

NEOLIBERAL GLOBALIZATION, CITIZENSHIP
AND SUBJECT CONSTITUTION IN TURKEY

A Master's Thesis

by
AYŞE YEDEKÇİ

Department of
International Relations
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University
Ankara
September 2012

To my parents

NEOLIBERAL GLOBALIZATION, CITIZENSHIP
AND SUBJECT CONSTITUTION IN TURKEY

Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

AYŞE YEDEKÇİ

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

In

THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

September 2012

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assist. Prof. Tore Fougner
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assist. Prof. Dimitris Tsarouhas
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assoc. Prof. Galip Yalman
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

NEOLIBERAL GLOBALIZATION, CITIZENSHIP AND SUBJECT CONSTITUTION IN TURKEY

Yedekçi, Ayşe

M.A., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Assistant Prof. Tore Fougner

September 2012

This thesis discusses the extent to which neoliberal globalization has had an impact on citizenship in general, and citizenship in Turkey in particular. Academic debates on citizenship usually revolve around the question of identity rights, overlooking political-economy dimensions that significantly influence the scope of rights enjoyed. By defining neoliberalism in a two-fold way as policy framework and governmentality, the study shows both the ways through which neoliberalism has affected the practice of social rights, and how individuals are constituted as neoliberal subjects through different governmental techniques. The thesis aims to adapt the conceptual-theoretical framework by analyzing how the neoliberalization process is experienced in Turkey.

Keywords: Neoliberalism, Citizenship, Governmentality, Social Rights, Political Economy, Turkey

ÖZET

TÜRKİYE’DE NEOLİBERAL KÜRESELLEŞME, VATANDAŞLIK VE ÖZNENİN İNŞASI

Yedekçi, Ayşe

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Tore Fougner

Eylül 2012

Bu tez, hem genelde, hem Türkiye özelinde neoliberalizmin vatandaşlık üzerine ne ölçüde etkisi olduğunu tartışmayı amaçlamaktadır. Vatandaşlıkla ilgili akademik tartışmalar, sahip olunan hakların kapsamını önemli ölçüde belirleyen politik-ekonomi boyutunu göz ardı ederek, genellikle kimlik hakları sorununa odaklanmıştır. Bu çalışma, neoliberalizmi siyasa çerçevesi ve yönetimsellik olmak üzere iki şekilde tanımlayarak, hem neoliberalleşme sürecinin sosyal hakların pratik edilmesi üzerinde ne tür etkileri olduğunu, hem de bu süreç içinde bireylerin çeşitli yönetsel metotlarla nasıl neoliberal özneler olarak kurgulandığını göstermeye çalışacaktır. Neoliberalizmin Türkiye’deki gelişim sürecine bakılarak belirtilen iki kavramsal boyutun da Türkiye’ye uyarlanması hedeflenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Neoliberalizm, Vatandaşlık, Yönetimsellik, Sosyal Haklar, Ekonomi Politik, Türkiye

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I am indebted to my supervisor Tore, without whose friendly and motivating manner this thesis would not have been possible. He has been more than a supervisor to me during this process, so no kind words will ever suffice to express my gratitude for him. I consider myself as a very lucky person for getting to know him, and a very lucky student for being able to work with him, and will surely remember these stressful times with the excellent supervision he made.

I also thank to Assoc. Prof. Galip Yalman and Asst. Prof. Dimitris Tsarouhas for taking part in the jury and reading the thesis word by word. The feedback they gave me and the enjoyable discussion in the committee has been valuable for me.

I would also like to acknowledge the academic and financial support of Bilkent University International Relations Department. Professional and academic and outlook I have gained here will always guide me in the future. Especially Pinar Bilgin's courses were invaluable experiences, through which I have realized how much I wanted to pursue the academic path.

Difficult times I had in this process turned many of my dearest friends into wonderful personal analysts and mentors. Among them, I owe my deepest gratitude to Sezgi for being a part of the family, a great friend and

pushing me as hard as she can when I was at my laziest. Erkam has always been so eager to help me when I was in need of an advice and motivation, and when I got lost in burdensome procedures. I would probably get lost if he was not that generous in helping me. We covered the distance with Deniz with her endless motivation sessions, whenever I lost faith in myself and what I do, which I will always gratefully recall. Emine, Neslihan and Toygar did not hesitate to share their experiences and encourage me. Sümeyra, Oya, Esin, Can, Selcen and many more friends have always been very understanding for the times I stole from them. I also want to thank my officemate Seval for exchanging her office space with me for more peaceful study environment, and my director Kevser Soykan for her understanding at the workplace.

Behind this process there has been my family being the greatest supporter, providing me a real home, doing everything they can do to relieve and encourage me at my lowest.

Last but surely not the least, no words will ever suffice for my biggest inspiration, Erdem, who will always be my hero. Life is always more meaningful and easier with his companionship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
ÖZET	IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VII
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL REFLECTIONS ON CITIZENSHIP AND NEOLIBERALISM	9
2.1. Citizenship.....	10
2.1.1. Social Citizenship	19
2.2. Neoliberalism	25
2.2.1. Neoliberal Policies at the Macro Level.....	26
2.2.2. Neoliberal Governmentality at the Micro Level.....	32
2.3. Neoliberalism and Citizenship	41
2.3.1. Neoliberal Policies and Social Citizenship.....	41
2.3.2. Neoliberal Governmentality and the Citizen-Subject.....	46
2.4. Concluding Remarks	55
CHAPTER III: NEOLIBERAL POLICIES AND SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP IN TURKEY	57
3.1. The Neoliberalization Process.....	58
3.2. The Status of Social Citizenship under Neoliberal Rule	67

3.2.1. Social Security.....	72
3.2.2. Poverty.....	77
3.2.3. Labour	85
3.3. Concluding Remarks	96
CHAPTER IV: NEOLIBERAL GOVERNMENTALITY AND CITIZEN-SUBJECT IN TURKEY	99
4.1. The Case: TEKEL Industrial Conflict	103
4.2. Discursive Constitution of Workers as Neoliberal Subjects-cum-Citizens	109
4.3. Limits to Neoliberal Governmentality	127
4.3.1. Neoliberal Representation with Limited Governmental Intervention	127
4.3.2. Resistance to Neoliberal Subjectification.....	139
4.4. Concluding Remarks	148
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION	152
BIBLIOGRAPHY	162

CHAPTER I:

INTRODUCTION

The last quarter of the 20th century was marked by neoliberal ideology, and its transformative characteristics have been expressed not only through the spread of new economic dynamics but, more significantly, through dramatic changes in the form of state-society relations from the early-1980s onwards. In this way, the term ‘neoliberal globalization’ is used to grasp the nature of rapid changes seen in the intertwined economic, social and political spheres at world and domestic levels. The process of neoliberalization has led to substantive economic transformations and, connected to this, changes in political objectives – the evidence of which can be found in fundamental policy transformations such as the liberalization of financial markets or increasing internationalization of the world trade etc. – but what is more striking, however, was yet to come through the consequences of these shifts for social conditions, as well as subject formations in society. As such, neoliberal globalization can be argued to have resulted in a form of social regulation that “deepens the commodification of social life” (Ryner, 2002:

121) which, consequently, have an impact on the citizenship regime by narrowing the basis and the scope of its substance. Against this background, the purpose of this thesis is to inquire into the extent to and ways in which neoliberalism has affected citizenship in general and citizenship in Turkey in particular.

In fact, an inquiry into such broad and indefinite concepts as neoliberalism and citizenship, with a variety of meanings and interpretations on which there is no single compromise, is a challenging task to undertake, as the prospect of going beyond a given theoretical frameworks is always there. This ever-present possibility is even higher in an attempt to bring these terms together and look at the possible interaction between them, making it an even more demanding endeavour. As two distinct, yet broad notions, citizenship and neoliberalism are no exception to this difficulty, since there is not a consensus on what they imply in their relevant literature. This study tries to overcome this problem by giving reference to different frameworks developed in relevant literature.

The debate on modern citizenship is usually considered to have been initiated following the publication of the seminal work by T.H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class*, in 1950, which conceptualized the evolution and scope of civil, political and social rights through time. With contributions from a variety of fields and viewpoints afterwards, citizenship studies experienced its 'spring' in the late-1980s and early-1990s, as claims of belonging and identity became more visible and loudly expressed. Indeed, although the formal ties between the state and its constituencies tend to come

to mind when thinking about citizenship, this might not be the case in academic circles, since citizenship studies have more recently come to be dominated by cultural rights and identity claims. Although the field was enriched by the launch of different dimensions such as gender, environmental, language and sexual rights, the political-economy aspect of citizenship has been neglected to a considerable extent, and the exercise of citizenship rights is generally treated as an issue isolated from developments within the market system.

At this point, rejecting the idea that the analysis of citizenship can be detached from the political-economic setting, this thesis examines various dimensions of the relationship between neoliberalism and citizenship, and raises the question of the extent to which the former impacts on the latter. With regard to neoliberalism, it is for various reasons impossible to define it solely in theoretical terms. First of all, it overlaps with a wide range of social, economic and political phenomena at different levels, some of which are very abstract like the growing power of finance, whereas other are relatively concrete like privatization or state-NGO partnerships (Saad-Filho and Johnston 2005: 2). Furthermore, the origins of neoliberalism cannot be determined precisely; its roots are long and varied, integrating insights from Adam Smith to neoclassical economics, the critique of Keynesianism, etc.

The broadness and difficulties involved in the precise characterization of both citizenship and neoliberalism make it a challenging task to study the relationship between them. What needs to be done, therefore, is to draw their boundaries in such a way that we can establish a solid basis for conducting

research and developing arguments. Towards this end, neoliberalism and its relation to citizenship will be conceptualized in a two-fold way in this thesis. What necessitates this dual understanding of neoliberalism and citizenship is the background of how they constituted the puzzles informing the thesis. The lack of political-economic vision in studies on citizenship made me question if there could be some ways through which the phenomena of neoliberalism and citizenship are somehow combined together in unconventional ways. Although such effort is undertaken by international scholars to some extent, it was largely missing in the Turkish context, where scholars of citizenship have rather tended to direct their attention to the issue of identity claims made by different ethnic and cultural groups in Turkey. Besides, despite the wide range of issues covered by neoliberalism, it is commonly approached merely as a policy framework and set of regulations, causing one to lose sight of its complex structure and overlook its ‘messy actualities’ of it (Larner, 2000), as well as having the potential of it being invoked as a catch-all category (Sparke, 2009: 290). I additionally wanted to inquire into the ways through which the rationality emerging from neoliberalism can be decisive in power relations that encompasses overall societal relations, implying a more sociological characteristic that is reflected more on ‘micro’ practices. Therefore, in order to facilitate a more thorough and coherent discussion, I divide neoliberalism into different levels in such a way that it signifies both market-oriented policy implementation and neoliberal governmentality in Foucauldian terms. The former is called as the ‘macro’ level with an explicit reference to ‘neoliberalism as we know it’, whereas the latter is referred to as

‘micro’ in focusing on processes through which citizens are constituted and acted upon as subjects within a neoliberal rationality of government.

This double understanding of neoliberalism also leads to a two-layered discussion of citizenship in relational terms, since the examination of possible consequences of the macro and micro levels on citizenship practices requires separate conceptualization of citizenship as well. In that respect, while deliberating the potential outcomes of the neoliberalization process for citizenship at the macro level, references will be given to the changing scope of social rights following the implementation of neoliberal policies. With regard to micro-level neoliberalism, the main point of departure will be asking to what extent citizens are constituted and acted upon as subjects in accordance with certain attributes of neoliberal rationality as part of a governmental project. In more specific terms, instead of a general category of citizenship, the citizen as an individual entity will be considered as the subject of neoliberal rationality in the analysis of micro-level neoliberalism and citizenship.

The actualization of the above-mentioned theoretical scrutiny is discussed with reference to the neoliberalization process in Turkey at both the macro and micro levels. Following the articulation of Turkey into the world economic order in the 1980s, policy agendas in each and every field were exposed to a rapid transformation process towards more market-oriented structures and policies, the effects of which was inevitably reflected in the social field. The reach of this transformation is not limited to a given time, but is rather an ongoing process that adapts its characteristics to contemporary

time by increasing its impacts gradually. In the part of the study dealing with macro-level neoliberalism and citizenship in the Turkish context, the concern is with the possible consequences of this ongoing process in the field of social rights by asking to what extent social rights have been affected by neoliberal policies in Turkey. For the micro part as the second component of the study, neoliberalism as a governmental project in Turkey is approached as a possibility. Utilizing governmentality as an analytical framework, and drawing in large part on a study of the TEKEL industrial conflict in 2009 and 2010, this is examined by asking to what extent workers-cum-citizens are constituted and acted upon as neoliberal subjects.

If the main concerns and the aims of this thesis outlined so far are to be summarized briefly, then the fundamental concern of the thesis can be put forward as an inquiry into the extent to which neoliberalism has had an impact on citizenship, and then a narrowed down focus can be articulated by adapting the same question to Turkish case with reference to both levels of neoliberalism as demarcated here. The answers are given by defining neoliberalism in a two-fold way; first as a policy framework, and second as a governmentality, a detailed account of which will follow in the next chapter. In discussing the relationship between neoliberalism and citizenship with reference to policy framework, the possible impact of fundamental neoliberal strategies in the field of social citizenship will be provided. In the complementary part that defines neoliberalism as a governmental project, the process through which citizens are sought to be constituted as neoliberal subjects will be at stake.

The organization of the next chapter is as follows. Following a brief introduction, a detailed account is presented of the key concepts constituting the backbone of the thesis, namely, citizenship and neoliberalism. They are analyzed by being divided into two levels as micro and macro, which then is followed by a section looking at the relationship between the two by asking the extent to which the neoliberalization process has had an impact on both the exercise of social rights as an essential component of citizenship, and the process of constituting citizens in accordance with neoliberal rationality.

In the third chapter, the former category identified as macro level neoliberalism, and how it is connected to the practice of citizenship is discussed with precise reference to social rights. Turkey's transition to neoliberalism in the 1980s and its gradual progress from then onwards is looked at. Then the chapter moves forward with the effects of neoliberal policy implementation on the exercise of social rights in Turkey. With the brief comparison between the conditions of pre- and post-neoliberal eras, a discussion will be offered with reference to two fundamental categories of social rights, that are social security, labour, and also to very crucial social phenomenon, poverty.

The fourth chapter attempts to adapt governmentality perspective to the Turkish context in exploration of the extent to which the government is informed by neoliberal technology and rationality in discursively constituting and acting upon citizens as neoliberal subjects with certain attributes. By employing governmentality as an analytical tool, the discourse employed by

the current government during the TEKEL industrial conflict is evaluated through this framework in order to locate it on the map of neoliberal governmentality in Turkey. The limits to neoliberal governmentality in Turkey are reflected both through the exploration of whether a broader attempt to govern workers-cum-citizens as neoliberal subjects can be detected in the field of labour, and also through a focus on the resistance and counter discourse on the side of the workers.

The concluding chapter brings theoretical and empirical focus in Turkey together and comes up with two distinct set of conclusions in the light of the analytical tools employed. It concludes with the discussion of the extent to which neoliberalism at the macro and micro levels has had an impact on both the social rights component of citizenship and on citizen subject constitution by setting forth from the Turkish experience.

CHAPTER II:

THEORETICAL REFLECTIONS ON CITIZENSHIP AND NEOLIBERALISM

The two main conceptual focus of this thesis, citizenship and neoliberalism are two broad concepts that need to be narrowed down for a coherent analysis. The theoretical conceptualization as such is especially vital for this study, since it has the claim of elaborating the issue differently than literatures on both citizenship and neoliberalism. Therefore, this chapter will discuss the background notions of neoliberalism and citizenship at the theoretical level by giving reference to different approaches, as they constitute the founding elements of the thesis. By doing so, I attempt to develop a theoretical framework with specific reference to the impacts of neoliberalization process on the exercise of citizenship. Therefore, after explaining how citizenship is usually understood in the relevant literature, I identify the scope of social rights that constitutes the first part of the citizenship understanding in this study with reference to the most cited scholar in the field, T.H. Marshall. Secondly, by examining the notion of neoliberalism in detail that comprises

the conceptual backbone of the thesis, I put forward a two-level approach to the term for a more comprehensive understanding of it.

In the first section titled as ‘macro’, I define neoliberalism in a ‘neoliberalism as we know it’ sort of approach that can be understood through the neoliberal policy framework and fundamental principles within the neoliberal policy agenda. After this more conventional analysis of neoliberalism, in the following part I call as ‘micro’, I define neoliberalism as a governing mechanism through which individuals are constituted as subjects with neoliberal rationality in social life, by giving reference to the ‘governmentality’ literature mainly by Foucault and his followers. After drawing two interlinked pictures of neoliberalism(s), I first look at the impact of neoliberalism at the macro level and social rights, and at the relation between neoliberal governmentality and the citizen subject. I conclude by inquiring into the ways through which we can speak of a citizen subject in compliance with neoliberal rationality.

2.1. Citizenship

An attempt to answer the question of what citizenship is as a point of departure can be considered as undertaking a very tough task, since citizenship is based on a number of different approaches and principles that vary across time and space. For defining citizenship is itself a political activity and hence it means different things to different people (Blackburn, 1994), having this aspect makes it a very ambivalent term to outline a uniform

description and any attempt to define will one way or another reflect the political outlook and position of the definer. Despite the multiple ways to approach the term, there are some central values to citizenship that can be identified in an attempt to sketch the very basic founding principles in general.

The development of the ideas constituting the theory of citizenship before the mid-20th century can be attributed to three broad eras in the history, the first of which is the Ancient Greek period. The remaining two can be identified as medieval and early modern periods, including the time of French Revolution, and lastly the 19th century, in which the influence of liberalism and capitalism had been decisive in developments of new outlooks on citizenship. The French Revolution is critically important as it can be interpreted as a first step to citizenship in a modern and organized sense, since revolt component it entailed against passive citizenship in the medieval and early modern times aimed at ensuring participation against the claims of the monarchy. It was in the 19th century that notion of citizens as individuals having their own different interests have gained prominence. Throughout most of the 20th century, citizenship was regarded as something merely on legal grounds and citizens as legal subjects as the holders of formal rights.

Citizenship in the modern sense has conventionally been linked to the nation state and usually defined with reference to a relationship between state and its constituents. Crucially, it is approached as a formal contract between state and society, as well as membership to a community defined in terms of nationhood (Kuisima, 2008). When we think about citizenship in

terms of a relationship between state and society, the way it usually emerges become the combination of rights and responsibilities; rights endowed to citizens by the state, and reciprocally duties and obligations ascribed from citizens to the state. Hence, citizenship is generally referred as the relationship between state and society, with ‘citizenship regime’ signifying the ways in which a state approaches its constituents (i.e. individuals, communities, cultural identities, etc). Indeed, if we look at the general literature on citizenship as a whole, we observe that the tendency to define citizenship intensifies mostly in the axis of rights, obligations, and membership to a community, all of which constituting the very fundamental background of most of the approaches to citizenship. For instance, as one of the leading scholars in the citizenship literature, Dahrendorf defines citizenship as ‘the rights and obligations associated with membership in a social unit of society, and notably with nationality’ (Dahrendorf, 1996). Similarly, another prominent figure in this literature, Barbalet construes citizenship as ‘both a status and a set of rights’ and explains that citizenship rights attach to a person ‘by virtue of a legal or conventional status.’ (Barbalet, 1988: 15-16). When the three fundamental axes of citizenship - namely, the extent (rules and norms of inclusion and exclusion), content (rights and duties) and deepness - needed to be redefined and reconfigured due to various political and social struggles for recognition and redistribution, citizenship came to be defined not simply as ‘legal status but as political and social recognition and economic redistribution’ (Isin and Turner, 2002: 4). While these general definitions are useful in understanding the roots of different approaches to citizenship, the

typologies can be argued no longer to capture the nature of citizenship thoroughly due to the ongoing process of globalization and post-modernization that invalidates prevailing terms tied to these discussions to a large extent.

However, leaving different particular definitions as well as the meaning and substance of citizenship aside, it is first and foremost crucial to separate different lenses displaying the same notion differently. Ayşe Kadioğlu's (2008: 21) way of classifying citizenship literature into four groups is very practical in that sense, for understanding the ways in which approaches to citizenship varies considerably in the literature. She pins down the first of these categories as the approach that identifies citizenship as national identity or nationalism in which citizen is equated to his/her nationality. With this understanding, referring to 'Turkish' and 'Turkish citizen' are the same thing and all entitlements follow from this national framework, regardless of any sort of particularities. In passport-based citizenship, the term 'citizenship' is always used in relation to official documents, and thus a person is deemed to legally qualify for citizenship rights as long as s/he holds the passport or necessary documents of a given country. This perspective is more embedded in legal analysis of citizenship (dual citizenship, etc.), with lacking cultural, political and social dimensions. The third category she puts forward is a rights-based approach, where the term citizenship becomes meaningful if completed and practiced with civil, political and social rights. This category, the theoretical roots of which can be traced back to T.H Marshall's seminal work *Citizenship and Social Class* in

1950, can be identified as the most prominent group in citizenship literature as it is followed by wide range of criticisms, questions and contributions, letting the enrichment of this sort and preparing ground for the development and gradual accumulation in citizenship literature as a whole. The last category is duty- and responsibility- based citizenship, where society and the general good have ontological priority over the individual. This last group also contains citizenship debates that have its theoretical roots in the Republican tradition.

However, if we intend to outline more particular approaches and what their focus is under the umbrella of this general classification, then the mainstream approaches to modern citizenship and their main focus in the analysis can roughly be listed as comparative studies that put forward different models of citizenship by corresponding to different traditions of (mainly French and German) nation-state building processes (Brubaker, 1990, cited in Kadioğlu, 2008), and theoretical-comparative studies in an attempt to classify and understand citizenship with reference to Liberal and Republican theories (Oldfield, 1990). In addition to these different comparative studies, some scholars highlighted three dimensions involved in the notion citizenship as status, identity, and activity where status corresponds to legal rights and duties (Kymlicka and Norman, 2000). Among all these forms, the position that relates citizenship with identity politics and rights concerned with multiculturalism has constituted a very important part of the literature especially after the 1990s. This group does not consider citizenship with a ‘membership to community’ alike manner, but disputes the scope and the

content of rights that is granted to different identity groups be they ethnic, religious or gender. Contributions to this literature have come from a variety of scholars and stances, yet it would not be wrong to mention Kymlicka as a prominent figure within this position. The group thought to be represented by Kymlicka in this category defends the idea that the demands of difference coming from historically unfavoured and disadvantaged religious, ethnic, cultural groups etc. should be underscored, and that they should be guaranteed with political and social inclusion that will be constitutionalized in legal structures (Kymlicka, 1995, 2000). The ‘politics of difference’ (Young, 1990), or differentiated citizenship is proposed in multicultural societies to preserve the very fundamental identity rights of minority groups, within an academic field which became very enriched with different contributions and critiques in the 1990s and onwards.

What one can extract from these different modes of explanations and diversity of approaches is that citizenship is such a notion that has a number of definitions, interpretations and understandings that vary spatially, temporally and politically. It is not a static and ahistoric concept, but rather dynamic and redefinable by nature due to changing social and political conditions of different eras, as well as reflecting the political and social outlook of whoever defines the notion. However, a little quote used by Ayşe Kadioğlu well outlines the dominant point of view towards citizenship which is characterized in the axis of identity. In order to illustrate that there are various different ways of defining oneself and how one can have multiple identities at the same time, she refers to well known political scientist Tariq

Ramadan's self definition: 'I am Swiss by nationality, Muslim by religion, Egyptian by memory.' (quoted in Kadioğlu, 2008:13). We can regard it as more or less an implicit summary of the dominant standpoint on citizenship, which underscores the significance of identities as an essential part of citizenship.

So, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the contemporary debates on citizenship are mostly intertwined with the whole deliberation on identity, difference, minorities etc. However, the way this study aims to identify citizenship is different from this conventional identity-based understanding of citizenship. While not disregarding the significance of it, the way I will address citizenship in this thesis is twofold, both of which are disregarded by most scholars to a large extent, that is the political economic aspect of citizenship. In other words, I will firstly set forth the relational nature of citizenship with a larger structure of world economy and with the developments in prevailing political economic order (which will be denoted as 'neoliberalism'), and secondly the impact of these political economic alterations on particular individuals, which I will refer as 'subjects' or 'citizen subjects' with reference to Foucauldian literature. This is not, however, merely a 'political economy of citizenship' thesis, nor a study on the development of neoliberalism and its social impacts. Considering the rarity of studies relating citizenship with political economy, it is an explorative attempt to analyze, first, how the neoliberalization process has affected citizenship, (specifically social aspect of citizenship) and, second, what impacts this has at a more micro level, where individuals become subjects of this neoliberal

rationality. The ‘subject’ here is not akin to how the same term is used in conventional citizenship literature to identify those who are targeted to become the bearer of official discourse and ideology during the nation-state building process. Rather, it refers to the individual, who increasingly becomes subject to the rigours of the neoliberal market system, and consequently transforms itself in line with the rationality of this market system.

Furthermore, if we conceptualize citizenship in terms of the meanings and roles attributed to people in everyday practices, then we can sketch how discourses of desirable (political-economic) identities construct mechanisms of exclusion and privilege (Işın, 2002). Therefore, when the term citizenship is used in this study, it refers to a scope beyond how Ramadan locates himself based on various identities, and implying two different connotations as ‘citizenship’ and ‘citizen-ship’, both of which will try to show it can be studied with respect to political economic and subjecthood dimensions.

After this brief conceptual clarification, it is crucial to focus on what Marshall put forward in terms of citizenship (mostly on social citizenship as it concerns political economic aspect of this thesis), as the framework he delineated will be employed as an analytical tool throughout this study. Though still having an explanatory relevancy with his precise classification in the study of citizenship, the theorization has been criticized on several grounds. For instance, he was criticized for disregarding the role of social movements and struggle in the progress of rights (Barbalet, 1988), assuming national belonging as pre-given as well as being irrelevant to a period of disorganized capitalism (Turner, 1986 and 1990) and neglecting the gender

dimension within citizenship rights (Fraser and Gordon, 1994). I acknowledge the soft spots of the theory with the contention that it reproduces the conventional and pre-given assumptions tied to citizenship such as the membership to a nation state, or nation state as the ultimate element and sphere in obtaining rights and underestimating the weight of class conflict in a Marxian sense, or creating an illusion as if the social rights are less political. Considering the earlier notice on the act of defining citizenship being a political activity [in itself] reflecting the definer's point of view, selecting Marshall's conception in the thesis' 'macro' part analyzing neoliberalism's impact on citizenship is mainly motivated by its explanatory strength in terms of observing a change caused by the working of the current global economic system. More concretely, setting social rights as the analytical category facilitates to see the impacts of neoliberal policies on the exercise of citizenship rights in general. Secondly, to the extent that categories such as the social security systems or the labour relations can be examined more systematically under social rights, picking this term makes more sense considering the main focus areas in the following chapters. This more pragmatic point can be linked to the fact that, despite the widespread criticisms and weaknesses, Marshall's category of social rights is still relevant and the dominant category in the literature that is widely employed in related topics.

As I have previously mentioned, citizenship is not static and unchanging concept, but rather open to different adjustments and interpretations changing over time. Therefore, there is no reason why we

should not think of it in relation to the world political economy, and speaking in the vocabulary of identity, why we should not insert 'political economic identity' as an intermingled dimension of citizen-ship. Before classifying 'macro' and 'micro' aspects of citizenship -that is the world economic order and its impacts on citizenship and individual subjects as will be explained below- I find it essential to outline the basic stances of Marshall's theory of citizenship, which is commonly considered the most influential work on citizenship in terms of the different dimensions he brings out.

2.1.1. Social Citizenship

Written in 1950, T. H. Marshall's *Citizenship and Social Class* has been regarded as the most influential exposition of citizenship conception in the post-war era (Kymlicka and Norman, 1994: 354). It can be considered as the first coherent and comprehensive theorization on modern citizenship with the rights-based approach. For him, citizenship is essentially about ensuring that everyone is treated as full and equal members of society, the condition which can be provided by granting people an increasing number of citizenship rights. Following a detailed account of English history from the eighteenth century onwards, he comes up with an evolutionary model in the development of rights in three centuries, and accordingly divides these basic citizenship rights into three categories as civil rights which arose in the eighteenth century; political rights in the nineteenth and lastly the social rights in twentieth century as a complementary totality (Marshall, 1991 [1963]).

Looking at them individually, civil rights imply ‘the rights necessary for individual freedom - liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice’; political rights are related to participation ‘in exercise of political power, as a member of a body of invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such body’ and includes ‘the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body’; and social rights refer to “the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society” (Marshall, 1991). As Marshall described them, these rights constitute the fundamental elements of modern citizenship. However, each one of them being complementary to each other, the most recent category of social rights, is defined in Marshall’s theory as a fundamental element for a full expression and practice of citizenship. Therefore, for him, it is in the welfare state that the most ideal implementation of citizenship can be enjoyed (Kymlicka and Norman, 1994: 354). In a democratic welfare state, civil, political, and social rights are guaranteed to all citizens, ensuring that every member of society can feel like a full member of it. Such analysis has inspired the study of social rights and how they were or were not operated within the social policies of the welfare systems.

However, a lot has changed since Marshall and his evolutionary framework came to be challenged on many different grounds. With the

changing global political economy conjuncture, and consequently the social setting, one need to keep in mind the transformed aspects of citizenship has also changed the fundamental assumptions on citizenship and what it means to be a citizen. Collective characteristics of rights that Marshallian understanding of citizenship entails turned more into individual- and group-based expression of rights with the newly addressed categories of gender, religion, culture etc., becoming the extent to which individuals and different groups enjoy citizenship rights. In recent years, these new elements which were not mapped out by Marshall were explored and they became central in most of the citizenship studies scene in the late-1980s and especially in the 1990s by incorporating the identity dimension. Therefore, he was criticized, for instance, for disregarding the role of social movements and struggle in the progress of rights (Barbalet, 1988), assuming national belonging as pre-given as well as being irrelevant to a period of disorganized capitalism (Turner, 1986 and 1990) and neglecting the gender dimension within citizenship rights (Fraser and Gordon, 1994). For the most part, it can also be interpreted as setting up passive and top-down relations between the citizens and the states, wherein the state gives rights to citizens for an active civil, political and social involvement.

These challenges are also applied to category of social rights. Through neoliberalization process, the nature of rights as depicted by Marshall in a collective base has now defined more in individualistic terms than social rights in Marshall's typology implied. It is mostly due to interrelated processes of deregulation, privatization, and individualization that weaken the

collective foundation of rights. However, keeping in mind that Marshall's analysis has inspired the study of social rights in a sense that social rights implied positive rights to "live the life of a civilised being according to the standards prevailing in society" (Marshall, 1992: 8), there are still good reasons to employ social rights as a category to analyze the relation between neoliberalism and the scope of the 'social' in the exercise of rights, albeit on more individual terms. As well as entailing the protection of collective bargaining rights and other labour-related rights in general, access to health and education etc., it also means the guarantee of minimum standards of living under sustained attack of neoliberal policies, which makes it –apart from Marshall – a relevant category to inquire into this relation despite the change in the basis of theoretical foundation.

Having said that, the idea of eliminating the tension between egalitarian citizenship and the unequal nature of capitalism as well as policies targeted this aim came under attack by neoliberal politics maintaining that intervening to the area of economic protection is contradictory to the neoliberal doctrine on the grounds that first; it is inconsistent with the demands of (negative) freedom, it is economically inefficient, and it implies stepping down the 'road to serfdom' (Kymlicka and Norman, 1994: 355). Against this, the practice of social rights is usually rationalized both in analytical and legal terms as a universal human right (Held, 1995). In that respect, social citizenship is a crucial aspect in analyzing the impact of neoliberalism on citizenship, since it is generally seen as having been exposed to a considerable threat in many ways following the demise of the welfare

state since the 1980s with what the neoliberal agenda brought forward. Roche (2002: 71) makes a distinction between the positive and negative characteristics of social citizenship, the negative ones comprising the target of minimizing individuals' risks of suffering from poverty, gross inequality and related problems of health and exclusion in capitalist societies. As such, within social rights as the supplementary chain to citizenship rights, protection of citizens against the inequality-generating nature of capitalism and the free market and safeguarding individuals' well-being and integrity in society is aimed. This is where the positive characteristic of social rights comes into play as it also refers to lifelong rights to income maintenance, full access to employment, shelter, education and health services, with the aim of minimizing the difference between more and the less fortunate; the healthy and sick, the old and active, the wealthy and poor, the employed and unemployed, etc. Due to the negative consequences of the free market system on citizens, counterbalancing the distributional effects on human lives in the form of unfair income distribution is regarded as being at the heart of state's commitment to social rights.

In order to relate social rights to the context analyzed in the following chapters, a clarification is needed on what is specifically referred to when using the term. However, one needs to keep in mind that the 'social' itself is political, and that they should be approached as closely interlinked spheres when delineating the scope of the social rights. Keeping this in mind, we can see the evolution of social rights progressing hand in hand with the developments within the fields of labour, poverty, and of social security as the

integral part. For instance, the field of social security is a constitutive field in which the exercise of social rights most evidently expresses itself and, accordingly, an area which is most immediately affected by the market-oriented policies. Another significant pillar within social citizenship is the labour aspect, the conditions of which one also shaped through the process of neoliberalization. Since it is within the market sphere that the scope of the rights, privileges and conditions of labour is determined, this aspect is also commonly included as an inherent part of social rights in relevant studies. Accordingly, the extent of labour market participation, employment security, unemployment-related problems in society and working conditions constitutes a fundamental focus within social rights as circumstances depend on the market fluctuations (Crouch, Eder and Tambini, 2001: 10). Social rights are thought to be serving to protect the employed and unemployed, along with those who are unable to work, by providing them with social security or public assistance (Esping-Andersen, 1990). Another significant element within the field of social rights that will also constitute a key reference point in this thesis is the perception that deems social citizenship as a collective response to poverty, since it reflects an understanding that views social rights as a strategy in which poverty is no longer an individual problem but a social one. Poverty emerges as a prominent issue within social rights, since solutions are tried to be found through individualized social policy responses when the exercise of social rights as a whole cannot be underwritten (Procacci, 2001). This brings forward an understanding that deems poverty alleviation as a social rights rather than an issue requiring individual and technical solutions,

which substantially lacks in the practices of Turkey by the application of charity and cooperative mechanisms as the ultimate solution.

2.2. Neoliberalism

In order to make the analysis clearer, it is significant to divide the conceptual tools into different levels. Approaching neoliberalism merely in terms of a policy framework and focusing on its policy consequences inevitably limits our vision in comprehending this phenomenon as it is rather a complex network of ‘messy actualities’ (Larner, 2000). Indeed, as Matthew Sparke puts it, ‘there are many good reasons to be cautious about invoking neoliberalism as a catch-all category for describing the political-economic arrangements and orthodoxies associated with contemporary globalization’ (Sparke, 2009: 290). In order to make sense of different dimensions brought about by neoliberalism and to focus on these dimensions thoroughly, the method employed in this study ‘neoliberalism’ will divide the phenomenon into two different levels in such a way to imply both policy implementation and ‘governmentality’. Whatever this distinction is called, such as neoliberalism as ‘policy-ideology-governmentality’ (Larner, 2000), top-down vs. bottom-up (*à la* Marxian vs. *à la* Foucauldian accounts) (Sparke, 2009), or as micro and macro level (Sparke, 2006), they are all and equally helpful tools for a more sophisticated comprehension of neoliberalism, so long as they imply the distinction between market based reforms and regulations on the one hand, and their impacts on individual actions and habits on the other. I

will simply refer to this methodological distinction as ‘micro’ and ‘macro’ levels in Sparke’s terms, to crystallize the nuance between the actual practices, and mode of subjectification brought about by neoliberalism, that is the ‘governmentality’ component embedded in the neoliberal practices. By doing so, one can focus on the requirements of market functioning such as free trade, privatization, financial deregulation, monetarism, fiscal austerity etc. at the macro level, whereas at the micro level the process of particular subject cultivation in a market based mentality and the internalization of neoliberal practices can be scrutinized with a Foucauldian lens of governmentality. More concretely, for minimizing the conceptual confusion specifically within the scope of this study, drawing insights from critical analysis on neoliberalism, the macro level analysis in the first part will look at how Marxian theories of post-welfare restructuring can be associated with the demise of citizenship rights (mainly social rights); and the second part concerning the micro aspect will focus on what the Foucauldian governmentality school has to say about citizen-ship projects of individualized responsabilization (Lemke, 2001)

2.2.1. Neoliberal Policies at the Macro Level

For several reasons, there is no one uniform and direct way to construe neoliberalism both methodologically and conceptually. By its very nature, it entails multi-level approach towards its basic theoretical assumptions and historical roots, since its systematic comprehension requires so. Though its origins are long and varied, its emergence is not precise. It is suggested to be

amalgamating different insights from a variety of sources, including ‘Adam Smith, neoclassical economics, the Austrian critique of Keynesianism and Soviet-style socialism, monetarism and its new classical and ‘supply-side’ offspring’ (Saad-Filho and Johnston, 2005:2), and is also considered as the ‘reassertion of fundamental beliefs of the liberal political economy that was the dominant political ideology of the nineteenth century’ (Clarke, 2005: 57), beginning in the early-1980s following the demise of the welfare state. Towards the final decades of the 20th century, markets came to be regarded as the most appropriate and desirable mechanism in regulating the world political economies as well as domestic political economies, and this set of thinking was embodied in principles identified as neoliberalism that became the thinking about and acting upon the economy (Fourcade-Gourinchas and Babb, 2002: 533). When Keynesianism and its stress upon state intervention in the field of social protection started to be discarded, what eventually followed was the introduction of neoliberal policies with the guidance of structural adjustment programmes to be imposed by IMF and World Bank, which mainly stood for decreasing social expenditures in line with the commitment to free market principle.

The inception of overall policies characterized as neoliberalism is usually identified with Reagan and Thatcher governments and these two names almost symbolize the application of neoliberal policies. Although it should not be completely wrong to call these names and their terms as a turning point, it is essential to mention that, first, it was not a deterministic transformation from point A to B (welfare to neoliberalism) and, second,

these two represent a case rather than the model itself and the way that neoliberalization processes are experienced are variegated, as will be discussed more in detail in the following chapter on Turkey. Therefore, constituting the two representative figures of neoliberalism, Reagan and Thatcher governments are invoked in order to map out the basic coordinates and direction of the neoliberalization processes, and to locate individual experiments accordingly (Peck, 2004: 393)

While describing what neoliberalism implies at the macro level, I will set forth from and adhere to the very brief and basic definitions of David Harvey on neoliberalism, a name that can be regarded as one of the most significant follower of and contributor to what Sparke calls an *à la* Marxian account. For Harvey, 'Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade' (Harvey, 2005: 2). Having its intellectual roots in early liberalism, this advanced mode praises these values and political economic practices associated with these values. Following the A B C of neoliberalism, if we take notice of another important Marxian scholar on basic policy strategies of neoliberalism in order to complete the picture, Bob Jessop identifies 'six mutually reinforcing policies' that the core mentality of neoliberalism relies on as follows:

- (a) liberalization, promoting free market (as opposed to monopolistic or state monopolistic) forms of competition as the most efficient basis for market forces; (b) deregulation, giving economic agents greater freedom

from state control and legal restrictions; (c) privatization, reducing the public sector's share in the direct or indirect provision of goods and services to business and community alike; (d) (re-) commodification of the residual public sector, to promote the role of market forces, either directly or through market proxies; (e) internationalization, encouraging the mobility of capital and labour, stimulating global market forces, and importing more advanced processes and products into Britain as a means of economic modernization; and (f) reduced direct taxes to expand the scope for the operation of market forces through enhanced investor and consumer choice. (Jessop, 2003:5)

Different governments in different parts of the world implemented series of reforms in accordance with the above principles, leading to a wave of privatizations, dismantling of social state apparatuses, establishment of public-private partnerships and the retreat of the state from the provision of fundamental social services, which had profound impacts on the relationship between citizens and the state. What comes forward from these basic principles is first of all that, in the theory and practice of neoliberalism, the free market is at the heart of economic efficiency and all regulations and schemes are shaped in accordance with this primary route. From this perspective, it seems that the overall outcome of the basic strategies that concerns the scope of this study is the seemingly opposite positioning of state and free market as though they are two antagonist spheres, and by shrinking itself and its area of manoeuvre gradually, the role of the state became to ensure the well-functioning of the free market through different means such as privatization, deregulation, public sector austerity and opening of markets to international corporations. Although the mainstream narrative on

globalization and non-critical accounts of neoliberalism/neoliberalization usually agrees on the declining role of the state by looking at the practice of this set of policies, and hence concluding neoliberalism derives some of its power from this 'absentee state' image (Peck, 2004: 395), critical accounts usually disagree with this assertion by arguing that the state is still a relevant, effective and interventionist actor, albeit in different ways. Therefore, contrary to representation, since first of all markets cannot emerge spontaneously and free of the state initiative and, second, as privatized, liberated or deregulated markets have to be managed and safeguarded; neoliberalization process cannot be simply portrayed as the replacement of the state by free markets. (Peck, 2004; O' Riain, 2000). Harvey names the apparatus within this controversial situation with the term 'neoliberal state', the main characteristics of which reflects the interests of private property owners, businesses, multinational corporations, and financial capital (Harvey: 2005: 7), bringing forward the disputes on whether state is really losing ground and get minimized with neoliberal imperatives and transnational actors, or it is still an actor with choices in hand and using this in favour of capital in the conflict between labour and capital. Giving an ear to the mainstream story of neoliberalism in which the state is minimal in terms of intervention and overall ineffective kind can thus mislead us in understanding the nature of the relationship between state and citizens. For Jessop, this small state narrative is obsolete and simplistic since neoliberalism as a political project seeks to roll back 'normal' forms of state intervention associated with the Keynesian welfare state or developmentalist and socialist plan state on the

one hand, and it tries to enhance 'roll forward' new types of governance that are more proper for a market-driven globalizing economy on the other (Jessop, 2002: 454).

This debate is significant for us as it is telling for the changing state-society relations, where state is still counted as major source of rights and privileges of individuals in their civil, political and social lives, and determining where they stand in their relation to the state. Unlike the arguments made about the inactiveness or impartiality of the state vis-à-vis the functioning of the free market, critical intellectual circles argue that; as the main interlocutor to its citizens, when fallen into a dilemma between the integrity of the free market (it might as well be the financial institutions at this stage as the most prominent actors of the current stage of capitalism), and the well-being of the citizen, the state was to privilege the former (Harvey, 2005: 48).

The primary role of the state in neoliberalism is assumed as creating and maintaining the conditions appropriate for the proper functioning of markets and, when needed, it is to take action in setting up the necessary environment for the establishment of markets in order to facilitate conditions for capital accumulation. So, in this outlook, in case of a conflict between labour and capital, a typical neoliberal state will tend to favour the interest of the capital. Similarly, in the financial era of capitalism, the state tends to protect the integrity of the financial institutions and the financial system in general over the wellbeing of the individuals. In this tradeoff, another term introduced by Harvey -namely 'accumulation by dispossession' (Harvey,

2003) - in a way explains this process, as dispossession entails the loss of rights for the restoration of class power. Indeed a broad range of social rights – from unionization to social security- are subordinated to the demands of greater labour market flexibility, and to lower overall social expenditure qua the cost of production (Jessop, 2003: 6).

2.2.2. Neoliberal Governmentality at the Micro Level

As comprehensive as it is, neoliberalism is commonly considered to be a phase of capitalism introducing a set of pro-market policies that seek the further expansion of the capital. However, that simple way of thinking about the notion does not signify what neoliberalism is all about. According to the scheme I initially put forward, this commonly accepted aspect equal to macro part. As can be extracted from the term itself, with the term *micro* I want to focus particularly on how the rationality embedded in market practices are reflected on the subject formation and what kind of impact that market related regulations and activities have on the individual's behaviour and on the relation they establish with state and society at large. The point I aim to reach is to show how and why the model of an 'ideal subject' in neoliberalism can be analyzed in parallel to 'ideal citizen'. The Foucauldian lens of *governmentality* will be employed as it stands as the most suitable and inspiring framework to study the process of subject formation. Though Foucault himself did not make a political economy analysis in particular, he made a comprehensive analysis on 'neoliberal governmentality', especially in his lectures given at College de France, collected under the title of *The Birth*

of *Bipolitics*. There, he established a constitutive connection between neoliberalism and the regulation of individual's lives (biopolitics), which he defined as the art of government that exercises 'power in the form, and according to the model, of the economy' (Foucault 2008: 134). The term originally denotes 'the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power...' (Foucault, 1991: 102) However, we cannot limit the implication of the term governmentality solely to neoliberalism, as it refers to the historical reconstructions starting from Ancient Greek to modern neoliberalism (Foucault, 1991), since 'complex form of power' is existent throughout centuries. Semantically, the notion links the act of governing (*gouverner*) to the modes of thought (*mentalité*) which implies the indispensability of power and the political rationality constituting this power and thus holds this relationship liable for the process of subjectification. (Lemke, 2001: 191).

Foucault's lecture on governmentality is an attempt limited neither to a certain mode of production nor to a period in history or contemporary time. Its concern is rather how subject formation has been taking place in different eras with the neoliberal era being one of them. In order to grasp the content and the scope of neoliberal governmentality, one should first consider neoliberalism as an active and intervening model that goes after creating (political economic) identities in line with its substance and rationality. For Brown, for example, neoliberalism is a constructivist project as 'it does not presume the ontological givenness of a thoroughgoing economic rationality

for all domains of society but rather takes as its task the development, dissemination, and institutionalization of such a rationality' (Brown: 2005: 40-41). In this constructivist attempt, governmentality scholars mainly deal with the question 'how the subject is constituted as subject' and how individuals are pragmatically and systematically guided and regulated in the everyday conduct (Ong, 2006: 4)

From the standpoint of governmentality scholars, neoliberalism is not treated as an economic doctrine but as rationality that 'grounds the imperatives of government upon the self – activating capacities of free human beings, citizens, subjects' (Rose, 1999: 64). It investigates the translation, technologization, and operationalization of Hayekian *homo economicus* as the centre of liberal political economic order in a diversity of contemporary situations with the neoliberal restructuring of society. The fundamental virtues of market rationality, such as discipline, efficiency, competitiveness etc., infiltrate into the domains of the social and the political, and it travels, become naturalized and internalized by individuals in diverse contexts (McNeill, 2005), be it a workplace, a school, an academy or a political body. Such subjectification process is dialectical in the sense that individuals in the subject position respond to these different identities and subjectivities (Larner, 2000) by constituting themselves as disciplined competitive, responsible, and efficient teachers, lawyers, and students etc., and position themselves as the protagonists who are free, self-responsible, and ready to take risk. Therefore, since studies of governmentality explores the means of conduct of 'people, individuals, or groups' (Foucault 2007: 102), and scrutinize how practices and

the reflection of these practises by individuals constitute themselves mutually, target of analyses in the studies of governmentality may vary from the raising of children to daily control practices in different public spheres, from the management of a company's employees to governing trans-national institutions (Bröckling, Krasmann and Lemke, 2011: 11).

Employing governmentality as an analytical framework is essential in an attempt to study citizenship from a subjectification point of view, because it problematizes the sphere of 'the political'. Governmentality as an analytical tool helps us to realize how the realm of the political is produced in the first place, as opposed to presuming it as pre-given. It attempts to unfold the distinction between the issues considered to be political and technical and, accordingly, to reveal how some problems are identified as needing practical solutions, irrespective of their social, political and economic causes. By asking 'how subjects are invoked as autonomous, emancipated, responsible, in technologies of government' (Bröckling, Krasmann and Lemke, 2011: 13), it endeavours to correlate the effects of these intertwined realms to different individual subjectivities that emerged out of these realms. Therefore, not assuming everything as a political activity, nor deducing politics merely to the processes or institutions, by widening the definition of the political sphere, studies of governmentality plays a functional role in analyzing citizenship at the micro level as the framework it present enables to view a student in a school, an employee of a company or an academician at a university as a citizen-subject in their relation to this complex process of subjectification.

Another value of governmentality studies for studying citizen-ship is its focus on the process through which subject is constituted at a certain historical period, rather than simply asking what subject is. With respect to this puzzle, they sought to uncover the rationality behind different governmental practices experienced in contemporary societies, and tried to indicate the ways through which certain practices becomes ‘thinkable and practicable both to its practitioners and to those upon which it [is] practised’ (Gordon 1991: 3). Through this structure of thought, we start to denormalize things and ask how certain actions, practices, different subjectivities became possible, sayable, doable, thinkable, practicable etc., and become more conscious in analyzing transitions from one type of subjecthood to another. In a very practical sense, and as far as my study is concerned, this denaturalizing and contextualizing aspect of governmentality is helpful to comprehend the transition from welfare to neoliberal subject and to analyze how the rationalities have reflected on the individual subjectivities and attributes such as responsibility, activeness or industriousness.

Foucault’s attention to liberalism mostly directed towards the liberal and neoliberal forms of government in his 1979 lecture series, at the beginning of which he discusses the classic liberal art of government by giving reference to the works of Adam Smith, David Hume and Adam Ferguson (Lemke, 2001: 192). His analysis of neoliberal governmentality though was examined with reference to two forms which are first German post-war ordoliberalism, where the state was to forge and foster development

of the free market, and Chicago School liberalism, the roots of which can be considered to constitute the purest form of the neoliberal doctrine.

The main tenet behind German ordoliberalism was the idea that the state has to govern for the market in order to ensure that it works in line with its theoretical premises. What Foucault intended to show with his analysis of ordoliberalism was that, the market was a precarious and formal mechanism, made possible by governmental technologies (Stäheli, 2011: 272), which do not directly aim at the market though. Nor this approach deems market as a pre-given entity. It develops a set of criteria of imaginary market so that one develops devices to govern for the market, which in turn reconstitutes it as new mode of rationality and measuring sphere of the efficiency of different governmental techniques and programmes, or what is politically working out or not in line with the principles of the ideal market, which overall is called as ‘market test’ by Foucault (2008). Market as an (imaginary) self regulative as such thus quantifies what is effective and worthless. Foucault’s comparative analysis of German ordoliberalism and Chicago school (neo)liberalism – with the latter basically conceiving of *all* human behaviour in forms of rational economic behaviour- brings forth another relevant evaluation on paradigms in these approaches, and on the way individuals are dealt in both. Unlike classical economy, he identifies a shift from the paradigm of exchange to the paradigm of competition at the centre of which stands not *homo economicus* in the conventional sense, but rather an individual who is an ‘entrepreneur of himself, being for himself his own capital, being for himself his own producer, being for himself the source of [his] earnings’ (Foucault 2008: 226).

Not merely a partner of exchange, the ‘entrepreneur of himself’ individual as the nucleus of neoliberal governmentality is also instituted as a self-controlling individual that ‘calculates about itself, and that works upon itself in order to better itself’ (Rose 1989: 7), which makes it constitute the founding template of a neoliberal citizen subject, as it is expected to bear not only the responsibilities drawn in relation to market activities, but also any sort of relevant consequences and failures related to these activities.

In this form, enterprise culture in general and the enterprising self in particular is a crucial device to promote as it extends the values and norms associated with the market such as responsibility, initiative, competitiveness, risk-taking and industrious effort (Young, 1992). In the seemingly ‘interference free’ area, individuals are loaded with an economic rationality through different ways and means. In this, individual freedom is utilized as the primary indirect technology of control, in an environment where direct control is impossible, and thus it is converted into indirect ‘conduct of conduct’ (Stäheli, 2011: 273). The figure of the ‘entrepreneur’ is a very commonly employed analytical tool used by scholars excessively in various different social spheres as the key mode of subjectification, be it in the form of consumer and her/his decisions, an academic, scientific entrepreneur, or even the social-care client, for becoming responsible for his own well-being.

Though the process of subjectification is usually examined with reference to neoliberal rationality, the subject formation is not unique to neoliberal era and it shows parallelism with the dominant social, political and economic conjuncture of a given era. In that respect, we can talk about a line

of consistency in terms of the act itself, which implies that there was a form of subjectification/subjecthood in welfare era too. Rose and Miller put this pattern by locating those to be governed as having ‘historically been conceived of as children to be educated, members of a flock to be led, souls to be saved’ (Miller and Rose 2008: 8). Throughout the establishment and institutionalization of the welfare state in the Western world, this subjection had been in the form of locating individuals as the subjects endowed with social rights and benefits as Marshall has put it. Though capitalist, it relied on the principles of equity and solidarity among people and embraced the notion of ‘social inclusion’, seeking to prevent dissolution by providing the needs of the population, ensuring the rights of socially responsible citizens and neutralizing the threats of social hazards (Dean, 2010: 179). Towards the final decades of the twentieth century, however, the welfare subject has been reconstituted with the above-mentioned attributes as entrepreneurs of themselves in each and every sphere while the state and political economic conjuncture constituted itself with the new mode of structure vis-à-vis its members.

Despite the widespread consensus on a noticeable transition in the mode of subjection from welfare to neoliberalism and its most discernible element as the entrepreneurial self, there are also those who are critical of considering this change as an accurate transformation from point a to b. Lessenich, for example, criticizes this deterministic understanding, which perceives this transition as a simple neoliberal move from welfare to active enterprise society, or a construction of a self-relying homo economicus

(Lessenich, 2011: 307). For him, while this viewpoint remains relevant to a certain extent, this is only half of the picture that amounts to more than just an enterprisation of the self. By re-posing the question of *what type of subjectivity* is created, the answer he reaches is that individuals are guided also by a social rationality, which adds a ‘socialized self’ to the entrepreneurial self, implying that the activation paradigm embodies a drive for acting also in the name of society. Acknowledging the transformation from welfare’s protective policies to neoliberal activating social policies, he names the handing over of social responsibility from public to individual actors as the ‘subjectivation of the social’. In contrast to welfare’s ‘practices of self-formation, practices concerned to shape the attributes, capacities, orientations and moral conduct of individuals, and to define their rights, obligations and statuses’ (Dean 1995: 567 quoted in Lessenich, 2011: 315), the activating social policies target at moving people into an ethical relationship with society as a whole, ‘making them want to serve society by protecting it from themselves, i.e., from the risk they pose to society if they do *not* act as responsible selves’ (ibid.: 315). Accordingly, both self-centred and pro-social subjects will be calculative, take risks, adopt an entrepreneurial stance towards life, and will have done all these in prudential way –as a contribution to society- at the same time.

Criticism and assertion of this sort fits into the attempt of elaborating citizenship from subjecthood point of view especially, as is the case in this study, when there is an endeavour to delineate an ‘ideal subject’ framework in approaching citizenship. The integral comprehension that relates inclination

towards entrepreneurial activity with the benefit of wider society can be considered as a contribution to conventional standpoints on citizenship (defined with respect to duties and responsibilities) in a way that by acting as responsible (risk taker) subjects they do not just behave entrepreneurial in every aspect of their lives, but also doing these activities in the name of the society, since they will think of their acts beneficial both to themselves and to society. What is more, as was also reflected by Lessenich, because the discourse of activeness is not restricted to conventional policy areas such as labour market or unemployment, but rather infused to various fields in social policy such as public education, health care, long-term care, and welfare provision in old age (Lessenich, 2011: 312), it broadens our lens and include different areas as fields to study citizen-ship from this perspective.

2.3. Neoliberalism and Citizenship

2.3.1. Neoliberal Policies and Social Citizenship

Today, we might no longer be living in an imperial or colonial world where one state is subject to the rule of another, but under the ultimate order of neoliberalism. States are subjected to this regulatory regime and consequently, citizens are inevitably exposed to the rigours of this greater system within which their states are incorporated. In the light of the basic policy framework of this neoliberal system, there are some significant points to be raised

regarding the citizenship regime wherever this order exists. Indeed, as Hindess puts it,

‘in order to understand the character of citizenship in the modern world, it is necessary to locate it as a part of supranational governmental regime in which the system of states, international agencies and multinational corporations play a fundamental role’ (Hindess, 2002: 127)

Not only individual states *per se*, but also the citizen subjects of states are increasingly subject to the rigours of the neoliberal market system.

Marshall addressed Western democracies as the ideal sites to enjoy full citizenship rights, where the evolution has been in the exact order and finalized with social rights as the end of the chain. While social rights have been comparatively more developed in Western states than in more peripheral countries, they have been exposed to considerable pressure since the 1980s with the neoliberalization trend (Hindess, 2005: 254). The restructuring of the economy have brought about a new outlook on the question of redistribution. In other words, how to distribute risks and gains of the economy and whose stakes should be central in this reformulation became a new question. It is usually this transition period from welfare to neoliberalism that most scholars identify as the era when social rights started losing ground as necessitated by the priorities in the neoliberal agenda. When Keynesian demand-oriented and government-initiated policies were replaced with more private sector aligned programmes, the citizenship, especially the social aspect of citizenship became ‘pressing theoretical issue’ in the light of new contextual challenges (Turner, 1994: 220). Against the purported contradiction between market

rights and social rights, Marshall defended the idea that there is a ‘delicate balance’ between them, and that the rise of the social rights in the twentieth century did not eliminate but rather kept the market within its limits (Marshall, 1992[1963]). However, what he once defined as the delicate balance seems to be rapidly and increasingly distorted against social rights due to the neoliberalization process, which relies heavily upon reduced government social spending. A consideration regarding social rights are regarded as just another policy option for a government, and estimated spending, on such things as education, healthcare or environmental quality are deemed as and debated in terms of their possible relative costs and benefits (McCluskey, 2003: 794). In a sense the success of the neoliberal project lies in its ability to construct a vision on these calculations and preferences that undermines social rights as natural and inevitable. This leads to the emergence of the conflict between the fundamental values of citizenship and the theoretical and practical necessities of neoliberalism.

As stated before, citizenship defines relationships between society, state and what rights and obligations the individuals constituting the society have. Within this simplified picture, dilemma between redistribution (as an element that fundamentally concerns social citizenship) and economic efficiency emerges as one of the major problematics in the relationship between neoliberalism and citizenship. On the surface, the free market is by definition the system and sphere where the overall well-being of society along with individual freedom can take place and be maximized. And, accordingly, the neoclassical-economics-originated neoliberal view claims to trim the role

of state so that the individuals can enjoy their freedom and make their choices freely without any artificial state intervention. In this vision -in line with classical liberal thought- since individuals are presumed to be free when they can actualize their rational self interests, the citizens' primary role in neoliberalism is assumed to be to maximize their interests in the form of buyers and sellers in market. Therefore, the basic attitude towards social well-being is generally oriented towards constituting an environment where individuals can pursue and maximize their interests and preferences in this 'free' sphere of the market system, since state act is regarded both as an infringement upon individuals' freedom, and an intervention to the effective working of the market. Accordingly, public policies in neoliberal systems prioritize the flawless working of the market system, rather than enlarging the societal pie (McCluskey, 2003: 787). Consequently, channelling economic resources partially to what is deemed fundamental social services to be provided by the state such as health, housing and education, are considered to damage basic liberal values of equality and freedom of individuals and free market, as these should be already under the responsibility of the individual. Besides, since free market is by definition the field where social well-being is originated, the very idea of redistribution is a threat to the overall social well-being for risking individual freedom and the operation of the market. This creates the fundamental distinction between social equity and economic efficiency, where the distribution of resources are traded off at the expense of the former.

Related to this emerging dilemma between redistribution and efficiency, the size and scope of social policy in general have evidently been influenced by the neoliberal policy agenda, bringing forward the transformation of social security systems, strategies such as privatization of basic state services, deregulation in the field of labour and accordingly flexibilization of labour markets, cuts in public expenditures on health, education, pensions etc., and decrease in the power of organized labour. The conflict is probably most notable in the labour market leading to a structural change in employment relations involving the structural unemployment and flexibilization of the employment through the general trend of flexibilization (Standing, 1999). The power relations were also irreversibly changed in favour of the employers in bargaining relations. The effect of these changes can also be seen in the measures of poverty and social exclusion as labour market changes are seen to be promoting social exclusion that it understood as undermining people's access to social rights and recognition as citizens (Roche, 2002: 74).

As such, especially the social component of citizenship rights has been increasingly defined in relation to the norms of the free market at the expense of the consolidation of property or consumer rights. In this environment the concept of citizenship is argued to have lost its true meaning, where social rights are increasingly undermined and the entitlements are dictated through the logic of the market (Öniş and Türem, 2002).

2.3.2. Neoliberal Governmentality and the Citizen-Subject

In searching for the relationship between citizen-ship and the process of subjectification, asking a few questions related to this process is essential to link the conceptual relevance of both. Lemke's set of questions can back up this endeavour to establish this, which basically asks:

‘How do liberal forms of government make use of corporeal techniques and forms of self-guidance, how do they form interests, needs, and structures of preference? How do present technologies model individuals as active and free citizens, as members of self-managing communities and organizations, as autonomous actors who are in the position—or at least should be—to rationally calculate their own life risks? In neoliberal theories, what is the relationship between the concept of the responsible and rational subject and that of human life as human capital?’ (Lemke, 2011: 178).

The attention of Lemke and many other governmentality scholars' attention are drawn to the ways in which new citizen subjectivities are conditioned through neoliberalization processes, and how individuals respond to this process in different spheres of their lives. Central to these discussions are how certain neoliberal ideals are taken up, reproduced or altered in certain times and places (Peck and Tickell, 2002) and, in accordance with this, what usually comes to the forefront is the shifting of responsibilities from (state) institutions to citizens by ‘recommending’ them to meet their own needs, well-being, integrity and security in that way, highlighting individual responsibility and rationality vis-à-vis various different situations faced.

In terms of the foremost characteristics of the political-economic identity of the subjecthood, the literature elaborates on the market-compatible trait of neoliberal subjects by asserting that ‘the key feature of neo-liberal rationality is the congruence it endeavours to achieve between a responsible and moral individual and an economic-rational actor’ (Lemke, 2001: 197). For Sparke, it might as well be described as ‘responsible and moral’ citizen, as neoliberal governmental practices busily and constantly feeds into a new and more market-mediated citizenship regime of economic and rational actors by locating normative individuality into national citizenship (Sparke, 2006: 6). Drawing on Lemke’s argument, Brown highlights a similar aspect of neoliberal governmentality as it ‘normatively constructs and interpellates individuals as entrepreneurial actors in every sphere of life’ (Brown, 2003). The new mode of governmentality through which people are governed and govern themselves appears in the discourse of entrepreneurialism, responsibility and expectation from citizens to act like rational economic actors. By reframing individuals as agents that should not expect of relying on state but rather be rational economic actors, the dominant form of identity was defined in relation to their attitudes vis-à-vis the state in the axis of docility, responsibility and industriousness. So, central to this reconstitution of political-economic identity was a responsible, hardworking individual, who is able to cope with insecurities individually (Larner, 1997). Thus, it was with the consolidation of the responsible, docile and non-resisting individual as a key political-economic identity, together with governmental mechanisms designed to give expression to this particular understanding of self.

One of the primary trademarks of the Foucauldian literature is its problematizing attitude towards authority and the relation it creates with subjects. Here too, in order to establish this link going from subjection to 'citizen subject', we need to invoke this problematic relation between modern authority and subjects, and to look at how authority utilizes individual freedoms in the way to domination and subjection. In that respect, it is such a Janus faced picture where both freedom is a condition for subjection and also subjection is a condition for freedom. It is the former in the sense that the exercise of authority presumes individuals as free subjects with its desires, needs, interests and choices. It is the latter in that acting freely requires subjects to be shaped, guided and moulded with a certain rationality and the discourse of responsibility in the first place (Dean, 2010: 193). In other words, the impossibility of direct command and control in modern governments necessitated to govern through freedoms by prompting individuals to govern themselves and give them incentives to act in a particular way and consider themselves as free subjects. So, it is through a particular rationality and the practices rooted in it that subjects are generated, and where the act of subjectivation becomes possible by evoking and legitimizing certain images of the self. That certain method is how we can build the conceptual affinity or link between being a (good/ideal) subject to being a (good/ideal) citizen, as in this way people are addressed in many ways –as political activists concerned about problems and future, as artists defining themselves through their creativity, as students or civil servants with their industriousness and/or obedience- within which to be invoked as citizens aware of their duties,

responsibilities and rights can be listed as one category. The process also functions dialectically as these people have internalized their subject positions and will articulate themselves accordingly as citizens, activists, artists, and so on. So, becoming a subject always means ‘actualizing certain subject-positions and dispensing with others (...) being addressed in a certain way as a subject, understanding oneself as a subject, and working on oneself in alignment with this self-understanding’ (Bröckling, Krasmann and Lemke; 2011: 14), where the image of a ‘good’ citizen is one category of self understanding in this subjecthood.

The discourse of risk is another element that makes the literature on subjectification parallel to that of citizenship at the micro level. In what Ulrich Beck (1992) calls ‘risk society’, risks are induced and introduced by modernization and unlike the case of the unified welfare state, it is individuals that are expected to deal with the insecurities and hazards that they face. Through discontinuous and fragmented agencies, which are defined as ‘technologies of agency’ by Mitchell Dean, ‘at risk’ and ‘high risk’ groups such as victims of crime, smokers, abused children, gay men, drug users, and the unemployed, are transformed into active citizens that are deemed capable and responsible to handle the risks which are to become self-managing, to transform their status and to manage their own risks (Dean, 2010: 196-198). Guarding against risks becomes an option and a commodity for individuals, which has its market where the protections are bought and sold. Individuals, families, households, and communities are responsabilized in relation to the risks of poverty, unemployment, illness or poor educational performance, and

minimizing these risks become a choice in the hand of these individuals, who are usually turned into clients and users of relevant services. This situation is called as 'new prudentialism' by O'Malley (1992, cited in Dean, 2010: 194), a regime of government in which active citizens are expected to add monitoring of any sort of risks to their area of responsibility. In this manner, a continuous line can be envisaged from subjecthood to target population (as risk groups) and from target population to a subject citizen, with respect to the self-understanding implanted.

The rationality of authority and the values promoted by it (competition, individualization, micro-entrepreneurship etc.) are read by Foucault as an attempt to create 'docile bodies' (Foucault, 1984: 182) that internalize and do not question the power and its values, and that always turn to themselves and hold themselves to account when faced with an undesired situation. Such a strategy of rendering individual subjects responsible and shifting the responsibilities for social risks such as illness, unemployment, poverty, etc. turns human life into a domain in which (social) problems become a matter of self care (Lemke, 2001: 201). This problematic becomes most visible in the domains of (un)employment and poverty, since neoliberal system limits them to the realm of individual responsibility and views them as failures of individuals. In consistency with the neoliberal strategy that holds individual responsible and accountable for their actions and well-being, individual success or individual failure is interpreted in connection with the entrepreneurial virtues or personal failings (not investing enough in one's own human capital, or not having enough responsibility and industrious effort),

rather than being attributed to any systemic aspect. When particular problems arose in society, like poverty or unemployment, it is considered to be because people failed in their lack of effort, discipline, flexibility or competitive strength, turning the contemporary neoliberal world into a Darwinian like place, where only the fittest should and do survive (Harvey, 1995: 157). Beside the portrayal of poverty as such serves to cast this problem as non-political, non-ideological and technical, and one has to follow the prescriptions laid out in order to find a way out of it.

The impact of neoliberalism on citizenship at the macro level was discussed mostly with reference to the demise of social rights as it is the area where the direct impact of neoliberalization process is most visible. At the micro level, we can think of the relationship between the two as one between two small and big cogwheels, the movements of which depend on other. More concretely, individuals internalize the market related 'facts' and developments, as well as the values and norms associated with the working of the free market, and bring their internalization of these norms to their micro level with an alignment of macro imperatives, which is confirmed by their prudential, responsible, risk-managing and entrepreneurial acts. So, macro policies of 'shrinking' the state are complemented with the techniques that remake the citizen subjects as free, self-managing, and self-enterprising individuals in different spheres of everyday life such as health, education, bureaucracy, the professions, and so on (Rose, 1999: 27-28). So, when we speak of a citizen subject in neoliberalism, it should not imply a citizen in the mainstream sense with claims of a nation-state, territory and entitlements, but

a self-enterprising citizen subject who is compelled to become an entrepreneur of himself or herself (Gordon, 1991: 43-44). The formation of a citizen subject as such is not peculiar to advanced liberal democracies, where the praxis of neoliberalism is likewise highly developed too. Rather, it is embedded in multiple global sites thanks to the effort of international agencies promoting neoliberal values such as the World Bank for they prescribe notions like ‘political entrepreneurialism’ or lifelong learning and expertise in developing countries to encourage citizens to self-manage and not lose their competitive skills (Ong, 2006: 14).

This leads many governmentality scholars to concur that citizenship in the conventional sense is being disarticulated and mutated in many respects, in which the economic logic become the defining feature. The must elements inherent in conventional citizenship theory (e.g. citizenship rights, entitlements, territoriality and nation) are maybe not losing their ground totally, but gradually replaced by new elements associated with the neoliberal criteria and the above-mentioned virtues that are related to subjecthood. For Ong, these are the values linked to human capital or expertise that are gained through investing in oneself. For instance, an individual who possesses a ‘valuable’ human capital and expertise, a sportsman or an academician, can exercise citizenship-like claims in diverse locations, regardless of the nation or territory (Ong, 2006: 6). So, it is more about the tradable attributes that one has than the conventional notions on citizenship that a subject has a more likelihood of being positioned as a citizen.

The need to go beyond legal structures and usual definitions in discussing citizenship at the micro level brings forward another necessity to think of citizenship as a mechanism to promote one type of individual over the other, and exclude that 'other' in approaching individuals and communities. Just like some identities, cultures or communities gain privileged positions in nation-building process, in this 'mutated' form of citizenship a certain model of individual is addressed and encouraged by setting apart some citizen subjects and portraying the latter group as the other in a secondary position. The exclusion and approval of individuals and communities is realized by assessing the neoliberal traits of individuals such as performance, skills, responsibility, industriousness and so forth. The citizen who are considered to be complacent, lacking the entrepreneurial or another type of neoliberal virtue and potential can sometimes be treated as less-worthy subjects and are rendered excludable, whereas the calculative practices and self-governing, self-sufficient subjects treated as preferred citizens (Ong, 2006: 16). The occasional exclusionary practices as such is what detach citizenship from its classical meaning –as legal status, membership to a political community, loyalty to a nation and territory etc. and redefines it at the micro level with reference to the marketable talents and acquired entitlements.

While promoting one type of individual as a model to society, a boundary is drawn between two clashing categories: between those who harbours these values and those lacking this potential; between the citizen subjects who are entrepreneur, active, responsible and hard working, and

those who are irresponsible, selfish, expedient and lazy subjects. The most obvious example was the era of Thatcher governments, when the ‘two nations project’ was carried out by clashing two sides consisting of the people complying with the neoliberal logic on the one hand, and those who did not on the other. In our present day, governmentality revolves around managing these boundaries and antagonisms demarcated between the passive and the active, the mobile and the immobile, and the good and the bad, and indeed the management of it is occasionally in the service of political authority to utilize the clashes in society and, at the same time, constitutes a functional contribution to the mobility regime of capitalist economies (Lessenich, 2011: 315-16). In Foucault’s words, the ‘the dividing practices’ through which ‘the subject is divided inside himself or divided from the others’ can be considered as an instrument to distinguish ‘the mad and the sane, sick and healthy, the criminals and the good boys’ (Foucault, 1982: 208), and as a vehicle to facilitate the governing of societies.

The mechanism of inclusion and exclusion also takes place at the juncture of competency to be a citizen. The subordinated and suspected outlook on the question of redistribution of resources leads to an ambivalent understanding of individuals that distinguishes them as those who are competent to be a citizen and those who are not in accordance with their market activity. With the idea that social good will be granted by maximizing the reach and frequency of market transactions and thus, by attempting to ‘bring all human action into the domain of the market’ (Harvey, 2005: 3), citizenship and citizen-ness become meaningful when human actions

practiced within this boundaries of the market, be it as buyer, seller or consumer. Valuing market activities leads to the emergence of conflicting categories as citizens and subordinate citizens in which the latter is deemed lacking the capacity of being a proper citizen by acting incapable of taking responsibility and thus conducting ‘freedom’ (McCluskey, 2003: 789).

2.4. Concluding Remarks

Appealing to the broad and challenging terms as neoliberalism and citizenship in one-dimensional and mainstream way inevitably confines our understandings to certain moulds and thus limits our vision in comprehending the unique characteristics of these phenomena. What I attempt to do in this chapter was to get beyond these limiting stances and to offer alternative ways of thinking in studying the relation between the two. Therefore, I examined these two broad concepts together, neoliberalism and citizenship by looking at the impacts of the former on the latter and giving categorical and theoretical insights on both. By taking neoliberalism both as set of policies and practices related to the basic premises of free market functioning (macro) and as mode of governmentality (micro), an enriched analysis of citizenship through the framework of social rights and subject constitution becomes possible.

Approaching neoliberalism as a policy framework while studying citizenship of course gives us new insight for it allows opening up new space for seeing the political economic dimension of citizenship, especially of its social dimension. That side was conceptualized as the ‘macro’ aspect of

neoliberalism implying the consequences of fundamental neoliberal policies on the exercise of social rights. In doing that while acknowledging and accepting the criticisms on weaknesses and insufficiencies in explaining the citizenship in contemporary period for it reproduces the nation statehood in global era, Marshall's conception of social rights in his citizenship rights typology was picked for I think the categories within social rights as he delineates can still help to explain the impacts of neoliberal policies. This will be better understood in the following chapter based on the experience of Turkey. What can be concluded concerning this part is the change in the priorities of privileges, and losing ground of social rights at the expense of smoother functioning of the market system.

Neoliberal governmentality on the other hand is what makes the analysis more peculiar as the constitution of neoliberal subject element within the theory allows for moving beyond the existing structure within citizenship studies, letting think more comprehensively in assuming citizen as the subject of governing activity. By means of employing this approach as a background, I discussed the ways through which the citizen is reconstituted in line with neoliberal rationality that consists of promoting a hard working, risk-taking, responsible, competitive individual. For a more concrete analysis of both, macro and micro level neoliberalism will be contextualized through the application of these frameworks to Turkey. The following part provides the first step of putting theories into a context with reference to the neoliberalization process in Turkey and how it is reflected on the main pillars of social rights.

CHAPTER III:

NEOLIBERAL POLICIES AND SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP IN TURKEY

The issues of identity and debates on cultural rights came to dominate the contemporary discussions within citizenship studies in the last years. Especially when the demands of identity blossomed and became more visible following the end of the Cold War, deliberations on citizenship has followed an entirely different direction. This being the case, the political economic aspect of citizenship was ignored to a considerable extent and it is generally taken up as an isolated problem from the developments within the market system. In the light of what is theoretically discussed in the previous chapter, the following sections adapt the objective of revealing this market system and citizenship relationality by looking at the developments in Turkey. To this aim, the specific focus will be on the question of how neoliberalization process was developed in Turkey at the macro level –in terms of policy framework- and what the implications of this process on citizenship regime in Turkey might be, which is answered with reference to three areas of social rights: social security, poverty and labour relations. The main interest will be

the extent to which neoliberal policies has had an impact on the exercise of given categories within social rights, and accordingly the key aim is to provide an analysis of these policy changes and new orientations in the given fields without making a normative proposal of what should (have) be(en). Therefore, the chapter will adopt the framework presented in the previous chapter to Turkey by first looking at the neoliberalization process in Turkey, and secondly relating the impacts of these policy shifts to given areas that regarded in social rights.

3.1. The Neoliberalization Process

Before discussing the penetration of the neoliberal agenda in Turkey and scrutinizing the milestones of transition to neoliberalism, a crucial notice should be raised with respect to the non-uniformity of neoliberalization processes in different places. What we commonly seem to know or read about neoliberalism and its common principles on transitions from welfare to neoliberalism is peculiar to the Western experience (neoliberalization processes in Europe and North America), and these are usually recounted as general and universal phases on the way to neoliberalization in the 1980s and tend to shape our understanding of the neoliberalization process in a homogenous way. However, when the intention is to look at the localized experiences of neoliberalism, in which there is a heterogeneity of Western political, social norms/institutions and that country's own historical/cultural/political peculiarity, we need to alter our lenses from

conventional understandings to more culturally, historically and locally sensitive tools to comprehend the substance of the processes these countries experience differently from their counterparts. In that respect, conceptual reference to the ‘variegated neoliberalisms’ framework can facilitate thinking about the Turkish case differently from those dominant narrations.

In studies dealing with neoliberalism and neoliberalization processes, there is usually a tendency to refer to it as a standardized process where there is a certain path in adopting its rules and regulations. However, for a better understanding of the unique aspects of neoliberalization processes, it is crucial to position what we read in abstract terms as distinct neoliberal models and hence acknowledge that there are not one but varieties of neoliberalism, in which the U.S under Reagan and the U.K under Thatcher governments represent a case rather than the model itself and are used as the coordinates to map the content of the neoliberalization process (Peck, 2004: 393). For instance, the debate on the hollowing out of state institutions with neoliberalism, as was discussed in the first chapter, is usually made with reference to Western experiences, where once existing traditions and practices of the welfare state was to be replaced by a set of regulations which allegedly introduces the abolition of state-sponsored services and provisions by pioneering market-based ones. In areas where the pre-neoliberal political economy framework was not determined by welfare principles but varied from developmentalism to socialism (i.e. some Latin American countries), this crude generalization loses its homogeneous ground. Different experiences of neoliberalism that address the geographically distinctive and diverse nature

of state-market relations as such indicate the need for a reconsideration of the notion with a more heterogeneous and pluralizing attitude. Taking these peculiarities into account is also crucial in that it can show how local patterns of state-society relations interact with the neoliberal transitions (Fourcade-Gourinchas and Babb, 2002), the combination of which might shift the direction towards different paths and expose different tendencies such as authoritarianism in the case of Latin America and Turkey.

If the articulations on neoliberalism take the hybridity of cases into account and attempt to be context-sensitive, they can partially overcome the challenge of linking local elements and neoliberal premises in general by pluralizing and decentralizing the definitions of it (Peck and Theodore, 2007). Since Turkey is no exception to this hybridity in terms of the political-economic past, assessing the neoliberalization process in Turkey from this lens in conjunction with its pre-neoliberal political economy environment, experiences and evolutions will help in understanding the neoliberalization-related processes in Turkey in an analytical way. Before beginning, stating the possibility of finding divergences as well as striking commonalities between the different experiences in comparative exercises (Öniş, 2006: 240) is essential for a more healthy analysis.

Turkey's encounter and experience with neoliberalism should be treated in a similar vein, as it also has its peculiarities in terms of the social and political past, which make its record on economic history a rugged one. The Turkish experiment, which is regarded as one of the early cases of neoliberal restructuring within the global wave of neoliberalization, was identified as a

success story in its initial phases in the 1980s, along with some other Latin American examples. In that respect, Turkey and Latin American countries (especially Argentina; Öniş, 2006) as peripheral economies, are often compared in their journeys to neoliberalism, especially with respect to their bittersweet experiences of this path (crisis, booms, involvement of military authorities, etc.) due to the peculiarity in their pre-neoliberal eras.

The Turkish experience of capitalism has taken the form of neoliberalism for nearly thirty years. Turkey's involvement in the world neoliberal order started in the early 1980s with the shift from import substitution-industrialization to an export-oriented economy, the conditions of which were provided through the 1980 military coup. By aiming to dissolve the chaotic social and political atmosphere and any sort of opposition at the time, the coup paved the way to the political and social order needed, somewhat reminding of Hayek's contention that a transition to the free market may sometimes require dictatorship (Coşar and Yeğenoğlu, 2009), which have been the case in Turkey as well as in many Latin American countries. For a deeper understanding of the dynamics of this transition period, the following part will give a brief outline of the prominent developments in the political economy environment in Turkey before and after 1980, which can be considered a turning point for Turkish political economic history.

In order to facilitate an analytical comprehension of the shifts in Turkish political economy, it is possible to analyze it in two main periods as the pre- and post- 1980. Until that time, and more particularly from the early 1960 to 1980, Turkey followed an industrialization strategy through import-

substitution policies and mainly oriented to domestic markets, which was accompanied by a series of government Development Plans (Aktan, 1997; Keyder, 1987). Through additional policy mechanisms such as state involvement, protectionism and regulated markets, this framework was strengthened (Şener, 2004: 7) until the local bourgeoisie declared their solution following the observed economic shortcomings of this strategy, causing a crises both in the social and political areas. The solution was supported also by leading international economic actors such as World Bank and IMF, that they proposed an economic transformation towards export-oriented liberal economic model.

In explaining the inception of the neoliberalization process in Turkey, what is generally referred to as the point of departure is the ‘January 24 Decisions’ (a set of economic regulations prior to coup) which was to be applied in a politically unstable and socially devastated country as Turkey. This package of economic stability measures was adopted with the aim of overcoming the gradually worsening economic problems. Its content is enough to consider it a manifestation of a new phase in Turkish political economy: It increased interest rates, and eliminated multiple exchange rates and price inspections, provided regulations to stimulate foreign direct investment, liberalized import rules and, most significantly, reduced the provision of basic goods and services (Coşar and Yeğenoğlu, 2009: 1). It overall brought about an export-oriented growth strategy by liberalizing of financial markets, introducing export-promotion, putting supply and demand system into practice in foreign exchange markets. This strategy not prepared

only by Turkish bureaucrats and politicians, but rather drafted with the support and under the supervision of the IMF and the World Bank (Balkan and Savran, 2002: xv). It was also hailed in these international financial, political and business circles as a turning point, as well as by the domestic bourgeoisie, as it signified a radical change both in the articulation mode of Turkish economy with the world economy and in the nature of the state-economy relationship (Yalman, 2009).

The coup of September 12 1980 was the finalizing act for the integration of Turkey with the international capital. Such large scale transformation could not have been achieved with the prevailing conditions, so the use of authority, along with the involvement of the major actors of market-oriented restructuring (World Bank and IMF), was needed for this total transformation to be ensured. January 24 decisions and the military coup as the facilitating step, were the total and most decisive attempt to launch the neoliberal agenda in Turkey, the measures of which required the organized workforce to be suppressed and deprived of their existing rights and privileges.

In the absence of any opposing sector in civil society, the military coup of 1980 located Turkey to the onset of neoliberalism without any resistance. The newly balanced and reshaped state began to implement economic measures that are appropriate for the requirements of big capital (Ercan, 2002: 25), both at the local and international level. By adopting the neoliberal agenda to its economy, Turkey became vulnerable to instability in the form of high interest rates, big trade deficits, short-term money flows,

rapid debt increases, devaluations, and gradually two big economic crises (Ertuğrul and Yeldan, 2003). The old domestic orientation was replaced with outward-looking global strategy which, as a consequence, brought about rapid increase in foreign trade, deregulation, privatization, price and interest rate liberalization and, most importantly, decreasing social service expenditures (Balkan & Savran, 2002: xv), through which the established relations between the state and its citizens were effected most in terms of social rights.

The new framework set in motion was reflecting the interests of the global capital representatives, and it was successful to the extent that it allied their cause with the domestic bourgeoisie. As a result, the neoliberal orientation consolidated the hegemony of global classes, prioritizing what was inherent to the emergent global order and what it consequently required. This caused local and global links to be redefined in such a way that the relation between state and society was renegotiated and the nexus between economy and society was restructured in accordance with this global setting (Emrence, 2008: 52). For Turkey, like most of the Western and Latin American world, while it is true that the penetration of neoliberal policies dates back to the early 1980s, the overall process in the last three decades have shown a consistency in a way that the neoliberal form of capitalism managed to renew and reproduce itself at breaking points and, hence, guaranteed the continuity of the neoliberal order for better or worse. In Turkey and elsewhere, even when the studied object is a given country or a case, one cannot analyze specific country experiences on the evolution of neoliberalisms and neoliberalism-related issues independently from how it has changed globally

over time, since the developments in these spheres are very closely interrelated. Having said this, the neoliberalization trend in Turkey is not immune from its general course in the world, and it cannot be looked at independently from its several reformulations following its ups and downs, crises and booms. After three years under military rule, the neoliberalization process continued with no interruption under the Motherland Party, which won the first post-coup elections in 1983, and with different coalition governments was sustained during the late 80s and throughout the 1990s. However, the 1990s were the years of turbulence. Due to widespread political and economic corruption and global crises of capital –mainly related to the East Asian financial crisis- Turkey experienced a massive instability throughout the 1990s, resulting from both its economic and political setting. Inevitable consequences were the two major crises of 1999 and in 2001, both of which brought active relations between the IMF and Turkey onto the scene. Looking at the period from 2002 onwards, the years under AKP governments can be seen as an extension of these attempts to carry out the neoliberal agenda, where the inherent measures of neoliberalism were continuously put into practice.

The continuity dimension of neoliberalism therefore emerges as one point that could be raised here, even though the process can be analyzed by looking at subsequent decades or dividing them into different periods within certain rationality. Regardless of the methodology employed, what one commonly sees in this process is that different governments throughout this course either readily adopted or had to abide by neoliberal measures (Coşar

and Yeğenoğlu, 2009: 1). Boratav's study (2009) is one example that supports this continuity argument by suggesting that the neoliberalization process since 1980s have witnessed three major circuits: the first one from 1989 to 1998, the second from 1999 to 2001 and the last one being from 2002 to 2007. He defines these circuits with reference to the annual rates of change in capital flows of the main blocs of the world economy, the outcomes of which affect the status of peripheral economies to a large extent. These cyclic moves start by following the peak of the previous period and consists of two phases, the one being the stagnation and the other being the revival periods (ibid: 1). The last of these circuits covers the years between 1998-2007, the recession/stagnation of which corresponds to 1998-2001 and the revival is 2002-2007. Likewise, Yalman and Bedirhanoğlu (2010) concur on this continuity argument, yet from a different point of view. They argue that it is the authoritarian form of neoliberalism that has persisted from the 1980s onwards through the AKP era; enhancing the state-class relations whereas the party has claimed to shift this setting to a more democratic environment. Hence, AKP reproduces neoliberal authoritarianism in Turkey through powerful articulation of economic, political and cultural processes blended with Islamist/conservative form, a viewpoint that can constitute a background for the current circumstances in social security, especially poverty reduction methods in the following part.

In that respect it becomes more noticeable why one can associate the last 10 years passed with AKP economic policies and its general performance with the changing conditions in global economic settings. AKP governments

have been the late-implementers of the IMF agreements that continued from 1998 onwards. Since its initial years the economic policies are formed within the framework of previous IMF packages and agreements, it can be considered as instance of above-mentioned continuity argument. By Independent Social Researchers (Bağımsız Sosyal Bilimciler), the period was described as ‘different governments, single politics’ (Bağımsız Sosyal Bilimciler, 2007), when it comes to the economic and social fields. Considering that the revival period of last circuit corresponds to the first five years of consecutive AKP governments, it is hard to think of a better time for a government to take over power in a peripheral economy. This continuity element constitutes an important outlook as far as the following parts on the implementation of social policies concerned, since I will mostly refer to the policy changes during AKP era as the latest and most decisive period in carrying out the neoliberal agenda.

3.2. The Status of Social Citizenship under Neoliberal Rule

The social sphere is the extension of these economic mechanisms, in which the reflections of the ups and downs of the market sphere is most clear. With the implementation of the Hayekian ideal of transforming each and every field of society into the free market, the spread of this rationality has marked the period after 1980. Especially for the Turkish context, the toughest impacts of the neoliberalization process were observed in the field of social policies. On the other hand, as the income inequality got deepened due to deepening unjust

income distribution, the need to recognize poverty as a social problem became inevitable due to the substantial levels it reached.

Therefore, these three fields –social security, poverty and labour market- have been chosen for both constituting the backbone of the exercise of social rights, and for being the areas where political-economic transformations are at their clearest. For example, social security system is believed to be the most indicative of the level of social rights in a given country. Likewise, poverty is significant especially for whether the way it is perceived is more inclined towards regarding it as social and collective problem or not, and thus the method chosen to alleviate it indicates under the responsibility of whom, which is crucial to understand the characteristics of a social rights regime. And lastly, I deem the field of labour central for two reasons, the first of which is its weight within the notion of social rights since it is conceptualized under this category in a Marshallian sense with the elements it covers such as right to enter into the workforce, unionize and strike not only as the worker right but as fundamental social rights in general. Secondly, with a more operational orientation, this category is selected as it makes the most sense within the scope of this thesis, especially as far as the next chapter is concerned. While commonly having been acknowledged within the scope of social rights category, these three components are of great significance in laying the foundations of, as well as constituting the prerequisite for enjoying other crucial rights.

As for how to proceed analyzing, by focusing on the reform stemming from the concern to comply with neoliberal agenda, I will look at the pre- and

post- social security reform settings and question what might have been the implication of these changes for the exercise of basic social rights. I will move more generally in terms of the poverty framework and focus more on to the contemporary forms of poverty and the way it is tried to be handled. By assuming the current government to be typical implementer of neoliberal framework, I will ask whether poverty alleviation methods contradict with the idea of social rights or not. Concluding with labour, I will examine how this critical component of social rights have been suppressed after the 1980s and connect this trend to the contemporary time by looking at the new labour law brought for flexibility, union politics and unemployment.

Before proceeding, I think it is important to give a rough picture of the general status of social rights in general for Turkey. However, while doing this, it is equally critical not to reiterate ‘strong state’ or ‘centre-periphery’ type of dichotomies that reproduce the state-civil society or state centricism (Yalman, 2002), while talking about the underdevelopment of social rights in comparison to social welfare states in the West. Having said that, it would not be wrong to suggest that the realization of social rights was indeed limited in Turkey before the inception of the neoliberalization process, in contrast to those European countries where social rights were operated more comprehensively. As far as particularly the social security regime is concerned, due to its cultural, historical and social specificities, it is hard to locate Turkey as belonging to either group of welfare countries, or to the Middle Eastern models. For some scholars, in speaking of the social security regime in general, there has not been a proper welfare regime in Turkey as in

the Western context (Elveren, 2008; Özdemir and Yücesan-Özdemir, 2008). Rather, Turkey is a hybrid model that can mostly be regarded as an example of a mixture of Middle Eastern and South European welfare regimes (Aybars and Tsarouhas, 2010: 747), or ‘quasi-social welfare state’ (Özdemir and Yücesan-Özdemir: 2004) or ‘eclectic social state’ that was dismantled, which can best be described with reference to the Bismarckian formal social security system incorporating informality and clientelism (Buğra and Candaş, 2011: 516) and, thus, giving way to dualist and exclusionary practices with constituencies covered by diverse programs and institutions. Additionally, social rights in what is referred as ‘indirect and minimalist welfare regimes’ such as Turkey are not composed of objective, institutionalized and clear-cut rules, but rather tied to discretionary administrative decisions that are politically manipulated and unsustainable (Arın, 2002: 75).

Prior to the neoliberalization process in the early-1980s, two decisive moments in terms of social policy setting can be identified, the first of which corresponds to early republican era, and second covers the period from the post World War Two 1980. In the early republican period, parallel to the conditions at the given time of a newly established country, there were the attempts of keeping poverty under control with social and political concerns and thus the ruling elite tried to keep poverty at the countryside and dealt more with the urban poverty and keep it under control. Needless to say, there were no institutionalized forms of social security, and traditional forms of solidarity and voluntary initiatives were widely appealed as a way to deal with social problems.

International developments in the post World War Two era has allowed for both the multi party system and the establishment of formal security structure in Democrat Party period, although it covered the small portion of society. But it was mostly the informal pact that governed the relation between state and society, in which “opportunities available to the masses to avoid destitution and to integrate in society were situated in a particular “moral economy” framework” (Buğra, 2007: 36).

These peculiar characteristics, in which the role of informal ties in solving different social problems is important, makes it difficult to place Turkey in the map of social security regime. For instance, though in the field of poverty the elements of clientelism were observed, the dominant approach towards this social problem can be characterized as shaped by traditional forms of solidarity and family relations (Buğra, 2008).

As far as labour is concerned, studies usually identify the 1960s as a positive and distinguished period in terms of the level of constitutional guarantee of economic and social rights (Öke, 2011: 228). For instance, the constitution recognized not only the right to organize both for workers and employers, but also collective bargaining as well as participation in strikes and lock outs. In the meantime, the role and the importance of trade unions increased considerably in society.

The application of neoliberal policies did not introduce an immediate change in the size and scope of state expenditures, unlike dominant viewpoints on neoliberalism. As was put forward in the previous chapter, contrary to the widely discussed idea that the state’s role and scope shrinks by

adopting neoliberal policies, the state keeps its manoeuvring area and uses its choices and resources in the service of the market benefits. In Turkey, this has been the case too. Rather than getting minimized, state expenditures and investment on infrastructure services rapidly increased in the Motherland Party era (Buğra, 2008: 198). The state's approach towards social rights generally and to social security particularly, was shaped mostly in the late-1980s in line with the requirements of the neoliberalization process, and not only did it show a consistency in terms of the rationale, but also developed by adding up different initiatives throughout the process. The AKP government, as the typical and periodical representative of this neoliberal order and rationality, has continued in this same line as a non-minimally-spending government. The same line of practices was appropriated in the sphere of social rights as well, and the AKP government kept its position vis-à-vis social expenditures as a common partner in the provision of social services rather than the direct provider of it. Now let us look at the impacts of the neoliberalization process on social security regime first.

3.2.1. Social Security

The social security regime of a country functions as a litmus test in showing how a country acts to regard the 'delicate balance' between market and society. Considering the prevalence of pro-market policies over social rights, a rethinking of social security emerges as a must element in relating the changes in the sphere of social rights as a fundamental part of citizenship rights. It is probably one of the clearest signals of the status of social rights

regime in a country, which provides protection to individuals against social risks especially of the labour market that arise from the nature and the working of capitalism that is based on generalized commodity production and labour power as a commodity (Arın, 2002: 73).

The social protection system in Turkey heavily relied upon social insurance system (Buğra and Keyder, 2006), which has undergone significant changes during the AKP period. Still characterized by the neoliberal principles, the pre-AKP social security environment – particularly public health and pensions system – was characterized by a pillared system whereby the working population was divided as civil servants, workers, and self-employed, peasants and farmers; which were respectively Civil Servants' Retirement Chest (Emekli Sandığı), Social Security Organization (SSK), and Bağ-Kur. Apart from these three institutions, the 'Green Card' programme as yet another health insurance component was launched in 1992, with the aim of providing health services to those left without health insurance coverage. As can be easily extracted from this, the social security system was dependent on the contributions from active workers and employers, and the state's direct contribution remained insignificant (Özdemir and Yücesan-Özdemir, 2008: 470). Besides, since it was a small segment of society that was incorporated into the formal social security system, it was not receptive towards all citizens but rather covering those who could work, and considering the occupational differentiations it makes within this labour force, it was discriminative in itself too. There was no systematic mechanism to provide social protection to those who were not direct recipients or their dependents, which made the

insurance system far from all inclusive. Its fragmentally designed aspect was not at all reflecting the equal citizenship regime, but rather established two-layered citizenship relations with people: first those who are employed and, secondly, through informal ties, those who rely on family networks of social solidarity in the case of illness, old age, unemployment, etc. (Buğra and Candaş, 2011: 519).

If we look at the more detailed account of the transformation of this social security regime in Turkey, it is possible to see the influence of the advices made by the IMF and the World Bank on the reform program that was initiated in 2003 and legalized in 2008. As part of the World Bank's new framework for what is called 'Post-Washington Consensus', the mottoes good governance, empowerment, poverty alleviation and market-friendly institutional building were introduced through a reform to deal with the fragile aspects of neoliberalism as revealed through severe crises, and Turkey became one of the first countries adopting such measures to its own policy making mechanisms. Among them, with its emphasis on keeping poverty at a sustainable level and fostering income generating measures such as vocational training, poverty alleviation initiative has constituted a significant source of inspiration in the making of the new social policy route in Turkey.

For the IMF, it was impossible to create market confidence and decrease risk margins for international capital if the transfer from budget to social security deficits amounting to 6 percent of GDP continues (Koray, 2005), the legal resolution of which could bring Turkey a new substantial loan by the IMF. The Social Security Reform enacted in 2008 has four aims

(Özdemir and Yücesan-Özdemir, 2008: 474), the first of which is to establish a new retirement insurance programme. In line with the neoliberal scheme of cutting the period in which the benefits are collected and enlarging the contribution period instead, the minimum age of retirement was increased. Under this category, different retirement incomes of working population was also tried to be alleviated, yet through weakening the legal status and benefits, rather than eliminating the status and benefit differences among different types as a whole. Secondly, the reform aimed at establishing a general health insurance system that covers the vast majority of people, which actually implied widening the share of the private insurance mechanisms in the delivery of health services. It was not a surprising act for those who are familiar with AKP's previous statements that the public share in health services should decrease considerably. In other words, by way of leaving the production and financing of the health and social security services to the market in the long run, it was an attempt of involving private insurance schemes and the private sector as an integral part of the reform. As a general requirement of the public sector functioning, the companies involved in health services too will tend to decrease the production costs by saving from the raw materials, labour costs, workplace etc., and try to maximize the prices from the contributors as much as possible, including huge amount of transfers from state, which can expectedly lead to a decrease in the quality and the amounts of the services produced. Needless to say, it clearly implied the gradual loss of meaning of the 'social' and the 'social rights'. The last two aims are interrelated in the sense that they both aimed at setting up a single institutional

structure and a social assistance system that would bring the dispersed institutional mechanism and social assistance under one umbrella.

Though the ineffectiveness and the discriminative aspect of the pre-reform system in terms of the diverse structure it entails in covering population is generally acknowledged by scholars and different authorities, attempt at reforming the social security system was interpreted as not convincing in solving the existing problems, because the orientation was rather towards taking the issue in a more consumer satisfaction-alike fashion and more as an ideological mean in getting the support of the public, who suffered long and deeply from the weaknesses of the previous social security system. It is usually argued that, far from being all-inclusive and that there have been no systematic assistance mechanisms to provide social protection for non-direct recipients and their dependents, which can be considered as the indicator of the lack of universal and all-encompassing welfare system (Bozkurt and Yalman, 2011: 2). What is, therefore, realized under the name of social security reform rather leaves a considerable portion of society outside of the scope of social security on the one hand, and narrows and limits the content of the rights of those who are covered by social security system on the other.

The ‘social’ attribute in the notion of social security has a broader meaning than implying a community of people, actually comprising the elements of equality and social justice between individuals within a society. In other words, social security is the state of rendering the ‘social’ secure against market mechanism. The rejection of all social rights of the individual

and the state of responsibility of one's own well being and security can only be individual security, but not social. While it is possible to see this approach in social security, we will also see a similar theme of individualization of responsibility in the part on poverty alleviation below.

3.2.2. Poverty

Along with socio-economic inequalities, poverty emerged as a major issue in Turkey within the context of the structural adjustment process during the last three decades (Yalman, 2011: 228). Following the realization that structural problems such as poverty cannot be overcome with the existing methods at a given market structure, the solution was also found within the same framework drawn by neoliberalism. The Post-Washington Consensus acknowledges the role to be played by the state in areas such as poverty, yet the extent was determined with reference to the market mechanisms through certain provisions by individual initiatives. So, it is the extension of the idea of 'good governance' in tackling the problem of poverty by settling on the extent of relations state establishes on different issues and with different segments of society, a situation which also finds its place within the Turkish context. It is through this framework that the perception of poverty alleviation methods emerged. The formally reformulated system of social security in accordance with the neoliberal agenda is already an indication of this, as it is, for the infiltration of neoliberal agenda to social security system.

For the content drawn for social rights given in this thesis, what is noteworthy with the current way of formulation is that the 'social' element is

not present, and that despite its recognition as a serious problem, it is tried to be overcome with an understanding that reflects a firm belief in the market economy. However, it is crucial to realize the conflicting characteristics of this approach as the actual causes of poverty stem from this very market structure. What is more significant and maybe unique to the Turkish case is that this perception is operated in conjunction with a conservative outlook inclined towards traditional forms of solidarity and social policy. Poverty alleviation emerges as the sphere in which this orientation is most apparent. Very much in line with the logic of neoliberal governance, the idea of cooperating with civil society organizations and philanthropic establishments in dealing with poverty and other major social problems became prominent in the field of poverty alleviation. So, it is from such a picture that we extract the themes of solidarity and morality as mechanisms binding and bringing together the ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ of society.

The institutional roots of this current tendency date back to the early-1990s, when there was the above-mentioned acknowledgment of the necessity for the state playing a role in dealing with poverty. In that connection, two developments in the mid-1980s early-1990s can be argued to have played a role in constituting the basis of today’s philanthropic vision (Buğra, 2008: 1999). The first of them was the establishment of the Fund for the Encouragement of Social Cooperation and Solidarity (Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışmayı Teşvik Fonu) during the Motherland Party era, and the other was the introduction of a law regulating the Green Card procedure, which would enable the poor without a health insurance to have access to health

services. The social solidarity concept enriched with the Islamic elements was immediately reflected in the institutional setting, eventually crystallizing the tension between social rights and philanthropy.

In general, philanthropy emerges as the most effectively played card by conservative and neoliberal administrations in response to poverty. Turkey is no exception to this generalization. It would not be wrong to say that philanthropic associations have recently become prominent in the fight against poverty and other social problems in Turkey. Before touching upon the details and implications of this stance, it is important to note again that the institutional backdrop of this trend was set in motion in 1986 during the Motherland Party era, with the establishment of the Fund for the Encouragement of Social Cooperation and Solidarity with the aim of providing social assistance to the poor population.

The purpose of the law founding the institution was asserted as ‘Supporting social cooperation and social solidarity is helping those citizens who are in need, and helping those who have come to Turkey for whichever reason, and distributing incomes fairly in order to institute social justice’ (quoted in Buğra and Candaş, 2011: 520). However, this fund did not play a profound role in generating effective social support mechanisms through formal social security means. Rather, it is significant to refer to it while talking about contemporary social security regime as it constitutes the organizational basis of today’s dominant philanthropy-, morality- and solidarity-based approach to solve existing social problems and poverty. In other words, it was the AKP government that would tap into this potential

much later with its inclination towards conservative ways of handling poverty¹. When compared with its counterparts in the Middle East and the rest of the world, the party is dissimilar with them in its approval of the market mechanisms and virtues in the conduct of social life. Yet, when it comes to the issues of social justice and/or personal behaviour, they share the puritanical worldview of those parties that privilege Muslim and non-Muslim religious codes (Dönmez, 2011: 69). Not only were these traditional and Islamic values highlighted, but various civil society actors and NGOs (mainly religious ones) were also incorporated as the main apparatuses in an attempt to deal with poverty. As such, the social initiatives in the field of social welfare are encouraged by making the discourse of civil society part of the neoliberal ideology. So, such a strategy entails the reconfiguration of the role to be played by the state not as the crucial agent, but as the main sponsor of the relevant policies (Yalman, 2011).

However, while outlining the major social rights initiatives and social spending in the recent periods, it is important to keep in mind the global conjuncture at the time in terms of the enunciation of the necessity of states taking responsibility in dealing with chronic poverty and unemployment as a common partner with other civil societal organizations within the framework of good governance. This general approach recognized the significance of the regulative and cooperative role of the state in continuity of the market economy, and acknowledged that the state had to take over some

¹ A reminder is needed: The reference to AKP does not imply that the main focus is specifically on the party policies on relevant problems. Rather, as indicated at the beginning of the chapter, the consecutive terms of the party are seen both as the continuation, and more importantly as the period the tenets of which can be regarded as the most overt reflection of the neoliberal mindset.

responsibilities in solving the indisputable levels of poverty. However, the biggest emphasis was on voluntarism and the role played by civil society organizations. In this new regime, therefore, the main stress has been on networks and public-private partnerships as crucial aspects of the contemporary approach to welfare (Jessop, 1999: 354), and the ‘new welfare governance’ was marked by the business partnership, social capital, religious associations and brotherhoods, and philanthropic activity in general (Bode, 2006; Smidt, 2003). With the blurring of the boundaries between the state, civil society and the private sector, what came to the forefront were the ‘traditional, socially conservative and family-preserving’ virtues (Buğra and Candaş, 2011: 517) in Turkey and elsewhere in the world. As was mentioned above, since the neoliberalization in Turkey cannot simply be put as the retreat of the state and expansion of the market within social security area too, and since the state was to play a certain role due to its social, political and economic history and to its previous social security structure, the position of the state was transformed as a partner mostly in these philanthropy-based social activities.

The discourse of philanthropy is currently used more extensively than in any other era owing to the pro-Islamic outlook of the AKP government, leading to a mobilization of civil society in providing social assistance in conformity with both the local traditions of Islamic charity and the dominant global approach to social policy which, in turn, results in a blurring of the boundaries between voluntary associations, the central administration and municipalities in terms of sharing the responsibility. Within this position,

while the amount of funds used by the central government on social assistance have declined since 2002 (Elveren, 2008), municipalities have emerged as the key players in providing social help to the poor, which included the provision of coal, food, clothing etc. that was mostly financed through charities and local riches. They became an important part of this social network consisting of Islamic and philanthropic associations. What is carried out through this collaboration is described by William Hale as follows:

Their activities include traditional Islamic charity such as providing meals for the needy through public kitchens and distributing fuel and groceries to poor families, besides establishing or equipping clinics and hospitals, providing transport and dormitories for students, distributing furniture and used clothing to the poor, and providing help in finding a job or even a spouse. (Hale, 2005: 306)

The governing party announces such activities from their ‘clean/white acts’ (AK İcraatlar) website as ‘In the course of our period in power, we have made 1 billion 95 million TL in kind and cash food aid to needy citizens, and 107 million TL in housing assistance to fifty thousand families between 2006-2010’. The big banners in the website illustrating the quote above go on with the statement that ‘For the first time in Turkey, the coal distribution to the citizens in need was achieved. Each year, we have distributed 11 million tons of coal from our national resources to approximately 2 million families’². If we leave aside the clientelistic and hierarchical language revealing itself through the discourse of asymmetrical relationship and endowment attitude as an indicator of a philanthropist state, these could best exemplify how the state

² All quotes from: <http://www.akicraatlar.com/Anasayfa/Ak-%C4%B0craatlar> (June 4)

was dissociated from the notion of the social and was transformed into an ordinary philanthropist. Above all these, such an approach is also worth to stress for it individualizes and depoliticizes the systemically and politically rooted social problems and presents them as if they can be solved through such discrete actions with the mercy of benevolence. Another social assistance mechanism in line with this motivation that has been very prominent during the same period was the Lighthouse Association (*Deniz Feneri*) and *Kimse Yok mu*. Especially *Deniz Feneri* became the leading NGO in orienting Islamic components by providing food, shelter, education, clothing, health, public kitchens and similar services with a typical conservative charity fashion. Its popularity and scope has mounted after the broadcast of a TV programme on Channel 7, which is already well known with its pro-Islamic outlook, with the same title and with the same theme of poverty and charity.³

It is not only the philanthropic associations that cooperated by the state that matters here, but also the possibility of observing a strong inclination towards referring to civil society when it comes to poverty and social problems and, consequently, various different civil society organizations are involved projects in which the state stands as a partner. To mention some, the projects exposing this determination can be listed such as the ‘Rainbow Project’ conducted jointly by the Ministry of Education, Administration for

³ Soon, however, the names related to this association were involved in a big scandal that first erupted in Germany and then spread to Turkey, with many prison sentences for the heads of both the charity organization and the Channel 7 with the claim of using huge amount of donations from benevolent people in Germany through irregular ways. There is currently a very controversial court case going on about the issue, in which the initial prosecutors revealing the scandal were dismissed and investigated.

Disabled People and related civil society initiatives with the aim of fulfilling the rehabilitation, education and vocation needs of 8.5 million disabled people, by ‘bringing together the social nation and the social state’ (quoted in Buğra, 2008: 240). Another example in the field of education is the ‘100 % Support for Education’ (Eğitime Yüzde Yüz Destek) campaign⁴ started in 2003 and extended until 2015, which implies the 100 % exemption from the taxes in case of a donation or a public school building incentive in an attempt to encourage external contributions.

Against this background, it should be plausible to suggest that the way chosen in dealing with poverty and similar type of social exclusion is transferring solution to civil society and voluntary-based initiatives. This brings forward an understanding that deems poverty not as a social problem, but rather as an issue requiring individual and technical solutions. What ‘social’ weights for signifies a more a political attitude with the recognition of the issues caused by systemic political-economic fluctuations such as poverty, and seeing them as part of collective responsibility. Present situation, however, through de-responsibilization of the macro political economic mechanisms in which the state constitutes a big part, the problem is detached from its actual roots and thus depoliticized by shifting the area of action to individual initiatives. As was stated in the first chapter, employing social rights as a normative idea implies a strategy in which poverty is no longer an individual but a social problem, which lacks to a large extent in Turkish experience under neoliberal rule. Functionally thinking, it also becomes

⁴ http://www.meb.gov.tr/haberler/html_haberler/EgitimeDestek.htm (June 6)

harder to put the exact (quantitative) levels of poverty and exclusion due to this singular efforts and lack of transparency in these attempts. It then becomes impossible to grasp its real dimensions. Therefore, these efforts overall tends to ‘gloss over the policy incoherencies engrained in the neoliberal policy agenda’ (Yalman, 2011: 228).

3.2.3. Labour

Labour market is the sphere in which the conflict of interests between the worker and capital is most apparent, where the exploitation takes place, and therefore is a very proper area to concretely observe the materialization of these clashes. It is also essential because it allows for seeing the impact of the living and working conditions of neoliberal policies on working classes that comprises the vast majority of society. It is in the labour market that the fact of the market economy being in conflict with human and social necessities most reveals itself. This part will examine the main components of the labour market and social policy orientation in Turkey in the 2000s with a focus on its peculiar characteristics and the general neoliberal route it has followed. As was seen in the previous parts on social security and poverty alleviation, the labour market policies have also been influenced to a large extent by the amalgamation of the neoliberal policy framework (Bozkurt and Yalman, 2011:1), undermining the interests of labour.

If we take a brief look at the situation of labour relations before the penetration of the neoliberal agenda in the 1980s, the constitutional guarantee of the fundamental rights of labour comes to forefront. Especially in the 1961

constitution, related to identifying Turkey as a ‘social state’ in the Article 2, along with other social policy areas labour relations emerged as the area through which the workers gained a significant ground to maneuver thanks to the provision of the rights in the workplace such as collective bargaining, unionization, paid leave and right to strike (Aybars and Tsarouhas 2010: 752). This constituted the ‘golden age’ of the labour relations for the not-so-good labour history in Turkey (Özdemir, 2004: 256). However, like many other areas affected by both the coup and the subsequent political-economic agenda, this relatively more liberated area of labour also became the target of neoliberal policies. The post-1980 political period dominated by Özal and his Motherland Party was marked not only by serious political and ideological pressures especially over the left, but more essentially with the blockage of the labour organization, and was recorded as the era where the redistribution dynamics, as was put as the main source of contradiction between neoliberalization and citizenship in the previous chapter, turned completely against the working population. The economic rationality became the basis on which labour relations were built, due to a series of regulations or the ‘deconstitutionalization’ of the labour rights (Özdemir and Yücesan Özdemir, 2006: 314). In addition to the legal restriction on collective bargaining, the workers’ organizations and unions lacked the possibility of negotiating with the state to the extent that it was rather the bourgeoisie class as that was more favoured in 1982 Constitution. These series of chains over the workers were to be followed with another one that partially prohibited the strikes because of the designation of various sectors in economy as strategic (Özdemir, 2004:

257). Prohibitions, restrictions, closing down of leftist unions (DİSK-Revolutionary Workers Unions Confederation) created a hole in the field of labour that was soon to be filled with the establishment under government supervision of the Islamist union Hak-İş in 1983. Along with these, not only were the fundamental rights of the labour affected, but the employment-related issues also become problematic as the employment prospects deteriorated, real wages diminished, informal and temporary employment rates rose, making Turkey a better place for capital, yet causing inequality in overall income distribution across the country (Cam, 2002: 89).

The situation of labour in Turkey was to be blamed for constituting a burden by the group of both local capital and the European Union -holding a power of sanction those days- for the worsening economy. The main argument was that the labour legislation was too rigid, and that new and more flexible individual labour was needed for a more liberated market economy (Yeldan, 2001). So, with the new labour law enacted in 2003, the current situation of labour relations was regulated so as to launch a new labour regime in line with the neoliberal reconfiguration of capital-labour relations, in which labour is seen as an ordinary commodity with its production cost (Özdemir and Yücesan Özdemir, 2006: 311). Regulated areas cover many components of the employer-employee relationship with respect to responsibilities and the technical division of labour in the workplace, as well as of capital-labour relations in the labour market. It is argued to have taken place in the axis of deregulation and flexibilization, changing the meaning and the

conceptualization of subordination, as well as the conditions of work in more flexible standards against the interest of the worker (Özdemir, 2004).

Though the previous Labour Law also reregulated the labour relations in the aftermath of the 1980 and lacked the worker-friendly content to a certain extent, in comparison to the newly-enacted one in 2003, the previous regulation on labour is argued to be more protective and more inclined towards a ‘social state’ discourse, or at least more on the side of the worker than the market in neoliberal terms. (Özdemir and Yücesan Özdemir, 2008:106). Reorganization of labour relations has taken place mostly in the axis of flexibilization and deregulation. The law was written in compliance with the neoclassical economy and the neoliberal labour-capital vision in which labour is simply induced to a calculable commodity (Özdemir, 2004), the fundamental tenet of which is the labour flexibility aspect. The following part will look at the basic principles of this standpoint, which also constitutes part of the background for the next chapter.

Labour market flexibility has become the most prominent aspect regulating the labour market, and has become a political mantra (Özdemir, 2004: 223) both in Turkey and elsewhere. This strategy of neoliberalism reflects its approach to employment with its orientation of deregulating rigid rules on the employment of workers as much as possible, as well as increasing the freedom of the employer within labour relations, with the intent of redistributing the risks away from the state towards the individual. As such, this strategy functions to keep the labour dependent on itself in any way, while at the same time rendering it flexible in a way to serve for the interest of

the employer, as well as passivating the labour unions and organizations (Munck and Waterman, 1999: 6).

For Mütevellioğlu and Işık (2009: 184), the most devastating impact on the labour market during the process of neoliberalization was given by the flexibility strategy. Like many other areas affected by the wave of neoliberalization, it was also the process from 1980 onwards that the foundations of flexibility was laid, throughout which the informalization of labour via increasing amount of subcontracting, temporary employment and minimizing the existing rights and privileges of the workers in the formal sector (Özdemir and Yücesan Özdemir, 2004: 35). Constitutionalization of this approach was comprehensively actualized with the aforementioned Labour Law in 2003, with great international support through the influence of the European Union with related *acquis*, ILO norms, and the encouragement of the Washington Consensus institutions (Özdemir, 2004: 235-36). It introduces new dimensions to labour relations beyond the existing standards and regulations that are in line with the inherent mentality of flexibility. Overall, this law has introduced on-call working, transfer of employees to another employer temporarily, intense working week, and eliminated the responsibility of making overtime payment (Mütevellioğlu and Işık, 2009: 184), as well as making temporary and part-time hiring (and firing) of workers easier (Bozkurt and Yalman, 2011: 8). All of them equals to the deprivation of the workers from their basic social citizenship rights at the expense of the employer's gains realized with the initiative of the state in the way of further extension and development of neoliberalism. The reason

constituting the acceptance of this neoliberal employment strategy is closely linked with the privatization acts inherent in neoliberal policy, not maybe the decline, shift of the works from permanent to partial or temporary, rising informal employment and the decline in the bargaining power of the unions. They have transformed the overall employment structure in which the core labour became insecure, unorganized, working under low wages and lacking almost each and every social right (Müftüoğlu, 2006:134).

Flexibilization agenda should be considered in conjunction with the global trend in neoliberal employment strategy, which treats labour as a commodity with its relative costs and benefits. For instance, various policies, treaties of the EU, structural adjustment programs encouraging greater flexibility and the control of the workforce penetrates into the policy agendas in the form of regulatory measures, as they are crucial devices making the status of labour in compliance with the changing production habits for further market expansion. By adopting these transformations, labour market rigidity as an obstacle to the effective use of the labour (Walby, 1992: 136) is avoided and labour costs are minimized, as well as the restricted power of the unions which makes labour completely like a commodity.

These new regulations and strategies not only dissolved worker rights that had been gained gradually with tough struggles and developed throughout 200 years, but also the way of passivating any possible opposition was opened through legal restrictions on unionization and making existing union structure ineffective, the example of which will be seen in the following part

In addition to these, already existing rights such as the right to strike became ineffective, which can clearly be observed in strike participation rates. Even in such short time between 2008 and 2010 it fell dramatically from 72,68 % in the former to 34,6 % in the latter⁵. It also fostered the fragmented structure in employment, such as permanent-temporary, insured-uninsured, public-private, secure-insecure, part time-full time, unionized-non unionized, and skilled-unskilled. So, overall labour market flexibility should be seen relationally and in conjunction with other labour related problems as it brings forward many implications for different fields too, such as the increase in subcontracting (taşeronlaşma) and decrease in the scope of unionization.

Union politics is also a significant indicator of labour relations, and has undergone a remarkable transformation since the 1980 restructuring. In parallel with the trend of authoritarian regimes in conjunction with neoliberal rule –like in Latin American countries and post-1980 Turkey- the market is employed as a mechanism to suppress labour through controlling and weakening the unions to the extent that it would not become an oppositional, ‘counter-hegemonic’ strategy for the regime (Yalman, 1997, cited in Özdemir, 2004: 252). In the 1980s Turkey, this has been the case too. In conformity with the neoliberal logic blended with authoritarian elements, trade unions were weakened through excessive use of repressive mechanisms for domination, and thus the workers’ collective bargaining power and right to be organized were limited to a large extent.

⁵Çalışma Hayatı İstatistikleri, 2009 and 2010

As for the regressive labour relations against the working population following the 1980 period, and the worsening conditions especially in the field of organized labour and unionization, it is possible to identify certain points of reference for the causes. In this connection, Ayşe Buğra (2008: 200) gives reference to three legal regulations passed in the early-1980s as an important phase in unionization to start to lose ground and eventually almost disappear. First, solidarity strikes and strikes not related to the wages were forbidden, and the government was authorized to postpone a strike with the motivation of ‘national interest’, which was a very suitable notion to be flexibly abused. Very much in line with this aspect of the term, national interest was defined vaguely and broadly in such a way that it contained the country’s export-related interests. Secondly, to obtain a right to join collective bargaining, a union had to organize more than 50 % of the workers in the workplace and at least 10 % of the workers in the workplace

In addition to these, contracted personnel do not have trade union rights, and the exercise of already existing rights for other unionized workers are also restricted to a considerable extent. For instance, while the public workers seemingly have trade union and collective bargaining rights, their strike action is banned in sectors such as transportation, banking and energy. Additionally, solidarity strikes, go-slow forms of industrial action and general strikes were also banned. In contrast to some legal protections that the public employees have against unfair dismissal, anti-union discrimination is very widespread in the private sector. Though the employers can be fined for such

discrimination, the sanctions are ineffective in addition to the requirement of proving dismissal (Öke, 2011: 247)

The union density was also badly affected by neoliberalization policies like elsewhere in the world. The leftist confederation, Revolutionary Workers Trade Union Confederation (DİSK) was banned for an extended period, and union actions were further restricted with the Unionisation Act of 1982. Not maybe instead of, but for filling this ideological gap, the Islamic trade union confederation Hak-İş was set up in 1983 with the support and the supervision of the state ‘in order to generate an ideological ambivalence within the working class’ (Cam, 2002: 97-98). It sought to foster the principle of Islamic brotherhood with employers, and against the conflict-generator nature of unionism. Such decline of the union activities not only has a weakening impact on the realization of unionization in general, but also brings forward other labour related problems such as the spread of informal employment and unemployment.

Following the rapid adoption of neoliberal policies from the 1980s onwards, the effects of the unequal income distribution was witnessed in the same rapidity over the working population (Elveren and Galbraith, 2008), as well as over those who are unemployed. Yet, contrary to the premise that ‘growth triggers social welfare and increases employment’, the rapid economic growth sustained during the 2000s (except from the crises years of 2001 and 2008-2009) in Turkey (see Table 1) has not brought along a considerable increase in labour force participation rates and/or a decrease in unemployment levels (Bozkurt and Yalman, 2011) (see Table 2). It was rather

‘growth without redistribution’, about which the World Bank disinclined countries for within the framework of the Post-Washington Consensus principles. Despite the significant rates of growth in the Turkish economy from 2003 to 2011 (average of which equals to 5.34), it is not likewise reflected to the employment rates. Furthermore in the same years the unemployment rate has increased by 1.4 % (See the Table 1 and Table 2).

*Table 1: Growth Rates (2003-2011)*⁶

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Annual Growth Rates	5,3	9,4	8,4	6,9	7,4	0,7	-4,7	8,9

*Table 2: Unemployment by Years*⁷

Unemployment Rates	
2003	10,5
2004	10,8
2005	10,6

⁶ TURKSTAT, GDP Statistics.

⁷ Source: TURKSTAT, *Household Labour Force Statistics (Hanehalkı İşgücü İstatistikleri)*

2006	10,2
2007	10,3
2008	11,0
2009	14,0
2010	11,9

While the rates of (un)employment are significant as they indicate a ‘massive exclusion of people from working life’ (Cam, 2002), these volatile rates bring along the necessity of discussing another very significant problem, which is the informal employment, since the decreases may sometimes take place due to employment in small-scale and temporary unregistered jobs⁸. Regardless of its whatsoever contribution to employment statistics, it stands as a very serious problem for the labour market in Turkey. With the move towards an outward-looking pro-market economic strategy, there has been a considerable decline in formal employment opportunities in the post-1980 period in Turkey (Aybars and Tsarouhas, 2010: 755). It is plausible to refer to the extensive privatization process and the flexibilization agenda mentioned above as the roots of this sharp decline in formal employment. 9.4 million out of 21.1 million workers were informally employed in 2009 (Elveren, 2010: 1), meaning that almost every one out of two people is employed informally by working under insecure conditions, doing longer hours of work with no job

⁸ For a similar discussion, see Yeldan, 2009.

security and, while doing these, earning less than minimum wage. While having various economic, cultural, social and political causes that are all interlinked, it brings forward very crucial problems for other labour-related fields that are equally intertwined within themselves and therefore should not be approached as an isolated issue. For instance, growing amount of unemployment along with informal employment imply a lack of security, lack of access to trade unions or other labour organizations, as well as badly affecting the development of unionization structure. It is closely interlinked with other sections in this part (flexibility and unionization) in the sense that it narrows the potential member base of the unions, adversely affects employment security, wage levels and undermines the collective bargaining power (Öke, 2011: 241).

3.3. Concluding Remarks

Following the permeation of neoliberal policy agenda to Turkey in the early 1980s, a rapid change in the political-economic setting through free market mediated regulations was intensively observed. Along with many other policy fields affected from this policy shift, social life has been the area that was most rigorously affected. In this connection, the relationality of the neoliberal policy agenda and shifts in the scope of social rights with reference to the neoliberalization process in Turkey can be identified. After outlining the articulation of Turkey to the neoliberal global order from 1980 onwards, I questioned what might be the consequences of this process for the exercise of

basic social rights, which I have narrowed down as social security system, poverty alleviation and labour market policies. By mainly focusing on social security reform as the outcome of this macro neoliberal framework, I attempted to address the exclusionary aspect of the nature of social policies. In the second component, I elaborated on contemporary forms of poverty alleviation as I believe it strongly embody neoliberal mentality that tends to cloud its systemic aspect by applying to individual initiatives such as philanthropy and governance. I have tried to highlight main aspect of this approach as an amalgam of neoliberal policies with traditional conservative outlooks. In doing so, the tendency to rupture it from political causes is addressed as the ‘social’ within the notion of social rights is thought to have political implications. In the final category of social rights, I have tried to identify the changes in the regulations on labour relations and their reflections on actual practices. I have argued that the leading pattern damaging fundamental labour rights have occurred in the field of labour is flexibility, which aims at liberalizing the rigid labour market, also having severe consequences on union politics and forms of employment.

Against relatively optimistic social rights setting (especially those concerning labour) granted by the 1961 constitution, with the stabilization package of January 24 and the following military coup, unions became the primary targets, strikes were prohibited, collective bargaining was stopped, and some unions were banned while the activities of the rest were suspended (Öke, 2011: 229). Along with all these, neoliberal policies resulted in the destruction of almost all social policies, badly affecting the exercise of social

and other rights overall. It demonstrates that far from bringing a societal well-being, the neoliberalization process in Turkey has worsened the socio-economic relations against the exercise of the basic social rights of access to health and education, income distribution etc. From a critical perspective, it would not be very unconvincing to interpret the current panorama within David Harvey's (2003) 'accumulation by dispossession' framework, which in a way implies the exclusion or dispossession of certain people from social, political and economic rights and opportunities with the expansion of the market and, thus, bringing forward social exclusion in favour of capital accumulation. For Harvey, privatization, decline in the job security, commodification of urban housing etc. are examples of the dispossession of the social rights that are gained through the course of capitalism. Therefore, for Turkey and elsewhere, it is possible to construe poverty, lack of access to education and health services, unemployment and other sorts of social problems as the ground for accumulation 'by allowing the proletarianization or market participation of groups previously exempted from these processes.' (Yükseker, 2009).

Concluding with labour is significant for it both summarizes the 'abandoned citizen' (Clarke, 2005: 453) as the lion's share in terms of responsibility is on the citizen in almost every sphere of social rights, and constitutes a connection point and a part of the background for the story of TEKEL that will be narrated in the chapter that follows.

CHAPTER IV:

NEOLIBERAL GOVERNMENTALITY AND CITIZEN-SUBJECT IN TURKEY

Identifying the relationship between neoliberalism -as we know it- and citizenship with respect to social rights is easier to contextualize in a country with specific reference to the relevant policy areas. That was the task undertaken in the previous chapter with reference to transformations and prominent characteristics of three fundamental components of social rights after the neoliberalization process in Turkey. However, as indicated previously, the approach to neoliberalism will remain one-dimensional if it is merely approached from the policy point of view. This chapter, therefore, reflects the second component of neoliberal governmentality, conceptualized as the micro level, and scrutinizes the extent to which neoliberal governmentality can be contextualized in Turkey. In that respect, one of the main focuses in the previous chapter, as well as the fundamental component of social citizenship, the labour field is chosen to discuss the prospects of citizen-subject constitution process in neoliberal governmentality with reference to the broader labour re(gu)lations in Turkey. In order to offer a more thorough

analysis to see the extent of neoliberal governmentality in Turkey in relation to labour, the discourse employed by the government during the TEKEK workers' resistance is examined in detail by asking whether the neoliberal elements found in the discourse can be the indication of the neoliberal rationality that constitutes the motivation of citizen-subject constitution. To put it more clearly, the following parts can be regarded as part of an attempt to discuss the question 'to what extent the discourse employed during the TEKEK resistance can be analyzed from neoliberal governmentality perspective with reference to neoliberal citizen-subject making process.'

Towards this aim, the chapter proceeds with the brief notices on neoliberal governmentality and conceptions of power by Foucault, which is then followed by an account of the TEKEK industrial conflict and the discursive stance taken by the government during the incident. Then, in an attempt to discuss the boundaries of neoliberal governmentality framework in relation to the TEKEK case as was indicated at the main question of the chapter, I will focus on whether such discursive constitution of the workers can be regarded as a part of a more comprehensive effort in labour regulations aimed at constituting and governing workers in neoliberal terms. The argument will be finalized with a section that lays out the workers' discourse as a counter narrative to be able to make assessment on the extent to which these workers central to the official discourse do internalize these demarcated subject positions, as well as to see if it can also be considered as a component of limits of neoliberal governmentality.

As indicated in the previous chapter repeatedly, in this work, neoliberalism is not approached solely as an economic discourse that promotes a certain economic agenda, but more importantly as political rationality that stems from economic rationality (Brown, 2006b: 693), and for Foucault, which is a form of normative political reason that organizes the political sphere, governance practices, and citizenship (Foucault, 1988). As the continuation of the previous ‘macro’ chapter that assessed the evolution of neoliberalism in Turkey with reference to policy framework in general; in this chapter, what I want to do is to focus on the ‘micro’ level neoliberalism that refers to Foucault’s governmentality perspective in pursuit of the question whether one can talk about the disclosure of neoliberal rationality in labour field as the motivation of constituting citizens as neoliberal subjects in Turkey. I will try to outline the different ways through which citizens were addressed during TEKEL workers’ strike by then trying to locate this discourse revealed during the crisis in the map of governmentality in general and in governing activity informed by neoliberal rationality in Turkey in particular.

The ‘governing activity’ mentioned above refers to a set of specific and observable practices, as well as conceptualizations about population in modern period (Lemke, 2001: 191), that are put forward by variety of bodies and institutions, political figures and units being the major of them. This attempt is closely linked to the study of citizen-subject for certain images of the self is approved, perpetuated and promoted as normal and ideal, in order to create legitimate, proper, normal, responsible and moral subjectivities in

modern period (Foucault, 1991; Dean, 1999). Indeed, the nexus of subjecthood and citizenship is a growing body of literature within the Foucauldian scholarship, in which the main concern is the question of ‘how particular types of subject are produced in different forms’; as responsabilized individual, job seeker, hard working, socially excluded etc. Hence, in this view, an individual can be studied as the (re)constituted citizen ‘that is successfully produced by the discourses, apparatuses and practices that seek to construct them’ (Clarke, 2005: 454), which enables to study the citizen-subject from variety of perspectives be it as consumer subjects to risk taking, responsible or active/empowered citizen subjects (Cruikshank, 1999).

While repeating the notions of ‘create’ and/or ‘constitute’ in discussing the essence of governmentality, I see the need of a further theoretical explanation for the adoption of them within a Foucauldian framework in this study, as I see their usage slightly ambivalent. If one is to denote the notions of ‘constitute’ or ‘construct’ with reference to Foucault’s own writings or his followers, it should be noticed that they are implied as performative terms, which can be equated to the ‘positive power’ conceptualization in Foucault. For Foucault, power can be either negative or positive. Yet, unlike the theoretical approaches that defines power as an external and negative structure, the way he refers to power is a positive and productive kind; which is not exclusionary but inclusionary, which operates not through negative but positive mechanisms, and is exposed to whole society in a capillary-like way. For him, power is not a possession, but a strategy that acts, as well as manifests itself in particular way: ‘Power must be

analyzed as something which circulates, or as something which only functions in the form of a chain . . . Power is employed and exercised through a netlike organization . . . Individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application’ (Foucault, 1980: 98). Therefore, when we speak of constructing/constituting/creating subjects of certain type, as is apparent from the nature of the actions, they will refer to a constructive use of power which can be equated to the positive power in Foucault. This short notice can be considered as a brief reminder for what follows in the next parts that will look at the TEKEL case and the pertinent labour market regulations in terms of the usage of a positive power found in Foucault through the discourse. The following section discusses if the discourse employed by the AKP government during the workers’ demonstrations can be regarded as the use of power in Foucauldian sense as such, since one can interpret the implicit and explicit as an attempt to discursively constitute the workers in certain way, as well as an attempt to neutralize these representation as normal. However, looking at the counter discourse set forth by the workers is critical as it shows the extent of which these subject positions and discursive representations were internalized and thus reproduced by the workers.

4.1. The Case: TEKEL Industrial Conflict

The significance of TEKEL analysis for the integrity of this study was mentioned above. The privatization of TEKEL (Turkish Tobacco Company) is significant for the scope of this analysis, not only its consequences illustrate

a typical case of privatization as a fundamental principle of neoliberalism, but more significantly for the possible extent of which it might give indications of a broader scope of neoliberal governmentality in labour field in Turkey.

Speeches and statements of the government are crucial in a sense that they can be considered as a discursive act to address citizen-subjects in certain way. In more theoretical terms, neoliberal rationality of the governments are revealed through the discursive and non-discursive representations that can be found in the texts, speeches and programs to the extent that they are designed to represent individuals in certain ways first, and then to produce the conditions through which individuals can govern themselves in accordance with the represented rationality, and consequently become subjects of a certain kind (responsible, entrepreneur, competitive, obedient etc). What I have tried in the part so far was to examine this active process of subject formation. Looking at the resisting TEKEL workers as the possible subjects is the idea, stemming from what is believed to be a discursive representation on the side of the government during the conflict, which will be analyzed in detail below. However, the present study does not consider TEKEL as a case of neoliberal governmentality, nor conceives it as a case to verify or falsify neoliberal governmentality in this labour-specific context of governmentality. Rather, by employing neoliberal governmentality as an analytical framework, it asks if TEKEL conflict can be thought within the broader context of neoliberal governmentality in Turkey in general.

TEKEL is chosen for two reasons: First, the early observation on the aspects of the conflict (the discursive practice and the resistance of workers)

is thought to be a unique and a possible indication of both discursive constitution of workers that fits with a neoliberal rationality of government. Second, the greater political-economy context behind the chain of incidents (privatization-resistance-discourse-counter discourse) renders the case significant for the first, offering a narrowed focus on a privatization-specific context, and second, for this very context links up with and also illustrates one of the most fundamental policy areas dealt with in the previous chapter as the reflection of ‘macro neoliberalism’. With the contexts of labour and unions harboured in the background of the TEKEL conflict, the elaboration of it connects with the previous chapter in number of ways. For instance, it can be regarded as the late consequence of gradually declining union politics. As assessed in the last chapter, it has undergone a remarkable transformation since the 1980 restructuring. In parallel with the trend of authoritarian regimes in conjunction with neoliberal rule –like in Latin American countries and post-1980 Turkey- the market is employed as a mechanism to suppress labour through controlling and weakening the unions to the extent that it would not become an oppositional, ‘counter-hegemonic’ strategy for the regime (Yalman, 1997, cited in Özdemir, 2004: 252). In the 1980s Turkey, this has been the case too. In conformity with the neoliberal logic blended with authoritarian elements, trade unions were weakened through excessive use of repressive mechanisms for domination, and thus the workers’ collective bargaining power and right to be organized were limited to a large extent.

If we look at the background information about the establishment, then we see that it has a long history with various factories all around Turkey.

TEKEL was a state economic enterprise that had employed 12,000 workers in 43 factories as well as workplaces in 21 cities across Turkey (Özuğurlu, 2011: 180). Its privatization was on the agenda since the launch of the 1999 IMF programme (Öniş, 2011), and was finally sold to British American Tobacco in 2008 as an extension and requirement of neoliberal policy agenda that was pursued by successive AKP governments, which resulted in the dismissal of thousands of workers at the beginning of 2009. Following the privatization, 12 factories were closed and approximately 12.000 workers were deployed to other public sector jobs, yet to be working under a different status than they were previously enjoying, the law known as ‘4C’, with pay cuts up to 40 % and reduced employment rights. The new status meant ‘increasing insecurity, unpaid vacations, and lower wages for public employees, as part of the privatization of these state workers’ (Karaağaç and Kaya, 2010: 33). What actually triggered the whole resistance was this new status under which the workers were forced to work with the loss of considerable pay and social rights that they had gained while working at TEKEL. The new status 4C included the regulations that implied a wage reduction from TL1.200 (roughly US\$800) to TL800 (roughly US\$550), the job contracts of 10 months with no guarantee of renewal (Özuğurlu, 2011: 180). These new jobs in which TEKEL workers were to work under depended on the worker’s ability and expertise and could include several tasks of simple public services including gardening public parks (Yeldan, 2010). What was tried to be imposed contained lack of severance pay, lack of unionisation, and poorly paid workers who can be laid off at any time.

Consequently, what followed was the reaction of the workers to this status for being unacceptable and their decision to resist to this new position offered by all coming from across the country, gathering in the capital city Ankara and setting up a camp of resistance in one of the central squares of the city, Sakarya and literally living in these tents for 78 days from 15 December 2009 to 2 March 2010. The resistance overall attracted widespread sympathy from the public, and the place of resistance, the ‘tent city’ became the centre of solidarity among organized or unorganized, collective or individual initiatives consisted of diverse occupations and places. The way through which the resistance took place as such has embarked on one of the most formidable strikes in Turkey since the 1990s that the worker movement have been gradually weakened, as a way of showing their response to the deepening of the neoliberal agenda of flexibilization and reduction of labour costs, as well as against the violation of the rights and life standards that they have established over the years.

The privatization of TEKEL can be regarded as a case that illustrates human and societal consequences of neoliberalism’s fundamental policy requirements. What is rather striking in the TEKEL case as far as the process is concerned is the critical speeches/statements given mostly by the politicians during the resistance, the details of which will be theoretically categorized in the light of Foucauldian analysis below. Before proceeding with this part, as the notion of ‘discourse’ is often stated, it is essential to acknowledge the significance of discursive practices to make a thorough reading of the process in a theoretical way. What we understand from ‘discursive formation’ or

‘discursive practices’ can be categorized as the ensemble of heterogeneous mechanisms for making statements that are functioned and produced in different ways. The object of these statements, as will be seen at the TEKEL case, might as well be the categories of unemployment, work, or any broader agenda concerning labour. Unemployment, employment, and work are not ‘natural’, pre-given realities that have neither an objective existence on their own, nor an economic existence in itself, that would be prior to the institutions and practices. Its construction functions by binding the security of the individual in relation to finding and holding a job, in addition bringing forth the “strategy of rendering individual subjects ‘responsible’ [...] shifting the responsibility for social risks such as unemployment, poverty, etc., and for life in society into the domain for which the individual is responsible and transforming it into a problem of ‘self-care’”. (Lemke, 2001: 201) This point is well illustrated also by Lazzarato (2009) for he elaborated on this issue by taking up labour, and addressed the division line between employment and unemployment, since neoliberal system views the latter as the failure of the individual, rather than that of the system. In that respect, the attitude of the politicians in Turkey during TEKEL workers’ strike is no exception to this as the dominant discourse was inclined towards referring the insecure conditions related to market fluctuations as the single cases on individual’s own accounts having nothing to do with systemic aspects.

4.2. Discursive Constitution of Workers as Neoliberal Subjects-cum-Citizens

The discursive acts have several functions in manufacturing social formations by creating dissociative and integrating impacts on society, some examples of which can be found in attempts to counterbalance social movements with well-operated discourses and the intention to passivate them through differences . Even though the governments are neither the only, nor the ultimate authorities for revealing discursive and non-discursive conducts in neoliberal framework with full of interlaced actors (such as media, civil society groups, networks etc.), it usually happens to be the most effective component of neoliberal government of conduct.

The reaction of state elite to TEKEL workers' resistance can be utilized as a discursive case of this sort, which illustrates the addressing one sort of subject as ideal against the opposing others. It also functions to (re)configure societal boundaries as 'us and them'. More specifically, the case is an attempt to show how the 'conduct of conduct' complies with the inherent rationale of neoliberalism that individualizes the endemic risks, and marginalizes the opposing segments of society by tacitly framing an ideal model of subject citizen.

The discourse targeting the TEKEL workers can be grouped in a number of categories in terms of their tones and contents, which can roughly be listed as the accusational language on the ground being unnecessary and idle workforce, their unproductiveness and thus ineffectiveness, being taken in by marginal groups, and ideological orientation of their causes. To start

with a general one that reflects the mindset throughout the whole process, the following statement of the Prime Minister could serve for the given purpose. During a ceremony speech, as response to a group of workers that shouted as ‘TEKEL workers are waiting for good news from you’, the Prime Minister said that:

I am not a kind of leader who is used to giving good news in haste. We have previously talked about the whole process on TEKEL with all union representatives and told them what is needed. Currently, there is nothing but only the warehouses in TEKEL. It is no longer a place that produces. It is transferred within the scope of privatization and those who wish are already given their compensation and severance pay. Additionally, we provide employment opportunities under 4C for those who want. I am sorry; we cannot take you service at your current jobs. Please do not provoke here. Unfortunately these kinds of elements have been appearing in Turkey so far. Such elements want to earn money by lying, without work. We have closed the era of earning without work. This does no longer exist. Think about the private sector. Do they pay for those who do not work? You will produce and then earn. No pain, no gain. The cost of 10.000 TEKEL workers to us is 40 billion. Will I give this 40 billion to one who produces nothing? No such thing can happen.⁹

In the statement above and in many that will follow, it is possible to see an amalgam of discourses in which one can extract the various dimensions of neoliberal rationality, the discussions of which was made previously. For instance, there is an inherent understanding that tends to value individuals so long as they produce. In that respect, the mindset is accustomed to assess individuals to the extent that they add value to the market functioning in the form of production, as well as it strongly tends to perceive the labour as a commodity that has an exchange value. Secondly, on workers’ account, their

⁹ ‘Tekel işçilerinden Erdoğan’a protesto’, *CNN Türk*. 5 Aralık 2009, <http://www.cnnturk.com/2009/turkiye/12/05/erdogana.tekel.iscilerinden.protesto/554272.0/>

inactiveness, doing no business is portrayed as if it is a choice made by the workers, rather than a consequence they avoid to be a part of. In that manner, with such an attempt, the workers are not only tried to be rendered as unnecessary in the eyes of the people, but also the discourse neutralizes and normalizes unemployment due to privatization. In other words, the unemployment and the insecure condition that the workers fell into is internalized and reflected as an independent, sui generis and technical issue; the causes of which is, therefore, non-political and inevitable, having no association with the greater agenda of labour flexibilization. With the corporate-alike mentality harboured, the primary identity of the resisting workers is not presented as the right-seeking individual but as the lazy people that seeks to earn by lying down. A similar line of reasoning can be found in the speeches of the Minister of Environment:

There is no such procedure. I am sorry; you will be given your compensation if necessary. Now it is no longer the time of earning by lying down. All of you will earn by working. As far as I know, the TEKEL warehouses are empty for years. You get your salaries for many years, didn't you? ¹⁰

By bringing these different statements together, it is possible to come up with a common pattern of an implicit reference to an image of the industrious worker-citizen. The common tendency here is also no different than what the doctrine supposes highlighting the responsibility side of citizenship than rights. And here, the responsibility expected from the workers emerges as the

¹⁰ 'Bakan Eroğlu'na Tekel işçilerinden protesto', *Milliyet*, 11 Aralık 2009
<http://siyaset.milliyet.com.tr/bakan-in--font-color-navy-cildirtan--font--sozleri/siyaset/siyasetdetay/11.12.2009/1172643/default.htm>

hard working behaviour, and these two merits tied together in a way that the core of responsibility is about creating the conditions of one's becoming a hardworking individual. Along with this, the language also conceals mentality of cost-benefit analysis, as it is possible to pick up that the workers are seen like inputs with a certain price and a relative cost. In another speech of the Prime Minister that accuse the workers, there is again a strong emphasis on the needlessness and idleness of the workers, as well as a tendency to conceive workers as a commodity, that follows as:

What are they doing? Do they make any business? No. These people just hang about the places called tobacco warehouses and their monthly cost to us is 40 billion. Approximately 10.000 people. Whose money are we paying to these? We are paying from people's money. We have said that these places do not work anymore; these are just the warehouses, the production of whatsoever is no longer there.¹¹

Beyond an effort to address the workers as the opportunist individuals that are unlawfully benefiting from the public wealth, this time the image of the 'people' is located to the opposite. The reiteration this figure occurs in several occasions to demonstrate the illegitimacy and unjustness of the workers' demands to the public. The discourse as above and as, "we are going to save this country from excess employment. State is not a ground to provide employment for non-productive workforce"¹² are this sort of endeavours that portray the workers as the burden over the state for constituting the workforce

¹¹ 'Bu insanlar tütün depolarında duruyor, iş mi yapıyorlar? Hayır' *Radikal*, 28 Aralık 2009 <http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalDetayV3&ArticleID=971446&Date=28.12.2009&CategoryID=101>

¹² 'Erdoğan: Açılım sürecini nihayete erdireceğiz', *Radikal*, 27 Aralık 2009 <http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalDetayV3&CategoryID=78&ArticleID=971411>

without production. It can be argued the antagonist environment in society is tried to be created in society, so long as that it leads to a formation of insiders and outsiders within the society as a whole by framing the resisting segments as lazy, unnecessary, unjustly benefiting from the public's wealth, and not contented with what they have.

At this point, the discursive representation of the 'people' on one side and TEKEL workers on the other in a binary way is a crucial component emerges from the discourse, since it posits different subject positions in society that conflicts with each other. This binary is perpetuated further in the Minister of Finance's saying that,

It is not rightful to give the money we take from citizens to the TEKEL workers. If our government made one mistake, it was being compassionate towards our workers who will lose their jobs due to privatization. Workers in the companies that were privatized were dismissed before us.¹³

Though the questions of for what purposes the 'money taken from the citizens' is used other than the worker wages or whether the workers do not fit into the category of these 'citizens' can be the topic of a different critical analysis of neoliberalism within what I referred as macro level, here, this very saying produces a citizens vs. the workers binary by reinforcing the boundary between the responsible and the reckless, which can as well be interpreted as the appreciation of those 'citizens' that hold these attributes. Needless to say, this leads to an inclusionary and exclusionary mechanism that is discursively

¹³ 'Şimşek'ten Tekel eylemi yorumu: Bizim hükümetin hatası merhameti', Radikal, 26 Ocak 2012.

<http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalEklerDetayV3&ArticleID=976735&CategoryID=101&Rdkref=1>

developed at the juncture of responsibility vs. irresponsibility, and industriousness-productiveness vs. idleness, which indirectly functions to praise the former category of citizens vis-à-vis the other. This mechanism is also well internalized by the group of ‘good citizens’ to the extent that these speeches succeed to create a public perception of the workers as the ‘social parasites’ in Sennett’s (1998) saying, as if the workers exploit the bare resources accumulated through all people’s efforts. The social parasites analysis is also very much connected to government’s effort to depict the whole case as ‘unproductive and dissatisfied workers’, since this attempt will legitimize, as well as facilitate the application of flexibilization agenda and eradicate the social rights gradually, as the public will start to conceive of their situation as unfairly taking advantage of what they also have a toil.

In another critical speech given by the Prime Minister in the course of events, it is possible to grasp the combination of different messages tried to be given to the workers:

The number of TEKEL workers is 10.850. We pay 40 million to these every month. The protests turned into an open campaign against government. Marginal organizations are exploiting it. I am calling out to my worker brothers there, you are being abused. You bear the responsibility of more than 3 million unemployed, those of minimum wage earners, workers, civil servants, pensioners, orphans. There are millions of unemployed people in this country that would gladly work with the wage we offer to these workers.¹⁴

¹⁴ Erdoğan öfkeli: ‘Bu ülke yolgeçen hanı değil!’, *CnnTürk*, 2 Şubat 2012
<http://www.cnntrk.com/2010/turkiye/02/02/erdogan.ofkeli.bu.ulke.yolgecen.hani.degil/561980.0/index.html>

Alongside constituting a repetitive example to the previous discussions in which the workers are regarded as a commodity, this speech also reveals the mindset that unemployment emerges as the single most effective and cruel device in pressuring the worker subjects, in Krasucki's terms (2010, 7). It does not only underscore the needlessness of both the workers as is existent in various statements, and their resistance in particular for there are thousands to replace them; but also such effort appeals to the already unemployed by pointing the workers as those who are not content with what is endowed. Needless to say, this sort of discourse is another supportive element in underpinning the different subject positions in society in way of two antagonist camps as the unpleasant employed and unemployed, or as the irresponsible lazy worker subject and responsible and content worker, civil servant, minimum wage earner and even orphan etc. The marginalization on the ground of being abused and trapped by some oppositional groups is more clearly spoken out in the following statements, but for now, it is important to notice the consequence of this 'exploitation' as bearing the responsibility of those other subject positions that are offended in this case.

The tone of critical language sometimes get acuter by adding up populist elements to the vocabulary such as those targeting the soft spots of the society, which occurs as ideological and the infringement upon the rights of others. This time, the Prime Minister asked as "Now I ask, is this not ideological or what? Is it possible to tolerate such a thing? But, excuse us, I

am the defender of my orphan's right¹⁵ and will not let anyone violate it by doing nothing there.”¹⁶ Indeed, when the Prime Minister declared himself as the defender of the orphans, TEKEL workers were no longer the group of dispossessed workers but the disharmonious members of the society as they intend to unlawfully benefit from the state possession. It should also be noted that the underlying elements in the discourse on ‘orphan's rights’ can be regarded as counter right with its full meaning because its connotation refers to a paternalistic eternal right approach, which clearly contrast with the legal subject principle (Özügür, 2011: 183). Leaving this point aside, it should not be exaggeration to see this populist pace taken similar to New Right's attempt to create ‘two nations project’ (Jessop, 1990), where an entrepreneur, active, responsible and hard working citizen is clashed with irresponsible, selfish, expedient and lazy outsiders, therefore drawing the boundary between inside and outside, between us and them.

As far as the ‘ideology’ part is concerned, both the quote above and another speech that declares the resistance to be ‘ideological and unjust demonstration’¹⁷, they can also be regarded attempts to trivialize and delegitimize the whole case as in the eyes of the public, since the word ‘ideology’ usually have an ominous connotation in Turkish politics. The

¹⁵ The term ‘orphan right’ has its roots in the Islamic faith and one of the most used idiom both in the Turkish language, and in the mainstream politics in Turkey. It refers to a common asset whose responsibility of safety is taken by the governor. Here, by referring as ‘orphan's right’, Erdoğan implied that accepting TEKEL workers' demand would be spending from this common money wastefully (Özügür, 2011).

¹⁶ ‘Tekel işçisine ‘yetim hakkı’ resti çekti bazı ilaçlara market kapılarını araladı’, Hurriyet, 28 Aralık 2009

¹⁷ ‘Erdoğan: Haksız ve ideolojik bir eylem’. CnnTürk, 4 Şubat 2010

<http://www.cnntrk.com/2010/turkiye/02/04/erdogan.haksiz.ve.ideolojik.bir.eylem/562325.0/index.html>

critical significance of the notion 'ideology' has here is that, whether the position of those who speak with this vocabulary is ideology-free or not, it is a usage that clouds and totalizes any undesired act in society like an 'all-inclusive' package. The usage here can be classified as the instrument to portray the acts of the workers in particular –negative-way, which finally takes us to the 'marginalization' component of the discourse in the following paragraph. Among sixteen different definitions of ideology he proposes, one attribute of ideology for Eagleton (1991) is 'that which offers a position for the subject'. Similarly here, we can locate the usage of ideology in this case to this framework, in a sense that it functions for positioning the citizen subjects to a place in the spectrum as that of with us and nearby, and those who are outside of the boundary: they lose their legitimacy to the extent that they distance themselves from where we are, which is not ideological. This discourse, as well, typifies the perspective that neutralizes and universalizes its own position vis-à-vis the rest. Ideology, like halitosis says Eagleton, is what the other person has (Eagleton, 1991:2). It, on the one hand, closes one's eye to reckon his/her ideology infected stance, and on the other hand functions for the passivation and illegitimation of those who are 'ideological' in the eyes of the others and create antagonistic subject positions in society. Consequently, operating through the discourse of danger as such somehow facilitates the boundary drawing between different subjectivities in society.

Among all these diverse directions that the government discourse reaches to, where we finally arrive is probably where the strictest tone of the language has got during the resistance. As mentioned in the above statements

and interpretations, the accusation of resistance to be exploited and lead by some marginal groups can be considered as one of the most decisive attempts to delegitimize the movement in the course of events. For instance, towards the end of the process, the Prime Minister addressed to the scapegoats for the ineffectiveness within the public sphere by saying that:

I warn TEKEL workers. Their hunger strike is an agitation. Do not get deceived by this ugly game of the opposition. Do not get trapped by the marginal organizations. Are 18.000 people with 4C not citizens? The private sector dismisses the inactive personnel immediately and pays the compensation, but is there as such thing in state? That is why there is no efficiency in state.¹⁸

Now I am calling out to my citizens: do not follow care about these speculations, do not fall into this trap and we shall carry on without falling into these traps. I am sorry, we cannot let the case get robbed that our nation has entrusted us. There are other brothers who benefits from this same 4C. We give you the same as they get. We are not able to give money to anyone that is not working and not even to mention the impossibility of it.¹⁹

While setting the fundamental criteria as productiveness and effectiveness, the obstacle on the way of fulfilling these principles was found beyond the workers' own initiatives and their quest for rights was associated with the deceiving activities guided by marginal, extremist, in short, with those who are called out under the umbrella of 'oppositional groups'. Just like the

¹⁸ 'TEKEL'e Başbakan şoku' Milliyet, 23 Ocak 2010,
<http://www.milliyet.com.tr/Guncel/HaberDetay.aspx?aType=HaberDetay&ArticleID=1189663>

¹⁹ 'Sivil diktatorya bizimle son buldu.' Radikal, 25 Ocak 2010
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=HaberYazdir&ArticleID=976570>

generous usage of the notion ideology at several occasions, the term ‘marginal’ also bears a similar character in the service of the politicians in Turkey. In that respect, even adding an ‘-ism’ suffix to the use of ‘marginal’ at this point should not be misleading as there is a strong fondness on the side of the politicians in flowing the term against any undesirable act or element faced. The discourse of ‘marginalism’ is thus frequently employed as an all inclusive notion to the extent that diverse groups from protesting students to football supporters, or workers as in here are involved in an officially disapproved act, and thus they shall be labelled as led or deceived by marginal groups, or are directly declared to be marginal. What we find in this relevant part can therefore be regarded as an extension of this dominant tendency, at the core of which rests an intention to delegitimize the given undesired element just as the discourse on ideology, or ideologicalness does.

One explanation of AKP’s usage of such rigorous language and the level of intolerance towards the workers can be found in how the party relates to tolerance as a means of repression in their relation to people in general. Eğılmez (2012) argues that, owing the roots to the Islamic belief in ‘communal duty’ assigned to each and every citizen that leads to the treatment of society as the combination of different interests and communities, AKP adopts the politics of toleration in order to govern or repress the dissent, which is reflected as the depoliticizing and passivating of the working class. Within the scope of the TEKEK case, regulative and productive aspect of tolerance put forward by Wendy Brown (2006a, cited in Eğılmez, 2012) can also be relevant as she considers it as an operation of ‘power, governance and

subject production'. In that respect, to the extent that the workers' demands and movement in general becomes intolerable, thus irrepressible and ungovernable for the politicians, and to the extent that they do not become part in these relations of power within tolerance that entails 'consented coercion' in a Gramscian hegemonic sense, the discourse turns into a highly accusative and marginalizing. Setting the criteria of 'tolerability' as being in compliance with the neoliberal rationality in this given case, the government's exclusionary and severe discourse on those who did not embody these expected virtues of industriousness, responsibility and obedience; and hence on those did not reconstitute themselves as neoliberal subjects can become more understandable.

As well as being a productive source on subject constitution, for Brown tolerance might as well be a passivating and depoliticizing in the neutralization of effective dissent again as in the case of TEKEL. In that sense, another reason that constitutes the tough discourse employed by AKP can be considered as the workers' determinate attempts for the recognition of 'politicalness' of their case, as is clear in the statements of the workers; which sharply contrasts with the depoliticizing impact inherent in toleration that refers to the disassociation of subjects from political struggle. Through productive, repressive and regulatory side of toleration, the political core of the whole resistance was tried to be dissolved until it had to acknowledge the irrepressibility and depoliticizability. The utterance of the Prime Minister as 'is it possible to tolerate such a thing' or 'we bear these (workers) for two years' can be regarded as implying the consequential intolerability towards

workers within repressive structure of the term, when faced with their insistence of getting their cause recognized as a political problem against the neutralizing attitude towards the issue as a sui generis and a technical one.

Now, if we question the extent of the relationship between the discourses above and the constitution of citizen subjects, then it should be kept in mind that the first step to address a certain type as ideal necessitates a drawing the boundary between outsiders and insiders. One of the main mechanism through which the meaning of the ideal, virtuous and desirable is constituted for the populations is the discourse (Dean, 1999), where the act of shaping and governing ideas and the positions in society indirectly takes place. The discussion of citizenship in a way contains such assumptions of who is responsible over what, and what should be the certain type of attributes that people are to be embedded with. In several discursive occasions, one can encounter the tacit formulation of the ideal type of subjects, which at the same time draws the boundary between those who internalized circumscribed roles and those who do not comply with the given positions; and thus limits the competence of being a good citizen. Therefore, what all these theoretical insights tell us is that, the elements of a new mode of subject/subjectification reflecting the mentality of neoliberalism can be found in the present discourse. What we can term as ‘neoliberal citizenship’ or ‘neoliberal citizen’ is also constituted through such discursive practices having market rationality in its centre (Altan Olcay, 2011; Hindess, 2002; Somers, 2008). By solely looking at the discourse, one can identify TEKEK case as an instance of the discursive constitution of neoliberal citizen through the delineation of a

citizen that harbours this market based mentality, by addressing people harbouring reverse attitudes of irresponsibility, unproductiveness and idleness. It is also an important instance for showing the formation of ‘two nations’ as those having these virtues and those who does not, which reflects the conventional characteristics of citizenship that contains inclusion and exclusion.

As far as the fundamental aspects of ideal neoliberal citizen subject is concerned, governmentality literature asserts that, “the key feature of neoliberal rationality is the congruence it endeavours to achieve between a responsible and moral individual and an economic-rational actor”. (Lemke, 2001: 197) For Sparke (2006: 6), it might as well be described as ‘responsible and moral’ citizen, as neoliberal governmental practices busily and constantly works into a new more market mediated citizenship regime of economic and rational actors by locating normative individuality into national citizenship. Drawing on Lemke’s argument, Brown highlights similar aspects of neoliberal governmentality as it ‘normatively constructs and interpellates individuals as entrepreneurial actors in every sphere of life’ (Brown, 2003). As such, while on the one hand one can speak of antagonist segments that are discursively formed in society, the example of which was outlined through TEKEL; on the other hand, it can be argued that though having its roots from typical capitalist-worker antagonism or distribution of wealth, the clashing positions in society of this sort is emanated from the new production of subjectivities (Read, 2009:32). In that respect, one can speak of a hegemonic political-economic identity that different subjects have. In neoliberal era, the

general context of this identity of the citizens have grounded upon the basic premises of the market logic, at the heart of which lies a responsible, entrepreneurial and self-dependent individual, who is expected to be guarded against any sort of precariousness in this case, and subsequently not to be a 'burden on the state' by handling the whatsoever consequences stemming from the hazards of the market individually. In TEKEL case, this emerges as the governing of a precarious situation resulted from a privatization act, which requires the discursive endorsement of unemployed as self-depending subjects, who are responsible for their own situation in case of systemic risks encountered. These aspects are evident in the discourse targeting the workers' resistance. However, discourse is not merely an adequate mechanism to be convinced that the combination of all statements above can fully be recognized as functioning to constitute worker-cum-citizens as neoliberal subjects. What can be argued at this stage of the discussion is that the governing elites are expecting workers to act like 'economic rational actors' by not relying on the state as the main provider of their well-being, by realizing their entrepreneurial virtues and acting responsibly, and therefore not idly exploiting the welfare of the others, all of which indicate an expectation of worker-cum-citizens to act in line with the way that encompass neoliberal rationality. Also within these discursively created subjectivities, a strong sovereign-subject relationship is also inherent, in which the latter is passively obedient, and that this obedience emerges as an essential instrument in social order (Rustemova, 2008: 4)

Overall, central to this reconstitution of political-economic identity was a responsible, obedient and hardworking individual, who is able to cope with precarious conditions stems from the neoliberal market workings individually (Larner, 2000). From the quotes of the politicians, it can be suggested that the government here tends to conceive citizens as the inhabitants of neoliberal economic rationality that encourage making reasonable choices and responsible behaviour. Responsible citizens are expected to make reasonable choices – and conversely, the ‘bad choices’ are the results of the irresponsibility of the individuals rather than the structural distribution of resources, capacities and opportunities (Clarke, 2005: 451).

Another important conclusion we can reach from the statements is the depoliticizing aspect seen in the government’s attempt in a sense that it endeavours to politicize seemingly unpolitical and technical issues, such as unemployment. The accusatory language targeting the workers for not doing anything but demanding money and rights from the government exposes this neoliberal understanding that perceives unemployment as a singular and non-political phenomenon. On this, Brown asserts that

As neoliberalism converts every political or social problem into market terms, it converts them to individual problems with market solutions. This conversion of socially, economically, and politically produced problems into consumer items depoliticizes what has been historically produced, and it especially depoliticizes capitalism itself. Moreover, as neoliberal political rationality devolves both political problems and solutions from public to private, it further dissipates political or public life: the project of navigating the social becomes entirely one of (...) procuring a personal solution to every socially

produced problem. This is depoliticization on an unprecedented level: the economy is tailored to it, citizenship is organized by it (...) and the political rationality of neoliberalism frames and endorses it. (Brown, 2006b: 704)

So, while giving the message of finding their own solutions to their individual problems through their own virtues of responsibility, entrepreneurship and industriousness is given to TEKEL workers in particular, and to all citizens in general, it should be noticed that the citizens are implicitly counselled to act in this way, when encountered with a similar situation. The significance of the TEKEL case for the scope of this analysis is that, while the governmental self formation process as such serves for the promotion of one type of worker against the other in a narrow sense, at a broader context it functions to (re)constitute the political-economic identity of Turkish people in general by pointing to an individual type as desired.

When we conceptualize citizenship in terms of the meanings and roles attributed to people in everyday practices, we can sketch how discourses of desirable (political-economic) identities construct mechanisms of exclusion of and privilege (İşin, 2002). The discursive stance taken by the government officials during TEKEL crisis is a reflection of the production of such exclusion and privilege at the juncture of above-mentioned neoliberal moral assumptions. Underscoring the inevitability of getting individually protected and guarded against market risks and insecurities, as well as the significance of where to be positioned with respect to ‘ideology’ and marginality, Turkish citizens were once again reminded and urged with an ideal citizen portrayal, which is and has always been envisaged as responsible, industrious, obedient,

and grateful (Üstel, 2004), yet this time as enriched with the neoliberal rationale.

Being a legitimate and ‘good’ citizen implies not getting away ‘ideologically’ from the mainstream; otherwise people become the potential bearer of the threat of being criminated as illegal, marginal and extremist. Besides, if the individuals are not protected or guard themselves against the severe consequences of autonomous market operations, as a responsible citizen is expected to behave, they become the potential irresponsible and unproductive subjects. During the series of events witnessed in TEKEL conflict, organized civil society and whoever speaking out their discontent is treated and framed as the enemy inside by becoming the centre of accusations for their purpose of irresponsibly and idly advantaging from public’s money. What is derived accordingly is a portrait of an acceptable and desired citizen, with the promotion of one sort of subject vis-à-vis its reverse. The attributes of the ideal subject is tacitly constituted from what it is not, from the attributes of ‘the other’, that is docile, productive, responsible, hard working and will be satisfied with ‘working under these conditions’. Or, the other option can be that, even if the citizen somehow finds himself in such status, he will know how to best break out of this situation individually with his ability to take responsibility, use his entrepreneurship and industriousness.

The sort of worker endorsed in the narrower level gives the clues of the sort of a citizen delineated at a broader sense: once the public, now discursively constituted as a group of people who were assigned an identity of

a market compliant ideal citizen. Thus, the TEKEL case is an incident revealing an inclination towards digesting the sort of individuals, the attributes of whom are not compatible with the idealized, legitimate citizen, and consequently defining ‘what should be’ by detecting and then addressing the missing features through negation. In that respect, the stance taken by the government officials in Turkey during the crisis was oriented towards discursively constituting the workers as the scapegoats and their ‘anti-’ rest as ideals. It was in a way discursively constituting an ideal citizen that will take responsibility, will not resist and comply with neoliberal logic by keeping up with the changing conditions. The polarization of society as such also works for the increase of threat perception, where anything seemingly constitutes an opposition to the workings of neoliberal market can be discursively framed as a new source of threat (i.e. as ideological, as terrorist etc.) in the eyes of society.

4.3. Limits to Neoliberal Governmentality

4.3.1. Neoliberal Representation with Limited Governmental Intervention

As I have initially indicated, the main purpose of this chapter was to see the extent to which the discourse employed during TEKEL resistance can be analyzed through neoliberal governmentality framework and the extent to which one can claim it to be an instance of a discursive subject constitution.

Making such assessment at this stage requires opening up more space for a further and more detailed account on the dimensions of governmentality.

Previously, one of the constitutive elements that makes of governmentality was indicated as the governmental projects' ability of shaping the choices, behaviours, goals and desires of individuals through acting upon and utilizing their autonomy and freedom and thus letting them be their own governors by overall influencing their actions. That is the basis upon which the act of creating different subjectivities is built within society through infusing the self-regulative mechanisms to individuals. Therefore, claiming the crystallization of two parallel phases in governmentality would not be a misleading contention if one is able to identify the processes, the first of which is (neoliberal) subject constitution as the defining moment, and subsequently an effective initiative to acting upon individuals with the aim of 'shaping or guiding the conduct of others through their capacity to regulate their own behaviour (Foucault, 2008: 307). To put it more concretely, within the framework of governmentality, individuals are constituted and acted upon as rational, calculative, entrepreneur, competitive, responsible, hard working etc. and then their actions and behaviour are systematically intervened and guided in this rational conduct to be shaped in these directions.

When our given case TEKEL is re-assessed with this notice in mind, the question then should be reformulated as 'whether this discursive constitution of the worker citizen-subject in neoliberal terms is part of a more comprehensive effort of government and its institutions to constitute, as well *act upon* workers to guide them as neoliberal subjects'. We clearly see the

operation at the discursive level, in which certain type of worker-subject is represented through highlighting the individual virtues of responsibility, industriousness, rationality and productiveness. While the acts of workers were criticized and accused on the lack of these, it was argued that such attitude might as well be regarded as part of an attempt to constitute workers in certain way. Additionally, the neutralization and depoliticization of certain actual categories within present situation –privatization, unemployment and political-economy related outcomes in general- also evokes governmentality perspective. However, beyond these endeavours of representation and depoliticization/neutralization, if governmentality is to be evaluated as a complete process, we should also address a parallel attempt to govern individuals in accordance with such representation/constitution effort. Here giving answer to the reframed question above depends on whether one can talk about an active governmental program through which these workers-cum-citizens acted upon in neoliberal terms through the field of labour market regulations.

At this point, when we look at the wider agenda regulating labour relations, it is hard to tell that there is an organized attempt that can guide and mobilize workers in line with the essence of discursive constitution. In that respect, though the labour law can be considered as a mechanism through which the actions and the behaviour of the workers are acted upon, albeit limited, the given framework of existing regulations will be insufficient to suggest that the workers are deliberately acted upon as neoliberal subjects. Nonetheless, there are certain courses within the new labour law that can be

referred as an effort to reregulate workers more in compliance with neoliberal rationality, especially those related to flexibilization of labour market, yet remain on a limited scale to be put as a governmental project of neoliberal subject/worker constitution, as will be discussed in the following section. Subsistence of such condition is where the limits of governmentality as a complete process comes into the picture within TEKEL case related to the existing legal and governmental structure, as it cannot be associated with wider attempt to act upon no longer employed workers.

As for what could have exemplified the actualization of both components of governmentality in a comprehensive and organized way, few fields of study among many can be coined in order to sketch the point put forward above more concretely. For instance, lifelong learning programs supported especially by the international bodies such as European Union and OECD that encourages the pursuit of knowledge and personal development regardless of the age is widely studied through governmentality framework. It is a pertinent topic since it implies both the promotion of a certain type of subject, i.e. active, competitive, self-responsible, employable, and also an organized and active attempt to mobilize individuals to particular direction where individuals can actualize themselves by investing in their own human capital in accordance with these attributes. So, the whole agenda is assessed as an effort for ‘governing the subject’ (Fejes and Nicoll, 2008). Such characteristics of governmentality analysis also enable studying global methods of poverty alleviation as a governmental project, through which the poor subject is sought to be reconstituted as responsible and self-dependent

individuals. World Bank's Social Risk Mitigation Project implemented in Turkey for poverty alleviation is also analyzed from within this framework (Şener, 2010) and is deemed a form of neoliberal governmentality in a sense that it firstly creates a discourse about the poor that contains the *representation* of it as a self-dependent and responsible subject, and then *produces* the poor as self-dependent and responsible subject through the systematic policy schemes, all of which in the end serves for the depoliticization of poverty. In a similar line of thinking, the same framework is applied to the role of competitiveness reports and country benchmarking in guiding and shaping the behaviour of the states as competitive entities, by assuming them to be the subjects of the international market system (Fougner, 2006 and 2008). Here too, the analysis is made first with reference to the process through which international competitiveness was discursively rationalized and normalized in reports published by World Economic Forum and International Institute for Management Development. Then correspondingly, states are acted upon and governed in accordance with this neutralized representation of competitiveness, and they are actively created as competitive entities by being articulated into the norms of this system.

Considering the structure of these topics studied above in the light of governmentality; the limits of analyzing TEKEK case as a discursive governmental project becomes more explicit with respect to the extent to which discursive constitution took place. If there were, for example, any organized programs or agenda operated by the government or institutions before or after the privatization act in order to mobilize workers in parallel

direction with what official discourse implies, i.e. an attempt to reconstitute them as responsible, productive and hard-working subjects, then we could have talked about the case as an exemplary one. However, since a supplementary action - like a governmental program, a scheme etc. - that would harmonize with the existing discourse lacks here in this case, talking about TEKEL as a neoliberal governmentality is limited to discursive representation of the workers with certain neoliberal attributes, as well as the depoliticization and naturalization of what workers resist for. Therefore the answer to be given as for how the study of TEKEL case can be informed by the governmentality context would be that it is explanatory to a certain degree as there is no holistic attempt to govern according to the representation, but rather an implicit promotion of an ideal worker-citizen. Another point that can be regarded as a limit to governmentality perspective with regard to this case emerges when counter discourse by the workers on government's position is included, showing the extent to which this promoted subject positions have internalized by the workers.

Despite the argument made regarding the boundaries of the governmentality approach due to a lack of complementary program within the labour field that can constitute a background for the discursive constitution took place in TEKEL case, it is still crucial to look at the prominent setting in labour relations that can be analyzed via governmentality. In that respect, as was done in the previous chapter, labour law can be scrutinized as it is the most comprehensive attempt to regulate the circumstances within the labour field that will soon lead to the new forms of subjection.

As analyzed at the labour relations part in the previous chapter, the 1980s witnessed the elimination of labour as the constitutive element from the constitution as a part of the global trend. This dismissal followed by a consequential disregard of its constitutive role at the societal level too (Yalman, 2002). With the loss of the constitutionality of labour and the understanding that deems it as a social entity, workers were no longer to claim a right collectively, but as single individuals that express their individual demands. Therefore, under the pressure of neoliberal envisioning, once acknowledged notion of ‘collective labour right’ has become a meaningless set of concepts (Özdemir and Yücesan Özdemir, 2008: 192). That is where the relation between this constitutional and social loss of meaning and the general attitude towards TEKEL workers can be established, since the right-seeking aspect of the resistance is identified as ‘illegal and unjust occupation’ as a way to delegitimize the whole act with respect to society. Additionally, the response given to this collective demand is shaped around the core individualistic values of responsibility and industriousness, related to the individualization of all values tied to once collectively identified labour.

The nature of work in the new labour law was redefined not in favour of the employee, but rather the employer in the axis of subordination. Changing meaning of the workers obligations and subordination were guaranteed with 2003 Labour Law, promoting flexibility and subordination as the new defining elements within labour relations (Özdemir, 2004). Indeed, especially the employment flexibility element was legalized both through the law, and through the decisions of the Constitutional Court in the period from

2003 onwards, becoming a natural outcome of employment relations, through which the workers were accustomed to get flexible and subordinate vis-à-vis the employer. Such characteristics makes this part of the agenda a most suitable category to analyze from the governmentality framework, in a sense that it can somewhat be regarded as the reconstitution of worker in certain way.

What we mostly extract out of Labour Law regarding the flexibility and subordination aspect is analyzed at the juncture of its impacts on the exercise of labour rights (Özdemir and Yücesan Özdemir, 2006) –which can be the focus of the previous chapter- and central aims it tried to achieve such as competitiveness, flexibility (Yıldırım, 2006). Similarly, various regulations on labour relations were involved in Omnibus Law that was enacted in 2011 also constitute the focus of some recent studies, albeit from the point of violation of existing rights. Having an idea of the vision of the government in labour field through these policies is possible as they more or less reveal the general approach, yet they remain at the level of ‘labour policy’ rather than exposing the attitude to govern ‘labour’ in more particular terms. Although the laws concerning labour as such will surely lead to the launch of new strategies and regulations that can be analyzed through governmentality framework, the amount of the material reflecting the understanding of government and, whether it is informed by neoliberal rationality or not is limited at the present time.

The stance sometimes discloses itself at some minor occasions such as the one reflecting the official perception of labour in Turkey in Prime

Ministry's 'Invest in Turkey' website encouraging foreign investment to Turkey. In the section '10 Reasons to Invest in Turkey', one of the reasons is mentioned as 'qualified and competitive labour force', which sets the criteria of qualification as follows: "Over 26 million young, well-educated and motivated professionals; increasing labor productivity; the longest working hours, and the lowest sick day leaves per employee in Europe with 52.9 hours worked per week and annual average of 4.6 sick days per employee."²⁰ Among all three that represents and promotes the virtues as marketable talents and productivity to the international arena, the last one is crucial for showing the limits of an attitude commodifying labour can get. Here, not a particular government but the state itself reflects how it conceives of labour by qualifying it by its productiveness and efficiency, putting the humane aspects aside. They are interesting and noteworthy mentioning as they can be considered as the extension of neoliberal rationality for reflecting a particular understanding on labour. But still, first they are only perceptions and thus minor to the extent that it is not supported by an attempt to act on workers in line with their inherent rationality. They are weak and non-systematic indications to be considered a part of a more comprehensive effort of governing labour in certain way. To the extent that the numbers and the scope of such examples increase, then one can start talking about the neoliberal governance of workers-cum-citizens that can back up incidents like TEKEL discourse.

²⁰ <http://www.invest.gov.tr/en-US/investmentguide/Pages/10Reasons.aspx>

Because flexibility component comes to forefront in new direction within labour area, it deserves a more focused analysis in order to be contextualized within the greater policy agenda of labour, which basically aims to harmonize the labour markets with neoliberal principles. Without grasping the multidimensional characteristics of the flexibilization of work and how increasing flexibility redefines the conditions of work, an attempt of understanding both the causes and the weight of TEKEL resistance will remain as a singular effort. I have previously outlined the impact of these basic policy premises of labour market flexibility on Turkey in the macro part; however what rather concerns us in this part is the governmentality aspect within the implications of flexibilization agenda, which actually constitutes the basis of the official attitude in our given case. Needless to say, the term ‘micro’ here denotes a series of governmental mechanisms in constituting individuals as neoliberal subjects while implementing these macro policies and practices.

Though Foucault taught us –with all else- about the modes of subjection in modern period with his writings during the industrial/fordist period, all of these made even more sense when looking at the practices within labour relations unique in post-industrial/neoliberal period, flexibilization policies being one of them. As Fraser (2003: 169) puts it, “flexibilization names both a mode of social organization and a process of self-constitution (...) and is a process of self- constitution that correlates with, arises from and resembles a mode of social organization”. Indeed, since the practices and policies of governments are regarded more than macro-political

procedures through the lens of governmentality, and that it enables to inquire the government of the self in accordance with this broader picture, it becomes possible to obtain how the practices of labour flexibility is reflected in the positioning of citizens as responsible, rational and calculative selves by employing this analytical tool. Then the focus in relation to the agenda that leads to TEKEL becomes how entities such as the state and existing or prospective employees are positioned vis-à-vis the responsabilization brought about by these policies and how these positions become natural and desirable.

When it comes to the analysis of labour market flexibility through governmentality analysis, the approach towards ‘employability’ comes to forefront as the defining element lead by these policies, serving to the ‘constitution of responsible citizen’ (Fejes, 2010). It is even argued by the same author that the discussions on employment are now shifting towards the debates on employability, when the question of ‘how governance operates in the production of a citizen subject who is positioned as responsible for his/her own employability’ comes into the play. Set of practices brought about by flexibilization necessitates individuals to become ‘flexible’ and adaptable subjects through switching themselves to the conditions of change, competition and entrepreneurship (Bunnel and Coe, 2005), all of which are construed as the inherent characteristics and responsibility of the individual. So, people become employable so long as they can adapt themselves to the above-mentioned flexibility criteria of working extra hours, doing extra works beyond their job description, working under vague security conditions with unpredictable future employment and eroded social rights. As such,

individuals are responsibilized again (Rose 1999) in this context too, to the extent that they bear the burden of being flexible enough to adapt themselves to these criteria as a way to become or remain employable.

One of the main points while I discussed the official discourse on TEKEL was the depiction and the implicit promotion of a desirable worker subject image that was not to be burden over the state, and to act in a manner to bear the responsibility of other citizens by demanding more privileges while doing nothing; which perfectly fits into the relational framework of governmentality and flexibility. In the related statements, we can easily see the discourse that positions worker subjects in terms of responsibility of his own employability by implying that the flexibility and adaptability should be inherent attributes to be found in individuals. What actually meant by the whole argument on idleness, or ‘they do nothing but still demand privileged position’ sort of discourse can be interpreted as the workers’ inability to changing circumstances in the labour market, implying a lack of responsibility in their adaptability. They also naturalize the precarious nature of neoliberal capitalism in a way that they hold individual responsible for not being mobile and flexible, as well as for the situation of other unemployed, other workers, minimum wage earners etc. In that respect all statements related to the discourse of flexibility can be argued to have constructed an idea of self-responsibility of the individual, for keeping themselves employable and making their own calculation with respect to the precarious situations in the future. Similarly, the declaration of workers to be redundant can be construed in similar vein with the logic that TEKEL workers were thought not to

embody these attributes and to lack these expected behaviour of adaptability and employability. Consequently, through this simple reasoning they were discarded out of their inadequacy; a viewpoint that has no reference or whatsoever to the systemic features tied to privatization and flexibilization, the bits of which could be noticed in the counter discourse of the workers. For Strath (2000), the discourse on employability and responsabilization as such is even used as an explanation and legitimization of unemployment, positioning the citizens as responsible for their own employment, and with no emphasis on structural causes, inequalities or problem within the labour market (Fejes, 2010: 90), or broader neoliberal agenda. Though these contentions on flexibility can be linked up with the governmentality aspect theoretically, so long as one cannot talk about the existence of concrete governmental technology informed by neoliberal rationality, the studies will remain at the limited level.

4.3.2. Resistance to Neoliberal Subjectification

Workers have obviously been central to all stages of the whole incident from beginning to the end. The focus in this study, though, has been the official discourse targeting their resistance until now. However, in order to hear the other side of the story, when we lend an ear to the workers on what they have to say about the way in which they are discursively presented by the governing elite, i.e. lying down, idleness, and the way they identify their subject positions, it is not hard to discern their consciousness in politicizing

their situation despite the attempts that portray the whole series of events as an inevitable instance. It is evident in the constant reference to rights-based discourse as the reason for their resistance, as well as to the privatization act as the cause of their situation. Against prominent positioning the worker-subjects as idle and lazy, a worker states that:

It is true; we have been 'lying down'. I am worker for 20 years and I have lied around for a year. Why? Because you have closed down my factory. You allocated me to other irrelevant jobs. There is no job, nothing to do there, but you have told me to hang about there. What could I have done? I mean, I had to hang about. Then they shamelessly say that they have wound down. We would work if we were to. Give me my job back. You should not have closed down my factory. It was the same worker that had made 70.000-80.000 packages in a day, it was me. Our workplace was given testimonials. That worker was also me. Why am I the one who is hanging out now? (Türkmen, 2012: 69).

Against the reiteration of the workers' uselessness and unfairness of the income they are given, a very simple way of thinking reflects the politicizing attempt found in Foucault and the relevant literature, that does not assume things and phenomenon as taken for granted but politicize them by relating it to the greater political, economic and social conjuncture. Here, the worker's way of thinking that relates his situation to the greater political economic agenda of privatization and subsequent reformulation of the labour market on the basis of flexibilization not only politicizes his conditions, but also denaturalizes the hegemonic discourse that narrates the events as inevitable and natural, consequently repeating the idleness of the workers for there is a need to highlight their needlessness. Another similar statement by a worker

named Şükrü also well illustrates the notion of ‘disposable worker’ coined by Harvey (2005: 169) by saying that:

The state aims at composing an army of unemployed through privatization. It aims at making the global rich much richer. I believe this. Now that the state makes loss out of me, and I lay around, why do you assign me to 4C? Allocate me somewhere I can produce, do not take back the right you have given me. I am still young, I want to work more. It chains me with this slavery law called 4C. It makes me a modern slave. You have sold these, left them unoccupied. You should not have sold. You should not have let them loose. You made them work in their youth, and then you got rid of them. (Türkmen, 2012: 94).

The way the workers constitute themselves is quite different than how they are constituted as the unnecessary workforce through the dominant discourse. By pointing at the precarious condition they fell into due to privatization, they raise their awareness on representation of themselves as the subjects lacking glorified market virtues of industriousness and effectiveness has nothing to do with where they stand as subjects – as they see themselves rather the victims of the prevailing system- but more to do with what is considered as the universally valid and commonly accepted truths and rules of the global capitalism. Besides, the point here raised by the worker also shows a self-reflection of himself as a right-holder citizen, which actually constitutes the fundamental reason of the entire resistance movement. The emphasis of this sort that addresses to citizenship qualification of oneself by opposing the understanding that is disposed to put workers somewhere other than the ‘citizens’ category, and placing himself as a ‘complete citizen’ is clearer in a worker’s statement stating that “as a citizen, we have done our military

services for this state, we pay our taxes, we live in this country. We want to live freely; it is rather our right, to live in a way we deserve”. (Türkmen, 2012: 142) Disclosure of such discourse can also be the ones against the hierarchical discourse of ‘compassion’ used by the officials. The workers themselves say that there should be no compassion in welfare state (sosyal devlet) that is constitutionally declared, but the citizenship rights, which they say they fight for, by stating that:

They say ‘we have pitied’. We do not beg for mercy from anyone, do not need it either. Those elected cannot speak out the word ‘mercy’ and cannot see themselves greater than their own people. There is no mercy but citizenship rights in a welfare state. This right is what we ask (Kaderoğlu Bulut, 2010: 324).

Far from accepting the subject positions put into words, the workers points to their positions as right-seeking individuals that resist against the unjust treatment they were confronted with. Questioning of generally accepted truths on state-citizen relations mostly in the axis of citizenship obligations manifests itself in one of the worker’s contemplation:

As a citizen, I feel I have been deceived many times before, I feel how insignificant human life is. I mean we thought they say ‘if my citizen is happy, then my country is happy too’ but they sincerely do not care if the citizen is happy or unhappy. All in all, we have done our military service, been in the battles, we pay our taxes too. They appeal to us whenever they need something, and then ‘go home and work for this money.’ What kind of social state is this? Turkey is a secular, democratic and social state when it serves for your interests, but when it comes to the action where is that social state? You give coal and assistance just

because they are going to vote for you tomorrow. 'If I pay more than 1000-1500 Liras to these men they will go and educate themselves, get enlightened; and maybe will not vote for me having realized my intents.' But what do they try to do? They try to push the whole country to the level of minimum wage and make them not think, not question. Then, he will not contemplate and vote for whoever provides assistance to him. That is slavery too. I realized that. (Türkmen, 2010: 144)

The resistance move as a whole lead the worker question the common assumptions about the formal tie established with the state and bring forward a critical understanding on the claims of equality and justice conceptually found within the institutionalized form of citizenship. Workers usually felt necessary to emphasize their competence as a 'real citizen' *despite* the resistance, by addressing to their fulfilment of fundamental citizenship obligations. However, the last quote is also striking for seeing the attitude towards them as part of an incentive to render people dependent to themselves and thus establishing the state-citizen relations in this axis of dependency, as well as seeing it as an attempt to make people subjects in a passive and obedient position. It is also crucial for associating the source of this subjection to the widespread exercise of philanthropy, instead of establishing this mutual relationship on the basis of the constitutional guarantee of social state.

When we look at how workers reflect on the accusing rhetoric found in the official discourse, they were largely seen as a way to relieve themselves. 'They attributed the work done by a particular sector to us in order to relieve their conscience, and thus, they confronted us with the citizens including the police.' (Akbulut, 2010: 281). The way that a worker

interprets the events and positions himself in a way recapitulates the ‘two nations project’ alike theoretical assumptions. Since the discourse employed by the government is directed towards the area that the workers actualize their existence, as well as towards their honour; it does not only futilities what they do or do no longer produce, but beyond their position as a worker subject, their own existence. For that reason, they call out to be recognized and to be respected.

Our end is not in fact materiality, because we will eventually get what we deserve one day. But the depreciatory statements of the government and the Prime Minister have terribly upset us. He deemed us as thieves. Plus, he presented us as those violating orphan’s right to the public. That saddened us very much, and humiliated. (Türkmen, 2012: 68)

We have worked for many years; we deserved and earned a certain amount of money by the sweat of our brow. But they have explicitly showed TEKEL worker as a bloodsucker and a burden over the state. But I am a working man who knows what *helal* (lawful) and *haram* (unlawful) is. I do never take what I do not deserve. Most of TEKEL employees are also people like me, lower class and sharing people, but they have presented us very differently (Türkmen, 2010: 120)

The self portrait the workers tried to depict is quite different that of they were discursively presented. In the statements here, as well as at the ones were not included, they stress on the normality of both themselves as individuals, and also of their action. They, therefore, in an effort to falsify the image drawn by the government officials by addressing to their rightness, and normality. Such attempt is also evident in the discourse concerning marginality. Though political maneuvers tries to make the whole situation seem as tainted by the

marginal groups as the resistance itself is an opposing act –which best suits to the marginals in the end- the unprompted defence made by a worker is a counter positioning of himself that simply expresses their situation as ‘We are not terrorists, we are workers. So we are fighting for our rights. We do not ask for a right that does not exist’ (Türkmen, 2012: 62). The constant portrayal of the illegitimateness and unfairness of the workers’ cause is also reflected as a natural defence mechanism developed by the workers, which again gives hints on how they actually constitute themselves as the legal subjects, and their resistance as a rightful cause. A worker named Adnan asks: ‘What would you do if I stole your bread? Of course you would react. We also show our reaction through the legal framework. Within the framework of the law. So, we do not violate the laws. We do not harm anyone. We do not disrupt anyone.’ (Türkmen, 2012: 146). The workers constantly refer to the material base that their actions are caused from by stating that they are after gaining their jobs and privileges back. It inevitably makes them speak concerning the claim of their cause being ideological. Regarding ideology and the roots of their resistance belonging to two distinct spheres, workers usually tends to refuse the rhetoric on ideology as they possibly believe that it spoils the rightfulness of their demands:

We do not want anything. We want our rights not to be taken back. We do not want a pay rise; we want our bread not be taken. We struggle for that, and do nothing else. We have no political ideology whatsoever. We want our bread. (Türkmen, 2010: 144)

While the general inclination is towards avoiding to refer the ideological roots, there are also some, albeit rare, that argue there is no ideology-free stance. While stating that their act is of course an ideological one, they also blend this argument with the rights discourse by striving to convince that ideology is not something evil that harms society in any ways:

I believe I have shown an honourable resistance. We don't do anything to torment people, nor provoke them. We only have an ideology, he said it himself. Some of the friends say 'we have no ideology.' And I told them 'this is impossible, there could be no one living without an ideology.' Here, we are in the pursuit of winning our bread, for the future of our children and for gaining rights for the generations to come (Yıkılmaz and Kumlu, 2011:250-251).

What can easily be observed in the statements of the workers when asked about the attitude of the government is their constant effort for creating a counter discourse on the rightness of their cause and attempt to make the resistance seem as a legitimate act that is motivated by the violation of their existing rights. For the negative depiction of their 'citizenship status' implied in the dominant discourse, the workers in their statements feel themselves obliged to prove that they are actually 'good' and responsible citizens. The reasons for such endeavour for legitimizing their citizenship status 'despite' the resistance can be found in the incriminating language towards them for hacking around, lying down, violating 'orphan's right', and getting provoked by some extremists. In various statements, workers are constantly in an effort to legitimize and justify their actions and emphatically declare that they are not terrorist, provokers nor traitors, and contrary to their representation, they are citizens that 'fulfil all the duties and responsibilities' they are meant to.

So, along with the attempt of legitimizing their cause, they rather address to what the government does as unjust and illegal that leads to their fight.

These protests are for not giving up on our existing rights, because they are already our rights. We do not want anything from them but they steal our rights from us. They are the rights we already have, because these are not randomly, verbally given rights. These are the rights given by the law. After all, I am a public employee (Yıkılmaz and Kumlu: 2011: 241-42)

What comes to forefront most in the given speeches is the emphasis on their subject positions as the right holder citizens who are after gaining these rights back which are violated due to privatization agenda. They see their legally guaranteed public employee position as a secure condition that cannot be easily dismissed. So, the central argument becomes that what they do is totally a legitimate act since they do not ask for anything new or extra, but want their rights of which they were dispossessed, but rather what government is involved is an illegitimate one.

So when we look at the general characteristics of the counter discourse put forward above, it is easy to extract the workers' defending position and not accepting the image promoted. Against accusing language directed on several points, they see what they do is already a rightful and a legitimate act, but they just try to justify their resistance with respect to the reverse image that is officially tried to be imposed both to them, and to the society in general. It is also crucial here that the workers do have the consciousness on the ways through which they had been pushed towards their existing conditions, which implied their ability to politicize where they stand. Such positioning can be regarded as a counter movement towards an attempt to

individualize social and political problems and thus depoliticizing them by simply referring and portraying them as technical and isolated issues. Besides the peculiar significance that this counter discourse by the workers has in itself, it is also important as it signifies the extent of the applicability of governmentality framework to the discursive act in TEKEL, due to refused subject positions by the worker-citizens. As discussed above, though the government's attempt is crucial for making sense of the discourse as a form of neoliberal subject constitution, in addition to a lack of an organized program to mobilize the workers as the conveyers of neoliberal rationality, the overall picture comes out of the worker statements also addresses the limits to governmentality framework as a twofold process, since it is understood that workers do not internalize these subject positions.

4.4. Concluding Remarks

So, what finally comes out of the adaption of neoliberal governmentality to a labour-specific case in Turkey is surely not a plain, but quite contrary a very complex picture. Staying committed to the aim that was initially put as “the extent to which neoliberalism (at the micro level) has had an impact on constituting the citizens as neoliberal subjects”, the focus was given to a labour field and more specifically to TEKEL industrial conflict, during which the discursive disclosure of neoliberal rationality was thought to have been revealed. Subsequently, having used neoliberal governmentality framework as an analytical tool to discuss the question “to what extent discourse employed

during TEKEL resistance can be analyzed from neoliberal governmentality perspective with reference to neoliberal citizen-subject making process”, a simplified order of what is analyzed and thus what came out in order to facilitate the grasp can straightforwardly be put as follows:

- a. *Discursive constitution of workers in neoliberal terms:* The discursive attitude taken by the government clearly resembles a discursive expression of neoliberal rationality: be it in emphasis on productiveness, in the implicit reference to industriousness or in addressing responsibility as a ‘must-to-have’ virtue. At first sight, it might in a way give a sense of an attempt to constitute worker-cum-citizens as neoliberal subjects, which compels us to look at the second stage in detail.
- b. *Absence of specific technologies –informed by ‘neoliberal rationality-to act upon and (re)constitute the workers as neoliberal subjects:* In order to detect an instance of neoliberal governmentality, one should talk about the existence of governmental programs or technologies informed by neoliberal rationality (Rose and Miller, 1990) which signifies a conscious attempt to govern individuals as neoliberal subjects. With this in mind, when neoliberal governmentality as an analytical framework is adapted to a labour-specific case in Turkey, the discourse of which is considered to have neoliberal elements, fundamental necessity of looking at a broader context emerges not in the field of ‘labour policy’, but in ‘labour governance’ implying the

relations established between the governments and worker-cum-citizens. It is because merely the discursive representation –speeches and/or statements on the side of the government- does not offer enough clues to conclude whether individuals are governed in accordance with neoliberal rationality or not. In that respect, looking beyond the TEKEL case is vitally important to see whether it is a part of a more general agenda that seeks to govern worker-cum-citizens as neoliberal subjects. The most plausible tool to appeal is set of regulations and the legal background in the field of labour, and this was done so by looking at the prominent characteristics of the legal background, as well as the labour governance, through which flexibility and performance-based assessment come out as decisive elements. Although they can constitute a backdrop to a certain extent, what rather becomes apparent is the absence of a systematic attempt to worker-cum-citizens as such, which constitutes limits to neoliberal governmentality in the discussion of TEKEL.

- c. *Resistance to neoliberal subjectification on the part of workers:* The second limit to neoliberal governmentality occurs when the subject positions brought about by the government is discursively refused and resisted too. It can be seen as a limit to the extent that governmentality is a dialectically functional process, requiring the internalization of promoted values by individuals, so that individuals can become self-governing subjects in line with neoliberal rationality as competitive, rational, obedient, hard working etc. individuals. This aspect is

observed to be lacking in the counter-discourse put forward by the resisting workers, who clearly have not taken up subject positions represented to them. Practices of resistance are not only limited extent to which a neoliberal subject position was not accepted and internalized by workers, but also they actively counter-produce an alternative subject position for themselves through a right based discourse on citizenship.

Against this background, it is not exactly correct to argue that neoliberal governmentality perspective is fully irrelevant to this privatization-specific case. The ways through which the events following privatization are handled by the political elite can be considered a disclosure of neoliberal rationality discursively, and related to this, it reveals the understanding that tends to individualize and naturalize the consequences of actually systemic risks and insecurities. Unemployment, privatization, responsibility and security-insecurity are not pre-given categories that have an existence and a meaning of their own, yet the discourse presents them as natural and inevitable realities. Yet overall, the wide scope of the extent of labour governance in neoliberal terms introduces limitations to this study with little evidence in the given field. Merely discourse of government –the speeches, statements- is not enough indicators to celebrate TEKEK case as an extension of neoliberal governmental project. A full-scale analysis of the extent to which neoliberal governance in Foucauldian terms can be detected in Turkey is far beyond the context of this thesis; therefore, this narrowed focus can open up a context for a prospective research in the future.

CHAPTER V:

CONCLUSION

Finding out the anatomy of citizenship is a pursuit embraced by variety of scholars in different ways. The same is the case with neoliberalism. The initial aim of this thesis was to bring these two areas of study together and question what might be the possible outcomes of the relation between them.

The problematique of this thesis was twofold, the first of which was motivated by the underestimation of political economic aspect within citizenship studies in an attempt to contextualize this theoretical scrutiny in the experiences faced in Turkey. The latter part, however, aims at exploring new ways in studying citizenship as a form of subjecthood, by defining neoliberalism as a form of governmental project and asking how citizens are discursively constituted as subjects. Neoliberalism is taken to imply both a set of economic policies, and an attempt to governing people in accordance with the neoliberal rationality of government. The duality of the conceptual basis and focus areas as such necessitated conceptualizing them distinctively, which is fulfilled by developing a scheme that defines neoliberalism both at the

macro (policy framework) and micro (neoliberal governmentality) levels; and then discussing citizenship according to these two levels.

Having stayed committed to these conceptual frameworks in developing the relevant arguments has lead to the elaboration of the relationship between the two in two distinct ways, which therefore resulted as the emergence of two sets of conclusions instead of a single one. So, if I clearly state the conclusion at the beginning: the thesis ends up with dual conclusions both in terms of the ways through which they were reached, and of the outcome attained; just as how citizenship and neoliberalism is dually defined. The first of these conclusions can be said to have been more straightforward to reach, whereas making assumptions about the second one has been tougher in terms of method and ways of thinking.

In the chapter on macro neoliberalization, I show how the political-economic setting has taken a neoliberal turn after 1980, which is followed by an inquiry into their impact on social rights and citizenship. This has been the first attempt at making sense of neoliberalism and citizenship with reference to the relation between neoliberal policies and social rights is easier to follow and observable so long as the conceptualization is made explicit with reference to certain categories –of social rights- and considered in relation to specifics of the neoliberalization process, and finally the relation between these two categories are identified in terms of the impacts.

By way of identifying three prominent social rights, it is not wrong to conclude that there has been a certain decline in the exercise of the rights in

these three fields in Turkey following the rapid neoliberalization process – this, when you move from a certain idea of social right, and also when you look at previous conditions that social rights were exercised, through which they were constitutionalized and guaranteed to a certain level. It is possible to claim that this deterioration has revealed itself most apparently in the field of labour as the main rights determining the scope of labour relations – unionization, collective bargaining, right to strike etc.- were enjoyed relatively at a more comprehensive level both through the constitutional guarantee and the practical level prior to neoliberalization. It can be seen as an inevitable consequence of the ultimate expansion and the dominance of the market over state-society relations, in which the labour component emerges as the weakest link to be eliminated due to its crucial position as the possible obstacle in the uneven progression of the market. Therefore, among other categories put forward, labour relations is argued to have damaged in a most negative way mainly due to a gradual decline of rights granted legally.

When we come to the poverty alleviation and social security on the other hand, the same ‘negative’ trend in terms of their implications on social rights is also present. Yet what comes to the forefront in terms of this decline emerges as something different, since it implies the systematic disclosure of a certain understanding more significant than the policy shifts in neoliberal terms. They were approached differently than labour since the method employed was the comparison between past and present situations in labour, whereas the conviction of this demise in social security and poverty was made by relying on certain categorical understanding that attributes certain

meanings of the ‘social’, in conjunction with the policy shifts in the relevant areas. The prefix ‘social’ in social rights entails a normative attitude against problems occurs in society, in individuals’ lives due to systemic reasons beyond their initiative and responsibility, (i.e. market functioning, cyclic economic crises etc.), and it necessitates an understanding that internalizes collective and responsibility when faced with such problems. However, what came to the forefront as the prevailing stance both in social security and poverty is the individualization of social issues and problems –social protection, poverty- which predictably signifies the losing ground of the ‘social’ and makes it an obsolete term in the Turkish context with reference to the regulations and practices seen.

In the field of social security, this conclusion was reached by looking at the exclusionary mechanism in social security system that only includes working and self-contributing population or their relevant. Though one can argue that the Turkish social security regime has always been pillared and exclusionary in the same way unlike some other countries with well-settled welfare traditions, or it equally has been protective due to its unique characteristics; the impact of the relations between international institutions fostering neoliberal agenda is undeniable in influencing the restrictions in existing social security mechanisms through different ways: launching more contribution period, cutting from the benefits in the name of equating differences etc. So, overall, the meaning of ‘the social’ as demarcated here was argued to have lost its genuine meaning.

In looking at the effects of neoliberalization on different levels of social rights, poverty has been the sphere where the least reference was given to policy shifts stem from neoliberalization process. Rather, an inherent understanding originating from this process was tried to be outlined, which is very much contradictory with the content of the ‘social’ in a sense that the case and individual-based solutions were appealed and social responsibility against these were transferred to particular civil society and voluntary-based initiatives. It reflects an understanding that does not deem poverty as part of social problems but rather individualizes it isolating it from political economic settings in which the state constitutes a big part. It equally depoliticizes the actual roots of the problem by discarding itself from responsibility. What is more unique to the Turkish case noteworthy has come out as the merging of conservative outlook with civil society initiatives in poverty alleviation, which perpetuated the individually handling with this social problem, in which solidarity and morality became the binding elements in mobilizing people against poverty.

It should be noted that the thesis did not necessarily undertake a mission of proposing an alternative act to be fulfilled by the state or a certain policy method, but rather aimed at showing that the methods in both poverty alleviation and social security regime do not comply with the notion of ‘the social’ as understood here. What I rather concluded is that, it is not majorly the policy shifts especially in the field of poverty alleviation and partially in social security, but rather the understanding that reflects a neoliberal approach to social problems that comes to forefront in looking at the development of

social rights in the Turkish context. It can alternatively be proposed that the influence on policy shifts is seen to a greater extent in the field of labour in Turkey. This is the case with regard to social security as well, but the reason I have categorized social security and poverty alleviation is mainly determined by the prominent implication that reflects a neoliberal understanding in approaching the problems in these areas, which is the individualization and responsabilization, which is not in compliance with the understanding of ‘social’.

Now, we have come to the second set of conclusion related to the ‘micro’ part of the thesis, which I termed as the labyrinth-like part in terms of the toughness of concluding the main points in a structured and ordered way. So, in order to make the line of reasoning and thus the concluding point of that part clearer, I will give the background motivation for studying that particular case from that particular framework. When I came across with the Foucauldian literature on governmentality, I was fascinated by its deep down scrutiny on the forms of power relations and governing, and how high level of abstractions can well be adapted to the structures, phenomenon, institutions and discourses we are surrounded with but unaware of in our daily lives. Besides, I thought that the utilization of this framework in studies concerned with citizen-subject constitution as a part of neoliberal governmental project provides a vantage point in studying citizenship in Turkey differently, which was my main motivation at the outset. Also the official discourse employed during the TEKEL conflict that had taken place recently at the time made me think whether the instance illustrates a case for neoliberal governmentality

framework due to the neoliberal essence I thought the same discourse had. However, the complex actualities of the theory have shown that it is not fully the case since there are many more points to be taken into account both within the theory and with the case as such. These dimensions have proven that studying TEKEK in the light of governmentality cannot be actualized deterministically, but is rather limited by context-specific aspects.

Now, if we tend to identify what these limits are, then before all else, we should straightforwardly say that neoliberal governmentality analysis was utilized as an analytical framework to conduct such empirical analysis, not to test whether it explains the TEKEK case or not. Following this notice, it is equally crucial to mention that the main concern when looking at the TEKEK case was asking how workers-cum-citizens were sought to be governed and to what extent the overall attitude and the discourse were informed by neoliberal governmentality. However, despite the earlier estimation that it might have as well been a case for governmentality, the research showed that one needs to look beyond the TEKEK case and ask whether the discourse and the attitude in general was informed by a more comprehensive effort to constitute worker-cum-citizens as neoliberal subjects, which required a broader study in the field of labour in pursuit of a systematic program, regulation or a technology that can constitute a complementary background to TEKEK case in order to conceive it as internal to governmental project.

If we take guidance from the analytical distinction between ‘governmental rationalities’, ‘governmental programs’ and ‘governmental technologies’ made by Rose and Miller (1990), the limits of the study can be

better understood. The first of these stages operate at the discursive level implying how things are discursively represented, the third one being a mechanism through which individuals are acted upon by the governors, and the second one can be put somewhere in between the two. Modified agendas and legal background regulating labour relations in Turkey were thus looked at in order to inspect the extent to which these junctures exist, and found out that, with the exception of the legalization of subordination and flexibility of the worker through which the reference could be given to governmentality to a certain extent, one can conclude that that such a systematic and comprehensive effort is not fully present. Since governmental program in Rose and Miller's way of putting would imply the mechanisms through which governors intervene and seek more directly to act on the actions of people we cannot trace such effort within the labour context in Turkey. Such absence of the joint existence of governmental rationality and governmental programs in acting upon worker-cum-citizens constituted the first limit to neoliberal governmentality

The second limit comes out due to discursive and non-discursive resistance on the side of the workers. Here the weight of TEKEL analysis become more crystallized for showing that, while it is a remarkable labour resistance on the one hand, it is crucial for presenting the extent to which these subject positions were accepted and internalized by the workers. What is essential in subjectification process is its dialectical characteristics in the sense that individuals do respond to different subjectivities (Larner, 2000) by constituting themselves as in line with whatever the promoted subject position

is: disciplined competitive, responsible, and efficient teachers, lawyers, and students etc. In this context however, workers actively counter-produce an alternative subject position for themselves through a rights-based discourse on citizenship. Such refusal, therefore, can also be regarded as limits to neoliberal governance as the internalization and the actualization of subject positions by the subjects is essential in neoliberal governmentality.

This research has been an interesting process for me especially for having found answers to my early questions in a different way that I had initially expected. I do not see this attempt as having come to the end since the changing directions that this research took me has left many more questions in my mind for prospective future studies. However, not with an optimism but rather with an explorative manner, the limits for the second part concerned can be regarded as the vital question marks for the future studies. If one is to feed what came out from this thesis into another research, the first question can proceed from narrow to broad, with the primary object of inquiry being whether there are some other issues, regulations, programs in the labour field that one can detect an essence of neoliberal governmentality or not. In that respect, for moving beyond these limits, relevant planning documents, debates, policy proposals, discussions etc. can be looked at, through certain rationality is harmonized with a conscious and informed attempt of governing, and we can start talking about how labour is governed. A broader context can be as changing the focus from labour to other fields that can give hints about the presence of a governmental project. Then setting forth from these answers, one can potentially switch the question to ‘why’ it is the case, regardless of

the type of the answers. This, of course, introduces a much more comprehensive analysis that goes beyond the scope and the aim of this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adaman Fikret, Buğra Ayşe and İnel Ahmet. 2009. "Societal Context of Labor Union Strategy: The Case of Turkey", *Labor Studies Journal* 34(2): 168-188.
- Akbulut, Hilal. 2010. "Çocuklarımı Getirdim Buraya, Geleceklerine Bir Faydası Olsun Diye", in *Tekel Direnişinin Işığında Gelenekselden Yeniye İşçi Sınıf Hareketi*, Ankara: Notabene Yayınları, 277-83
- Altan-Olcay, Özlem. 2011. "Reframing the ideal citizen in Turkey: National Belonging and economic success in the era of neoliberalism", *New Perspectives on Turkey*, no. 44: 41-72
- Arın, Tülay. 2002. "The Poverty of Social Security: The Welfare Regime in Turkey", in Balkan, Neşecan and Savran, Sungur (eds.), *The Ravages of Neo-Liberalism: Economy, Society and Gender in Turkey*, New York: Nova Science, 73-91.
- Aybars, Ayşe İdil and Tsarouhas, Dimitris. 2010. "Straddling Two Continents: Social Policy and Welfare Politics in Turkey", *Social Policy and Administration*, 44(6): 746-63.
- Bağımsız Sosyal Bilimciler. 2007. *IMF Gözeti minde On Uzun Yıl, 1998-2008: Farklı Hükümetler, Tek Siyaset*, İstanbul:Yordam Kitap
- Balkan, Neşecan and Savran, Sungur. 2002. "Introduction" in Balkan, N. & Savran, S. (eds.) (2002) *The Ravages of Neoliberalism: Economy, Society and Gender in Turkey*, New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc, xiii-xx.
- Barbalet, Jack. 1988. *Citizenship: Rights, Struggle and Class Inequality*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bode, Ingo. 2006. "Disorganized Welfare Mixes", *Journal of European Social Policy*, 16(3), pp.346–59
- Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, London: Sage.

- Blackburn, Robert. 1994. "Introduction: Citizenship Today", in: Blackburn Robert (Ed.), *Rights of Citizenship*, London: Mansell
- Boratav, Korkut. 2009. "Bir Çevrimin Yükselişi Aşamasında Türkiye Ekonomisi", in *Küreselleşme, Kriz ve Türkiye'de Neoliberal Dönüşüm*, edited by Mütevellioğlu, Nergis and Sönmez, Sinan. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, pp 1- 25
- Bozkurt, Sümercan and Yalman Galip. 2011. "AKP Governments and the Social and Labour Market Policy Transformations in Turkey in the 2000s"
<http://www.emergingcountries.org/pdf/labour%20market.social%20policy.Turkey.pdf>
- Brown, Wendy. 2003. "Neo liberalism and the end of liberal democracy", *Theory and Event*, 7(1): 1-21.
- Brown, Wendy. 2005. "Neoliberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy," in *Edgework: Critical Essays on Knowledge and Politic,s* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 37-60.
- Brown, Wendy. 2006a. *Regulating Aversions, Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Difference*, Princeton and Oxford : Princeton University Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 2006b. "American Nightmare: Neoliberalism, Neoconservatism, and De-Democratization", *Political Theory*, 34(6): 690-714.
- Bröckling Ulrich, Krasmann Susanne, and Lemke Thomas. 2011. "From Foucault's Lectures at the Collège de France to Studies of Governmentality: An Introduction", in Ulrich Bröckling, Susanne Krasmann and Thomas Lemke (eds), *Governmentality: Current Issues and Future Challenges*, London: Routledge, 1-34.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1990. "Immigration, Citizenship, and the Nation-State in France and Germany: A Comparative Historical Analysis", *International Sociology*, 5(4): 379-407.
- Buğra, Ayşe and Keyder, Çağlar. 2006. "The Turkish Welfare Regime in Transformation", *Journal of European Social Policy*, 16(3), 211-228.
- Buğra, Ayşe. 2007. "AKP Döneminde Sosyal Politika ve Vatandaşlık" *Toplum ve Bilim*, 108: 143-167
- Buğra, Ayşe. 2007. "Poverty and Citizenship: An Overview of the Social-Policy Environment in Republican Turkey", *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 39 (1): 33-52.

- Buğra, Ayşe. 2008. *Kapitalizm, Yoksulluk ve Türkiye’de Sosyal Politika*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Buğra, Ayşe and Candaş, Ayşen (2011). “Change and Continuity under an Eclectic Social Security Regime: The Case of Turkey”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, 47(3), pp. 515-528
- Bunnell, Tim and Coe, Neil. 2005. “Re-fragmenting the ‘political’: Globalization, governmentality and Malaysia’s Multimedia Super Corridor”, *Political Geography* 24 (7): 831-849.
- Cam, Sürhan. 2002. “Neo-liberalism and labour within the context of an 'emerging market' economy Turkey”, *Capital & Class*, 26: 89-117.
- Clarke, John. 2005. “New Labour's citizens: activated, empowered, responsabilized, abandoned?”, *Critical Social Policy*, 25(4): 447-63.
- Clarke, Simon. 2005. “The Neoliberal Theory of Society”, in *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader*, London and Ann Arbor: Pluto Press, 50-60.
- Coşar, Simten and Yeğenoğlu, Metin. 2009. “The Neoliberal Restructuring of Turkey’s Social Security System” *Monthly Review*, 60:11.
- Crouch, Colin, Edere, Klaus and Tambini, Damian (eds.). 2001. *Citizenship, Markets, and the State*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Cruikshank, Barbara. 1999. *The Will to Empower. Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. 1996. “Citizenship and Social Class”, in Bulmer M. and Rees A. (Eds). *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T.H.Marshall*, London: UCL Press, 25-48.
- Dean, Mitchell. 1999. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, London: SAGE.
- Dönmez, Rasim Özgür. 2011. “The Justice and Development Party's Perspective of Social Exclusion: Between Societal Security and Morality”, *Middle East Critique*, 20(1): 67-80.
- Eğilmez, Burcu. Forthcoming. “Governing or Repressing Dissent via the Politics of Toleration: The Justice and Development Party versus the Working Class”, *Turkish Studies*, 13(3).
- Elveren, Adem. 2008. “Social Security Reform in Turkey: A Critical Perspective.” *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 40 (2): 212-32.

- Elveren, Adem and Galbraith, James. 2008. "Pay inequality in Turkey in the Neo-Liberal Era: 1980–2001". University of Texas Inequality Project Working Paper No. 49, April 21, http://utip.gov.utexas.edu/papers/utip_49.pdf (Retrieved on June 12, 2012).
- Elveren, Adem. 2010. "The formalization of the labour market and social security deficits in Turkey: What should be done?", in 6th International Policy and Research Conference on Social Security Luxembourg, 29.9–1.10.2010.
- Emrence, Cem. 2008. "After Neo-Liberal Globalization: The Great Transformation of Turkey," *Comparative Sociology*, 7 (1): 51–67.
- Ercan, Fuat. 2002. "The Contradictory Continuity of the Turkish Capital Accumulation Process: A Critical Perspective on the Internationalization of the Turkish Economy" in ed. Balkan, N. & Savran, S., *The Ravages of Neoliberalism: Economy, Society and Gender in Turkey*. New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc., pp.21-37.
- Ertuğrul, Ahmet and Erinc Yeldan. 2003. "On the Structural Weaknesses of the post-1999 Turkish Disinflation Program." in *The Turkish Economy in Crisis*, Öniş, Ziya and Barry Rubin (eds). London and Portland: Frank Cass, 53–66.
- Esping-Anderson Gosta 1990. *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Fejes, Andreas and Nicoll, Katherine. 2008. *Foucault and Lifelong Learning: Governing the Subject* (London: Routledge).
- Fejes, Andreas. 2010. "Discourses on employability: constituting the responsible citizen", *Studies in Continuing Education*, 32(2): 89-102.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, London: Harvester Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1982. "The Subject and Power", in: "*Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*" Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984. "Docile Bodies", in *The Foucault Reader* ed. by Paul Rabinow, London: Penguin, 179-188.
- Foucault, Michel. 1988. "Politics and Reason" in *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-84*, ed. Kritzman, Lawrence, New York: Routledge, 57-86.

- Foucault, Michel. 1991. "Governmentality" (Lecture at the Collège de France, Feb. 1, 1978), in: Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, & Peter Miller (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester, 87-104.
- Foucault, Michel. 2007. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*, trans. G. Burchell. Hampshire/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, Michel. 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France 1978–1979*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fougner, Tore. 2006. "The state, international competitiveness and neoliberal globalization: is there a future beyond 'the competition state'?" *Review of International Studies* 32: (1), 165–185.
- Fougner, Tore. 2008. "Neoliberal Governance of States: The Role of Competitiveness Indexing and Country Benchmarking." *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 37 (2): 303-26.
- Fourcade-Gourinchas, Marion and Babb, Sarah L. 2002. "The rebirth of the liberal creed: paths to neoliberalism in four countries". *American Journal of Sociology* 108, 533-79.
- Fraser, Nancy. 2003. "From Discipline to Flexibilization? Rereading Foucault in the Shadow of Globalization", *Constellations*, 10 (2): 160 - 171.
- Gordon, Colin. 1991. "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction", in Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1–51.
- Hale, William. 2006. "Christian Democracy and the AKP: Parallel and Contrasts", in: Yavuz, M. H. (ed.) *The Emergence of New Turkey*, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 77–82.
- Harvey, David. 2003. *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. 2003. "Accumulation by dispossession", in *New Imperialism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. 2005. *A brief history of Neoliberalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Held, David. 1995. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Hindess, Barry. 1996. "Neo-liberal citizenship", *Citizenship Studies*, 6 (2): 127 - 143.
- Hindess, Barry. 2005. "Citizenship and Empire", in T.B. Hansen and F. Stepputat (eds) *Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants, States in the Sovereign World*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 241–56.
- Isin, Engin F. and Turner, Brian. 2002. "Citizenship studies: an introduction", in Engin F. Isin & Brian S. Turner (eds) *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, London: Sage, 1–10.
- Işın, Engin. 2002. *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*. London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 1990. *State Theory: Putting Capitalist States in their Place*, London: Polity.
- Jessop, Bob. 1999. "The Changing Governance of Welfare: Recent Trends in its Primary Functions, Scale, and Modes of Coordination", *Social Policy and Administration*, 33(4): 343–59. <http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/237/> (Retrieved on June 12, 2012)
- Jessop, Bob. 2002. "Liberalism, Neoliberalism, and Urban Governance: A State- Theoretical Perspective" in *Antipode*, 34(3): 452-472.
- Jessop, Bob. 2003. "From Thatcherism to New Labour: Neo-Liberalism, Workfarism, and Labour Market Regulation." in H. Overbeek (ed.), *The Political Economy of European Unemployment: European Integration and the Transnationalization of the Employment Question*. London: Routledge, 137-153.
- Kaderoğlu Bulut, Çağrı. 2010. *Tekel Direnişinin Işığında Gelenekselden Yeniye İşçi Sınıf Hareketi*, Ankara: Notabene Yayınları.
- Kadioğlu, Ayşe. 2008. "Vatandaşlık Kavramının Farklı Anlamları" in Kadioğlu Ayşe (ed.), *Vatandaşlığın Dönüşümü*, İstanbul: Metis, 21-31.
- Keyder, Çağlar. 1987. "The Political Economy of Turkish Democracy", in Schick I. C., Tonak A. T. (eds), *Turkey in Transition: New Perspectives*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Keyman, E. Fuat and Icduygu, Ahmet. 2003. "Globalization, Civil Society and Citizenship in Turkey: Actors, Boundaries and Discourses", *Citizenship Studies*, 7(2), 219-234.
- Koray, Meryem. 2005. *Sosyal Politika* Ankara: İmge.

- Krasucki, Henri. 2010. *Sendikalar ve Sosyalizm, Sendikalar ve Sınıf Mücadelesi*, İstanbul: Sorun Yayınları.
- Kuisma, Mikko. 2008. "Rights or Privileges? The Challenge of Globalization to the Values of Citizenship", *Citizenship Studies*, 12(6): 613-627.
- Kymlicka, Will and Norman, Wayne. 1994. "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory", *Ethics*, 104(2): 352-381.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship. A liberal theory of Minority Rights*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, Will and Norman, Wayne. 2000. "Citizenship in Culturally Diverse Societies: Issues, Contexts, Concepts", in: W. Kymlicka and W. Norman (Eds), *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-41.
- Larner, Wendy. 1997. "The Legacy of the Social: Market Governance and the Consumer", *Economy and Society* 26(3): 373-399.
- Larner, Wendy. 2000. "Neo-liberalism: policy, ideology, governmentality", *Studies in Political Economy*, 62: 5-25.
- Lemke, Thomas. 2001. "'The birth of bio-politics'- Michel Foucault's lecture at the College de France on neo-liberal governmentality", *Economy & Society*, 30(2): 190-207.
- Lemke, Thomas. 2011. "Beyond Foucault, From Biopolitics to Government of Life", in Ulrich Bröckling, Susanne Krasmann and Thomas Lemke (eds), *Governmentality: Current Issues and Future Challenges*, London: Routledge, 165-185.
- Lessenich, Stephan. 2011. "Constructing the Socialized Self: Mobilization and Control in the 'Active Society'", in Ulrich Bröckling, Susanne Krasmann and Thomas Lemke (eds), *Governmentality: Current Issues and Future Challenges*, London: Routledge, 304-321.
- Marshall, Thomas H. 1992 [1963]. *Citizenship and Social Class*, London: Pluto Press.
- McCluskey, Martha. 2003. "Efficiency and Social Citizenship: Challenging the Neoliberal Attack on the Welfare State", *Indiana Law Journal*, 78: 783-878.
- McNeill, Donald. 2005. "Narrating Neoliberalism", *Geographical Research* 43(1): 113-115.

- Miller, Peter and Rose Nikolas. 1990. "Governing Economic Life", *Economy and Society* 19(1): 1-31.
- Miller, Peter and Rose, Nikolas. 2008. *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Munck, Robert and Waterman, Peter. 1999. *Labour Worldwide in the Era of Globalisation: Alternative Union Models in the New World Order*, London: MacMillan.
- Müftüoğlu, Özgür. 2006. "Kriz ve Sendikalar", in *Türkiye'de Sendikal Kriz ve Sendikal Arayışlar*, (ed) Fikret Sazak, Ankara: Epos, 117-157.
- Mütevellioğlu, Nergis and Işık, Sayım. 2009. "Türkiye Emek Piyasasında Neoliberal Dönüşüm", in *Küreselleşme, Kriz ve Türkiye'de Neoliberal Dönüşüm*, edited by Mütevellioğlu, Nergis and Sönmez, Sinan. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 159-205.
- O'Malley, Pat. 1992. "Risk, power and crime prevention", *Economy and Society* 21(3): 252-75.
- O'Riain, S. 2000. "States and markets in an era of globalization", *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 187-213.
- Oldfield, Adrian. 1990. "Citizenship: an Unnatural Practice?", *The Political Quarterly*, 61: 177-187.
- Ong, Aihwa. 2006. *Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Öke, Mustafa Kemal. 2011. "Social Rights as Ideal Citizenship", in Societal Peace in Dönmez, Rasim Özgür and Enneli, Pınar (eds), *Societal Peace and Ideal Citizenship for Turkey*, Maryland: Lexington Books, 227-57.
- Öniş, Ziya. 2006. "Varieties and crises of neoliberal globalisation: Argentina, Turkey and the IMF", *Third World Quarterly*, 27(2): 239-263.
- Öniş, Ziya. 2011. "Power, Interests and Coalitions: The Political Economy of Mass Privatization in Turkey", *Third World Quarterly*, 32(4): 707-724.
- Öniş, Ziya and Türem, Umut. 2001. "Entrepreneurs, Democracy and Citizenship in Turkey", *Comparative Politics*, 34(4): 439-56.
- Özdemir, Ali Murat. 2004. "Political Economy of Labour Law in Turkey: Work, Employment and International Division of Labour" Unpublished PhD Thesis, METU, Ankara.

- Özdemir, Ali Murat and Yücesan Özdemir, Gamze. 2004. "Living in endemic insecurity: An analysis of Turkey's labour market in the 2000s", *South-East Europe Review*, 2: 33-42.
- Özdemir, Ali Murat and Yücesan Özdemir, Gamze. 2006. "Labour Law Reform in Turkey in the 2000s: The Devil is Not Just in the Detail But Also in the Legal Texts", *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 27: 311-331.
- Özdemir, Ali Murat and Yücesan Özdemir, Gamze. 2008. *Sermayenin Adaleti: Türkiye'de Emek ve Sosyal Politika*, Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.
- Özdemir Yücesan, Gamze. 2008. "Opening Pandora's box: social security reform in Turkey in the time of the AKP", *SEER-South-East Europe Review for Labour*, 9(3): 469-83.
<http://www.ceeol.com/aspx/issuedetails.aspx?issueid=fb88899a-7d4a-4bae-9fe0-8197c87bf5a4&articleId=71ec950b-7de6-4b6b-a957-059497a67f60> (Retrieved on June 12, 2012)
- Özügürlü, Metin. 2011. "The TEKEK resistance movement: Reminiscences on class struggle", *Capital & Class* 35: 179-87.
- Peck Jamie and Tickell Adam. 2000. "Neoliberalizing Space", *Antipode* 34(3): 380-404.
- Peck, Jamie. 2004. "Geography and public policy: constructions of neoliberalism", *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(3): 392-405.
- Peck, Jamie and Theodore, Nik. 2007. "Variegated Capitalism", *Progress in Human Geography* 31(6): 731-772.
- Procacci, Giovanna (2001). "Poor Citizens: Social Citizenship versus Individualization of Welfare", in Crouch, Colin; Edere, Klaus and Tambini Damian (eds.) *Citizenship, markets, and the State*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 49-69.
- Read, Jason. 2009. "A Genealogy of Homo-Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity", *Foucault Studies*, 6: 25-36.
- Roche, Mauris. 2002. "Social Citizenship: Grounds of Social Change" in Engin F. Isin and Brian S. Turner (Eds) *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, London: Sage, 69-89.
- Rose, Nikolas. 1989. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Routledge.

- Rose, Nikolas. 1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rustemova, Assel. 2008. "Economics of National Ideas in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan", Paper presented at the Changing Europe Summer School 2008.
- Ryner, J. Magnus. 2002. *Capitalist Restructuring, Globalisation and the Third Way: Lessons from the Swedish Model*, London: Routledge.
- Saad-Filho, Alfredo and Johnston, D. (eds). 2005. *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader*, London and Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.
- Sennett, Richard. 1998. *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*, London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Smidt, Corwin. 2003. *Religion as Social Capital: Producing the Common Good*, Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Somers, Margaret. 2008. *Genaologies of Citizenship: Markets, Statelessness, and Right to Have Rights*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sparke, Matthew. 2006. "A Neoliberal Nexus: Economy, Security and the Biopolitics of Citizenship on the Border", *Political Geography*, 25(2): 151–180.
- Sparke, Matthew. 2009. "On denationalization as neoliberalization: Biopolitics, class interest and the incompleteness of citizenship," *Political Power and Social Theory*, 20: 287-300.
- Stäheli, Urs. 2011. "Decentering the Economy: Governmentality Studies and Beyond", in Ulrich Bröckling, Susanne Krasmann and Thomas Lemke (eds), *Governmentality: Current Issues and Future Challenges*, London: Routledge, 269-85.
- Standing, Guy. 1999. *Global Labour Flexibility, Seeking Distributive Justice*, London: Macmillan.
- Strath, Bo. 2000. "After full employment and the breakdown of conventions of social responsibility", in *After full employment: European discourses on work and flexibility*, ed. Strath, Bo, Brussels: Peter Lang.
- Şener, Meltem Yılmaz. 2004. "The Relationship between Neoliberalism and Authoritarian States: The Case of Turkey",

www.rrojasdatabank.info/neolibstate/meltemyilmazsener.pdf
(retrieved on June 11, 2012).

- Şener, Meltem Yılmaz. 2010. *The World Bank's Risk Management Approach to Poverty as a Form of Neoliberal Governmentality? The Case of "The Social Risk Mitigation Project" in Turkey*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Turhan Hurmi, Bahar and Temel, Bülent. 2011. "The European Union and Turkey: Transformation of the State–Society Relationship", in Dönmez, Rasim Özgür and Enneli, Pınar (Eds), *Societal Peace and Ideal Citizenship for Turkey*, Maryland: Lexington Books, 207-227.
- Turner, Bryan. 1994. "Outline of a Theory of Citizenship", in Turner, Bryan and Hamilton, Peter, *Citizenship (eds): Citizenship: Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.
- Türkmen, Nuray. 2012. *Eylemden Öğrenmek*, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Üstel, Füsun. 2004. *Makbul vatandaşın peşinde : II. Meşrutiyet'ten bugüne Türkiye'de vatandaş eğitimi*, İstanbul: İletişim
- Walby, Sylvia. 1992. "Flexibility and the Changing Sexual Division of Labour" in *Transformation of Work?*, ed. Stephen Wood, London: Routledge, 127-141.
- Ya1man, Galip. 1997. *Bourgeoisie and the State, Changing Forms of Interest Representation within the Context of Economic Crisis and Structural Adjustment, Turkey during the 1980 s'* Unpublished Dphil Thesis, University of Manchester, Manchester.
- Yalman, Galip. 2002. "The Turkish State and Bourgeoisie in Historical Perspective: A Relativist Paradigm or a Panoply of Hegemonic Strategies?" in N. Balkan and S. Savran, eds., *The Politics of Permanent Crisis: Class, Ideology and State in Turkey*. New York: Nova, 21-54.
- Yalman, Galip. 2009. *Transition to Neoliberalism: The Case of Turkey in the 1980s*, İstanbul: Bilgi University Press.
- Yalman, Galip. 2011. "Discourse and Practice of Poverty Reduction Strategies: Reflections on the Turkish Case in the 2000s" in Eren, İpek (ed.) *Converging Europe: Transformation of Social Policy in the Enlarged European Union and Turkey*, Surrey: Ashgate: 227-245.
- Yalman, Galip and Bedirhanoglu, Pınar. 2010. "State, Class and Discourse: Reflections on the Neoliberal Transformation in Turkey", in A. Saad-

- Filho & G.Yalman (eds.) *Economic Transitions to Neoliberalism in Middle Income Countries*, London, Routledge, 107-128.
- Yıkılmaz, Gamze and Kumlu, Seray. 2011. *Tekel Eylemine Kenar Notları*, Ankara: Phoenix.
- Yıldırım, Engin. 2006. "Labor Pains or Achilles Heel": The Justice and Development Party and Labor in Turkey", in M. H. Yavuz (ed.), *The Emergence of a New Turkey, Democracy and the AK Parti*, Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press.
- Yeldan, Erinç. 2001. *Küreselleşme Sürecinde Türkiye: Bölüşüm, Birikim ve Büyüme*, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Yeldan Erinç. 2009. "Turkey's Response to The Global Crisis: An Initial Assessment of the Effects of Fiscal Stimulus Measures on Employment and Labor Markets", http://www.bilkent.edu.tr/~yeldane/2009ILO_G20CountryBrief_Turkey.pdf (Retrieved on June 11, 2012).
- Yeldan Erinç. 2010. "TEKEL workers' resistance: Re-awakening of the proletariat in Turkey". 30 January, online at http://www.sendika.org/english/yazi.php?yazi_no=29021
- Young, Iris Marion. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Young of Graffam, Lord. 1992. "Enterprise Regained", in P.Heelas and P. Morris (eds) *The values of enterprise culture: the moral debate*", London: Routledge, 29-36.
- Yükseker, Deniz. 2009. "Neoliberal Restructuring and Social Exclusion in Turkey," in *Turkish Economy in the Post-Crisis Era: the New Phase of Neo-Liberal Restructuring and Integration to the Global Economy*, eds. Ziya Öniş and Fikret Şenses, London and New York: Routledge.