'da ise teori ve pratik özelindeki ikilik ekseninde radikal, revizyonist ve merkezdeki sosyal demokratların tartışmaları, sosyal demokrasinin gelişimi ardındaki belirleyici faktördür. Bu noktada, Almanya'nın sosyal demokrat partisi SPD içerisinde Karl Kautsky ve Eduard Bernstein'in argümanları, hem Almanya sosyal demokrasinin hem de 20. ve 21. yılda sosyal demokrasinin ideolojik formasyonuna ışık tutması nedeniyle önem arz etmektedir. Marksizm'in önemli figürlerinden Karl Kautsky işçi sınıfına atfettiği önem ve demokrasi üzerine yürüttüğü argümanlarla sosyal

demokrasi tarihi içerisinde çok önemli bir yer sahibidir. Ona göre işçi sınıfı sosyalist toplumun inşasında kurucu öge konumundadır. Sanayileşme geliştiği sürece işçi sınıfı en kalabalık sınıf haline gelecektir ve üretimi kendi çıkarları doğrultusunda düzenleyecektir. İşçi sınıfının örgütlü mücadelesinin yanında parlamentoyu kontrol altına almasının da gücünü artıracığına inanmaktadır. İşçi sınıfının özgürlüğü demokratik kurumların idaresi ile ilişkilendirilmektedir. Revizyonizm tartışmalarının en önde gelen ismi olan Eduard Bernstein ise sosyalizmi demokrasinin sistematik olarak hayatın her alanında uygulandığı ve böylece eşitsizliklere son verildiği bir düzen olarak kurgular. Ona göre toplumlar sürekli bir değişim içindedir. Önemli olan bu değişim sürecinde pratik ihtiyaçlara cevap verebilecek kurumsal ve ekonomik değişimlerin takipçisi olmaktır. Sosyalizmin nihai zaferinden öte hareketin her şey olduğuna inanır. Teori ve pratik arasındaki uyuma dikkat çeker. Sınıf farklılıklarını ortadan kaldırılması işçi sınıfının devletin demokratikleştirilmesini talep etmesine bağlıdır. Bernstein, bir diğer taraftan da Marksizm'in çelişkili bir ideoloji olduğunu söyler. Maddi koşulların değişiminin Marksistler tarafından ıskalandığını belirtir. Marksizm'in en problemleri iki yanının Hegelyan diyalektik ve Blankizm olduğunu, böylece sosyalizmin pratikteki ihtiyaçlarını görmezden geldiğini söyler.

Birinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında endüstriyel yoğunlaşma kendini farklı biçimlerde birçok alanda gösterirken, büyük güçler kendi ulusal hedefleri üzerine odaklanmakta; ulus devlet modelinin sağladığı süreklilik ile kapitalist mülkiyet ilişkileri garanti altına alınmaktadır. Piyasa ilişkilerinin uluslararası düzeyde belirlenimi ve bu dönüşümün sınıfsal niteliği sosyal demokrasinin özellikle savaş sonrası dönemdeki tarihsel dönüşümü üzerinde belirleyici olmuştur. Bretton Woods sistemi ile düzenlenmiş, kontrollü bir parasal sistem ile Amerika'nın finansal piyasalar üzerindeki hegemonyası üzerinde yükselen tekelci kapitalist sosyal düzende; devlet ile toplum arasında ticaretin liberalleştirilmesine dayalı bir uzlaşma sağlanmaktadır. Böylece, ulusal ekonomiler daha esnek siyasi ve politik kararlar alabilirken; üretkenlik artmış, emeğin mobilizasyonu genişlemiş ve 19. yüzyılın ortalarından bu yana en yüksek büyüme oranları yakalanmıştır. Devlet kredi genişlemesini desteklerken yaratılan değer sosyalleştirilebilmiştir ve emek ile sermaye arasındaki bütünleşme sürekli kılınmıştır. Bu politik ve iktisadi gelişmeler karşısında özellikle iki savaş arası dönemde yükselen faşizm karşısında Avrupalı sosyal demokrat partiler, demokratikleşmenin, eşitlik ve adaletin temsilcileri olarak görülmüşlerdir.

Sosyal demokrasi, sosyal reformların biricik uygulayıcısı olarak konumlandırılmaktadır. Refah devleti politikaları ile kitlelerin politikaya mobilize edilmesi sosyal demokratların en büyük başarısı olarak görülmektedir. Büyük Buhran'ın ardından ekonomi politikaları sosyal demokrasinin en önemli gündem meselesi haline gelmiştir. Bu bağlamda devlet kapitalizmi kontrol altında tutan bir araç olarak kurgulanırken; sorunsuz çalışan bir kapitalist sistem, demokrasi, sosyal denge ve genel çıkarların bütünleştirilmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Talep yönlü Keynezyen politikalar tam istihdam amaçlanırken bölüştürücü vergi politikaları ile adil ve eşit bir toplum idealize edilmektedir. Böylece sosyal demokratlar ücretli çalışan kesimin sorunlarına getirdikleri somut ve pratik çözüm önerileri ile politik gücünü de artırmayı başarmış, elde ettiği kazanımlar ile Avrupa'da solun en önemli aktörü konumuna erişmiştir.

Fakat savaş sonrası dönemde bir taraftan devletin gücünü kontrol altına alarak kapitalist üretim ilişkileri meşrulaştırılır ve stabilize edilirken bir diğer taraftan da toplumsal şartların iyileştirilmesi çabası problemleri bir hal almaktadır. İlk olarak, sosyal demokratlar Avrupa'da siyasi gücünü artırırken hala sınıf ittifaklarına ihtiyaç duymaktadır. Bu süreçte burjuva ideoloji çerçevesinde işçiler sınıf perspektifinden öte bireysel düzeyde ele alınmakta, komüniteryan dayanışma her ne kadar gözetilse de Batı kapitalizminin büyüme modelleri kabul edilmektedir. Böylece Avrupalı sosyal demokratlar, liberal-demokratik kurumlar üzerinden siyaset geliştirdikleri sürece diğer partilerle benzeşmeye başlamaktadır. İkinci olarak, parlamenter gücün ele geçirilmesi nihai amaç olarak belirlendiği sürece sosyal demokrasinin sınıflar arası eşitliği sağlama çabası sosyal politikalar üretme kapasitesiyle sınırlı kalmaktadır. Sosyalist toplumun inşası, sadece sosyal demokrat topluluğun devletin kontrolü ile genişletilmesi ile eş tutulur hale gelmektedir. Böylece emek ve sermaye arasındaki uzlaşının sonra erdiği, finansal ilişkilerinin üretim ilişkilerini domine ettiği, merkez bankacılığının fiyat istikrarını hedeflediği ve hükümetlerin refah sermaye sahiplerinin mülkiyet ilişkilerinin koruyucusu konumuna geldiği neoliberal dönemde sosyal demokrasi sermaye ve emek arasında kurduğu uzlaşmayı sürdürmesi problemleri bir hal alacaktır. Finansal piyasalar önündeki kontroller kaldırılır, devletin rolü küçültülür ve sosyal demokratların emek adına elde ettiği tüm kazanımlar ortadan kaldırılırken; sosyal demokrasi kapitalist üretim ilişkilerini refah ve zenginliğin kaynağı olarak görmeyi, demokrasi kapitalizmin sosyal ve ekonomik

problemlerini telafi eden bir kavram olarak ele almayı sürdürmektedir. Böylece 1970'lerde yüksek enflasyon ve işsizlik karşısında Keynezyen ekonomi politikaları çözüm üretmedikçe, refah devletinin sürdürülebilirliği problem haline gelmekte; sosyal demokrat topluluğu devletin kontrolü ile genişletip, parlamenter demokrasinin araçlarıyla sosyal reformları hayata geçirmeyi hedefleyen sosyal demokratlar, neoliberal politikaları kabul etmek ve market yanlısı politikaları benimsemek zorunda kalmaktadır. Bundan sonra sosyal demokratlar kendi rollerini “dönüştürücü” olmak yerine “iyileştirici” olarak tanımlarken, örgütlü işçi gruplarıyla olan ilişkileri de kopmaya başlamıştır. Üçüncü yol politikaları ile emek ve sermaye arasındaki çelişki tamamen reddedilirken, sosyal demokrasi neoliberalizmin istenmeyen sonuçlarına karşı alternatif politikalar üretmekle görevlendirilmektedir.

Görüldüğü üzere sosyal demokrasinin tarihsel gelişimine dair anlatı Avrupa'nın tarihsel formasyonuna, Avrupa'daki üretim ilişkileri ve bunun sınıfsal karakterine dayanmaktadır. Oysaki yakın zamanda literatürdeki tartışmalarda da konu edildiği üzere, sosyal demokrasinin gelişmekte olan ülkelerdeki özellikleri ortaya çıkış ve gelişim koşulları farklı bir değerlendirme gerektirmektedir. Bu bağlamda gelişmekte olan ülkelerde heterojen sınıf yapısı ve sanayileşme-demokratikleşme-sosyal vatandaşlığın birbirini izleyen süreçler olarak gelişmemesi tartışmaya açılmaktadır. Bu bağlamda Türkiye'de de geç sanayileşme, örgütlü bir işçi sınıfının ve köklü bir demokrasi geçmişinin yokluğu sosyal demokrasi tartışmalarının ana gündem maddesi olmuştur. Türkiye'de CHP geleneği içerisinde ortaya çıkan ve gelişen sosyal demokrat hareket, partinin devlet ile arasındaki ilişki ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'ndeki sosyal ve ekonomi politikaları üzerinden konu edinilmiştir. 1960'lardaki ortanın solu hareketi ile 12 Eylül 1980 askeri darbesinin ardından SODEP ve ardından SHP'de örgütlenen sosyal demokrat hareket, Türkiye sosyal demokrasinin iki özel dönemini oluşturmaktadır. Tez boyunca Türkiye'nin bu belirli tarihsel koşullarına değinilse de; Türkiye'deki sosyal demokrasinin bu iki dönemi, değişen üretim ilişkileri ve sınıfsal dönüşüm üzerinden yeniden anlamlandırılmaya çalışılmaktadır. Özellikle 1990'larda Türkiye sosyal demokrasisinin yaşadığı siyasi kriz ve krizin politik iktisadi değerlendirmesi odak noktasında bulunacaktır.

1960'lar Türkiye'sini ticaret burjuvazisinin gücünü kaybettiği, planlama ve korumacılık ile birlikte iç pazara dönük sanayileşmenin ön plana çıktığı birikim

modeli ve beraberindeki sınıfsal ilişkiler çevresinde yorumlamak mümkündür. İthal ikameci sanayileşme modeli çerçevesinde Türkiye’de kaynakların dağıtımını şehirli sanayi burjuvazisinin tercihleri doğrultusunda şekillenmiştir. Devlet demir-çelik, petrokimya gibi ağır sanayi sektörlerinde yatırım yaparken, özel sektör devlet güvencesinde dayanıklı tüketim malları imal etmektedir. 1970’lere kadar yüksek büyüme oranları yakalanırken; ticaret açıkları, uzun ve kısa dönemli krediler, dış yardımlar ve işçi dövizleri ile sürdürülebilmştir. Genişlemeci politikaların devamlılığı sağlandıkça, egemen bloğun uzun dönemli çıkarları ile kitlelerin kısa dönemli talepleri uyumlaştırılabilmiş, işçi ücretleri bir maliyet unsuru olmaktansa talebi artıran bir faktör olarak görülmüştür. Ayrıca yabancı sermayeye açık ve artık tüketim malları yerine sanayi malları ithal eder konumda bulunan gelişmekte olan ülkelerin varlığı, uluslararası sermayenin işleyişine de uyum göstermektedir. Böylece Türkiye’deki sanayi burjuvazisi altın çağını yaşarken, sermaye ile emek arasındaki çelişkilerin ve şehirleşmenin ardından sosyal-ekonomik problemlerin daha da belirginleşmesi ile işçi sınıfı güçlü biçimde örgütlenmekte, mevcut durumların yanında sistem eleştirisi de getiren büyük toplantılar ve grevlerle sosyal alanda etkisini daha da artırmaktadır.

1960’ların siyasi gelişmeleri yaşanan bu dönüşüm üzerinden şekillenmiştir. Yeni sanayi sınıfı ile yükselen işçi sınıfı arasındaki gerilim artarken sol, Türkiye İşçi Partisi etrafında örgütlenmektedir. Yön-Devrim ve Milli Demokratik Devrim hareketleri ile Kemalist entelijansiya sosyalist kalkınma modelleri üzerine tartışırken Türkiye’nin sınıf yapısı tartışmaya açılmaktadır. Bir diğer taraftan da sanayi burjuvazisi, liberal, muhafazakâr, milliyetçi ve seküler kesimler egemen bloğun yeni siyasi temsili olan AP (Adalet Partisi) etrafında toplanmaktadır. Türkiye’de sosyal demokrasinin bir siyasi program olarak gündeme gelişi 1965 seçimlerine giderken yükselen sol ve sanayi burjuvazisi arasında CHP’nin seçim çalışmaları ve stratejileri doğrultusunda şekillenmiştir. CHP ithal ikameci sanayi stratejisi ile 1950’lerin sonundan itibaren planlı kalkınmaya, sendikalaşmaya, sosyal haklara dikkat çekmeye başlamıştır. DP’nin (Demokrat Parti) anti demokratik politikalarına tepki göstermiş ve koalisyon hükümetleri boyunca emek piyasasında işçi sınıfı lehine düzenlemeler yapmıştır. CHP içerisinde; partinin ideolojik konumun ortanın solunda olarak tanımlanmasının ardından partinin geleneksel ve reformist kanadı arasında gerçekleştirilen tartışmalarla Türkiye’de sosyal demokrasi üzerine yapılan tartışmalar

gelişim göstermeye başlamıştır. Ecevit liderliğindeki reformist grubun parti içerisindeki gücünü artırmasının ardından CHP, bağımsız ve demokratik sosyal örgütlenmeleri ekonomik kalkınmanın gerçekleştirilmesi ve sosyal adaletin sağlanması için idealize eden bir parti haline gelmektedir. 1972’de İsmet İnönü’ye karşı genel başkanlığa seçilmesiyle birlikte CHP’nin söylemi radikalleşmekte; emeğin üstünlüğü, sosyal adalet, ulusal bağımsızlık, dayanışma gibi idealler dile getirilmeye başlanmıştır. Böylece parti toplumsal desteğini genişletebilmiş, 1977 Genel Seçimlerinde oy oranını yüzde 41,4’e kadar yükseltebilmiştir. Türkiye’de sosyal demokrasinin ilk adımları olarak nitelenebilecek ortanın solu hareketi daha yakından incelendiğinde üç noktanın ön plana çıktığı görülecektir. Öncelikle, ortanın solu hareketi yükselen sol ve sağ karşısında geliştirilen popülist bir politika olarak kendini var etmiştir. Özellikle toplumun refahını ertelemek ile suçladığı radikal sola dair geliştirdiği eleştiriler üzerinden ideolojik konumu belirginleştirmiştir. İkinci olarak, demokrasi ortanın solu hareketinin altını çizdiği en önemli kavram olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Kamu yararının güvencesi olarak görülen demokrasi, devletin baskıcı uygulamaları ve azınlığın refahı karşısındaki en temel değer olarak idealize edilmektedir. Üçüncü olarak ortanın solu, Türkiye’nin tarihsel gelişimini gözetten bir siyasi hareket olarak kurgulanmaktadır. Demokratikleşme sürecinde Atatürk devrimlerine yapılan vurgu önemli bir yer tutmaktadır. Reformlar aracılığı ile Türkiye’nin sosyal, ekonomik ve kültürel dönüşümü, toplumun demokratik gelişimi, eşit ve adil gelir dağılımı ile sosyal adalet hedeflenmektedir. Sosyal demokrasi bu süreçte kendi meşruiyetini, Avrupalı benzerleri gibi emek ve sermaye arasında kurulmaya çalışılan uzlaşa üzerine kurmaktadır.

Kronik dış ticaret açıklarına dayalı ithal ikameci sanayileşme stratejisi 1970’lerde ihracatta durgunluk yaşamakta, ödemeler dengesinde problemler ile karşılaşmaktadır. Dış kaynaklara dayandırılarak sürdürülen büyüme oranları sınırlarına ulaşırken; IMF gibi kuruluşların dış ticaret rejiminde deregülasyon ve devalüasyon baskıları karşısında Türkiye, ekonomik ve sosyal problemleri erteleme yolunu tercih etmiştir. Genişlemeci politikalar cari açığa neden olurken, artan işsizlik, kamu maliyesindeki problemler ile birlikte 1970’lerin sonunda kriz kaçınılmaz hale gelmiştir. Emek sermaye arasındaki çelişki, yaşanan ekonomik sıkıntılar ile birlikte toplumsal hayatta etkisini artarak göstermektedir. Bu esnada, sanayi burjuvazisi örgütlenerek politik alanda da gücünü artırmayı sürdürmüştür. İşçi örgütleri ve sendikaların sayısı

artarken toplum içerisindeki nüfuzlarını da artırmışlardır. İşçi sınıfı özellikle yerli ve yabancı sermayenin gücünün yüksek olduğu otomobil, demir-çelik gibi sektörlerde örgütlenerek gücünü artırmıştır. Bir taraftan da ticaret ve ödemeler rejiminin liberalizasyonunu, Kamu İktisadi Teşekkülleri üzerindeki kontrollerin kaldırılmasını ve makroekonomik dengenin sağlanmasını öngören İstikrar Programı maddelerini 24 Ocak 1980’de hayata geçirilmiştir. Yerli ve yabancı sermayenin emek karşısındaki konumunu güçlendirmesiyle sıradan bir yapısal uyum programına benzeyen 24 Ocak kararlarını, otoriter bir devlet formasyonu ile sermaye sahiplerinin hegemonyasını tahsis eden ve sınıf temelli politikanın sonunu getiren 12 Eylül 1980 askeri darbesi izlemiştir. 12 Eylül, sivil siyaseti Türkiye’deki ekonomik ve politik istikrarsızlığın en büyük kaynağı olarak görmektedir. Anayasayı, parlamentoyu, siyasi partileri, sendikaları askıya alan darbe yönetimi Türkiye’deki aşırı sol ve sağ grupları hedef alırken; yürütmenin gücünü artırmaktadır. Temel hak ve özgürlükler sınırlandırılırken ordu sermayenin taleplerini karşılayacak siyasi gücü elinde toplayabilmiş, neoliberal politikaların uygulanmasıyla Türkiye’nin uluslararası piyasa koşullarına adapte olmasının önünü açmış ve Türk-İslam Sentezi üzerinden sosyal hayattaki tahakkümünü de artırabilmiştir.

Bu süreçte, sivil siyaset baştan aşağı yeniden inşa edilirken Türkiye’de sosyal demokrasi, demokratikleşme, temel hak ve özgürlüklerin yeniden tesisi ve sosyal-ekonomik eşitsizliklerin sona erdirilmesi üzerinde dursa da; yeni bir siyasi parti etrafında örgütlenme ve CHP geleneğinin sürdürülüp sürdürülmeyeceği Türkiye’deki sosyal demokratların ana gündem maddesini oluşturmaktadır. Emeğe ve emek örgütleri ile kurulacak güçlü ilişkiler ya da CHP’nin devlet kuran parti misyonuna bağlılık 1980 sonrasında Türkiye’de sosyal demokrasinin karşısındaki yol ayrımını oluşturmaktadır. 1983 Genel Seçimlerinde Milli Güvenlik Kurulu’nun denetiminde Türkiye’de sosyal demokrat oyları bir araya toplamak için kurulan HP (Halkçı Parti) kazandığı yüzde 30,5 oy ile büyük bir başarı elde etmiş gözükmektedir. Oysa Erdal İnönü ve arkadaşlarının kurduğu SODEP, kurduğu demokratik söylem ve yapıcı siyaset ile Türkiye sosyal demokrasisinin 1980’lerdeki gerçek temsilcisi olabilmeyi başarmıştır. Kendisini emeğin partisi olarak tanımlayan SODEP 12 Eylül sonrasında demokratikleşme sürecini hızlandırmayı, sosyal-ekonomik eşitsizliklerin ardındaki sosyal ve kültürel durumları dönüştürmeyi ve böylece de liberal, çoğulcu bir sosyal hukuk devletine ulaşmayı amaçlamaktadır. Böylece parti, otoriter devlet ve

neoliberal politikalar karşısındaki kesimlerin taleplerine karşılık verebilmiş, kısa sürede ciddi bir toplumsal destek edinebilmiştir. 1985'te SODEP ile HP arasında imzalanan birleşme protokolünün ardından Türkiye'de sosyal demokrat hareket, SHP (Sosyal Demokrat Halkçı Parti) ile yoluna devam etmiştir. Temel ilkeler ve ideoloji bakımından SODEP ve SHP arasında bir süreklilik olduğundan bahsetmek mümkündür. Demokratikleşme parti programının en önemli maddesidir. Halkın, halk ile halk için yönetimi esas alınmaktadır. Üretici güçlerin gelişiminin emek ve uluslararası rekabet için önemli kazanımları olacağına inanılmaktadır. Serbest piyasa ekonomisi, getireceği kazanımlar doğrultusunda kabul görürken, devlet kontrollündeki kurumsal düzenlemeler ile istenmeyen sonuçlarının önüne geçileceği öngörülmektedir. CHP'nin altı oku demokratikleşme ve zenginliğin eşit bölüşümü üzerinden yeniden yorumlanmaktadır. SHP farklı toplumsal kesimlerle güçlü bağlar kurmayı başaramış; özellikle ücretli çalışanların büyük desteğini kazanmayı sürdürebilmiştir.

Fakat bir diğer taraftan da 1980 sonrası Türkiye sosyal demokrasisi, parti içindeki hiziplerin mücadelesi ve ideolojik tartışmalar ile konu edinilmektedir. Parti içerisinde üç grup arasında mücadele sürmektedir. Bunlardan ilkini Erdal İnönü, Fikri Sağlar, Turan Beyazıt, Onur Kumbaracıbaşı, Ekrem Kangal, Erol Ağagil isimlerin başı çektiği grup oluşturmaktadır. İkinci olarak Deniz Baykal ve takipçileri, bu hizipleşme içerisinde en güçlü grubu meydana getirirken; Fehmi Işıklar, Abdullah Baştürk liderliğinde Güneydoğu Anadolu milletvekillerinin de desteklediği sol kanat üçüncü grubu oluşturmaktadır. Temel gerilim Baykal ve takipçileri ile ikinci grup arasında yaşanmaktadır. İdeolojik tartışmalardan ve belirli sosyal gruplara yönelik politikalar geliştirmekten öte geniş kitle desteği ile iktidara gelmeyi hedefleyen Baykal ve takipçilerine karşılık sol kanat temel hak ve özgürlükler, sosyal adalet ve ezilen gruplar üzerine kurulu bir siyaseti tercih etmektedir. Kürt meselesi, bu gerilimi daha da yükseltmektedir. 1987 Genel Seçimlerinin ardından Kürtçenin serbest konuşulması ve azınlık sorununa dair yaptıkları konuşmalar sonrasında Turgut Atalay partiden iki yıl uzaklaştırılırken ve Mehmet Eren Grup Disiplin Kurulu'na sevk edilmiştir. Bunu 1989'da Paris'te yapılan Kürt Konferansı'na katılan yedi milletvekilinin ihracı ve bunu takiben 13 parti üyesinin istifası izlemiştir. SHP 12 Eylül sonrası demokratikleşme mücadelesine tam anlamıyla destek vermemekle eleştirilmektedir. Bunun yanında, 1991 Genel Seçimleri sonrası DYP (Doğru Yol

Partisi) ile kurduđu koalisyon hřkřmetinden 1995'te CHP ile birleřmesine kadar; SHP, CHP geleneđine yakınsaması ve sosyal demokrasinin evrensel deđerlerinden taviz vermesi Ĺzerinden tartıřılmaktadır. Břylece geniř toplumsal kesimlerden aldıđı desteđi kaybederek seřimlerdeki bařarılı performanslarını sřrdřrememesi sonucunda siyasi bir krizle karřı karřıya olduđu ileri sřrřlmektedir.

Třrkiye'de sosyal demokrasinin 1980 sonrasında demokratikleřme ve eřitsizlikler ekseninde geliřtirdiđi siyaset, kazandıđı geniř toplumsal desteđin ardından hizipleřmeler ile CHP geleneđi tartıřmalarına dayanan parti ięerisindeki mřcadeleler ile yařadıđı gřę kaybı Třrkiye sosyal demokrasisinin 1990'larda yařadıđı kriz olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Fakat bu tezin iddiasını parti ięi siyasi eękiřmeler ile getirilen aęıklamalardan ziyade, yařanan bu krizi Třrkiye sosyal demokrasisinin politik iktisadi deđerlendirmesi Ĺzerinden yeniden anlamlandırmak oluřturmaktadır. Öncelikle özel tarihsel kořullarını gřzetmenin yanında, Třrkiye'de sosyal demokrasinin tartıřılmaya bařlanması, bir parti politikası olarak gřndeme getirilmesi; emek ile sermaye arasında uzlařma yakalama eębasına dayanmaktadır. Ortanın solu hareketinde emek, dayanıřma, sosyal adalet gibi deđerler vurgulansa da Třrkiye sosyal demokrasini daha ilk adımlarında yřkselen sol karřısında popřlist bir siyaset olarak kurgulanarak tartıřılmaya bařlanmıřtır. Emeđin ũstřnlřđü prensibinin altı eęizilse ve ealıřan kesimleri hedef alan politikalar ũretilse de sınıfsallık gřzetilmemekte, geniř kitlelerin desteđi ile iktidarın ele geęirilmesi ve reformlar ile třm toplum kesimlerinin refahının artırılması amaeplanmaktadır. Avrupa'daki emsallerinde olduđu gibi kapitalist ũretim iliřkileri refah ve zenginliđin kaynađı olarak gřrřlřrken, demokrasi kapitalizmin beklenmeyen sonuęlarını tedavi eden bir kavram olarak idealize edilmektedir. Třrkiye'deki sosyal demokrasinin de tarihsel dřnřřmřnř belirleyen etken bu kavramsallařtırmadan hareketle, emek ve sermayenin uzlařtırılması olarak belirlenmektedir.

1960'lardan 1990'lara kadar Třrkiye sosyal demokrasisinin politik iktisadi deđerlendirmesi yřkselen sanayi burjuvazisi ile iřęi sınıfı arasındaki mřcadeleye dayanmaktadır. İthal ikameci sanayileřme strateji sřrecinde egemen gřęlerin uzun dřnemli eıkarları ile kitlelerin kısa dřnemli taleplerinin uyuřurken ve ũretilen deđerin sosyalleřtirilebilmesi mřmkřnken; Třrkiye sosyal demokrasisi hem parti ięerisinde örgřtlenme modelini dřnřřtirme hem de emekten yana sřylem ve

politikalar geliştirerek geniş kitlelerin desteğini kazanma fırsatını iyi değerlendirebilmiştir. Fakat otoriter bir devlet formasyonu ile sermaye sahiplerinin hegemonyasını tahsis ederek sınıf temelli politikanın sonunu getirmeyi amaçlayan 12 Eylül darbesi ve sonrasında; demokratikleşme ve sosyal-ekonomik eşitsizliklerin sona erdirilmesini amaçlayan söylemiyle yeniden örgütlense de Türkiye'deki sosyal demokrat hareket neoliberal politikalara alternatif oluşturamamasından ötürü mevcut toplumsal desteğini kaybetmiştir. Uluslararası finansal ilişkiler ulusal ekonomi politikalarını daha fazla etiler hale gelir devlet, piyasa ve toplum ilişkileri emeğin kazanımlarını tehdit eder biçimde dönüşürken; Türkiye sosyal demokrasisi hala farklı sosyal grupların desteğiyle devlet gücünü kontrol altına alıp reformlar yoluyla kitlelerin refahını artırmayı amaç edinmektedir. Böylece süreç içerisinde neoliberal politikaları benimser hale gelmekte, parti politikalarında piyasa verimliliğine eğilmekte, sermaye çevrelerine yeni yatırım ve sanayileşme stratejileri önermenin sözünü vermektedir. Karşılaşılan kriz emek ve sermayeyi uzlaştırma çabası üzerinden yorumlanırken, Türkiye'deki sosyal demokratların devlet ve toplum ilişkilerini nasıl yorumladıklarını da ayrıca tartışmak mümkün hale gelmektedir. 1990'larda aktif siyasetin içerisinde yer alan sosyal demokratların yazıları ve sosyal demokrat örgütlenmelerin metinleri incelendiğinde, temel olarak devlet-toplum ilişkilerinin dışsallaştırıldığı gözlemlenmektedir. Devlet toplumsal mücadelelerin alanı olmaktan uzak, kendi çıkarlarını gözetebilen bağımsız bir değişken olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Toplum, güç ilişkilerinden bağımsız biçimde kavramsallaştırılmaktadır. Böylece devlet ve toplum arasındaki ilişkiler neoliberal dönemde dönüşüme uğrarken, sosyal demokratlar bu dönüşümü kapitalist üretim ilişkilerden kaynaklanmayan devletin farklı güç kullanımları biçimlerini ifade eden kurumsal değişimler olarak yorumlamaktadır. Ayrıca bu durumun bir sonucu olarak toplumsal ilişkiler modernleşme-geleneksellik, militarizm-demokrasi gibi ikilikler üzerinden yorumlanmaktadır. Devlet, sosyal sınıflar arasında düzenleyici bir özne olarak konumlandırılırken, sivil toplum onun karşısında özgürlükler ve demokrasinin gerçekleştiği alan olarak anlamlandırılmaktadır. Merkez-çevre analizi bağlamında Türkiye'nin tarihsel dönüşümü bürokratik elitler ile sıradan halkın modernleşme üzerine yaşadığı çatışma ile açıklanmaya çalışıldığı süreçte; neoliberal dönemde toplumsal ilişkilerin dönüşümü toplumsal güç ilişkilerinden bağımsız olarak değerlendirilmektedir.

## APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

### ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

### YAZARIN

Soyadı :

Adı :

Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

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 alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: