

DISCOURSES ON THE ECONOMIC CRISES OF 1979 AND 2001

FROM A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

145748

by

TUĞBA TEKEREK

Submitted to

The Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

- 145748 -

Boğaziçi University

2004

“Discourses on the Economic Crises of 1979 and 2001 from a Comparative
Perspective”,

a thesis prepared by Tuğba Tekerek in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts degree at the Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History

This thesis has been approved and accepted by:

Asst. Prof. Nadir Özbek
(Thesis Advisor)



Prof. Şevket Pamuk



Asst. Prof. Meltem Ahıska



An abstract of the Thesis of Tuğba Tekerek for the degree of Master of Arts from the Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History to be taken September 2004

Title: Discourses On The Economic Crises Of 1979 And 2001 From A Comparative Perspective

This study analyses the discourses on the economic crises of 1979 and 2001 from a comparative perspective. The different ways the field of economy was conceived, and how society was imagined in the late-1970s, and early-2000s are examined, with the assumption that the crises provide fertile ground for analysis.

The study shows that, as far as its representation in the media is concerned, the economy became a more abstract field with less permeable borders from the 1970s to the 2000s. The references to daily life experiences were replaced by abstractions and technical calculations. The economy started to be conceived of as a distinct sphere of reality, with particular dynamics that can be understood only by experts. The emergence of economy as a separate field was concomitant with the replacement of welfare state regimes with neo-liberal economy policies, and the consequent reconfiguration of the social. Under neo-liberal governmentality, the social lost its importance as the subject of government; while the people were started to be codified more market players than as citizens.

In line with this transformation, discourses on the crises indicate that in the two periods what was called an economic crisis was quite different. In 1979, the daily experiences of the lower and middle classes were represented to be the crisis, while in 2001 the abstract financial markets were taken to be the centre of crisis. The temporal and spatial coordinates of the crisis changed accordingly as well as the representation of devaluation.

Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü'nde Yüksek Lisans derecesi için Tuğba Tekerek tarafından Eylül 2004'e teslim edilen tezin kısa özeti

Başlık: 1979 Ve 2001 Ekonomik Krizlerine İlişkin Söylemlerin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi

Bu çalışmada 1979 ve 2001 yıllarındaki ekonomik krizlere ilişkin söylemlerin karşılaştırmalı analizi yapılmaktadır. Krizlerin analiz için verimli bir alan oluşturduğu düşüncesinden hareketle ekonomi ve toplum kurgularının 1970'lerin son yıllarından 2000'lerin ilk yıllarına geçirdiği dönüşüm incelenmektedir.

Çalışmada elde edilen sonuçlara göre 1970'li yıllardan 2000'li yıllara gelindiğinde ekonominin, basında, soyut ve sınırları daha belirgin ve daha az geçirgen bir alan halinde temsil edilmeye başlandığı görülmektedir. 1970'lerde gündelik hayat deneyimlerine referans verilerek kurulan ekonomi anlatısı yerini 2000'li yıllarda soyutlamalara ve teknik bir anlatıma bırakmıştır. Ekonomi, yalnızca sahanın uzmanları tarafından anlaşılabilir kendine özgü dinamikleri olan bir alan olarak temsil edilmektedir. Ekonominin gerçekliğin ayrı bir alanı olarak ortaya konması, 1980'lerde doğan yeni bir yönetim zihniyetiyle ve buna bağlı olarak şekillenen toplum kurgusuyla örtüşmektedir. Bu dönemde, refah devleti uygulamalarının yerini alan neo-liberal politikaların yönetim nesnesi olarak toplum önemini kaybetmiştir.

Bu dönüşüme paralel olarak kriz söylemlerinde de önemli farklılar görülmektedir. Kriz olarak tanımlanan görüngüdeki değişiklik bu farklılardan en çarpıcı olanıdır; 1970'lerde kriz alt ve orta sınıfın gündelik hayatında yaşadığı zorluklardan hareketle tanımlanırken, 2001'de finansal piyasalardaki değişiklikler kriz olarak adlandırılmaktadır. Benzer şekilde, basında temsil edildiği haliyle, krizin zamanı ve mekanı, ayrıca devalüasyonun anlatımı da farklılaşmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

After three years of study at the Ataturk Institute, I am about to complete my thesis, and prepared to receive my master's degree. While these three years have been very difficult as I have also been a full-time employee in a company, they have been very valuable in that I have been transformed, both intellectually and personally. I am indebted to many people for their guidance, help, support and encouragement in this period.

First, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Nadir Özbek. His guidance, and support during the thesis preparation stage were important. In addition, the discussions in his courses had a critical role in my intellectual formation. It is a particular pleasure to acknowledge my debt to Dr. Meltem Ahıska. She helped me very much in the formulation and development of the arguments presented in this study. She also encouraged me about the importance of exploring this topic, and gave the psychological support, which has been very valuable for me. Indeed, I feel very lucky, since I met her in the very first days of my graduate studies. In the following three years, while learning a lot from her, I also had the chance to see bits and pieces of her beautiful soul. I also would like to thank to Kathryn Kranzler, who edited this thesis. She has been tolerant and helpful despite the heavy workload this year, and supportive throughout the process.

My friends Barış, Cangül and Mustafa shared with me some parts of the thesis preparation process. They commented on the drafts, and encouraged me during bad times. The presence in my life of Hande, Selçuk, and Aslı has been invaluable with their belief in me and support regarding my academic studies. My

brother Hüseyin was always there to help me, prevented me from procrastinating with housework especially in the first years of my graduate studies. More importantly, his being by my side has always given strength to me.

Last, but certainly not the least, thanks go to Kivanç. Needless to say, it would have been impossible to complete the coursework and this thesis without his help. I am grateful to him for helping me during and sharing with me sleepless nights when preparing papers, and tolerance for long periods of and unplanned absences at the office. But I thank him mostly because with his being my side, he has given me the power to endure difficult times, and made my life more beautiful.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
An Overview of Discourses on the Economic Crises of 1979 and 2001.....	1
The Concept of Crisis.....	7
Research Topic and Tools.....	8
2.THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....	12
Governmentality.....	12
Globalisation.....	18
Turkey Context.....	20
The Crises in Economic Terms.....	38
3. DISCOURSE ON THE ECONOMIC CRISIS OF 1979.....	41
General Conception of Economy.....	42
Discourse on the Economic Crisis.....	47
4. DISCOURSE ON THE ECONOMIC CRISIS OF 2001.....	71
General Conception of Economy.....	71
Discourse on the Economic Crisis.....	76
5. COMPARISON OF DISCOURSES ON THE CRISES OF 1979 AND 2001....	107
Change in the General Conception of Economy.....	107
Differences in Discourses on the Economic Crises	113
6. CONCLUSION	119
APPENDIX.....	125
BIBLIOGRAPGY.....	128

PREFACE

It has been always astonishing for me that people asked so-called “economists” “how the economy is going?” “are we really in an economic crisis as some newspapers suggest or in good conditions as politicians argue?” Those questions sound to me like asking a meteorologist how the weather is, whether it is rainy or sunny.

Like every concept we perceive through the world, “economy” is an artefact. It came into being and was transformed under particular historical and social conditions, with particular discursive and governmental practices. Its borders, priorities, agencies are defined accordingly.

Foucault, in the preface of *The Order of Things An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* quotes “a certain Chinese Encyclopaedia” (which was quoted in a passage of Borges), which read that “animals are divided into: a) belonging to the Emperor, b) embalmed, c) tame, d) sucking pigs, e) sirens...” and which went to the division n) “that from a long way off look like flies.” This taxonomy, he notes, shatters “our thought that bears the stamp of our age and our geography,” and breaks up “all the ordered surfaces and all the planes with which we are accustomed to tame the wild profusion of existing things.”¹

In this context, the economy can be considered as a category which appears during the endless effort of human beings in the ordering of things. In this process of

¹ Michael Foucault, “Preface,” in *The Order of the Things An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), p. xv-xxiv, p. xv.

“taming the wild profusion of things” the notion of “economy” came into being at a particular historical time, and was transformed in time.

It is a subject of endless discussion what should be considered economic, and what should be considered non-economic. For example, whether the labour of woman in the household should be considered economic or not. If yes, why is it not included in the calculations of Gross National Product of a country? If no, what does make it different than the labour used in production processes outside of the house? How does this enframing of the field of economy take place, how is it decided what should be taken inside of the frame, what should be left outside?² While in its current form, economy disregards the labour women in the household; it leaves the military expenditures out of economic discussions. Why cannot military expenditures be a subject matter of economic discussion? Why can we not speak about “lavish expenditures for the military,” and but say “lavish expenditures for the social security system”? Why is the item of “personnel payments” put into the first line in the presentation of state budget, while the military expenditures cannot be seen in the same presentation?³ Populism in economic policies is another controversial issue. Is populism a good thing, or a bad thing?⁴ Why does it have a pejorative meaning in Turkey, although the very same policies have been considered as part of democracy in Western European countries?⁵

The answers to be given to those questions would help to shed light on the map of meanings existing in the minds of people at a particular historical time. The governmentality prevailing in the period would be one of the determining factors in

² Michel Callon, “An Essay on Framing and Overflowing: Economic Externalities Revisited by Sociology,” in *The Laws of the Markets*, edited by Michel Callon (Oxford; Madlen: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), p. 244-269.

³ The presentation of central government budget is available [online] at <http://www.muhasabat.gov.tr>

⁴ Haldun Güllalp, “Popülizm İyi Birşey mi Yoksa Kötü mü?” *Birikim* 155 (March 2002), p.20-22.

⁵ Ibid. Güllalp elaborates on these questions in the article.

the formation of conceptual maps. As mentioned above, economy is a human artefact, the production of the concept is entangled in particular political processes. The formation of the concept, changing the frame of it, putting forward some actors in economic processes while concealing some others are all subject of political struggle, which never comes to an end.

Turning back to the questions mentioned in the first paragraph, it is again the certain historical and social conditions, and results of the struggles for hegemony that make people ask experts how the economy is going. It shows that in the 2000s, people think that there is a category of economy, the course of which can be explained by an expert. It also indicates a particular positioning of himself/herself in the field of economy and a perception that the knowledge of an expert is more precious than his/her experiences.

In this study, how economy came to be seen as a unity, as a field, or a distinct sphere of reality, in which experts rule in the 2000s in Turkey will be examined. With Mitchell's formulation of how "economy" turned into "the economy,"⁶ or with Polanyi's formulation how it was detached from the social relations containing it were the questions leading this study.⁷ In addition, the imagination of society as a subject matter of economic processes will be explored.

For the analysis of the conception of economy and the imagination of society, crisis times open up fertile ground. Comparing the crisis discourses in 1979 and 2001 helped me to historicize the notion of economy and society. After the bitter experience of the so-called 2001 crisis, the people participated intensely in hot

⁶ Timothy Mitchell, "Society, Economy, State" in *State Formation After The Cultural Turn*, edited by George Steinmetz (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), p. 76-97.

⁷ Karl Polanyi, *Büyük Dönüşüm Çağımızın Sosyal ve Ekonomik Kökenleri*, translated by Ayşe Buğra (İstanbul: İletişim, 2000).

debates about the reasons behind the crisis, how we could make a way out, etc. Yet it was not questioned why the situation was called a crisis, how the actors in this crisis discourse were defined, or with which words the crisis was discussed. I thought that making those hot debates subject of the study, and comparing them with the discussions in 1979, I could make a modest contribution in understanding the change in the notion of economy. Indeed, so far either only the cultural transformation, or the change in economic structure in the 1980s and 1990s have been subject of analysis. Yet there has been hardly any academic study for understanding the change in the perception and representation of economy. This study is prepared as a modest contribution furthering the analysis of the issue.

In the first chapter of this thesis, the subject of the study is introduced, and the reasons why the crisis experience is considered to be a fertile ground for understanding the conception of economy and the imagination of the social are explained. In the following chapter, the theoretical framework used in this study, and historical background of the notion of economy in Turkey are discussed. In the theoretical framework section, the literature on governmentality is reviewed, and in the historical background section the formation and transformation of the concept of economy in Turkey are presented within this framework.

Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 are devoted to the analysis of the discourses regarding the economic crises in 1979 and 2001, respectively. In the beginning of both chapters, before elaborating on the crisis discourses, reviews of the general conception of economy in the periods were made. The appearance of economic issues in the mass media, and the handling of them at the state management level, and the words used in economy articles are examined. Then discourses regarding the crises were focused on, what were called crises, who spoke on them, what the

temporal and spatial coordinates of the crises were, and whether the crises were discussed as a national matter are analyzed. The case of devaluation is also examined to see all those issues in a nutshell. The last sections of both chapters are allocated for the conception of the social in relation to the economic developments. How the society was represented, which segments were included in or left outside of the picture of civil society are the questions explored in these sections.

In the Chapter 5, the general conception of economy and discourses on the crises in 1979 and 2001 are compared to emphasize the distinctive features of each period. The last chapter briefly summarizes the findings in this study, discusses what could be considered to be the gaps of the analysis, and points to areas for further research.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The records were brought from the Treasury. The revenues and expenditures were compared. It was seen that the expenditures of the state highly exceeded its revenues. The financial situation of the state has really worsened. The Treasury fell into a crisis. Unfortunately, there was no translation for the word “crisis” in Turkish. It was a real problem to translate the word. One night, we had a meeting in Fuad Efendi’s house, and this issue came up. While we were discussing the matter, the word “*buhran*” was found, and accepted as the translation of “crisis.” In the report submitted regarding the issue, the situation was called “The Treasury’s *buhran* situation”, afterwards *buhran* was used in place of crisis.¹

In this chapter, after a short introduction of the topic, the reasons why the times of crisis open up a rich space for analysis are discussed. In the final section, the main points of the thesis are summarized, and research method used in this study is explained.

An Overview of Discourses on the Economic Crises of 1979 and 2001

Looking at the media coverage of the economic crises of 1979 and 2001, it becomes clear that the phenomena called economic crisis were different things. In

¹ Ahmet Cevdet Paşa, *Tezâkir* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1953). For original text of quote, see Appendix.

1979, the crisis was defined by making reference to the daily experiences of ordinary people, whereas in 2001 the developments in the financial markets were taken to be the crisis. It seemed that experience was replaced by figures, human beings were replaced by market players, and everyday images were replaced by abstract concepts. In 1979, articles about the crisis generally talked about the absence of consumption goods and related feelings (missing the smell of coffee, happiness of obtaining a cylinder LPG) whereas in 2001, the plunge in the stock exchange, or “skyrocketing” interest rates were the main topics of the crisis.

In fact, the change in the representation of crisis was part of the transformation in the wider picture. The different perceptions of crisis reveal the transformation in the construction of economic and social realms, from the 1970s to the 2000s. The 1980s, which marked a shift to a new capital accumulation model, indicate a significant turning point in that transformation. In this reconfiguration of the economic and social, the economic activities were separated from the social relations. This process can be considered a new turn in the relation between economy and society in the context of Turkey, which had accompanied the development of global capitalism in the world. According to Polanyi, this “great transformation” was that the economy was “disembedded” from the social relations in which they had been previously contained.² Polanyi notes that with the emergence of the market economy, land and labour, which previously could not be detached from their natural and human contexts, started to be treated as market goods.³ In the context of Turkey, it can be argued that this disembeddedness, detachment, separation of the economic from the social took a significant turn in the

² Karl Polanyi, *Büyük Dönüşüm Çağımızın Sosyal ve Ekonomik Kökenleri*, translated by Ayşe Buğra (İstanbul: İletişim, 2000).

³ *Ibid.*, p.114-124.

1980s. Things started to be defined as narrowly economic, and stripped from other values. As a result, the economy became more like a “field” in the sense that Bourdieu uses it. According to Bourdieu, a field has its particular logic, particular rules, and particular profit; the economic field is a universe “within which ‘business is business,’ where the enchanted relations of friendship and love are in principle excluded.”⁴ In this *isolated* field of economy in 2000s, there are things which are purely economic, people who merely pursue their economic interests, and rules, which are formed solely by the market rationale. The economy newspapers, economy pages, which treat things as if they are merely economic things, can be regarded as phenomena of this self-enclosed, self-contained sphere.

This situation indicates a significant shift when compared to the perception of economic activities in the pre-1980 period. In those years, there was no clear-cut line between the person as a citizen and person as a market player; the social interest and economic interest could not be easily separated from each other, but they did have to be reconciled somehow. For example, the lack of foreign currency could not be treated as merely an economic phenomenon. It was reported in a news item that when Turkish people in Germany died, their bodies could not be brought to Turkey due to the lack of local currency. As can be seen also in this case, the economic, social, national, human could not be easily separated from each other. The experience was treated more like a totality; the economic facet of the experience cannot be detached from its social facet. The perception of the developments in this way are reminiscent of E.P. Thompson’s words; “social and cultural phenomena do not trail after the economic at some remote remove; they are at their source

⁴ Pierre Bourdieu, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. (Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 94.

immersed in the same nexus of relationship.”⁵ In this framework, it was not possible to talk about economy newspapers or economy pages in the pre-1980 period. Though there were economy sections in the dailies, they included news other than the “economy news,” and economy news were spread to other sections. It should also be noted that the economy news did not only mention figures, technical terms, but those figures were somehow linked to daily experiences. For example, the news about the fluctuations on the international gold markets also included the price increases in gold tooth fillings, and its effects on the relations between the dentist and the patient.⁶

However, we see that the daily experiences of the ordinary people are not present in the economy news in the 2000s. Economic facts were detached from the social life, social practices, feelings, and desires; from their social and human context. Related to this point, we should note that the meaning of “the social” invoked by the economy discourse also changed. The economic processes seemed to be taking place within a smaller group of people, rather than throughout the nation. The majority of society, together with their experiences, disappeared from the economy pages. The experiential dimension of the crisis was replaced by figures, rates, mathematical symbols in some data (like statistics regarding unemployment, or credit card usage rates). In addition, people appeared as anonymous market players. For example, an article following the devaluation in 2001 categorized people under the titles of winners and losers with regard to the devaluation.⁷ They were represented as “homo-economicus” rather than people situated in a social and

⁵ Edward P. Thompson, “The Peculiarities of the English,” in *The Poverty of Theory* (London: Merlin Press, 1978), p. 245-302, quoted in Harvey J. Kaye, *The British Marxist Historians An Introductory Analysis* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995), p.193.

⁶ “Altın doları yendi” *Hürriyet*, February 15, 1979.

national context. For example, people with their occupations became less visible in the 2000s.

The only part of society that was represented under an occupation was businessmen. The readers were informed about the statements, views, and situation of the businessmen. It is important to note that the businessman Sakıp Sabancı spoke in the name of whole society, and mentioned the poverty creating effects of the crisis.⁸ The remaining part of society disappeared from the economic sphere. Economic developments *affected* them, and the experience of those effects generally became the subject of the so-called third-page news (like the articles that read “unemployed man commits suicide”). They came up onto the agenda as the objects of the economic developments, the passive recipients of developments, and mostly were turned into “victims.” It was suggested in the articles that the economic contraction *hit* people, that *economic* developments had some *social effects*. Those experiences (the economic problems of the ordinary people) were seen as the *result* of the economic developments rather than *part* of it.

In this way, people *watched, read, and were affected by* the economic developments, rather than *experiencing directly*. As a result, after the 1980s, the economy became abstracted from society, from the world in which it was produced. In this way, the economy field constructed as such -in isolation from others, detached from its social context- seemed to be out of the reach and control of people. It was constructed as a field which could be penetrated, comprehended, and challenged less by society, than it had been in the pre-1980 period. People took the economy as something that operated with its own rules, and which had its own dynamics. The economic processes produced by human beings seemed to be

⁸ “Sabancı: Hepimiz %40 Fakirleştik” *Hürriyet*, February 24, 2001.

something natural, mathematical, and technical. Only experts could understand and have a say in this field.⁹ Mitchell argues that the construction of economy in this way made it something that can only be *intervened* by an *externally situated* state.¹⁰ He underlines that the state was no more considered an actor directly participating in the economic processes, it was no more considered within the economic field. Rather, economic activities of the state were thought to be intervention from outside to the economic field, which had its particular dynamics. The state was left outside of the field of economy in this “self-contained, internally dynamic totality.”¹¹ Looking from a wider perspective, it can be argued that what was left outside this field was the politics. The economic field seemed to have intelligence independent from and exterior to society. Some principles in the economic activities (such as the “right” of private property) were presented as if they existed autonomously from society.¹² This abstraction, exteriority, universality, and technical representation of the economy field furthermore obscured the fact that it was produced by the local factors, social conflicts, and political processes.

To sum up, we see that the economy became an isolated sphere of reality in the 2000s, where the society was somehow bypassed. The economy took place in a network of market players detached from their human context to a great extent, rather than socially situated humans throughout a nation. As a result of the separation of the economic and social realms, the field of economics seemed to have its own internal dynamics, which could be *intervened* into by the state, and provided little room for challenge.

⁹ Timothy Mitchell, *Rule of Experts Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity* (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 2002).

¹⁰ Timothy Mitchell, “Society, Economy, State” in *State Formation After The Cultural Turn*, edited by George Steinmetz (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), p. 76-97.

¹¹ Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, p. 93.

¹² Mitchell, “Principles True in Every Country” in *Rule of Experts*, p. 54-79.

The Concept of Crisis

The economic crises in 1979 and 2001 provide a fertile area in which to analyze the change in the construction of field of economy from the 1970s to the early 2000s.¹³ The articulation of the crisis points to a shake up of the stability in the presumed order of things. Crises can also be defined as processes in which the structure of a system is called into question.¹⁴ It opens up a space where the set and naturalized boundaries of economic and social realms become more visible. The distinctive features of crisis conditions, as an object of analysis, can be summarized as follows:

First of all, the phenomena called crisis is one of the most important things that can help in understanding the way the existing conditions are perceived. What one calls “economic,” how one defines the priorities of the economic field, how one sees its relation with other realms determine the definition of economic crisis. What one calls crisis is closely connected to how the status quo was perceived. When one talks about crisis, this means that one is talking about the crisis of a particular system, which was previously configured. The way the problem is put gives important clues to how the conditions are understood.

Related to this point, one points out the reasons behind the crisis, suggests solutions, blames some actors, according to the already existing construction of economy field in one’s mind. What is said regarding the reasons, agencies, and solutions of a crisis can help in deconstructing the economic field in minds. In the

¹³ Indeed the discussions following the 2001 economic crisis were not limited only to the economic facet of the crisis. The concept of crisis came up to the agenda as a point of focus. The “Crisis” issue of *Cogito* is a notable example in this respect. In addition, the “Crisis” issue of “Düşünen Siyaset” can be reviewed for thoughts on crisis and Turkey from a wider perspective.

¹⁴ Claus Offe, *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. (London: Hutchinson, 1984), p. 36.

case of an economic crisis due to insufficient production, one can blame the workers' unions demanding high wages, or the state collecting high taxes, which demotivate investors. Or the investors can be held responsible for channelling their funds with speculative investments. These are again related to how the economic system was configured previously.

It should also be noted that crises are the times when experiences take a more intense form. Under the pressure of time, and the need to take action urgently, there are some excesses compared to the discourse in operation under the normal course of events. Things which cannot be mentioned in normal times may be revealed under pressure.

Crisis are the times when the status quo is seriously shaken, which can be followed by its rupture. The world in the particular way it was understood becomes unsettled. The crisis of existing conditions renders possible to take a critical distance from those conditions, asking questions which could not be previously asked, and saying what previously could not be said. Crisis can also be the times of judging the system established, and proposing alternatives depending of the results of those evaluations. Thus, the crisis conditions would reveal several positions in understanding the status quo and contest to make different meanings out of the world.

Research Topic and Tools

The economic crises of 1979 and 2001 provide important arenas in which to see the transformation in the construction of economic and social realms, and the relation between them.

In this study it is argued that discourses regarding the economic crises of 1979 and 2001 indicate that the conception of economy and the social changed significantly from the 1970s to 2000s.

The economy emerged as a distinct sphere of reality in more solid way in the 2000s. The issues which are considered to be “economic” today were dispersed under different headings in the pre-1980 period. However, in the 2000s, they were all gathered under the heading of economy; the field of economy, which had its own players, own rules, and own relations emerged. The border of the field was drawn so boldly that it became less permeable than in the previous period. In this transformation the replacement of daily life experiences with abstractions and technical calculations played a significant role. As the conception of economy got far away from the concrete places and tangible actors, the issues could be treated as merely economic more easily, and they were detached from their human and social context. The economy also started to be regarded as a field of expertise, as it had its own dynamics.

In addition, the social as the subject of economic processes took a different form. The person who could be called the representative of men/women on the street disappeared from the economy pages. He/she was replaced by the businessman, who became more visible in the 2000s, compared to the pre-1980 period. “The new economy” was a one that cared less about the low and middle class people, and took the abstract market players as its main concern.

To explore on these issues, the questions asked are what was considered an economic crisis; how the society was imagined at the crisis time; and how the borders, priorities, agencies in the economic field were defined.

To analyze the crisis discourses I reviewed three newspapers, which position themselves as the representatives of three different political stands. For 2001, the newspapers analyzed were *Cumhuriyet*, *Yeni Şafak*, and *Hürriyet*. *Cumhuriyet* defines itself as the safeguard of the Republic, and can be considered as a representative of the nationalist social democrat stand in Turkey. *Yeni Şafak* and *Hürriyet* can be placed in the conservative right and central right of the political spectrum, respectively. It should be noted that *Hürriyet* has one of the largest readerships, while *Yeni Şafak* and *Cumhuriyet* remain more marginal in this sense. For the year of 1979, I analysed *Cumhuriyet* and *Hürriyet*, which can be considered to have had the same political stand in the post-1980 period. As the representative of conservative stand, *Tercüman* was examined. The fact that the dailies are the representatives of different political stands was expected to reveal the differences between them in construction of the economic and social realms, according to those different ideologies. While the dailies constituted the main body of the material to be searched, they were supported by the weekly magazine *Yankı*, and annual publications of *Cumhuriyet*, and the book *Hürriyet Sayfalarında Ekonominin 50 Yılı (50 years of Economy in the Pages of Hurriyet)*.

With regard to the 1977-1979 crisis, there was not a particular date or period marking the start of crisis. I chose the June 12-18 period as the first period of analysis; it was the week just after the devaluation took place, and can be considered to be a period when economic difficulties reached their peak. It was also the period when the government and the IMF reached an agreement. Thus I was able to analyze the representation of the relations with the IMF, and the foreign world, as well as the devaluation. To provide a parallel with the analysis of 2001 discourse, I also reviewed the news in the week of August 12-18, the period two months after

the first period analyzed. As for the 2001 crisis, the week of February 20-26, after the crisis erupted between the President and the Prime Minister was chosen. In that week, the government took decision for the devaluation of the local currency, and it was in close contact with the IMF for the management of the crisis. This allowed me to compare it with the representation of devaluation and the foreign world in 1979. In addition, I analyzed the news in the week of April 20-26, to see how the experiences in the society were reflected, at a time when the economic difficulties exacerbated.



CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In this chapter, the theoretical framework used in the analysis and the historical background of the subject matter are introduced. First, the governmentality issue, which provides the theoretical framework for this study, is discussed. The concept of “governmentality” helps in understanding how the field of economy, and the meaning of the “social” changes in relation to the different ways of governing at particular historical times. Another important factor for understanding the transformation of the field of economy in the 1980s is the globalisation issue. Following the governmentality issue, the effects of the globalisation process on the construction of economic and social realms are examined. Then, drawing on these concepts, the emergence and transformation of the conception economy in the case of Turkey since the establishment of the Republic is discussed. The following section is earmarked for explaining the crises in economic terms.

Governmentality

These changes in the construction of the economic and social realms can be understood within the framework of the governmentality concept proposed by

Foucault.¹ According to Foucault, governmentality is a specific and complex form of power, which is the distinctive feature of modern state, and that emerged in the eighteenth century. It takes population as its object to govern. The security and well being of the population together with the patterns of its growth and decline are the main concerns of the modern state. In this context, economy emerged as a register through which the population was to be governed. The economy started to be seen as “a specific sector of reality”² or “a field of intervention”³ to be used for the well being of the population. To foster productivity, the modern government was to make positive interventions into the economy and the population.

The emergence of governmentality was concomitant with the establishment of political economy, and the appearance of the liberal conception of economy proposed by Adam Smith. Smith proposed that the economic agents pursuing their self-interests should be left free in this pursuit to obtain the best results for public good. Thus, the government should work through the free capacity of the individual. A proper government of the population also meant to know the limits of political power, and the limits of intervention. In that way, not intervening into the economic processes, the state was indeed taking action to foster the economic productivity of the population. It was in a way “government *through* rather than *of* the economy.”⁴

¹ Michael Foucault, “Governmentality” in *The Foucault Effect Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), pp. 87-104.

² Ibid., p. 102.

³ Ibid., p. 93.

⁴ Mitchell Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* (London; California, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001), p. 114.

The Emergence of “the Social” and Welfare Regimes

Adam Smith’s formulation of the economic field offered a new reality to be governed. However, this reality has been also a problematic and unstable one. The economic subject, pursuing its own interests, has dissolving effects for society. However, the political power needs to treat the society as a unified body for its legitimation, since in the end it is acting in the name of the general will. The problem can be put in another way: the acts of the economic subject create inequality. However, the object of government also should be positioned as a judicial and political subject in a community of equals.

The emergence of the idea of the social, and consequently welfare regimes, can be considered as an attempt to address this newly defined and problematic space to be governed. According to Foucault, “civil society is the concrete ensemble within which these abstract points, economic men need to be positioned in order to be made adequately manageable.”⁵ It is an interface, for the reconciliation of the governed, that is the centrifugal economic subject, and the government, that is the centripetal judicial and political power.

“The social is a specific vector of our forms of knowledge, intervention, and practices, of our ways of thinking about and acting upon ourselves and others” writes Dean⁶. In this way “we might become certain types of people engaged in certain kinds of conduct, inhabiting certain types of ‘lifeworlds’,” he continues.⁷

⁵ Michael Foucault, *Lecture*, College de France, 5 April 1978; quoted in Colin Gordon, “Governmental Rationality: An Introduction” in *The Foucault Effect Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 1-51, p. 23.

⁶ Mitchell Dean, “Sociology after Society” in *Sociology After Postmodernism*, edited by David Owen (London; California, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001), p. 205-228, p. 207

⁷ Ibid.

This social is the subject that the government takes as its subject, and produces certain agencies in accordance. Under welfare state regimes the government acts upon the social to make it compatible with conflict creating economic mechanisms. Donzelot explains how in the late nineteenth century the notion of the social emerged in France as a way of addressing the problem of the positioning of the individual and the state to each other.⁸ The individual, the sole subject of rights, and the state as the embodiment of the general will should be made compatible. Drawing on the solidarity concept proposed by Durkheim, the modern state developed a new form of governmental rationality. In this new form, the notion of the social, laid the grounds for the intervention of state into the economic and social processes. The government's acts were legitimised in the name of preserving solidarity against the dissolving effects of economic rationale. It was in fact the discrepancy between the economic rationality and social solidarity upon which the government acted. However, still the free capacity of the economic subject provided the boundaries for the political power. The government intended to preserve social bonds rather than change the social structure created by economic processes.

The social, and the agencies were produced in relation to the different governmental practices under particular historical conditions. Procacci's article about the invention of pauperism shows how the government makes the conflict-creating economic processes and social solidarity compatible, without making structural changes in the economy and society.⁹ Poverty, which was defined as the counterpart of wealth, was not something that could be acted upon, since the

⁸ Jacques Donzelot, "The Mobilization of Society" in *The Foucault Effect Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 169-180.

⁹ Giovanna Procacci, "Social Economy and the Government of Poverty" in *The Foucault Effect Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 151-168.

classical political economy defined the economic system on the basis of this couplet. However, the invention of pauperism that was the “poverty intensified to the level of social danger” as something unnatural, antisocial provided the government with tools to act upon it.¹⁰ Yet, the poverty remained in the system, while its intensified form became an object of government. In this way, without changing the social structure, the state reconfigured the social. This new social laid the grounds for the government of poverty.

Economy under Neo-Liberal Government

In the era of neo-liberal government, it seems that the social lost its importance as a problematic issue for the government. The new way of government can be defined as an attempt to “bypass the sociological problematic of the fragility of the conflict ridden unity of society.”¹¹ Under advanced liberal rule “we are ceasing to understand and act on ourselves as members of society, in which society is the totality of interactions and relations among a population existing within the territoriality, defined jurisdiction of a national government.”¹² Now, against the dissolving effects of economy, the government does not need to form policies to strengthen the social bonds, to keep society together. The following statement by Margaret Thatcher marks a significant change in the conception of the social for the government.

“I think we’ve been through a period where too many people have been given to understand that if they have a problem it’s the government’s job to cope

¹⁰ Ibid.,p. 158.

¹¹ Dean, Governmentality, p. 152-153

¹² Dean, Sociology after Society, p. 224.

with it 'I have a problem I'll get a grant.' 'I'm homeless, the government must house me.' They're casting their problem on society. And you know, *there is no such thing as society*. There are individual men and women, and there are families. And no government can do anything except through people, and people must look to themselves first.”¹³

The new form of governmentality draws upon the idea that the problem that should be addressed was not the adverse effects of the market economy on society, but the anti-competitive sides of the society, which are incompatible with this market economy. So the market rationale should be diffused in every sphere of society. “If the government is the embodiment of rules of conduct, the reconfiguration of social must take the form of markets.”¹⁴ This is rather than a government through economic and social process, the government of governmental techniques, according to Dean. The government, in the neo-liberal era, does not use economic and social policies, but governs the existing forms of government (which is the market), and produces subjectivities accordingly. In that way the problematic of social is bypassed. Under this form of government that is the reflexive government, every agency, individuals and also the private and public authorities learn how to govern themselves. In this framework, the proliferation of associations, and non-governmental organizations, as well as spreading up of risk-management issue can be considered the attempts for self-governance.

¹³ Margaret Thatcher, “Interview”, *Women's Own*, October 8-10, 1987; quoted in Dean, *Governmentality*, p. 151; emphasis mine.

¹⁴ Dean, *Governmentality*, p. 172.

Globalisation

The changes in governmental mechanisms and the construction of economic and social realms take place under certain historical conditions. The welfare state regimes had their heyday in the cold war period, under the threat of increasing leftist wave, and after the drastic fascist regime experiences. Attempts were made to mitigate the increasing class conflicts by a construction of a social, the members of which were solidly bound to each other.

As for the passage to the neo-liberal conception of economy, and bypassing the problem of social, the metamorphosis in the operation of capitalism was an important factor. After the 1980s, the economic activities started to take place less within the nations and more on a global scale compared to the previous period. The financial capital flows reached unprecedented levels after the 1980s. With the advancement in technology and communication, parts of the same production process can take place in different corners of the world. These developments have been sufficient to notably reduce the functions of state over economic processes in an open market economy. Capitalism now operates on a planetary scale, and the nation-state has fewer tools to control it. This “decontextualisation, the distantation from place” of economic activities has made them more immune to the interventions of the state.¹⁵ The state has less room to use some economic and social policies, thus it should have to position itself to be compatible with the global capitalism. Under those conditions it is pushed to govern through the markets, rather than policies, as suggested by Dean.

¹⁵ Jean Comaroff and John Comaroff, “Millennial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming,” *Public Culture*, p 291-335, p. 303.

The globalisation has also some effects on the dissolution of the social defined in the national context. Previously, the national capital and national labour was considered as complementary parts in a national economy. Now, capital, which is more fluid, became more autonomous from labour and more integrated with the international capital. Thus the social, defined on the national context, lost its importance to some extent for the economic processes.

These processes can be summarized as the denationalisation of economic processes and the commoditification of national values. Treating something as national had meant to attribute to it some values other than the economic. Treating a person as a *Turkish* worker, for example, meant that the person had value other than being part of merely economic processes. This means that the worker had a nation; he/she was situated in a social context. However under neo-liberal economies, labour has been separated from the human context, society has been replaced by the market, as argued by Comaroff.¹⁶ To put it differently, people has been treated less like citizens, more like stakeholders in an economic enterprise.

Coronil draws attention to a paradigm shift in the measurement of wealth of nations in World Bank reports, to understand this transformation.¹⁷ He notes that, in the World Bank reports, natural resources and human resources, as well as produced assets, should be treated directly as capital. This new paradigm equates human beings, and land with produced assets. The treatment of land as an economic value, and stripping it from its national values, indicates a significant turn. Land was once considered one of the most important values, which could not be torn apart from its national attachments. He gives the example of the increasing pressure for turning

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 305.

¹⁷ Fernando Coronil, "Towards a Critique of Globalcentrism: Speculations on Capitalism's Nature," *Public Culture* 12 (February 2000), pp. 351-374.

oil, which had been defined previously as a national patrimony, into mere commodities subjected to the free play of market forces in Argentina or Venezuela. Similarly in the case of Turkey, natural resources (for example mines) have been stripped of their national values and assessed from a mere economic point of view, and have been made narrowly economic things. As a result of this process, it became possible to sell out some “national assets” to foreigners, with economic concerns.

Turkey Context

In the context of Turkey, the changes in the economic field and the construction of social, as a result of different governmentalities, can be analysed in three periods. 1) The 1923-1950 period. It was marked by the state's efforts to constitute an economy and social within the framework of a nation. 2) 1950-1980 era of the multi-party regime. In this period, the government was more sensitive to the demands of society. Especially after 1960, under the pressure of increasing class conflicts, the field of economy was reshaped to mitigate those conflicts, while solidarity discourse gained importance to preserve society as a whole. The nation continued to be the container both for the social and the economic, and was used as an instrument to create a bond between them. 3) The period after 1980. The state withdrew from the economic processes. Especially with the turn of century, in the era of globalisation, the nation-state had less room to attach national values to economic factors. Thus nation, which had been the bond between the economy and society, lost its importance. The economic and social were separated from each

other to a significant extent. The market replaced the economic and social policies of the state as a governmental mechanism.

Construction of Nation and National Economy, 1923-1950

The political and intellectual elite who imprinted the ideology of the Early Republic saw the absence of a coherent society which could be mobilized around common goals as one of the main reasons behind the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. The formulation of the problem in this way determined the course of developments just ahead and after the establishment of the Turkish Republic. In the last years of the Empire, some ideologies such as Ottomanism and Islamism appeared to address the problem. However, they did not pay off. It was thought that especially the lack of coherence between different ethnic groups had led to the disintegration. In the new era, a coherent social was to be created around the Turkish identity, and this social was to be the container for the economic activities.

This was the juncture at which the idea of *milli iktisat* (national economy) came into being at the start of twentieth century in the mainstream intellectual currents in the Ottoman Empire.¹⁸ Ziya Gökalp, who was a leading intellectual figure of the period, was important in the formulation of the idea of national economy. He severely criticized the “*kozmpolit*” nature of the economy in the Ottoman Empire.¹⁹ He also stood against the liberal treatment of economy as a science, which operates according to some abstract rules, independent of the

¹⁸ Zafer Toprak, *Milli İktisat-Milli Burjuvazi* (İstanbul : Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

realities of a nation.²⁰ According to him, the economy cannot be left to operate according to its own dynamics. It must be manipulated according to national values. The economy should be national, and foreign elements should be eliminated, he argued.

According to *milli iktisatçılar* (national economists), who generally adopted the views of Gökalp, since the society had a cosmopolite structure, there was no feeling of national belonging, and this was the factor behind many economic problems those were faced during the First World War.²¹ They linked the black marketeering, bribing, and corruption, which appeared due to the shortage of some goods under war conditions, to this factor. According to them, those developments showed that the individual interest and public interest did not overlap. If there had been *içtimai vicdan* (social conscience) those problems would not have occurred; and that social conscience could be formed by a nation only.²² In this framework, Gökalp said that a common conscience could not be created between the non-Muslims and Muslim-Turkish populations.²³ The slogans in the early twentieth century “Drinking Nestle Milk is Treason!” illustrates the hostility towards the foreign and also the zealous attempts to form a common identity who were to constitute a nation.²⁴

In summarized, these views hold that different ethnic groups and individuals pursuing self-interests constituted a significant problem. A good government would

²⁰ Ibid, p. 147.

²¹ Ibid, p. 153.

²² Ibid., p. 153.

²³ Ahmet İnel, “Milliyetçilik ve Kalkınmacılık” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce Milliyetçilik*. (İstanbul: İletişim, 2002), p. 763-776, p. 765.

²⁴ Mentioned by Zafer Toprak in Seyfettin Gürsel, Ahmet Kuyuş, and Zafer Toprak. “Açıkoturum Yerli Malı Yurdun Malı; Her Türk Bunu Kullanmalı” *Cogito* 21 (Winter 1999), pp 186-218. Original quote: “Nestle Sütü içmek vatan hainliğidir.”

have addressed the problem of the lack of solidarity between the members of society. The nation, and the national economy were the solutions to that problem.

The political authority took advantage of the war period to take some actions against some factors that had adversely affected the formation of a national economy; for example it abolished the capitulations and took steps for the creation of a Muslim-Turkish national bourgeoisie.²⁵ The efforts to constitute a nation and national economy continued after the foundation of the Republic in 1923. Most important of those policies were those that took the ethnic differences within the population as its target. After a number of actions taken, the share of the minority population in total declined from some 18% in 1906 to 2.6% in 1927.²⁶ Those policies attempted to form a more homogenized society. They also served the goal of creating a national economy. The assets which had belonged to the minority were transferred to Muslims to create a national bourgeoisie. However, it should be noted that, although the state was trying to create the “missing bourgeoisie” as Keyder notes, it stressed that there should not be any conflicts within the ethnically homogenous society.²⁷ The ultimate goal was to create a homogenous society, free of conflicts, that was “*imtiyazsız sınıfsız kaynaşmış bir kütle*” (an amalgamated mass which has no class and privileged groups).

The creation of nation and national economy went hand in hand. Economic activities were defined within the borders of the nation and directed towards the goal of national development, thus they served to strengthen the feeling of nation. For example, the railways were seen as forming ties between the different corners of the country, as the song for the celebration of 10th anniversary of the Republic

²⁵ Toprak, *Milli İktisat*, p. 151.

²⁶ Çağlar Keyder, *Türkiye’de Devlet ve Sınıflar* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1993), p. 111-112.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

underlines, “we wove the homeland with iron webs from four corners.”²⁸ The campaigns for using nationally produced goods, is another example showing how the creation of nation and national economy were entangled. İnsel analyses the role of the state economic enterprises (SEEs) in the formation of the notion of nation, and legitimization of political authority.²⁹ He argues that social-political concerns overrun the economic concerns in the establishment and operation of the SEEs. They were the instruments carrying state ideology (in the form of cultural values, industrial relations, etc.) to the distant parts of the country. Economic processes, and institutions created the bonds for the nation. Also, as a governmental mechanism economy was a register through which the nation was to be governed. It should be noted that economic development was not an end in itself, but an instrument to reach the level of the advanced civilizations. It was the way through which modernization, national independence, and national welfare would be achieved. Mustafa Kemal said, “the aim of our struggle today is full independency and whole independency is possible only via fiscal independency”³⁰ and “the economic development is the backbone of Turkey’s ideal for an independent, always mightier, and wealthier Turkey.”³¹

For the early Republican period, it can be easily argued that what was national and economic could not be separated from each other. A statement by a leading political figure illustrates this point; “no difference should be thought

²⁸ Original quote “*demir ađlarla ördük ana yurdu dört bařtan.*”

²⁹ Ahmet İnsel, *Düzen ve Kalkınma Kısacasında Türkiye* (İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 1996).

³⁰ Genelkurmay Başkanlığı, *Atatürkçülük Atatürk’ün Görüş ve Direktifleri* (Ankara: Genelkurmay Başkanlığı, 1983), p. 89. Original quote: “*Bugünkü savaşlarımızın gayesi tam bağımsızlıktır. Bağımsızlığımızın bütünlüğü ise ancak mali bağımsızlıkla mümkündür.*”

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 88. Original quote: “*Ekonomik kalkınma; Türkiye’nin hür, müstakil, daima daha kuvvetli, daima daha refahlı Türkiye idealinin bel kemiğidir.*”

between foreign industry's stepping into domestic markets, and a military unit's stepping on the country's land.”³²

The Multi-Party Regime, 1950-1980

In the early Republican period, the principle of *halkçılık* prepared the ground for the state's formation of a homogenous society, and transformed it according to the projects of the political elite. However, under *Demokrat Parti* (the first party that come to the office in the multi-party system) this approach took the form of a real populism, notes Sunar.³³ “*Halka rağmen halkçılık*” (*Halkçılık* in spite of society) motto of the single-party regime was reinterpreted in a way to resonate the desires of the society in this period. This brought a new perception of the social; society was no longer regarded as the object of the state's elitist project; however, its demands were taken into consideration for the formulation of new projects, although the ideology of populism crafted these demands in its own image of society. In this process, the economy took shape taking into consideration the demands of society. Turkey saw its first populist economic policies under the *Demokrat Parti* regime.³⁴ Economic policies, which were intended to spread the economic development to a larger base, included the proliferation of the SEEs, the increase in state subsidies for agriculture sector and high support purchase prices for agricultural products.

³² Recep Peker, quoted in İnel, “Milliyetçilik ve Kalkınmacılık”, p.770. Original quote: “*Bir ulusun iç pazarlarına yabancı manifaktürün ayak basması ile bir düşman müfrezesinin ülke topraklarına ayak basması arasında bir fark tasavvur olunmamalıdır.*”

³³ İlkey Sunar, “Demokrat Parti ve Popülizm” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vols 7-8, p. 2076-2086, p. 2081.

³⁴ Roger Owen and Şevket Pamuk, *A History of the Middle East Economies in the 20th Century* (London: I.B. Taurus,1998), p. 110.

The demands of society took a different form after the 1960s, with increasing class conflicts. The industrialization efforts in the previous years had created a sizable working class and that class was becoming politicised. The growing leftist wave undermined the “homogenous, classless society” project of the early Republican period, and made apparent the fragility of the society under capitalism. In the cold war era, and under the threat of communism, the state felt itself more obliged to mitigate the conflicts in the society, for a proper government.

Thus the class conflict was the main problem to be addressed for preserving the social solidarity up to the 1980s. First of all, the economic model implemented in the period that was the import substituting industrialization (ISI) required a more just economic distribution mechanism, compared to the neo-liberal model of the post-1980 period. It foresaw the creation of a domestic market for the consumption of goods to be produced by the domestic industry. This meant higher wages for workers and civil servants, who would compose the demand side of domestic market. The bourgeoisie accepted sharing a higher portion of the surplus with the worker than it would have in an open market economy. Indeed, the real wages of the workers doubled from 1960 to 1976.³⁵ Also, a comprehensive social security system was formed in the period. It seemed that the state intended to mitigate the effects of the class-based economic system. On the other side, the national bourgeoisie was protected against foreign competition by high tariffs, and were subsidized by the state through the cheap input of state economic enterprises.

In the political discourse of the period regarding the economic processes, words such as “peace,” “justice,” “just distribution” and “welfare” were frequently pronounced. For example, the goal of the “*toplumsal anlaşma*” (“social

³⁵ Korkut Boratav, *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-1985* (İstanbul: Gerçek, 1995), p. 111.

agreement”), which was signed in 1978 between the government and the workers’ union, Turk-İş was, defined as “to guarantee the development of democratic working life in a way to strengthen democracy and economy, to facilitate a healthy and balanced growth, to spread welfare to all segments of society and to improve a just system.”³⁶ In the collective bargaining negotiations, both the workers and bourgeoisie threatened the dissolution of social peace when posing their demands. Those conflicting economic interests would have to be reconciled to preserve the social peace.

The first five-year plan puts as one of its principle in the designation of policies as the social justice.³⁷ The plan further read that

In an undeveloped country, which aims to provide a higher life standard distributing the increase in national product in line with social peace principles, the importance of using labour force as much as possible rather than capital, which is scarce, is apparent. To this end, the cooperation spirit, which would provide labour force to participate in the production process in most efficient way, should have settled in industrial groups. Such cooperation can be achieved with the implementation of the social justice principles and the understanding the fact that the industry serves to the society as a whole, and settlement of the peace.³⁸

This text clearly shows that “the industrial groups,” which indeed refers to the social classes, should be in cooperation in an undeveloped country where the capital was weak, which means that the bourgeoisie has not strengthened yet. It also shows the emphasis made to cooperation, social peace, and justice. For reaching

³⁶ Cahit Talas, *Bir Toplumsal Politika Belgesinin Yorumu: Toplumsal Anlaşma* (Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1982), p. 46. Original quote: “demokratik çalışma yaşamının, demokrasiyi ve ekonomiyi güçlendirecek, kalkınmayı sağlıklı ve dengeli olarak hızlandıracak, refahı toplumun tüm kesimlerine yayacak ve hakça bir düzeni geliştirecek yönde gelişmesini güvence altına almak.”

³⁷ Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, *Kalkınma Planı, Birinci Beş Yıl*, (Ankara, 1963), p. 2, quoted in Cahit Talas, *Türkiye’nin Açıklamalı Sosyal Politika Tarihi* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1992), p. 152.

³⁸ Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, *Kalkınma Planı, Birinci Beş Yıl*, (Ankara, 1963), p. 2, quoted in Cahit Talas, *Türkiye’nin Açıklamalı Sosyal Politika Tarihi*, p. 154. For original text of quote, see Appendix.

that social peace, many regulations were made after the 1960s, from the establishment of social security institutions to giving the right for forming workers' and civil servants' unions.³⁹

Therefore, it was not possible to talk about a self-enclosed field of economy in this period. The economy was in the serve of social goals (defined in the framework of nation), and it was to step back when it conflicted with the social solidarity. It should also be noted that the treatment of the economy in the service of the social also made the modernist project of the state elite inclusive for all segments of society. Keyder notes that the worker who achieved satisfying living conditions provided an example for all people with low-incomes and an instrument to keep them within the national domain.⁴⁰ The economic welfare promised to all segments of society made the modernist project of the state viable.

The field of economy took shape under these conditions, in which the class conflicts were threat for the solidarity of society. Thus, the well being of all segments of society was an important concern and the development as a whole was an important source of legitimation for the state. This positioning of the economic and social had important implications. First, the borders, priorities and content of the macroeconomy were determined accordingly. Equal income distribution and unemployment were among the important concerns for the policy makers. The economic growth should pull up the income level of society as a whole. Disadvantaged people in the system should be taken care of, so social security expenditures, or social policies, were not seen as a burden to the economy. Inflation

³⁹ A detailed description of the regulations made in Turkey in the area of social policy can be found in Talas *Türkiye'nin Açıklamalı Sosyal Politika Tarihi*; see also Songül Sallan Gül, *Sosyal Devlet Bitti, Yaşamın Piyasa! Yeni Liberalizm ve Muhafazakarlık Kışkacında Refah Devleti* (İstanbul: Etik, 2004).

⁴⁰ Çağlar Keyder, *Ulusal Kalkınmacılığın İflası* (İstanbul: Metis, 1996).

was considered a threat not because it created a fragile investment environment, but since it would mean a decline in the purchasing power of the people.

In addition, the nation continued to be a solid container for the economic processes and society. Thus, people were seen less as individuals who appeared in the market as consumers, or workers, than as citizens. Similarly, goods were not just commodities to be exchanged, or consumed, but they were the national resources, goods. In this context, the news in the media referred to things such as “*buğdayımız*” (“our wheat”) “*tütünümüz*” (“our tobacco”) and concerned with the value loss in “*paramız*” (“our money”). The issue of currency should be underlined here. It was much more than an instrument to be used in transactions. It was the *national* currency, and the value of lira was linked to the pride of the nation.

Neo-Liberal Globalism, After 1980

The 1980s saw a rupture in the construction of the economy and social realms. Under the pressure of neo-liberal globalism, the nation lost its importance as the container of economic activities. The need for and capability of, the government to reconcile economic and social priorities declined notably. As economy detached from the social realm, it became to be seen as an internally dynamic entity, apart from the social relations within which it was produced.

The closed economy model based on the import substituting industrialization model was replaced by the open economy model, which foresaw export-oriented growth in the 1980s. The state started to withdraw from the economy, and the market filled the space left by the state. While the economy was opened up to

foreign direct investment, the financial system was integrated into the international markets. As a consequence, the borders of the nation no longer corresponded to the framework of the market, and the playground of capitalism. In the era of global capitalism there were foreign firms within the national borders, and the national elements sought their interests abroad. Capital was less in need of consent of the labour to operate. The borders between the inside and outside, the national and foreign, blurred. The nation did not provide the solid walls for the operation of economy, as was the case in the pre-1980 period.

This also meant the dissolution of the social consensus that had been formed around the import-substituting model of the 1960s and 1970s. There was no need to form a national market or create a social consensus. So in designing the economic policies the state treated society less as a unified body, which it should take care of. Similar to the statement of Thatcher that is “there is no such thing as society. There are individual men and women ... people must look to themselves first,” the Turkish state promoted the idea that “*herşeyi devletten beklememek lazım*” (everything should not be expected from the state). It was argued that people should not see the state as “*devlet baba*” (paternalist state). The discourse of one of the leading political figures, Süleyman Demirel that was “*benim işçim, benim köylüm, benim memurum*” (my worker, my peasant, my civil servant) took the backseat in the 1980s. The new leading political figure, Turgut Özal, declared that he preferred wealthy people; “I like rich people,”⁴¹ or “a rich Muslim is better than a poor Muslim.”⁴²

⁴¹ Rifat N. Bali, *Tarz-ı Hayattan Life Style'a Yeni Seçkinler Yeni Mekanlar Yeni Yaşamlar* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2002), p. 33. Original quote: “*ben zengini severim.*”

⁴² Ibid. p. 33. Original quote: “*zengin bir müslüman fakir bir müslümandan daha iyidir.*”

However, it should not be mistaken that the state did not need any source of legitimation, a social to act upon, or it did not introduce policies to mitigate the effects of the conflict creating economic system. It is a fact that the economy has been integrated to the world economy to a significant extent, and the state has fewer tools to control the economic processes. Nevertheless, the nation-state remains in place. It has still an important weight in determining economic policies. Besides, there is a social that should be preserved to act upon, and which is still bounded with national ties, albeit weaker. Though the nationalism in the economic sphere was eliminated to a significant extent, the nationalist ideology remains in place, making use of some other social and political matters (for example the Kurdish or Cyprus issues). The “national” gained other meanings such as cultural heritage and the role of the nation-state started to be defined in militaristic terms, to a greater extent. In addition, populist economic policies (for example the higher-than-expected increase of the minimum wages just before the elections) also emerged to create a source of legitimation for the state.

Nevertheless, under the open market economy, the government has stepped back from the economic processes, and intervened much less to the market mechanism. The import-substituting industrialization model inherently included a more just redistribution mechanism. On the other hand, the free market economy of the 1980s did not include such a mitigation mechanism. The populist policies were motivated by the short-term interests of the political parties. They could not replace the economic policies, which targeted some serious improvements in the living conditions of the low-income people, or structural elements in the system, such as a properly working social security system.

The quotation below from the First Turgut Özal Government Programme bluntly put the changing conception of social justice.

Social justice should not be under the domination of particular ideologies, and prejudiced formulas...The primary goal of our government which adopted real social justice principles, is the combat against inflation at all costs...The government would not intervene to the markets, as the final cost of interventions is always shouldered by low income people, and it would also prepare the ground for economy policies which would initiate the determination of foreign exchange rates freely in the market. The trade tariffs will be liberalized and the consumers would be provided with cheap and qualified goods. ...Thirdly, measures to increase the income of middle class people will be taken. To this end, all steps to strengthen the saving tendency will be taken. As the savings will be shifted to stock exchange, profit-sharing papers, and state borrowing papers, the industrial ownership will spread to a large base.... Our social security policies will be directed to the goal of caring the disadvantaged people, and their being beneficial to the society, not to the goal of giving incentive to the people who do not work.⁴³

For reaching social justice, the program offers combating inflation, the liberalization of foreign exchange market, trade tariffs, and the deepening of financial markets, not better an improved social security system, or more just income distribution. Yet, the free market system was presented to be mechanism to provide social justice. This statement indicates that governments still pose their arguments on the principles of social justice, social state, in sum, a society. Yet, the content of those concepts seems to have undergone under a sea change. Sallan Gül notes the deterioration of social security system services, privatisation policies in the education sector, and the decline of the funds allocated for health services in the budget under the Özal governments.⁴⁴

⁴³ N. B. Dağlı, *Aktürk Hükümetler ve Programları 1980-1987, 1983-1987, 1988: Özal Hükümet Programının Okunması*, Vol 3 (Ankara: TBMM Kütüphane ve Tercüme Müdürlüğü), Yayın No: 12, quoted in Songül Sallan Gül, *Sosyal Devlet Bitti*. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

⁴⁴ Songül Sallan Gül, *Yaşasın Piyasa*, p. 285-300.

It can be argued that the government, through economic and social policies, was to a significant extent replaced by the government of the market, which is a governmental mechanism itself. The market, and the market rationale, took the place of the central authority as a new form of government. The state's functions were limited to overseeing the healthy operation of the market. This is the form of reflexive government, the government of governmental mechanism, which Dean proposes, rather than government through economic and social policies. Instead of intervening when the market fails, the state enlarges the market mechanism also to govern those failures. For example, rather than mitigating the effects of conflict-creating market via the social security system, it introduces the private social security mechanism, where everybody should take care of himself using the market mechanism. The market expands to cover the government functions of political authorities as well.

It should be noted that the neo-liberal policies took a new turn with the start of twenty-first century in the case of Turkey. At the end of 1999, the government started to implement a stand-by program designed by the IMF. This program foresaw the further transformation of governmental mechanisms. It aimed to accelerate the state's withdrawal from the economic field. The privatisation process, which had started in the 1980s, sped up; some public banks, and the branches of some others, were closed down, and the subsidy mechanism regarding the agriculture sector was eliminated to a significant extent. This meant that the government had fewer tools with which to intervene into the economy.

What was more important as a distinctive feature of governmentality in the 2000s was that the decision-making process on economic issues was transferred to so-called autonomous boards. For example rather than the political authority, the

energy market board was authorized to take decisions regarding the energy sector. Those boards started to regulate almost all of the important sectors, from banking to tobacco. Those boards treated sectors as mere markets, stripping them of all other values. In the tobacco sector, the farmers were detached from their identity of being citizens, and tobacco from its value of being a national product.⁴⁵ Another important development at this juncture was the public sector reform bill, which foresaw the transfer of the authority and responsibility of some important public services, such as health to local administrations. Then, the central political authority is prepared to resign from its mission of providing public services to a great extent. Similar to the autonomous boards, the local administrations would act according to the market rationale. For example, according to the rationale of the bill, local administrations would treat themselves as economic enterprises and the citizens as customers. Alper argues that according to the rationale of the bill, the legitimacy of the state would be based on its capability of creating an efficient and profitable market mechanism, and attraction of foreign capital rather than the public sovereignty.⁴⁶

Under these conditions, concerns regarding economic processes have changed. Society is seen less as a unified body, where the disadvantaged should be helped. So the economic policies pay less attention to caring about low-income people. The wages of civil servants and workers have come up on the agenda as a burden on the state budget. The national development goal was replaced by the target of sustainable growth. This shift showed that a stable investment environment (which can be created by the sustainable growth) gained priority over the welfare of all (which can be provided by national development). The economic stabilization

⁴⁵ See the article on tobacco law Huricihan İslamoğlu, "Yeni Düzenlemeler ve Ekonomi Politik: IMF Kaynaklı Kurumsal Reformlar ve Tütün Yasası," *Birikim* 158, (June 2002), p. 20-27.

⁴⁶ Emin Alper, "Bürokrasinin Parçalanmış Demir Kafesi," *Birikim* 180, (April 2004), p. 60-77.

and disinflation programs, which meant a secure investment environment, replaced the national development programs of the pre-1980 period. When looking at the subtitles of the letter of intents submitted to the IMF, one sees that budget discipline, structural reforms for the deregulation of some sectors, privatisation, and the enhancement of investment environment are the main policies.⁴⁷ Yeldan argues that the “stability” and “confidence” which the IMF programmes aimed to restore, referred to the stability of the high return of the investments of the foreigners in Turkey, and confidence of the foreigners that their loans would be paid back on time.⁴⁸ The economic policies were directed less maintain social solidarity, than to enlarge the space of the market as a governmental mechanism. The introduction of private pension funds, or the transfer of public services to local administrations which will adopt market rationale, can be regarded as parts of this process. It is very important that unemployment ceases to be an economic problem that should be combated; rather it is presented as a category that society should learn to live together, or a question of charity.

Under a neoliberal regime, as a result of denationalisation, things are defined in narrowly economic terms. The values other than the economic one are disregarded, detached from national, social, and human contexts. In this context, it should be noted that the currency was treated less as a national asset when compared to the pre-1980 period. It was reported that Turgut Özal found “absurd” the law on the preservation of the value of Turkish Lira.⁴⁹ Yet, traditionally, the currency meant also the symbol of national pride. In that process the economy has emerged as a self-enclosed, self-contained and internally dynamic totality, detached from the social

⁴⁷Treasury Undersecretary of Turkish Republic. Available online at http://www.hazine.gov.tr/standby/imf_standbyeng.htm.

⁴⁸ Erineç Yeldan, “İstikrar Kim İçin” *Birikim*163-164, (November-December 2002), p.97-119.

⁴⁹ Hasan Cemal, *Özal Hikayesi* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1989), p. 297.

realm. It is not treated as part of the daily experiences of ordinary people. The economy in its representation in the 2000s has been externalised, abstracted, and has taken an autonomous form from the society.

Representation, as such, helped to obscure that economy was something made under particular historical conditions, and served to particular political ends. It was represented as something non-political. Politicians were tried to be kept away from the field of economy while boards made up of “experts,” which were presented as non-political, were introduced to the decision making mechanism. The experts, rather than the politicians, would have a say in the economic field, so the market would operate in healthier ways, it was argued. The financial markets, besides the autonomous boards, were another factor that should be noted here. The players in the financial markets are said to be assessing the decisions of the politicians from the economic point of view of the expert, and reward or punish them accordingly. Thus they create a non-political stand-point from which to assess the political decisions. Under these conditions, it is easier to present the “regularities” in the economic processes, as laws of the markets, which cannot be changed, as Callon suggests. “The regularities, related to the stabilization and particular forms of organizations of market relations, remain limited in time and space.”⁵⁰ However, the experts seem to be working according to quasi-natural laws, independent of time and space.

To sum up, the shape of the economy and the reconfiguration of the social changed over time. Before the 1980s, the government needed to reconcile the economic and social, and defined them within the borders of the nation. However,

⁵⁰ Michel Callon, “Introduction: The Embeddedness of Economic Markets in Economics” in *The Laws of the Markets*, edited by Michel Callon (Oxford; Madlen: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), p. 1-57, p. 47.

under neoliberal globalisation, the economy no longer needed to reconcile with the national concerns, as it started to take place in a more transnational environment. Then, citizens, ordinary people, Turkish workers, or farmers lost their importance as parts of the economic processes. The economy started to take place more within a network of individuals, who were detached from their human, social, national contexts. As well as the players, the rules of the game, the things at stake were defined by narrow economic terms. Then there appeared a self-enclosed, self-contained economic field, which was much less permeable compared to the previous periods. That self-enclosed, abstracted, and externally situated field also made more difficult the challenge of economic processes, as it became less a field where ordinary people could penetrate, more a technical field in which experts represented as non-political agents, had the say.

Besides the point mentioned above it should be added that the so-called financial economy grew significantly after the 1980s. The banking sector had a much stronger presence, while financial markets, like the stock exchange market, the bond market became operational. Making money from money became an important economic activity. The material production processes took a relatively smaller field in creation of wealth. Besides, the growth of service sector should also be noted here. All these processes served the expansion of the intangible side of the economy as Comaroff and Comaroff argue.⁵¹ The factories, the fields, were now accompanied by an “intangible” economic activity.⁵² The speculation economy took its place beside the real production. It is an important fact that the new term of “real economy” was needed to be introduced to the economic discourse. The growth of

⁵¹ Jean Comaroff and John Comaroff, “Millennial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming,” *Public Culture*, p. 291-335.

⁵² *Ibid.*

this intangible economy also served economy's being situated something external to the society, and which had its own dynamics. There was an economy, which seemed to have no roots in the real life.

Besides, we see the significant growth of statistics, turning economy into a much more mathematical field after the 1980s. They also helped the economists to pose their arguments with the figures, graphics, and mathematical models. Those arguments could not be easily challenged with the non-experts in the issue. The power of figures helped the economists to make truth claims more zealously.

The last point I would like to make is that the opening up of economy to the foreign world, starting from the 1980s also had some effects in the transformation of the perception of the economy. The foreigners, who were to make business in Turkey, looked from a distance at the economy of the country. The Turkish economy was analysed by an external eye. It had to be transformed into a form that can be comprehended by them. It was standardized, regulated to be comprehensible by these foreigners. The statistics for example, the data collected, the presentation of it were modified accordingly. Thus economy became something from which a step should be taken backward and which should be looked at from outside.

The Crises in Economic Terms

The 1960 coup d'etat introduced a new economic model, namely import substituting industrialization, which was to be implemented for the following two decades. Under this model, imports of intermediate and consumption goods were to be substituted by domestic production. Domestic industry was protected with high

tariffs against the competition of exported goods and produced mainly for the domestic market. The state had an important weight in the economy both as producer and regulator. It provided cheap input to the private sector via the production in state economic enterprises (SEEs). The state also regulated prices in the market with the products directly offered for consumption. In addition, it regulated wages in the labour market, through the salaries provided to workers in SEEs. High salary level in general helped to create a strong consumption demand for domestic industry.

The model resulted in serious economic growth during the 1960s, and early 70s. However, by the end of the 1970s the model came to a dead-end. Turkey inevitably had to import some products, which were indispensable for production. However, the domestic production was not directed towards exports, and consequently foreign trade gap grew, and shortage of foreign currency to import basic products became a serious problem. The oil crisis, which started in early 1979, led to the ballooning of Turkey's import bill, making daily life miserable. Besides oil, some elementary items, such as cylinder gas, butter, coffee, tobacco were the products difficult to find. Black marketers took advantage of the situation, aggravating the problems. Especially in the winters of 1978-1979, heating became a significant problem. Moreover, due to the lack of foreign currency, Turkey faced problems in back payments of foreign loans.

The 1977-79 crisis was followed by so-called January 24 decisions in 1980, which were the first steps in the way of creating a market-based and export-oriented economy. In line with the IMF prescriptions, trade regime was liberalized, price controls were eliminated. While prices of SEE products were raised substantially, wages were pressurized downwards. Also financial markets were liberalized; and to

attract hot money interest rates were freed. Consequently, short-term foreign capital made Turkish economy more vulnerable to shocks; in fact a crisis erupted in 1994 related to this factor. Those policies created a bottleneck in the turn of the century. The budget deficits grew to substantial levels, giving way to higher public sector borrowing requirement, and higher interest rates. High yields inevitably led to crowding out effect; the funds were channelled to state rather than being transferred to real sector for investment. Meanwhile, the debt stock mounted and high inflation became chronic.

Addressing those problems, an IMF programme started to be implemented at the end of 1999. When the 2001 crisis erupted, this program was in practice. The program aimed to reduce inflation, introducing fixed exchange rate regime. Pre-announced exchange rates were to act as an anchor to reduce inflation expectations. Yet, on February 19, 2001, tension between the Prime Minister and the President raised serious concerns about political instability. Coupled with the growing current account deficit, concerns intensified over the sustainability of the exchange rate regime. Investors withdrew their short-term capital investments, and portfolios were switched to foreign currency from local currency; this led to a sharp decline in the Central Bank's fx reserves. To stop the decline, the government had to abandon fixed exchange rate peg as of February 21, letting the rates to be determined in the free market again. This meant a sharp depreciation of local currency, which brought a severe contraction in the economy, and decline in income level. To overcome the crisis, a new IMF program was introduced. The new program accelerated the restructuring of the Turkish economy, and its integration to the world capitalist system. All barriers before the foreign direct investment were removed, the privatisation process gained momentum.

CHAPTER 3

DISCOURSE ON THE ECONOMIC CRISIS OF 1979

We asked Mahmut Atilla, an employee at *Denizcilik Bank*, who was coming from shopping in Aksaray with his wife, how they make ends meet...

“We have been living in Istanbul for forty years, but we are originally from Bolu. We have four children. We went shopping today. However, we were unable to buy much for six hundred liras. We could only afford to buy beans, tomatoes, peppers and cucumbers... We were astonished.

We are unable to go to the theatre or the movies; our only entertainment is to sit in Fatih Park and watch the people passing by. I was in line to buy a cylinder of LPG for two nights and I fell ill for one week. If I retire we would be worse off, since I will not be entitled to bonus and over-time pay. We cannot go back to Bolu, because life is difficult there, too. We do not know what would happen.”¹

In this chapter, the discourse regarding economic crisis of 1979 is explored. First, the general perception of economy in the media is overviewed. Then, the crisis-related articles is elaborated on, specifically focusing on the phenomena called crisis, and the imagination of time and space related to the crisis. Analysing the representation of devaluation, discussions are made on how an economic phenomenon was approached in 1979. In the last section of the chapter, the ways the society was represented in the crisis-related articles are examined.

¹ “Zam Sağanağı Geliyor... Allah Yardımcımız Olsun,” *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

General Conception of Economy

Economy in the Mass Media

The economy branch in the media was not a developed one before the 1980s, if there was such a branch at all. First of all, there were no newspapers or magazines which focused on economy related developments. There were only publications by the businessmen's organizations, which did not target reaching out the masses. Moreover, it is not possible to talk about an economy section in the daily newspapers as a solid field, as far as the late 1970s is concerned. In the daily *Cumhuriyet*, there was no economy section. Once a week, in a page titled "Economy," commentaries written by columnists were gathered. There was no section dedicated only for economy related news. In the daily *Hürriyet*, there was just one column earmarked for short economic news, which were at most ten lines. The arrangement in the daily *Tercüman* regarding economic news was the most similar to the "economy pages" in the 2000s. There was a page with the title of "Economy" included every day in the newspaper, but almost half of this page was taken up by advertisements. More importantly, the articles which are considered to be related to economy today made their way to other sections and pages. For example, the news "Letter of Intent to Be Signed Finally"² and "Gas 21.70, High Octane Gas 24.70 TL"³ were not placed in an economy section or on an economy page in *Hürriyet* and *Tercüman*, but on other pages.

The weekly magazine *Yankı*, and the annual publications by *Cumhuriyet*, where the most important news of the year were collected, give further clues about

² "Niyet Mektubu Nihayet İmzalanıyor," *Hürriyet*, June 14, 1979.

³ "Benzin 21.70 Süper Benzin 24.70 TL Oldu," *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979.

what was considered to be economic. In these publications, all articles were presented under a topic, such as “domestic events”, “economy”, and “health” unlike in the newspapers (in the newspapers, only some articles were presented under categories). This categorization helps to clarify the meaning maps of the period, as we can see an issue considered to be economic in the 2000s went under which heading in the late 1970s.

First, it should be noted that economy was not a heading which took its place in the weekly magazine *Yankı* regularly, unlike sections such as domestic events, or foreign events. In addition, the economy pages were limited just a few pages in fifty-page weekly. As for the annual publications of *Cumhuriyet*, the space earmarked for economy articles was also minimal. For example, in the 1979-1980 annual, only seven pages were earmarked for economy out of the total 176 pages of articles, whereas the articles related to domestic events were allocated 126 pages.

Another important point that should be made is that the stories which we consider to be the “news on economy” today were dispersed under different headings before the 1980s. They generally went under the heading of domestic events (the counterpart of which is domestic politics today). For example, in the annuals of *Cumhuriyet*, as the economic issues were generally discussed in terms of their political connotations, they were generally placed in the “domestic events” section. The news on inflation and devaluation together with effects on income distribution,⁴ the dependency relations that the foreign debt engendered⁵ were all considered not primarily economic, but domestic events. It was also possible to see economy-related news making their ways into pages other than domestic events. For

⁴ “Enflasyon Devaltasyon ve Özveri,” *Cumhuriyet* 79 80, p. 16.

⁵ “Teşhis ve Tedavi,” *Cumhuriyet* 79 80, p. 70.

example, in *Yankı*, news about the protests of taxi drivers for higher prices appeared under the heading of traffic,⁶ and the rise of oil prices in Turkey in the energy section.⁷

In summary, the space earmarked for economy section in the media was minimal (not much more than the space allocated for health or education articles), and many issues which are considered to be economic today were dispersed under different headings, mainly under domestic politics. It can be concluded that the economy was not a developed branch in the media, and it was not seen as a unity as it is today. Besides, from this categorization it can be inferred that what we considered to be mainly economic today was regarded to be mainly political twenty-five years ago.

The Management of the Economy

In the period before 1980, it was mainly the Prime Minister, who spoke about economic matters. There was no Minister of Economy, since economy had not appeared as a specific sector of reality. Other than the Prime Minister, the Ministry of Finance was mainly responsible for the economy; the Finance Minister spoke to the media on economic matters. As known, the Finance Ministry is mainly responsible for the state budget, the revenues and expenditures of the state, and the allocation of resources. The Finance Minister's management of the economy indicates that the economy was seen as an inflow-outflow matter, and the efficient management of that flow.

⁶ "Kontak ve Tencere Siyaseti," *Yankı* 420, April 2-8, 1979, p. 14-17.

⁷ "Enerji Politikası Yanlıştır," *Yankı* 421, April 9-15, 1979, p. 25.

When an economic issue –“economic” with today’s conception- other than the state budget came up on the agenda, the authority was defined much differently than today. For example, he/she was the Energy Minister, who spoke on the oil shortage issue, the Forest Minister on the rise of paper prices, and the Industry and Trade Minister on the problems of the tradesmen. In this case, the rise of paper prices was not thought to be mainly an economic issue, but something also related to the forests.

This dispersion in the management of the economy, together with that of economic news under different headings show that economy was still not a field which was seen as a unity. The absence of an Economy Ministry, and attributing different authorities for the increase of oil prices and rise of paper prices show that those issues were not considered necessarily to be linked. They were not considered to be the parts of same unity.

Economy As a Field of Regulation

Economy, rather than a field, which had its own dynamics, was regarded to be a field subject to the regulations of governmental authority, as far as the articles in the mass media were concerned. A significant portion of the economy-related news in the dailies, concerned the government decisions, communiqués, and announcements. That type of news was about the announcement of support purchase prices for agricultural products, which is highly important for many people, or the rise in benefits given for heating granted in addition to wages of civil servants, which is less important. In addition to that there were many news items about issues which could be called bureaucratic. An announcement about the materials required

when applying to the social security institutions was also reported in the newspapers. All those news together depicts an economy which was subject to the national government's authority. It was not a field which had its own dynamics, but a field that was regulated and arranged in detail.

Economy as the Field of Officials

The people, who were asked about their opinion regarding the economic issues were the "*ilgililer*" ("people concerned") or the "*yetkililer*" ("officials") in the late 1970s. For example, about the problems of the furniture sector, people from the sector spoke before the media, and they were either called "the people concerned" or "the officials." Beside the people from the sector, it was the politicians or bureaucrats who spoke on economic matters. However, none of those people were called "experts." Their statements were quoted because either they had experience related to the issue (in the case of people from a particular sector) or they had the authority (in the case of bureaucrats). To be the concerned people or to have authority means to be engaged to the issue. The readers hardly saw any experts speaking in the newspapers in a cold and measured way, who were not engaged in that issue, but watch developments from a distance and make comments.

The Language of Economy

When looking at the language of the economy towards the end of the 1980s, it was easy to understand for layman and generally referred to daily life experiences. Indeed there was not too much difference between the language of the economy

news, and that of the people. The examples of the words, and phrases generally used to define the economic situations are *hayat pahalılığı* (cost of living), *geçim sıkıntısı* (making ends meet), *yoklar ülkesi* (the country of absences), *70 cent'e muhtaç olmak* (to be in need of 70 cents). It should be underlined that the phrases “cost of living”, or “price increase” were used much more often than “inflation.” Even the politicians, heads of businessmen’s organizations and academics used the phrase “cost of living” together with inflation. In addition, no words borrowed from other languages, such as *likidite* (liquidity) or *ON* (referring to Overnight interest rates) were used in the period.

Discourse on the Economic Crisis

The Phenomenon Called “Crisis”

In 1979, the word “crisis” meant extraordinarily difficult conditions in daily life. The definition of crisis was based on some material factors, such as the absence of margarine, inflation in every field “from rents to cheese,”⁸ or “to have to wait for two nights and get cold to obtain a cylinder of gas.”⁹

When looking at the newspapers, it is all apparent that shortages of consumption goods, price increases, the consequent decline in the purchasing power of the people, and unemployment were the main components creating a crisis situation in the period. The crisis was reflected in the newspapers with headlines

⁸ “Apartman Katından Peynire Her Alandaki Büyük Fiyat Artışı, Talebi Piyasadan Siliyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, August 15, 1979.

⁹ “Zam Sağanağı Geliyor... Allah Yardımcımız Olsun,” *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979.

such as “Market in Turmoil”¹⁰ (“the market” referred here was not the financial market, rather it was the place where economic activities took place; the article mentions price increases, taxes, and changes in exchange rates to be applied for the exports of agricultural products), “Wave of Price Increase”¹¹ or “Struggle for a Piece of Meat”¹² (the news focuses on the shortage and high price of meat, together with its reasons, and reflections on the lives of people).

The crisis was in no way defined depending on some “signals” or changes in some so-called macroeconomic “indicators”, before they were felt in the daily lives. Neither were the developments in financial economy, or in “intangible” economy were taken into consideration when calling situation a crisis. Rather, the problems in economic activities which were physically felt and experienced by the people were represented as crisis in the newspapers.

Those experiences were at the very heart of the daily lives of people. For example, one news item read that,

We asked Mahmut Atilla, an employee at *Denizcilik Bank*, who was coming from shopping in Aksaray with his wife, how they make ends meet...

“We have been living in Istanbul for forty years, but we are originally from Bolu. We have four children. We went shopping today, however, we were unable to buy much for six hundred liras. We could only afford to buy beans, tomatoes, peppers and cucumbers... We were astonished.

We are unable to go to the theatre or the movies; our only entertainment is to sit in Fatih Park and watch the people passing by. I was in line to buy a cylinder of LPG for two nights and I fell ill for one week. If I retire we would be worse off, since I will not be able to entitled to bonus and over-time pay. We

¹⁰ “Piyasa Altüst Oldu,” *Hürriyet*, June 12, 1979.

¹¹ “Zamlar Dalga Dalga Geliyor,” *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979.

¹² “Et Çilesi,” *Cumhuriyet*, August 17-18-19, 1979.

cannot go back to Bolu, because life is difficult there too. We do not know what would happen.”¹³

The news included a photograph of Mahmut Atilla and his wife, together with the bags in their hands.

This was just one example of many articles on the experiences of people related to the economic crisis. Some other examples are as follows. A news item titled “Mobile Shops Mushroomed in Oil Queues”¹⁴ reported that people waited at night to buy gas, and there emerged vendors who sold meatballs, beverages, and cigarette to them. According to another item “At the Religious Holiday, We will Buy Candy for 150-450, Chocolate for 900, and Coffee for 1800 Liras in the Black Market.”¹⁵ In another item, an advertisement “long-sufferer wanted” was quoted; it read that “A person who has a driving license, who is able to wait in queues for margarine two days a week, for cylinder LGP once in every two weeks, for oil two times a week, with a benign personality, is wanted.”¹⁶

In addition to the experiences of people who were from the middle class, which represented the ordinary person on the street, there were also the stories about different segments of society such as football players or workers in the movie sector. The stories were constructed with fragments from the lives of those people. The news regarding football players reported that they wanted an increase in the money paid by the football clubs, noting the rise in the prices of cherries, green peppers, or cucumbers. They argued that they could not even buy a slum house with the money

¹³ “Zam Sağanağı Geliyor... Allah Yardımcımız Olsun,” *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

¹⁴ “Benzin Kuyruklarında Seyyar Büfeler Türedi,” *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979.

¹⁵ “Şeker Bayramında Şekeri 150-450, Çikolatayı 900 Liradan Yiyebilecek Karaborsa Kahveyi 1800 Liradan İçebileceğiz,” *Cumhuriyet*, 18 August, 1979.

¹⁶ “Çilekeş Aranıyor,” *Hürriyet*, June 16, 1979. Original quote: “haftada iki gün sanayağı kuyruğu, 15 günde bir tüpgaz kuyruğu, haftada iki gün benzin kuyruğuna girecek şoför ehliyetli mutedil mizaçlı çilekeş kişi aranıyor.”

they earned. The news on the cinema sector read that negatives could not be imported due to the shortage of foreign currency, thus the workers in the sector were in an economically difficult position.¹⁷

From those examples it can be concluded that the newspapers were full of reports on the crisis-related experiences of people especially from middle and lower classes. People reading the newspapers in that period saw an economy that referred to their daily experiences (going to market place, or preparations for the religious feast), materials and tangible things in their lives (tomatoes, cucumbers, or negatives). From the news, it can be learned that a shortage of oil was experienced as waiting in the queues for nights and falling ill afterwards, or that waiting in the queues took such long hours regularly that it turned into a daily routine, and can even be considered to be an occupation.

In addition, the discourse regarding the economic crisis represented the experiences with the five senses of the people. The news talked about smells, tastes, feeling cold. For example, a news item titled “People Smelled the Coffee” included sentences such as “its smell comes to us so far away from Saraçhane; bitter and warm,”¹⁸ with a picture of a man who smells coffee. There were also news items which talked about the forgotten taste of margarine. Children, who were cold in classrooms, because the heaters did not work due to the shortage of oil, were also a topic of the news.

It was also possible to see the feelings of people related to that economic crisis. The happiness of an old man who was able to get a cylinder LPG was

¹⁷ “İlk Parti Negatif Filmler Bu Ay İçinde Geliyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, June, 16, 1979.

¹⁸ “Halk Dağıtılan Kahveyi Kokladı” *Hürriyet*, February 17, 1979. Original quote: “*Taa saraçhane’den geliyor kokusu, acı, sıcak, özlem dolu...*”

reported in an item titled “Come on, My Boy” since he carried the cylinder of gas using his walking stick.¹⁹ Feelings of anger at the authorities or despair also appeared in the news very often. For example, a man was quoted as saying

We are so full of anger...we have a kid going to secondary school, we have deprived ourselves of everything...we do not buy new clothes, we do not go out, we even barely buy something to eat...we used to buy meat once a week, now we buy it once every two weeks...May God help us...Do you see any way out?²⁰

News on the Macroeconomy or Sectors

In addition to news on the daily life experiences of people, there were also articles about larger economic processes. They can be called news on the macroeconomy (the rise of oil prices in the world), or on particular sectors (tourism, pharmaceuticals). They approached the economic issues from a wider angle. Rather than the consumption side, they took the production and supply of goods as their subject (for example, the process of production of meat and its being provided to the consumers).

Like the news about daily life experiences, this news was fully understandable to the reader. The production and supply processes were explained in detail. There was almost nothing technical, intangible, and abstract in the news. They were not written for sector experts, or economic analysts, and they constructed a world, which was in no way alien to the average person.

¹⁹ “Deh Deh Yavrum,” *Hürriyet*, February 15, 1979.

²⁰ “Zam Sağanağı Geliyor... Allah Yardımcımız Olsun,” *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

A good example of macroeconomic developments regarded oil prices. The article “Oil: Games behind Closed Doors” explained the reasons behind the increase of oil prices in a clear way.²¹ The article noted that the rise of oil prices had started with Iran’s halting of oil exports. The reduction in the oil supply had resulted in OPEC’s (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) rising prices to fifteen-sixteen dollars. However, due to the oil shortage the prices had jumped to thirty-three dollars on the European spot markets. Thus, some of the oil exporting countries earmarked part of the petroleum to be exported, to sell in the spot markets in Europe at higher prices. As a result, the amount of oil exported to the countries other than Europe declined. In order to attract more oil, which was started to be channelled to Europe, the US decided to purchase oil at a price five dollars higher than the official one. Thus, despite the official fifteen dollars, the oil was traded at much higher prices. The law of the jungle ruled in world oil market, and the ones who gave the price, played the flute, the writer noted.²²

When developments in a sector were under focus, the news mentioned about the stages before it reached the hands of the consumer, the agents who took part in those stages, or the components of the cost. The news focusing on the construction prices noted that land constituted half of the overall cost. The land prices had increased sharply because they were in the hands of speculators.²³ Another news item listed the prices of raw materials and intermediate goods and the change in years in an item about the problems in the furniture sector.²⁴ In the article titled “Struggle for a Piece of Meat” it was reported that the cattle farmers in Anatolia sold their cattle before they grew up to the “Shylocks” (people who lent money at

²¹ “Petrolde Oynanan Oyunlar,” *Cumhuriyet*, June 13, 1979.

²² Ibid.

²³ “İnşaat Yaptırmak da Ateş Pahası Oldu,” *Hürriyet*, August 15, 1979.

²⁴ “Mobilyacılar, “Fiyat Söylemeye Yüzümüz Kalmadı” Diyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, August 15, 1979.

very unfavourable rates) for 15-25 liras/kg, because they could not find any fund to feed them. Shylocks sell those cattle at eighty-ninety liras/kg in the market where the animals were traded in Istanbul. The commissioners, commissioner agents, wholesalers, and retailers were the other middlemen who took part in the process as other intermediaries before the meat was sold to the final customer, and pulled up the price.²⁵

The last example regarding the issue involved copper goods production.²⁶ The newspaper noted that cooper goods were produced in Urfa, Mardin Diyarbakır, and Kahramanmaraş. Previously, the copper artisans from those cities had gone to Istanbul for production; however they had been unable to adapt to the city, read the news. The fact that the artisans had returned to their villages, both reduced production costs and the social problems of the artisans.

The economy, in the way represented in the newspapers, in no way had its own dynamics or complicated processes that could not be controlled or intervened in by human agents. Rather, the economy was a field made by human agency. It was the men and women who took their places in those processes, and the developments came into being as a result of the actions of certain actors, persons, groups, interest groups, or states.

Another point that should be made is that those macroeconomic and sectoral developments were not treated in isolation, as merely economic. They were put into a social context. To give an example, the news about the copper production mentioned the problems of the copper producers who had immigrated to Istanbul from their villages. The problems of cattle farmers were taken up as a social

²⁵ "Et Çilesi," *Cumhuriyet*, August 17, 1979.

²⁶ "Hediyeilik Bakır Eşyadan Yılda 5 Milyon Dolar Sağlanabilecek," *Cumhuriyet*, June 12, 1979.

phenomenon as well as an economic one. Apart from this, the macroeconomic developments were shown to be intertwined with the political matters. According to the article about the rise of oil prices, it was not the market dynamics, but the games played by some states that were the factor behind it.

The Interpretation of Technical Language to Daily Life

It should also be noted that almost all figures, abstract concepts, and so-called economic indicators were translated into the language of daily lives of the people. Economy was an understandable field; if there was something that was technical, it generally was presented in a way that could make sense for people who were non-experts in the field. A piece of news regarding gold prices is a good example of this point.²⁷ The news underlined the fact that the gold reserves in the world were limited. To illustrate this, the article noted that all of the gold in the world could only cover the field of Berlin Stadium. In this way, the mechanism of supply and demand, and the resulting price movements became more concrete, more understandable.

The same news also noted that the increasing gold demands of oil exporting countries had pulled up gold prices.²⁸ This fact was translated into the life of ordinary person as the news added that the rising gold prices had pulled up the prices of gold tooth fillings. In Turkey, dentists were afraid of the patient's reaction, when they said the price of the service, the news furthered. This example bluntly stated that the relation of a worldwide economic development to the world of the

²⁷ "Altın Doları Yendi," *Hürriyet*, February 15, 1979.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

average person in Turkey. The reporter had to connect all those sentences about prices, including figures, to the daily life, to have it make sense. The figures made sense as far as they were translated into the daily lives of people.

Another example is that when the support purchase prices for cotton was announced, a news item noted that this made 100,000 liras revenue for a trailer of cotton, which was a good amount.²⁹ Petkim's raising the price of goods was given with the title "Prices of Everything from Tires to Clothes Pins to be Increased" and provided a list of the goods, the prices of which would rise. As a result, a reader who could not know the goods in which petrochemicals were used, would understand the effects of petrochemicals company Petkim's raising of the prices of its goods. The last example that should be noted here regards construction prices. The news included many details about the components of construction costs, and the changes in them, but also calculated what those changes in cost meant for people. The news was as follows

The most important need of people, housing, has become a significant burden, and a difficult problem to be solved. The studies showed that the construction costs have increased by 1200% over the last ten years. Ten years ago 100 meters square of housing had cost 90,000-100,000 liras; the very same housing today costs not less than 1 million- 1.2 million liras, and is sold for 2 million liras at least. The studies also showed that a retired public servant, or a worker, who could easily buy a house with his retirement bonus, today he/she needed to pay two times more to buy a house.³⁰

²⁹ "Üretici Pamuk Taban Fiyatından Memnun: Bir Römork Pamuk 100 Bin Lira," *Cumhuriyet*, August 13, 1979.

³⁰ "İnşaat Yaptırmak da Ateş Pahası Oldu," *Hürriyet*, August 12, 1979. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

“Our Economy World”

“*Ekonomi Dünyamız*” (“*Our Economy World*”) was the headline of the section under which some of the economic articles were presented, in the newspaper *Hürriyet*. This section title can be read to symbolize the relation of the people to the economic processes of the period. In summary, the field of economy was something that also included people, and that was created by people. It was the world of *ours*. The articles under this section claimed to be reflecting the world of the readers. There was no imagination of an economy operating in a remote place. The field of economy, which gave the experiences of people a central place in the representation of the field, which narrated macroeconomic and sectoral developments as a human product, which placed economic developments in a human and social context, and almost all elements of which were translated into the daily lives of people to make sense, can be truly called “our economy world.”

The possessive pronoun was used also in other cases related to the economic phenomena. For example, a news item reporting devaluation read, “*Our* money, which has been constantly losing its value, was devaluated against foreign currencies,”³¹ “*our* money has turned into worthless bits of paper.”³² Other examples are “*our* wheat” (in “Greeks produce flour from *our* wheat and get rich”³³), “*our* tobacco” (in “Pirate factories in Europe made 7.5 billion liras with the Samsun

³¹ “Yandık Yandık Gene Yandık,” *Hürriyet*, February 26, 1980; emphasis mine. Original quote: “*yabancı paralar karşısında sürekli değer kaybeden paramız devaluasyona tabi tutuldu*”

³² “Demirel: Paramız Paçavraya Çevrildi” *Hürriyet*, June 13, 1979; emphasis mine. Original quote : “*paramız paçavraya çevrildi*”

³³ “Yunanlılar Buğdayımızı Un Yapıp, Milyonlar Vuruyor,” *Hürriyet*, February 19, 1979; emphasis mine.

branded cigarettes that were made out of *our* tobacco and sold to Turkey”³⁴), and “*our* maritime business” (in “our maritime business is sinking”³⁵). The usage of words in this way indicates that they were not seen just as commodities to be exchanged. It established a link with those goods and the world in which they were produced. Those things could not be thought out of their human, social, and national context, the tobacco from the people cultivating it, and the lira from the Turkish nation. The mediation of nation in the feeling of possession was particularly important. Those things were seen as assets of the nation. So, as every asset belonging to the nation they should be treated with care, and cautiously. They were not evaluated from the economic point of view, but they were attributed some other values.

Those goods were placed in their social and national context. In the analysis of the tourism sector, for example, the sector was not treated solely from economic perspective. When the problems of tourism sector were discussed, it was done not in the cold and pseudo-objective voice of an expert, but in the voice of a citizen, who was subjective in his/her evaluations, and closely related to his/her country with nationalist feelings. For example, an academic approaches to the tourism sector as follows.³⁶ According to him, Turkey was one of the luckiest country in the world in terms of natural assets. It was also rich with historical and archaeological assets, which he listed at length from the Noah’s Ark to St. Sophia of Byzantium and concluded “the pieces exhibited in the British Museum or in the Louvre are nothing but toys when compared to the rich collections of Topkapı Museum.”

³⁴ “Samsun Sigarası Vurgunu,” *Hürriyet*, February, 22, 1979; emphasis mine. Original quote: “Korsan fabrikalar bizim tütünlerimizle Avrupa’da yapıp Türkiye’ye sattıkları Samsun sigarasından geçen yıl 7,5 milyar lira kazandılar”

³⁵ “Gemi Sanayicileri: Denizciliğimiz boğuluyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, August 12, 1979; emphasis mine.

³⁶ “Türkiye Hala Yılda Bir Milyon Turistle Avunuyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, August 12, 1979.

Normative Judgements

It can be argued that people thought that they had a right to their say in *their* economy world. The economy was not treated as a mechanism operating with its own rules that could not be taken under control. It was not a sphere which was beyond normative judgments. It was both easier and possible to make judgments. In late 1970s, It was easier because the economic processes were understandable, and provided room to make evaluations, and making judgements was possible because there were the actors of the economic processes who could be held responsible for their actions.

First of all, the IMF and the government were the main target of the criticisms, and the government was criticized and urged to take particular actions.

With regard to the rise of oil prices, the actors pulling up the oil prices were said to be the European countries, which paid higher prices for oil in the spot market, and the U.S., which provided subsidies respectively.³⁷ Those states were presented to be playing games in the sector, which was unethical, the article implied. “The one who gives the money plays the flute,” and the law of the jungle ruled in the oil market, the writer commented. Similarly, an article read that on the day following the Iranian revolution, “the pirates took advantage of the scarcity and demanded very high prices.” Those, who sold oil at prices higher than the market were called as pirates and criticized in this news. The black marketeers were also blamed. Their taking the advantage of the conditions was not normalized.

³⁷ “Petrolde Oynanan Oyunlar,” *Cumhuriyet*, June 13, 1979.

Similarly, in an article about the pharmaceuticals sector, the companies were accused of being the extensions of the world giants, exaggerating their costs to pull up prices.³⁸ In the rise of meat prices, the middlemen were held responsible.³⁹

Temporality of Crisis

As mentioned above, the economy was regarded not to be operating at a place remote from the daily lives of the people, the definition of crisis was related to those daily lives; the temporality of the crisis took shape accordingly. The course of events in the economy flowed at a pace parallel to the changes in everyday life. The people in the 1970s started to call the situation crisis when there was a crisis in their daily lives, when they could not find cylinders of gas to cook food, when they severely missed the smell of coffee, or when the children sat in cold classrooms due to the lack of oil.

In the 1977-79 period, the developments culminated into a crisis, the crisis was a process, it was an accumulation. Indeed there were significant developments which would have marked the start of crisis. For example, in February 1979, the oil crisis broke out in the world, following the Islamic revolution in Iran. Oil prices sharply increased. Though it was estimated that Turkey would be seriously affected from the world oil crisis, according to the media, there was no crisis in Turkey the following day. It was possible to talk about not a sudden eruption, but the culmination of events into a crisis. In the course of time, conditions became worse, and after a period of time, the situation was defined retrospectively as a crisis. The

³⁸ “74 İlaç Firmasının 18’i Üretimin Yüzde 60’ını elinde tutuyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, August 12, 1979

³⁹ “Et Çilesi,” *Cumhuriyet*, August 17, 1979.

crisis indicated a slow process towards the end of the 1980s. It was not possible to talk about an atmosphere of panic that was out of control.

That is why there was no specific day, or month in which the crisis was said to have started. The crisis was not called or referred to with a specific date, like “Black Wednesday” or “the February 21 crisis.” Retrospectively, it was called generally “the 1977-79 crisis,” “the crisis towards the end of the 70s,” or “the second wave of the crisis that started in 1974.” The period of crisis was a long one, of which the starting and ending dates were blurred. The time was not cut with a knife in the discourse on crisis in the pre-1980 period.

Sites of Crisis

In the newspapers, the crisis was described with reference to certain places in general. Thus the crisis did have places, in which it took place. Those sites, articles mentioned can be grouped under three categories: places where the daily experiences took place, the locations where larger economic processes occurred, and a geography, defined by the national borders.

As mentioned above, the daily experiences were at the very heart of economic developments in the discourse regarding the 1979 crisis. The experiences had a place, so did the economic developments. Inflation had a place, unemployment had a place, the developments related to foreign currency shortage had a place. Inflation was not just a figure, but something that was felt in the market places, and the groceries. For example, when a pensioner wanted to explain his/her difficult economic position, he said that he could not even fill his bags in the

market.⁴⁰ Coffee houses were places where the unemployed waited. A news item noted that the unemployed workers from the movie sector spent their time in coffee houses.⁴¹ In an open letter to the tobacco minister, released in a newspaper a coffee-shop owner tried to draw attention to the importance of coffee houses in Turkish culture, and devastating effects of the coffee shortage to this tradition.⁴²

In addition, people spoke about the problems of tradesmen in different districts of Istanbul. For example, a news item quoted an official from the furniture sector:

The shops, streets, and offices in the furniture district of the Kapalıçarşı, everywhere is full of merchandise, the drop in furniture sales is observed not only in the Kapalıçarşı, but also all over in Istanbul, from Pendik to Çatalca, from Osmanbey to Bakırköy.⁴³

Similarly, according to another news item, which put the price increases in shoe sector under focus, a tradesman argued that the prices in Beyazıt and Çarşıkapı should not be considered as expensive because of the particular traits of that neighbourhood. The high costs stemming from rents, wages to employees who can speak foreign languages, and the spending of shop owners who had high living standards pulled up the prices.⁴⁴

It is also possible to see crisis-related news from different parts of the country. For example, a news item read, “after squash producers, tomatoes

⁴⁰ “Zam Sağanacağı Geliyor... Allah Yardımcımız Olsun,” *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979.

⁴¹ “İlk Parti Negatif Filmler Bu Ay İçinde Geliyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, June 16, 1979.

⁴² “Serbest Kürsü,” February 15, 1979.

⁴³ “Mobilyacılar, ‘Fiyat Söylemeye Yüzümüz Kalmadı’ Diyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, August 15, 1979. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

⁴⁴ “Ayakkabı Fiyatlarındaki Yükseliş Çok Değişik Nedenlerden Kaynaklanıyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, June 12, 1979.

producers too went bankrupt in Erdemli.”⁴⁵ The item “in Bursa the bread 750krs” reported the price for a 750gr bread in Bursa was set as 750krs, the bread producers did not accept to produce 550gr bread at 6 liras in İzmir, while the talks on bread prices between the people concerned continued in İstanbul.⁴⁶

The Crisis of the Nation

The crisis took place in a geography surrounded by national frontiers. The borders of the country were seen clearly in the economic crisis of 1979, which separated national from foreign. The division between the inside and outside was drawn boldly.

First of all, the national authority and representatives of the international capitalist system were separated clearly. The representatives of the international capitalist system and Turkish officials were constructed as two sides in a dependency relation. Rather than the unquestioned relent to the international system, a reluctant acceptance of its help by the government was seen. On the other hand, the opposition parties harshly criticized the government for signing an agreement with the IMF. The headline of one article was “Opposition Calls for Vote of Confidence in Government. The Reason: Absolute Obedience to the IMF, and Anarchy.”⁴⁷

According to the discourse in 1979, “external debt” was something that should be definitely avoided, and sought only as the last resort. It was described as

⁴⁵ “Domates 2 Lira Olunca Kim İflas Etmez,” *Hürriyet*, June 18, 1979. Original quote: “Erdemli’de kabak üreticilerinden sonra domates üreticileri de iflas etti”

⁴⁶ “Bursa’da Ekmek 750krş Oldu,” *Tercüman*, June 14, 1979.

⁴⁷ “Muhalefet Hükümeti Güvenoyuna Çağırıldı Sebepler: İmf’ye Mutlak İtaat ve Anarşi,” *Hürriyet*, July 1, 1979.

“begging,” and the dependency situation in which it would result was emphasized. The article “Inside or Outside?” read that “the only solution to finding foreign currency is not begging, but preventing lavish spending... Would it not be better if we found the solution within ourselves instead of begging?”⁴⁸

In 1979, a news item in foreign media, which pictured Turkey as an underdeveloped country, was quoted.⁴⁹ At first sight, it was similar to news quoted later in 2001. The article was titled “Turkey: Sick Man.” It described the anarchy, and the lack of goods, and argued that Turkey looked like Iran at first sight. However, it was added that Turkey was quite different from Iran upon closer inspection, and noted the secularism brought by Atatürk, more even income distribution, and the modernization process, which had started earlier than that in Iran. The understanding was that Turkey should preserve its strength in the international arena, and that it had positive traits, which should be promoted, as well as its negative ones.

It should also be underlined that “the Other” in the definition of Turkey’s national identity, Greece received frequent mention. Greece was the Other by which Turkey defined itself. Turkey was always pictured in rivalry with Greece. In this context, the deterioration in economic conditions also meant that Turkey was losing the competition to its historic rival.

For example, an article discussed the adverse effects of the economic conditions on the Turkish press. After the devaluation of TL, the foreign publications had become too expensive for the Turkish media sector to follow,

⁴⁸ “Dışarıda mı İçeride mi?,” *Hürriyet*, February 22, 1979. Original quote: “Çözüm döviz bulmak için ona buna avuç açmak değil savurganlığı önlemek... Çözümü ... kendi içimizde aramak ona buna avuç açmaktan çok daha iyi değil midir?”

⁴⁹ “Time: Türkiye Hasta Adam,” *Hürriyet*, February 22, 1979.

according to the article. This resulted in the Turkish media's loss of touch with the world. On the other hand, Greece was incorporating into the world at an accelerated pace, the article read. The article also described the offices of the big media groups in Athens, or the International Press Institute's meeting in Greece. Greece was the benchmark to explain the deteriorating conditions in Turkey in every context. In another article titled "First News on Greek TV Was devaluation of TL" a Greek newspaper was quoted as writing that "The economy in the land of Attila is collapsing." Last example regarding the issue was that "Greek produces flour out of our wheat and making millions"⁵⁰ Greeks represented the eye of envy, through which Turkey defined itself. Seeing the unfavourable economic developments from the viewpoint of Greece, which was codified as the envious foreigner, helped Turkey draw its borders more boldly. This strengthened the feeling of nation.

The Case of Devaluation

The case of devaluation provides a good example of how an economic phenomenon was treated in the late 1970s. This reveals how such developments were approached as part of the daily experiences, how they were situated in the social context, and treated not as merely an economic issue, but also a national issue.

In 1979, the devaluation of the local currency did not mean anything in itself. It was not only a change in exchange rates; it was not limited to the world of figures. It meant that this would make life more costly, and price increases were imminent. *Hürriyet* reported "the citizens interpreted the economic measures that

⁵⁰ "Yunanlılar Buğdayımızı Un Yapıp, Milyonlar Vuruyor," *Hürriyet*, February 19, 1979.

seem extremely difficult to understand as ‘devaluation’ and ‘price increase’.”⁵¹ Indeed this interpretation indicated the approach of the media to the issue. There was no news solely talking about the devaluation decision. The devaluation was the first news, but it was also given together with some other information, such as price increases. In the daily *Tercüman*, even the expected price increases (before they were officially announced) in coal and oil were given priority over the devaluation decision. “Prices of Oil and Coal to be increased” made the headlines, while “Devaluation: 1 Dollar Equals 47.10 Liras” was given in smaller letters. In *Hürriyet*, the headline was “Market in Turmoil” referring to the changes in prices, and the new exchange rates were given again in smaller letters. *Cumhuriyet* was the only newspaper, in which the devaluation decision was reported in big letters; “1 Dollar Equals 47.10 Liras, It Is Certain That An Agreement Will Be Signed with the IMF,” yet the article also reported expected price increases.

A similar example was a report of devaluation on January 24, 1980, with a story titled “Devaluation Hurts Once Again.”⁵² The story read that the devaluation would be followed by price increases in many goods, and gives a detailed list of them. To make it more concrete, the increase in cost of a meal is calculated under the title “Cooking Pot Index.”⁵³

The article “Citizen Are Worried” on day following the devaluation gave a very good picture of what devaluation meant for people.⁵⁴ In addition, the effects of the devaluation on other economic variables (such as inflation, purchasing power, demand) were explained by people who were not experts in the economics. In the

⁵¹ “Vatandaş Endişeli,” *Hürriyet*, June 12, 1979. Original quote: “*Son derece karışık gibi görünen ekonomik tedbirler vatandaş tarafından “devalüasyon” ve zam şeklinde tercüme ediliyor*”

⁵² “Yandık Yandık Gene Yandık,” *Hürriyet*, February 26, 1980

⁵³ “Tencere Hesabı,” *Hürriyet*, February 26, 1980

⁵⁴ “Vatandaş Endişeli,” *Hürriyet*, June 12, 1979.

article, a doctor said that devaluation meant a rise in the prices of x-ray films, and pharmaceuticals for him. A taxi driver noted that he had bought a clutch disc at 5,575 liras that he had bought for 2,150 liras the previous year, and it would be 7,000 liras after the economic measures. He said that he would not be able to find any customers due to the rise of oil prices, according to the news. A secretary said that she wanted to spend all the money she had early in the month, because the prices of the goods increase towards the end of month. She also said that her employer had accepted their demand for wage increase after the devaluation in the past, however he/she rejected the demand this time, since the company was in an economically difficult position.

It should also be noted that the devaluation was evaluated with its adverse effects on the national asset of the country that is Turkish Lira. The main criticism of the opposition party of the government, which was brought to the headlines, was that “Our National Currency Has Been Stabbed in the Back.”⁵⁵ The value of the Turkish Lira was approached as a symbol of national pride, and its devaluation meant an attack on this pride. The expression “our money” indicated the feeling of possession, and “to stab” had important emotional connotations. The interpretation of devaluation as an attack on the national values can also be traced in the criticisms that the IMF had dictated those decisions, the government was no longer the government of Ankara but of Paris.⁵⁶ Bowing to the demands of the IMF for securing foreign loans was criticized harshly. The devaluation and consequent decision of increasing the prices of public goods were not treated only from an economic perspective. They were not treated as the iron rules of economy that the government should apply. It was a national issue as well as an economic one.

⁵⁵ “Demirel: Giderayak Milleti de Hançerlediler,” *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

Society

Society as the Sum of Citizens

Looking at the news regarding the economic crisis in 1979, the people subject to those experiences were generally called citizens. For example, an article in daily *Hürriyet* following the announcement of devaluation decision was titled “Citizens Are Worried.”⁵⁷ Other examples were “17 billion needed for the Ministry will be taken from the citizens’ pocket,” which referred to the expenditures of health ministry.⁵⁸ “Citizens having hard times with lack of goods, this time were shocked by devaluation.”⁵⁹ The arguments were made from position of citizen, and the state was called on to take action for the good of its citizens, to whom it was responsible for. Society, as sum of the citizens, was the entity on which the arguments were based.

It should be noted that people were treated generally as a homogenous body, affected by the economic decisions of the government more or less in the same way. They were in no way pictured as individuals pursuing their self-interests in the market, which would be in conflict with each other. The devaluation affected all the people adversely according to the news, from the lawyer to the secretary as the example above illustrated.⁶⁰ There seemed to be no winner in the devaluation decision, while the feeling of being in the same boat dominated. People also were not codified as consumers. No argument was made from the position of a consumer, and no news talked about “consumer rights”.

⁵⁷ “Vatandaş Endişeli,” *Hürriyet*, June 12, 1979.

⁵⁸ “Hastane Ücretleri %500-1000 Oranında Arttırıldı,” *Tercüman*, June 12, 1979.

⁵⁹ “Zam Sağanağı Geliyor... Allah Yardımcımız Olsun,” *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979.

⁶⁰ “Vatandaş Endişeli,” *Hürriyet*, June 12, 1979.

In the society, which appeared as a unity, the middle and low-income people were more visible. The problems of citizen with low and middle income, which is mainly composed of pensioners, civil servants, workers, and peasants, were put forward, and they were elaborated on. The reader heard their voices, and saw their pictures. Their statements were generally were given in quotation, coupled with a picture next to the statements. Especially low-income people were cared for. The income of people, and their life standards were important concerns. As mentioned above, their experiences made their way into the pages of the newspapers together with their feelings and thoughts. People appeared in the newspapers in the flesh and blood. Their problems were also presented in a detailed way.

There was no news about the problems faced by high-class people, or specific to the businessmen. The life fragments of the high-class people were less visible. As for the foreigners, there were some statements by some businessmen, which argued that foreign investment should be initiated, but those statements were placed in the margins in the newspapers. However, there was no representative of foreign businessmen talking about their problems, or making some arguments or suggestions about the Turkey's economy.

Civil Society

Beside the people on the street, the society was represented in the newspapers at the level of associations at the time of the crisis. The unions of the low and middle-income people were given important places also in this form of representation.

For example, when *Tercüman* reported on “domestic reactions” to the devaluation decision,⁶¹ the statement by the workers’ union Turk-Is was presented at top, and had almost the same amount of space earmarked for other associations. The statements by the head of *Türkiye Sanayi ve Ticaret Odaları Birliği* (The Union of Chambers of Industry and Trade of Turkey, representing businesspeople from medium-sized companies) *TÜSİAD* (Turkish Industrialists’ and Businessmen’s Association, representing businessperson from big-sized companies), *TİSK* (Turkish Confederation of Employer Associations) and a parliamentary representative were presented to be the other reactions in the news. In the article “Everybody is Asking: How Do We Make Ends Meet?”⁶² spokespersons from various unions representing the low and middle-classes conveyed their views about the worsening economic conditions. The workers via the leftist *DİSK* (Confederation of Revolutionary Workers’ Unions) and rightist *MİSK* (Confederation of Nationalist Workers’ Unions), the civil servants via *Memurlar Derneği* (Civil Servants Association), and peasants communicated their arguments alongside the representatives of the businessmen via *Ege Bölgesi Sanayi Odası* (Aegean Region chamber of Industry) and *İstanbul Sanayi Odası* (Istanbul Chamber of Industry). It should also be underlined that peasants were considered to be an important part of society in the crisis-related news. For example, the support purchase prices provided for agricultural products were given large spaces in the newspapers.

In *Cumhuriyet*, people from low and middle-class came onto agenda in their various branches. The workers in the mining sector via *Türk Maden-İş* (The Union of Turkish Mining Workers), architects and engineers via *TMMOB* (The Union Of

⁶¹ “Devalüasyon Büyük Tepki İle Karşılandı,” *Tercüman*, June 13, 1979.

⁶² “Herkes Soruyor ‘Nasıl Geçineceğiz,’” *Tercüman*, June 14, 1979.

Chambers of Turkish Architects and Engineers),⁶³ the workers working in road construction (*Yol-İş*), and employees in the press sector via *Basın-İş* , and railways via *DYF İş Federasyonu* ⁶⁴ were all represented as the components of the civil society, who showed their reaction to the government's devaluation decision. In the pages of *Cumhuriyet*, it was even possible to hear the voices of the Association of Chemists, or Association of Archaeologists. ⁶⁵ So, it can be concluded that in *Cumhuriyet*, almost all organized segments of the society, could express their views regarding the economic developments.



⁶³ DİSK: "CHP İşçi Desteğini Elinin Tersiyile İtti," *Cumhuriyet*, June 14, 1979.

⁶⁴ "Disk'ten Sonra Türk-İş'e Bağlı Sosyal Demokrat Sendikalar da Hükümeti Eleştiriyor," *Cumhuriyet*, June 15, 1979.

⁶⁵ "Teknik Elemanlara Tazminat Ödenmesini Öngören Kararnamenin İvedilikle Çıkartılması İstendi" *Cumhuriyet*, August 13, 1979.

CHAPTER 4

DISCOURSE ON THE ECONOMIC CRISIS OF 2001

Two hours of turmoil in the markets directed Turkey into a new uncertainty.¹

Turkey is not the Turkey as it was 10 years ago...it reacts against every wrong step taken. The markets reacted after yesterday's crisis too.²

In this chapter the discourse regarding the economic crisis that erupted in February 2001 is analysed. Before elaborating on the crisis discourse, first the construction of the economic field in general is reviewed. As for the crisis discourse, it is analysed mainly by looking at the phenomenon called economic crisis, the borders of the economic field, and the relation between the field and actors in it. The words used, the temporality and spatiality in relation to the crisis also provide clues about how the economy was imagined in the 2000s. In the final section, how the society was imagined throughout the crisis is discussed.

General Conception of Economy

In the 2000s, the way the economy was perceived and represented in the media was quite different than it had been in the pre-1980 period. The economy became a more self-enclosed, self-contained sphere. It was significantly a new

¹ "İki Saatte 4,9 Milyar Dolar Çekildi," *Hürriyet*, February 20, 2001. Original quote: "piyasaların iki saat içinde yaşadığı sarsıntı Türkiye'yi yeni bir belirsizliğe yönlendirdi."

² "Sizi Barıştıralım," *Hürriyet*, February 21, 2001. Original quote: "Türkiye artık 10 yıl önceki Türkiye değil... yanlış atılan her adımda reaksiyon veriyor. Çünkü krizden sonra piyasalar reaksiyon verdi."

phase, in taking apart the economy from the field of social relations that contains it, as Polanyi mentioned.³ In many cases, things were treated as merely economic, disregarding its social context. Related to this transformation, the 2000s saw an important step in the way of passing from “economy” to “the economy” thinking with Mitchell’s formulation.⁴ Another important dimension of the transformation was that the borders of the field of economy were less permeable, and more and more detached from other spheres of life.

Economy in the Mass Media

To explore on these arguments, first the special section allocated for the economy news in the mass media should be analysed. An important change was that, daily newspapers started to include “economy pages,” where all news considered to be pertaining to the economy were brought together. Now, the economy became a more solid field, the border of which was less permeable. Moreover, a newspaper started to provide a separate bulletin in a different colour where economy related developments were reported.⁵ The national newspapers, the TV channels focusing on economy news should also be noted here.⁶ On TV channels, we started to see that some part of the news bulletins was allocated for reporting the developments in financial markets. Then, it can be said that a distinct

³ Karl Polanyi, *Büyük Dönüşüm Çağımızın Sosyal ve Ekonomik Kökenleri*, translated by Ayşe Buğra (İstanbul: İletişim, 2000).

⁴ Timothy Mitchell, *Rule of Experts Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity* (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 2002).

⁵ Sabah provided a separate bulletin of economy-related news in different color during April 1992-Mar 1993.

⁶ Dünya and Finansal Forum are the newspapers, CNBC-e is the TV channel focusing on economy news.

sphere was earmarked in the media for the economy news, and it was separated from other spheres with bolder lines than it was the case in the pre-1980 period.

The Management of the Economy

The management of the economy at the state level also pointed to a change in the conception of economy. The Prime Minister started to speak less on economic issues in the 2000s compared to the case in the pre-1980 period. On the other hand, a Minister, who was responsible for economy, became a public figure. The Economy Minister was to manage the convoluted field of economy, while the management of state budget was reduced to a technical level (in the pre-1980 period, the Finance Minister was the political figure who was responsible from the economy, following the PM; he/she spoke on the economic matters before the media). As a result, the management of economic matters under different Ministries in the late 1970s left its place to the management from a single point in the early 2000s. Thus, it can be concluded that economic issues were brought together under one hat, and a field of economy appeared more solidly. In that field, the thing to be governed was much more complicated than the state budget.

The Minister of State responsible for the Treasury was regarded as the “captain” of the economy. After the February 2001 crisis, the businessmen were not satisfied with the existence of Minister of State overseeing Treasury, they went on further, and demanded a Minister who would be called formally “the Economy Minister;” that Minister should be the Deputy Prime Minister, according to the businessmen. Although such a post was not created officially, Kemal Derviş and his successors, who were appointed to the post of Ministry of State overseeing the

Treasury after February 2001 crisis, were started to be called as “the Economy Minister” unofficially in the media.

Economy with its Own Dynamics

The phrases like “the *dynamics* of economy” or “the *balance* of economy” started to appear much more frequently in the 2000s, while the news on government communiqués started to appear fewer. The news mentioned, for example, “the debt dynamics of Turkish economy,” or “the economy on knife-edge balance.” Economy, detached from its human context, and abstracted from the social sphere started to be situated on the side of natural in the human being-nature dichotomy.⁷ It seemed to have a nature-like existence, against which human being should combat. It was imagined to have a presence autonomous from the human being. Economy was said to be “heating up,” or “cooling down,” like a self-enclosed mechanism, like an engine of vehicle.

The phrases like “the weapon of interest rate” or “injecting liquidity” should also be noted here. For example, it was said, “the Central Bank should inject money to relieve the market. Open market transactions and the interest rate weapon will settle down the current rates to a certain level.”⁸ In this sentence the economy seemed something that should be combated against, or a separate entity, which is positioned against the human being. The people who have authority in the field (for example the IMF officials, or Central Bank Governor) were represented in the media as the cold-blooded military officers or the doctors. A similar well-known

⁷ Mitchell discusses the creation of nature-human being dichotomy, and representation of some economic matters as natural in “Rule of Experts.”

⁸ “İstikrar Programı Çöktü,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 23, 2001. Original quote “*Merkez Bankası ... piyasayı rahatlatacak nakidi enjekte etmeli. Açık piyasa işlemleri ve faiz silahı kuru belli bir oranda dengeleyecek.*”

example is the “inflation monster.” Calling inflation a monster, it was represented as something external to the society, apart from the world it was produced in. Moreover, as a monster, the inflation was symbolized as an entity much more powerful than the human beings.

Economy as the Field of Experts

The definition that “people concerned” had started to take less place in the articles in the 2000s. In cases where a person from a particular sector was quoted in the news he/she was started to be called “expert” in the early 2000s, rather than “the people concerned” in the late 1970s. For example, a bank general manager was called an “expert”, not “the person concerned”. This obscured the fact that indeed those people had particular interests in the processes. They were depicted as politically-neutral people who had no particular interests. In addition, when called expert they automatically had significant power in the field, their truth claim could not be easily challenged.

Moreover, the experts who were outsiders, started to show up in the dailies. Those experts were not directly engaged in the field; they neither had experience or nor authority in the field. For example, regarding the problems of the public banks, banking experts started to speak. Similarly on tobacco issue, the World Bank specialists expressed their views. As such, the economy pages became a field, where mainly experts speak, while experiences of the people who are concerned in the sector started to appear much fewer.

The Language of Economy

There was also a serious change in the words used in reporting economic developments in the newspapers. The words, phrases used to define economic situations such as “*hayat pahalılığı*” (cost of living), “*geçim sıkıntısı*” (making ends meet), “*yoklar ülkesi*” (the country of absences), “*70 cent’e muhtaç olmak*” (to be in need of 70 cents), were replaced by the technical words, which did not make sense to the ordinary person. Those situations would be defined with the words “inflation,” “net income level” or “balance of payments crisis” in the 2000s.

The words used in the economy articles in the 2000s were generally highly technical such as “*Net iç varlıklar*” (net domestic assets), “*para tabanı*” (money base), “*rezerv para*” (rezerv money), “*likidite sıkışıklığı*” (liquidity squeeze), “*ON faizler*” (ON interest rates), “*dezenflasyon*” (disinflation). As can be recognized, they were generally terms in English (*dezenflasyon*, *ON* in *ON faizler*), or one-to-one translation from English (*net iç varlıklar*). The representation of the Turkish economy was constructed with technical and imported words, which were quite alien to the world the economy operated in.

Discourse on the Economic Crisis

The Word of “Kriz”

I would like to start the analysis of the 2001 crisis discourse from the word “*kriz*” (crisis) used to call the crisis phenomena. It was different from the word “*buhran*” or “*bunalım*,” (“depression”) which had been used previously. First, it

was a word borrowed from another language, which had started to circulate more intensely after the 1980s. In addition, the word “depression” brings to minds a more deep-rooted phenomenon, which spreads to a wider region, and indicates a longer process. On the other hand, the word “crisis” hints that the problem may be at the surface; it may emerge at a particular moment, and can be solved in a short period of time. I would further go into details in the following pages regarding the relation of crisis conception to time. Yet, I should note here that unlike “depression”, “crisis” points out to a problem more on the surface, and that does not affect the social processes deeply.

The Phenomenon called “Crisis”

One of the most important differences between the crisis discourses in 1979 and 2001 was that the phenomena, which were referred as “crisis,” were quite different things. In 2001, the definition of crisis was not based on the daily lives of the people, but some other factors. It was mainly the sharp moves in financial markets that were called as crisis.

The daily *Hürriyet* attributed utmost importance to the financial markets in the determination of the agenda, and the general course of the developments; “...two hours of turmoil in market directed Turkey into an uncertainty.”⁹ Thus, it was a very short step for the daily to pass from the sharp moves in financial markets to the word “economic crisis.” The title of the daily on February 20 was “this is the

⁹ “İki Saatte 4,9 Milyar Dolar Çekildi,” *Hürriyet*, February 20, 2001. Original quote: “...piyasaların iki saat içinde yaşadığı sarsıntı Türkiye’yi yeni bir belirsizliğe yönlendirdi.”

quarrel, this is the bill.”¹⁰ Under “this is the quarrel,” the discussion between the President and the Prime Minister was reported without touching the subject matter of tension; rather the words exchanged such as “ungrateful cat” and “shameless” were underlined. According to the daily, the “quarrel” (the content of which was presented as insignificant, and similar to the quarrel of children¹¹) resulted into a high damage to the country. “The damage” that was reported under “this is the bill” consisted of high demand of foreign currency, and sharp decline in stock exchange market. The developments, those were reported in big bullets with strong words such as “collapse,” “run away,” were called as economic crisis on the following pages.

Some can argue that the developments in financial markets were given importance due to their effects on larger economic process, and they were taken as an indicator of an upcoming crisis. However, analysing the articles one sees that they were in no way treated as indicators, but they were important in themselves, and enough to call the situation as crisis.¹² It should also be underlined that it was more appropriate to call the situation “financial crisis” since it was confined to the financial sphere in the first days. However, the situation was rarely called as particularly “financial crisis,” it was generally referred to as “crisis” or stamped as “economic crisis.” The examples are “when considering the amount of foreign currency that left the coffers of the Central Bank, it was the shortest and sharpest

¹⁰ “İşte Kavga İşte Fatura,” *Hürriyet*, February 20, 2001.

¹¹ Oktay Ekşi, “Bunu Çocuklar Bile Yapmaz,” *Hürriyet*, February 20, 2001.

¹² It should be reminded that in a similar way the developments in financial markets in November 2000 were called as economic crisis in the media. However, the things soon got on right track, before having any effect on the economy. This is a good example of the case that the changes in daily life practices, or larger economic processes is not the critical factor for calling as situation as crisis, but developments in financial markets by itself can be crucial in definition of crisis situation.

daily crisis in the Turkish history,”¹³ “the crisis stemmed from the quarrel,”¹⁴ “formulas to overcome the crisis,”¹⁵ “the economy that re-entered to a collapse period.”¹⁶

On February 21, the daily *Hürriyet* reported, “the system came to a complete halt.”¹⁷ Looking at what the word “system” in the title stood for, one sees that it was only the banking sector. The news reported the operations of the Central Bank, the Treasury, public banks and private banks, and included many technical details such as “The Central Bank could not confirm to the banks about their EFT account balances in the beginning...” “interbank limits did not work either.”¹⁸ However, the developments confined to the banking sector were presented, as if it took place in the whole economic system. Similar to the case in the financial markets issue, the banking sector was not taken to be the hearth of or central to the economy, and given importance due to its effect on a larger sphere. Rather it was treated as the whole system.

Then it can be said that in the phenomena called “economic crisis,” the *economic* referred to a very narrow field. The difficulties faced in a very narrow sphere were projected onto the whole of the economy. The developments in financial markets were treated as developments in the whole economy sphere, while

¹³ “İki Saatte 4,9 Milyar Dolar Çekildi,” *Hürriyet*, February 20, 2001. Original quote: “Özellikle Merkez Bankası’ndan çıkan döviz itibariyle bugüne kadar Türkiye’de yaşanan en kısa ve en sert günlük kriz.”

¹⁴ “25 Dakikalık Kavgaya 30 Saat Alarm Durumu,” *Hürriyet*, February 21,2001. Original quote: “Kavganın yarattığı ekonomik kriz.”

¹⁵ Ibid. Original quote: “krizi atlatma formülleri.”

¹⁶ Emin Çölaşan, “Olan Türkiye’ye oluyor,” *Hürriyet*, February 20, 2001. Original quote: “yeniden çöküş sürecine giren ekonomi.”

¹⁷ “Sistem Kilitlendi,” *Hürriyet*, February 22, 2001.

¹⁸ Ibid. Original quote: “Merkez Bankası bazı bankalara açılıştta EFT bakiyelerini (geçemedi)... bankalararası limitler de çalışmadı.”

the banking sector stood for the entire system. This representation narrowed down the sphere of economy to a great extent.

Looking at the newspapers *Yeni Şafak* and *Cumhuriyet*, we see that they were not as quick as *Hürriyet* to call the developments in financial markets as crisis. Indeed, the most important thing was not the financial markets for these newspapers. *Yeni Şafak*'s title on February 20 was "siphoning off came to an end, markets collapsed."¹⁹ As well as the developments in financial markets, the subject of the tension between the President and the Prime Minister (the President's implying that the government was not determined enough in combating against corruption) was the main concern of the daily. Moreover, *Cumhuriyet* mainly focused on the political tension between the President and the Prime Minister, and the reasons behind it; the developments in the financial markets were given second place. The title of the daily newspaper *Cumhuriyet* on February 20 was "we will not let the country to be robbed."²⁰ Those newspapers did not picture a panicky atmosphere, and did not directly project the sharp moves in the financial markets onto the whole of the economy.

Yet, in the end, the word of "crisis" showed up in also those dailies just after February 19, after the turmoil in financial markets. They also started to call the situation as crisis -though not intensely- before no change took place in the general sphere of economy, and the daily lives of people. They, just like the newspaper *Hürriyet*, referred to the financial markets, not "the economy below," when calling the situation as crisis.

¹⁹ "Hortum Patladı, Piyasa Çöktü," *Yeni Şafak*, February 20, 2001.

²⁰ "Ülkeyi Soyduktumuz," *Cumhuriyet*, February 20, 2001.

It should also be noted that *Cumhuriyet* and *Yeni Şafak* provided some articles about the particular experiences during the crisis. There were news reporting that the people could not withdraw their time deposits from the banks,²¹ the cash usage via credit cards was halted,²² and some pensioners had a difficulty to get their pensions from the banks,²³ or the newspapers would stop preparing the regional publications due to the economic difficulties.²⁴ Yet, those fragments from the daily lives remained on the margins, were presented to be just the *effects* of the crisis on people, those experiences were not the crisis in themselves.

The priority, and central position given to the financial markets, in the economy world could be seen also in those dailies. For example, there was a news item with the heading “interrupted NSC meeting to be held, expectations in *economy* increased” in *Cumhuriyet*. However, when looking in the context of the news we see that what “the economy” referred to was money markets again; the second heading is “anxious wait in *money markets*.”²⁵ The phrase “money markets” was used in place of the economy, and the expectations of market players were presented to be the expectations of all of the economic actors. Similarly in *Yeni Şafak*, under the big title of “People on Fire” the first subheading was “Markets Uneasy” (the markets referred to financial markets; the stock exchange, repo rates, and TRL/USD rate were mentioned in the article). It was only after the developments in financial markets, the issue of price increase showed up; “price increase from thread to needle” is the second subheading.²⁶ In the representation of

²¹ “Yatırımcı Repoya Koştu,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 22, 2001.

²² “Kredi Kartından Nakit Çekimi Durduruldu,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 24, 2001.

²³ “Emekliler Şube Kapılarında,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 24, 2001.

²⁴ “Gazetelerin Bölge Ekleri Kapanıyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 26, 2001.

²⁵ “En Kritik Gün Yarım Kalan MGK Toplantısı Yapılacak, Ekonomide Beklentiler Arttı,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 26, 2001.

²⁶ “Halk Yaniyor,” *Yeni Şafak* February 23, 2001. Original quotes: “*piyasalar tedirgin*” ,“*iğneden ipliğe zam.*”

the economy, the first place was given to the financial markets; the difficult situation of society given the second place.

As a result, it can be said that the turmoil in financial markets were projected onto the whole of the economy in all newspapers. The phrase “financial markets” were used at many places to refer to the whole field of economy. For example, it was commented by Tuncay Özilhan the head of businessmen association TÜSİAD “Turkey is not the Turkey as it was 10 years ago...it reacts against every wrong step taken. The markets reacted after yesterday’s crisis too”.²⁷ “Turkey” reacting to the developments refers to “the markets”; the reaction of the markets is the reaction of Turkey, according to the statement. This representation provides the basis for weird statements such as “the effects of November 2000 and February 2001 crisis on economy”²⁸ or “the crisis hitting the economic indicators.” It seemed that the *economic* crisis took place somewhere out of this *economy* sphere and then it hit the economy sphere. The words “after a week full of crisis, we enter a week full of the effects of crisis” imply that the crisis took place and ended up in a week.²⁹ In fact, what took place in one week was the turmoil in financial economy; so the developments in larger economic processes were presented to be the effects of crisis, not the crisis itself. There seemed to be two “economies,” one of which is composed of the financial markets, and the other one is larger economic processes. The former one was the central, the core, and the determining one in the definition of crisis, while the other one remained on the periphery. It should be reiterated that

²⁷ “Sizi Barıştıralım,” *Hürriyet*, February 21, 2001. Original quote: “*Türkiye artık 10 yıl önceki Türkiye değil... yanlış atılan her adımda reaksiyon veriyor. Dünkü krizden sonra piyasalar reaksiyon verdi.*”

²⁸ “Kasım 2000 ve Şubat 2001 Krizleri Ekonomik Verileri Sarsıyor,” *Hürriyet*, April 26, 2001.

²⁹ Mustafa Balbay, “Kaza Yapan Arcacın Lastikleri Değiştiriliyor,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 26, 2001. Original quote: “*krizlerle dolu bir haftanın ardından, krizin izleriyle dolu yeni bir haftaya giriyoruz.*”

in the definition of crisis, larger economic processes seem to be totally ignored, they were totally out of the picture in the so-called “crisis days.”

The Crisis Like the “Dooms Day”

Related to the representation of crisis in this way (starting from a very narrow conception of economy, which does not take into consideration the everyday life practices), the crisis came to the scene as the dooms day, or a natural disaster. The examples are “Turkey like fire scene,”³⁰ “a shock fire,”³¹ “dooms day.”³² Especially the words such as “economic earthquake” were abundant in the dailies; it was argued that the political developments had the effect of August 17 earthquake on economy³³ or “economic crisis creating an earthquake in industry sector.”³⁴ This “dooms day effect” was supported with strong words such as “collapse,” “skyrocket,” “shock,” “panic,” “alarm” etc.

This is a way depicting the economy as collapsing onto the heads of the people. The economy was placed in a sphere, which was autonomous from and out of the control of the people. In the cases of dooms day or earthquake, people are subject to a huge power, in no way they can comprehend, control and challenge. In the 2000s, the economic activities have been pictured as processes, which does not contain human agency; this is why the economic crisis in 2001 seemed to be like a natural disaster. According to the titles of three news items, in the same page of *Yeni*

³⁰ “Türkiye Sanki Yangın Yeri,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 22, 2001.

³¹ “MGK Acil Toplansın,” *Yeni Şafak*, February 22, 2001.

³² “Kıyameti Telekom Koparmadı,” *Yeni Şafak*, February 25, 2001.

³³ Oktay Ekşi, “Bunu Çocuklar Bile Yapmaz,” *Hürriyet*, February 20, 2001.

³⁴ “Konya, İkinci Mudurnu Olabilir,” *Cumhuriyet*, April 22, 2001. Original quote: “*sanayi sektöründe deprem yaratan ekonomik kriz.*”

Şafak “market surprised,”³⁵ “foreign investor shocked too,”³⁶ “exchange boots stop.”³⁷ It seemed that all those actors were shocked. Then they should be passive receiver of developments, and they did not take any active part in that process. As there was nobody taking active part in the eruption of economic crisis, the crisis seems to be a disaster created by a non-human entity.

The Temporality of Crisis

There was a day, even an hour marking the start of the crisis in 2001. The news that the Prime Minister left the room, where the National Security Council meeting was held, was reported as “breaking” news on some TV channels. The word “crisis” entered into circulation shortly after those news, as the financial markets started to plunge. The fast pace of financial markets resulted into triggering of the crisis in a very short period of time, just as the news noted “two hours of turmoil in the markets directed Turkey into a new uncertainty.”³⁸ The metaphors of natural disaster also support the argument that the crisis erupted all of a sudden. It should also be noted that the crisis in 2001 has been called as “February 2001 crisis,” or “February 21 crisis.” For example, “the stock exchange index exceeded 10,000 level, it is back to its pre-February crisis level.”³⁹

³⁵ “Piyasa Şaşkın Ördek,” *Yeni Şafak*, February 23, 2001.

³⁶ “Yabancı Sermaye de Şokta,” *Yeni Şafak*, February 23, 2001.

³⁷ “Döviz Büroları Stop,” *Yeni Şafak*, February 23, 2001.

³⁸ “İki Saatte 4,9 Milyar Dolar Çekildi,” *Hürriyet*, February 20, 2001. Original quote: “... piyasaların iki saat içinde yaşadığı sarsıntı Türkiye’yi yeni bir belirsizliğe yönlendirdi.”

³⁹ “Borsa 10 Bini Aştı,” *Hürriyet*, April 25, 2001. Original quote: “Borsa 10 bini aştı, Şubat krizi öncesine döndü.”

In addition, in the newspaper *Hürriyet*, the developments in financial markets were reported in short time intervals, and presented as the course of the crisis as follows

11.04 ON rates reached 400% level

11.50 ON repo rates increased to 1000%

13.25 Interest rates increased to 1400% level in the market, rates were 864% on average

13.35 ON repo rate hit 1600%, daily average rates hit 975% levels⁴⁰

This report covered one column of the economy page from top to bottom. Thus, in a way, the ticking time of the financial markets dominated the whole page, and the economy. The pace of financial markets was taken to be representing the pace of the economic crisis.

The Spatiality of Crisis

With regard to spatiality, the cities and villages of Anatolia remained out of the scope of the economy news. This was parallel to the disappearance of the ordinary person, and the daily life practices from economy pages. Istanbul, presented as the heart of economy, gained more and more importance. An example regarding the issue was the article written by Ercan Kumcu. In the article, he noted the effects of crisis on economy, such as unemployment, or the depression in economy. He continued that to address those problems the government should take action urgently. However, the title of the article was “Ankara Does Not Quite

⁴⁰ “İki Saatte 4,9 Milyar Dolar Çekildi” *Hürriyet*, February 20, 2001. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

Understand İstanbul.”⁴¹ In fact, in general the dichotomy of the governors and the governed has been put as Ankara vs. Anadolu, such as “Ankara does not listen to the voice of Anatolia.” Ankara had been considered to be the centre, which governs Anatolia as well as İstanbul. However, in this case, it seems that Anatolia left its place to Istanbul. Istanbul was considered to be the heart of “the economy.” Indeed, Istanbul was the place where the financial institutions were centred and most of the large-scale businesses operated. This point of view indicated that economy was narrowed down to those activities. In line with this point of view, there was hardly any news from cities other than Istanbul in *Hürriyet* and *Tercüman*, and just few in *Cumhuriyet*.

Another important note is that while the economy news got far away from the villages and cities of the country, they came closer to “the financial centres of the globe.” Rather than Muş or Elazığ, we saw the effects of crisis on the stock exchange markets of Frankfurt, or Moscow as the subject of the news. The crisis seemed to be taking place at a space, which is beyond the national boundaries. There were many news such as “Turkey hit Brazilian Real too,”⁴² “Our crisis hit Rouble”⁴³ and “Crisis in Turkey affected Europe, too.”⁴⁴

⁴¹ Ercan Kumcu, “Ankara İstanbul’u Pek Anlamıyor,” *Hürriyet*, April 24, 2001.

⁴² “Türkiye Brezilya Reali’ni de Vurdu,” *Hürriyet*, February 22, 2001.

⁴³ “Bizim kriz Ruble’yi Vurdu,” *Hürriyet*, February 24, 2001.

⁴⁴ “Türkiye’deki Kriz Avrupa’yı da Vurdu,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 23, 2001.

The Devaluation

The reports regarding devaluation provide another example of the confining economic developments in a very narrow sphere as a technical issue, and not bridging the distant realms of economy and society.

On February 21, the government took the decision to abandon the fixed exchange rate peg and implement floating exchange rate regime. The daily *Hürriyet* reported this decision with the article titled “New Era in Economy.”⁴⁵ Indeed, this was a decision, which was to mark a new era in the economy, and have significant and severe repercussions for large segments of society. However, looking at the content of the article one saw that the “economy” referred to a very limited sphere, and disregarded the larger economic processes. The article presented the decision as only a change in monetary policy. It read that under floating exchange rate regime, the exchange rates which had been previously announced in the framework of the stand-by programme designed by the IMF would be invalid, however in the new system the rates would be determined in the free market. The article also included the official statement that the economic programme would be continued to be implemented neatly. So, it can be concluded that “the new era” was defined from the point of view, which took the foreign exchange market and the stand-by programme as the basic criterion.

Similarly, the article titled “What Is Going to Happen under Floating Exchange Rate Regime?” put the important future developments as follows;

...currency peg will come to an end. Currency basket values, previously announced, will become invalid.

⁴⁵ “Ekonomide Yeni Dönem,” *Hürriyet*, February 22, 2001.

...floating exchange system will be implemented. Under that system the foreign currency rates will be determined in the free market.

Central Bank law will be amended so that the Bank will support the market. The Bank will not announce exchange rates.

Inflation targets 10% for CPI, and 12% for WPI will be revised up. 2002 target will remain unchanged.

In case some banks have difficulties under the new system in the first phase, they would be supported immediately.⁴⁶

The report included many technical terms such as “nominal anchor,” “exchange rate basket,” or “WPI,” which could not be understood by the people who are not experts in the field. It was not possible to understand what “the amendment in the Central Bank law,” and the “Bank’s supporting the market” meant, too. The effects of devaluation were presented as a technical issue. In the news, the only component of the system that was the subject of concern was presented as the banks.

However, the report did not include the most important thing for the whole economy; that was the devaluation. It was for certain that the passage to floating exchange rate would give way to devaluation. However, it was not mentioned as one of the developments that would take place under the new regime. The devaluation has severe repercussions throughout the economy, but however it was somehow bypassed in the news. Besides, one of the major results of the depreciation of local currency was the increase in prices. Rather than noting that the floating exchange rate regime would bring inflation, the news noted that it would result in an increase in inflation *targets*. In another words, not the inflation, but the change in inflation targets is the concern of the news. Reporting expected inflation rates would have

⁴⁶ “Dalgalı Kur’la Neler Olacak?,” *Hürriyet*, February 22, 2001. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

indicated a standpoint for which the society was the main concern (since people would be affected by inflation). On the other hand, reporting the expected change in inflation targets pointed out that the implementation of stand-by program designed by the IMF was the main concern (as inflation target is an important component of the stand-by programme, mainly because to create an investment environment).

Then, in the report regarding devaluation, it was observed that a very technical language was used. The economic phenomenon was not reported with its larger effects on society. Passage to the floating exchange rate regime means devaluation in the first phase, and price increases, and decline in net income of people consequently. However, the economic development was treated as a technical issue, and not interpreted to the language of society.

According to a news item in *Hürriyet* “minute by minute, first day of floating exchange rate,” was as follows

10.00 Due to the uncertainty stemming from the latest developments, the market started the day at 7,037 level under the sale pressure

10.05 Intense sales in the stock exchange pulled down the index to 6,796 level⁴⁷

The news continued to report the developments in financial markets in short-time intervals in the same way. Reading the title (that was “minute by minute, first day of floating exchange rate”), one expects the news to mention what people did, how the economic processes were affected by the change in exchange rates, however, it only mentioned about what happened in the financial markets. As a result of this, the pace of developments in financial markets, again determined the

⁴⁷ “Dakika Dakika Dalgalı Kurun İlk Günü,” *Hürriyet*, February 22, 2001. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

temporality of an economic phenomenon. The course of developments related to devaluation was watched with the time of financial markets. This narrative indicates a temporality, which had nothing to do with the daily life of a person.

Looking at *Yeni Şafak* and *Cumhuriyet*, we do not see the highly technical language in the newspaper *Hürriyet*. There were also reports on the effects of the devaluation on society, on the economic conditions of the people. It was reported that the devaluation would result into loss in net income of people who had TRL-fixed wages, while the people, who had fx-denominated savings would benefit from the devaluation, what the devaluation would mean for the people.⁴⁸ The decline in the minimum wages in USD terms after the devaluation was subject of another article.⁴⁹

However, even these news were very different from the news in the pre-1980 period when the devaluation was given smaller bullets, and the price increases in bigger ones, the devaluation did not mean anything in itself, yet it was immediately translated to be the price increases and decline in purchasing power of people. The narration in *Yeni Safak* and *Cumhuriyet* did not talked about the devaluation as something technical and abstract, and in a way tried to bridge the gap between economy and society in *Hürriyet*. However, it was not a translation of the devaluation to a concrete world as it was the case in the pre-1980 period.

About the devaluation, it should also be noted that the value loss in the currency did not give way to national concerns. There was hardly any news or articles, which treated the devaluation as an attack to the value of a national asset. No article in the newspapers, including the ones in the nationalist *Cumhuriyet*,

⁴⁸ "Dövizdeki Artış Yurttaşların Cebine Nasıl Yansıyacak," *Cumhuriyet*, February 22, 2001.

⁴⁹ "Asgari Ücret 100 Doların Altına İndi," *Cumhuriyet*, February 23, 2001.

emphasized “the national” in the *national* currency. The money was treated as a technical and abstract thing, and was stripped of its national values.

Experts

Looking at the people, who spoke on the economic crisis, they were generally the experts, and those “captains” of the economy. It should also be noted that the politicians (the Prime Ministers or the leaders of the political parties) were given less space compared to the pre-1980 period. It was “the Economy Minister,” economy bureaucrats, and the “experts” of the economy that generally spoke on the economy. Those experts were generally depicted as people who had no political considerations.

With regard to experts, it should firstly be noted that the people, who were engaged in financial market activities (as professionals or as the financial market players) were called as “experts.” Rather than the names of their professions such as broker, dealer, or banker, they were directly called as experts. For example in a news item the general managers of the banks Koçbank, Akbank, and the deputy general manager of the foreign bank The Chase Manhattan Bank were all called as experts.⁵⁰ Another example was that in an article Enis Berberoglu treated the people who trade in the markets as “experts,” and asked their view on issues such as which exchange rate was “realistic,” whether the Central Bank should have sold fx at the time of crisis.⁵¹ Those experts were also asked about their views on economic and political matters. For example regarding the crisis “a group of experts (bourse

⁵⁰ “Faizle Birlikte Kırılganlık da Arttı,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 21, 2001.

⁵¹ Enis Berberoglu, “Eğilirsen Daha Çok Zıplarsın,” *Hürriyet*, April 20, 2001.

experts) said that economy was hit severely and the recovery would be difficult.”⁵² They comment for example that the Parliament should issue particular laws hastily, or the relations of the government with the Economy Minister Derviş should be on right track.

It should also be noted it was not generally clear that who were those experts in fact, what were their field of expertise, how they got the license of expertise. They were generally not named, their identities remained vague, but there appeared an abstract subject of “experts” who were licensed to speak about any issue, from economy to politics. An example is “pointing out the uneasiness of the hot money, the experts noted that increase in interest rates should be prevented.”⁵³ Here, again we see the abstract subject of “the experts” which were given a high authority. “The experts” could go further even to disclose their views in irrelevant issues, and they come up to agenda with that high authority in absurd cases. A striking example was that a news item reported Kemal Derviş (who was appointed to the Economy Minister post after the eruption of crisis) had made a phone call with the Prime Minister ten days before the crisis erupted, and warned him about the adverse developments in economy. Finally, the news read “the experts said that Kemal Derviş’s prediction of crisis had turned into a bitter reality of the country after ten days.”⁵⁴

Some economy bureaucrats were presented also as experts in the field. They were depicted as politically neutral, rational people who knew “the iron-rules of

⁵² “Borsada Siyaset Şoku,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 20, 2001. Original quote: “bir grup uzman (borsa uzmanı) ise ekonominin çok büyük bir darbe aldığını ve toparlanmanın güç olacağını söylediler.”

⁵³ “Türkiye Sanki Yangın Yeri,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 22, 2001. Original quote: “sıcak paranın diken üzerinde oturduğuna dikkat çeken uzmanlar, faizlerdeki tırmanışın önüne geçilmesi gerektiğ(in)e.. dikkat çekiyorlar.”

⁵⁴ “Derviş Uyarmıştı,” *Hürriyet*, April , 2001. Original quote: “Uzmanlar ‘Kemal Derviş’in ekonomik kriz öngörüsü on gün sonra ülkenin acı gerçeğine dönüştü...’ dediler.”

economy,” more than the politicians. They were attributed more power than the politicians. Sometimes their statements were reported in the form of command to the politicians such as “Do not promise anything to farmers and tradesmen.”⁵⁵ The news reported that the Treasury Undersecretary said that it was impossible to provide financial assistance to the farmers and tradesmen.

It should also be noted that since they were presented as people who were away from political considerations, those experts could also be foreigners. In that way they could have the same right to say on Turkish economy and politics as a Turkish expert. The bourse experts can be from the stock exchange in Nikkei or Frankfurt; “the experts from the Frankfurt stock exchange underlined that the crisis in the state caused turmoil in the markets, and said that the capital outflow would continue.”⁵⁶ The views of the Vice President of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and General Manager of Koçbank presented as the views of the experts in the same news. Similarly, we often see comments and demands of the officials from the IMF, the EU, or credit rating agencies, regarding Turkish economy, as experts of the field.

Society

As for the society, imagined in relation to economic developments throughout the crisis, three features of the representation should be emphasized. Yet before passing on those representations, it should be reiterated that the ordinary people were not the prior actors in the economy sphere, the experiences in society were not central to the definition of economic processes. It was rather a field

⁵⁵ “Çiftçiye Esnafa Söz Vermeyin,” *Hürriyet*, April 25, 2001.

⁵⁶ “Piyasalar Tepetaklak,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 22, 2001. Original quote: “Frankfurt Borsası uzmanları ‘devlet krizi’nin piyasaları altüst ettiğine dikkat çektiler ve... büyük sermaye kaçıının devam edeceğini bildirdiler.”

affected from the economic developments, they were the passive receivers of the events. There was a distance between the social experiences and the crisis; the unemployment and poverty were mentioned as the *effects* of economic crisis.

Abstract and Instrumental Society

With regard to the representations of society, one of them was the abstract society, which was touched with a few sentences to pose arguments. The economic problems, experienced in the society were mentioned with a few sentences and then arguments were made. In those articles, the economic problems did not seem to be the main concern, the solution for which was sought for. They were rather the instruments used in a rhetorical way to strengthen the points. No necessary linkage was established between the economic problems of the society and the points made. For example, the poverty and unemployment issues were mentioned to argue that autonomous boards should be established without establishing a reasonable connection between them. Another example was the article “People are worried about their lives, what about the others.” It started with the sentences

The economic crisis is suffocating people. Everybody has forgotten even about making ends meet, worried about his/her future.

Low-income people are in depression. They are deeply concerned about the future of their children.

Unemployment swallows people like an avalanche.

Tradesmen, farmers are desperate.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ “Halk Can Derdinde ya Ötekiler,” *Hürriyet*, April 23, 2001. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

In the remaining part of the article, the author criticized some Ministers, who allegedly pursued their personal interests

There are people trying to take the country out of this disaster. They try ceaselessly. But the others, who do not want their interests to be harmed, try to raise obstacles before them.

For example, the Housing Minister blocks the amendments into the public procurement law in order to keep his political clout intact. He did not want to transfer the power and authority of his ministry over the tenders.

So is the Transportation Minister. He, too, drags his feet in order not to lose his powers in THY and Türk Telekom.

Because of the Ministers' attitude, the privatisations of these two companies are delayed. However, in order to overcome the crisis, these two companies should be privatised immediately.⁵⁸

In this article, the columnist did not explain how those ceaselessly trying people would pull up those suffering masses out of that disaster, and what was the connection between the privatisation of state-run companies and the end of the disaster. Indeed, the society did not seem to be his concern at all. Once somebody is presented as saviour, people cannot, and do not need to question his actions. Hence, the columnist just needed to draw a picture of disaster, to present some people (those he called as the people “who are ceaselessly trying”) as the saviour. His main concern seemed to be sidelining of the Housing Minister and the Transport Minister; to this end he wants to present somebody as saviour, who could sideline them, thus he draws a picture of a disaster, and suffering masses waiting for their rescuers. The abstract society was instrumentalised to this end.

Another example regarding the issue was an article by Ertuğrul Özkök. He argued that the investment of Ford in Turkey was an encouraging development at

⁵⁸ Ibid. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

the time of crisis. He harshly criticized the arguments that the state land was provided to Ford in an unlawful way. According to Özkök, those arguments would mean the “stealing the future of children.”⁵⁹ He imagined that the children were protesting the government, which had stolen their future. However, similar to the article above, he did not make a connection between criticisms of state land’s being provided to a foreign company and stealing the future of children.

It should also be noted that in those articles, the society seemed to have no agency in general, no power to challenge the situation it was in, no ability to act. For example, it was imagined as “People devastated economically, left all alone with their destiny”⁶⁰ or “that country, which lost its hopes because of the crisis.”⁶¹

In *Yeni Şafak* and *Hürriyet*, the society, and its economy-related problems did not remain at a rhetoric level. There were news particularly pertaining to the economic difficulties that people faced, such as poverty or price increases. However, it should be noted that those news remained on the margins. Although, there were news directly related to the economic problems of the low-income people, they remained fewer compared to the news where abstracted developments in the economy sphere were reported in a technical language.

It should also be noted that generally the economy pages were earmarked to the statements of the experts and the economy officials, while the economy-related experiences of the society were given place in the other pages. For example, the piece of article that “poverty is everywhere,”⁶² or increasing applications to fak-fun-

⁵⁹ Ertuğrul Özkök, “Bu Mitinge Torunum da Katılır,” *Hürriyet*, April, 26, 2001.

⁶⁰ Emin Çölaşan, “İkinci Ayda Havanda Su Dövmek,” *Hürriyet*, April 20, 2001. Original quote: “*Ekonomik açıdan göçertilmiş kaderine terk edilmiş kitleler.*”

⁶¹ Ertuğrul Özkök, “Keşke Biz de Yılmasaydık,” *Hürriyet*, April, 21, 2001. Original quote: “*Krizden umudunu kaybetmiş bu ülke.*”

⁶² “Her Yerde Yoksulluk Var,” *Cumhuriyet*, April 23, 2001.

fon⁶³ (the fund providing financial support to low income people) made their way into the pages other than the economy pages.

Society As the Sum of Market Players / Consumers

As mentioned above, economic developments seemed to be taking place in a very narrow sphere, the effects of an economic decision were reported in a very narrow sphere as well. If the larger processes and society somehow became the subject of news, society came up to agenda generally as sum of market players, or the consumers.

In the news on the effects of floating exchange rate regime “Whom Does the Floating Exchange Rate Regime Make Happy and Unhappy?”⁶⁴ *Hürriyet* divided people into two categories; those who would get upset, and who would be happy. The ones, who would be upset were earning their wages in liras, civil servants, workers, wage earners, people rent out their apartments in liras, automobile owners, people have debts in foreign currencies, people pay their employees’ wages in foreign currencies, importers who have their merchandise waiting at customs, football clubs. The people who would be happy were people who rent out their real estates in foreign currencies, people who run tourism companies, exporters, people who have savings in foreign currencies. Similar categorizations of “winners” and “losers” were also made in *Cumhuriyet*.⁶⁵ As can be seen from this picture, the society was a highly fragmented one. Each party had different positions, capitals, and consequently different benefits from the same incident. Rather than a

⁶³ “Yardım Peşinde,” *Cumhuriyet*, April 21, 2001.

⁶⁴ “Dalgalı Kur Sistemi Kimi Sevindirdi Kimi Üzecek,” *Hürriyet*, February 22, 2001.

⁶⁵ “Dövizdeki Artış Yurttaşların Cebine Nasıl Yansıyacak,” *Cumhuriyet*, February 23, 2001.

homogeneous body, one saw a fragmented one in the field. It had not been the case under the national development model, where everybody had been seemed in the same boat and everyone's interests depicted as overlapping. In 2001, economic incidents were not perceived through the same way generally, and it was not possible to make the same comment that would be true for the whole society. It was not possible to see a title similar to "Devaluation Hurts Once Again" following the devaluation that took place in January 24, 1980.⁶⁶ As there was no group of people affected in the same way from the incident, it was not possible to make a normative judgment on the effects of devaluation decision on people. It should also be noted that the fact that majority of the people would be affected adversely from the decision did not change the situation. All categories were equalized; in this case, the workers and civil servants were not given higher importance, although they represented the majority of the society. However, they were regarded as a category, which had no difference from the category of professionals who had salaries in foreign currency.

Another way the members of the society represented in *Hürriyet* was that they were consumers. The people were depicted as being adversely affected from the crisis as consumers. An example regarding the issue was a piece of article regarding pensioners.⁶⁷ The article read that Vakıfbank increased the interest rate on the loans provided to pensioners. However, this report took place in part of the daily that was earmarked for consumer problems. The report stood together with the news that Citibank preserved the data of its previous cardholders, and cable TV subscription price was indexed to the pre-paid mobile phone fees. The pensioners

⁶⁶ "Yandık Yandık Gene Yandık," *Hürriyet*, January 25, 1980.

⁶⁷ "Emekliye de İnsafsız Faiz," *Hürriyet*, April 23, 2001.

were treated equally with the cable TV subscribers and Citibank ex-customers. There was no concern particularly for the low-income people.

Another news item was regarding a suit filed by a “consumer,” who appealed to the Ankara Consumer Court not to pay back the fx-indexed loan to the bank at the exchange rates of the post-crisis period.⁶⁸ The lawyer of the person was from the Consumer Rights Association. The news also noted that the head of the Consumer Rights Association would help consumers that were affected from the crisis in the same way.

Civil Society Represented by Businessmen

In crisis news, we see that there was a “civil society,” which criticized the national government harshly, and posed demands. However that civil society was represented by the businessmen to a great extent. While, the farmers, teachers, and the unemployed disappeared from the economy news, the businessmen became more and more visible.

In each of the seven days following the crisis, erupted on February 19 the daily *Hürriyet* included a report regarding the views of the businessmen club TÜSİAD (Turkey Industrialists’ and Businessmen’s Association) on economy. The statements of TÜSİAD were generally accompanied by the other businessmen associations. Following the first day of crisis, *Hürriyet* reported the views of the businessmen associations TOBB (Turkish Association of Bourses and chambers) ASO (Ankara Chamber of Industry) ATO (Ankara Chamber of Commerce)

⁶⁸ “Döviz Kredisine Tedbir Yağıyor,” *Hürriyet*, April 21, 2001.

TÜSİAD, İTO (Istanbul Chamber of Trade), and TİM (Turkey Exporters Assembly). Although the news was titled “Business Circles in Shock,” it did not include any statement from the representatives of the workers’ unions. The business world in this article excluded the workers.

As for the news “Civil Organizations Demanded Head,” the statement penned down by 5 associations representing, workers’ unions, farmers, and tradesmen, and small and medium sized enterprises was reported in a single paragraph.⁶⁹ However, the statements of TÜSİAD, TİM and İTO, YASED (Foreign Businessmen Association), and İSO (Istanbul Chamber of Industry) were each earmarked one paragraph, and parts of their statements were given in spots. There was no article mainly earmarked on the views of a workers’ unions or the associations representing low-income people.

Yeni Şafak too put forward the businessmen in the representation of society in the economy pages. However the emphasis was put on the businessmen who were known with their Islamist tendencies, or the medium-sized companies with conservative stand. Rather than TÜSİAD, MÜSİAD was given the first place in the economy news. Besides, ASKON (Anatolian Lions Industrialists and Businessmen Association), formed by the medium-sized businessmen came up in the economy pages, while the associations of lower classes did not show up. Also in the leftist *Cumhuriyet*, “the business world” was composed of the businessmen organizations TÜSİAD (Turkey Industrialists and Businessmen Association), İTO (Istanbul Chamber of Commerce) ASO (Ankara Chamber of Commerce), and TÜĞİAD (Turkey Young Businessmen Organisation), and pharmaceutical industrialists. This

⁶⁹ “Sivil Örgütler Kelle İstedi,” *Hürriyet*, February, 23, 2001.

picture of the business world in *Cumhuriyet* also excluded the workers.⁷⁰ There were some news on the statements of workers unions, but they were less than the statements of the businessmen organizations. Besides, the statements of civil servants, or peasants could hardly find any place in the daily.

It is also important to note that the effects of the devaluation on the society was expressed by a businessman in the news “Sabancı: All of Us Have Got 40% Poorer.”⁷¹ This was the only news which took the poverty creating effects of devaluation on the society, and it was expressed by one of Turkey’s wealthiest businessman. In a sense, Sabancı became the representative of all people. He said that the crisis resulted into an increase in borrowing costs of the Treasury, and furthered that “who paid the difference, it was the 65 million people. Low-income people did. All of us lost 40% of our wealth in 3-4 days.”⁷² In the leftist *Cumhuriyet*, an article read

(with the crisis) for the first time the organizations of workers, employees, industrialists, and tradesmen bring up similar demands and complaints. Previously only employees had voiced the democracy-related demands. Now, TOBB and TÜSİAD warn the government regarding the issues about which workers’ unions afraid of to speak.⁷³

This indicated a society in which there was no class-based conflict; rather the businessmen had the same demand with the workers. The businessmen were

⁷⁰ “İş Dünyası Sağduyuya Çağırıldı”, *Cumhuriyet*, February 20, 2001.

⁷¹ “Sabancı: Hepimiz %40 Fakirleştik,” *Hürriyet*, February 24, 2001.

⁷² Ibid. Original quote: “bu farkı kim verdi, 65 milyon verdi. Dar gelirli verdi. Hepimiz varlığımızın gücümüzün %40’ını 3-4 gün içinde kaybettik.”

⁷³ “İki Yüzlü’ Ekonomik Kriz,” *Cumhuriyet*, April 21, 2001. For original quote of text, see Appendix.

presented to be voicing the demands of society, which the workers could not speak about. This approach gave license to the businessmen to speak in the name of the whole society, while silencing the lower classes.

It should also be noted that this segment of society, the businessmen were attributed significant power in the news. They were very harsh in their criticisms towards the national government. The examples were “the authorities that are supposed to solve problems, create problems,”⁷⁴ “when the economy is on the knife edge balance, the country cannot cope with the political crisis...it is not nice.”⁷⁵ It was also reported that businessmen said, “we watch the quarrel with bewilderment.”⁷⁶ They even suggested that military dominated National Security Council should form a new government.⁷⁷

The news “let us reconcile you” should also be noted here to show the power attributed to the businessmen.⁷⁸ In the news, the head of businessmen club Tuncay Özilhan went on further to say that “the problem should be solved without the *intervention* of the private sector.”⁷⁹ The word of intervention has been traditionally used in the context of the intervention of the public sector to the private sector. However, as far as the statement of Özilhan is concerned, it seemed that the state was the trouble-creating area, and the private sector had the right, authority, and reasonability to intervene into the public sector. The word intervention implies a hierarchy between the intervening and the intervened, in favour of the first one.

⁷⁴ “Sizi Barıştıralım,” *Hürriyet*, February 21, 2001. Original quote: “sorun çözecek makamdakiler sorun yaratıyor.”

⁷⁵ Ibid. Original quote: “ekonomi bıçak altında seyrederken, siyasal krizlere ükenin tahammülü olmaz... Hoş değil.”

⁷⁶ Ibid. Original quote: “kavgayı hayretle ve ibretle izliyoruz.”

⁷⁷ “İş Dünyası Şokta,” *Hürriyet*, February 20, 2001.

⁷⁸ “Sizi Barıştıralım,” *Hürriyet*, February 21, 2001.

⁷⁹ Ibid.; emphasis mine. Original quote: “özel sektörün müdahalesi olmadan problem çözülebilir.”

Mentioning the intervention of private sector to public sector, Özilhan turned upside down this hierarchy, and put the private sector to the higher rank.

“Giant” Foreign Investors

While the domestic businessmen were much more visible in the economy pages as powerful actors during 2001, there was an entirely new actor in the economy pages, those were the foreign businessmen.

The foreign businessmen were part of the civil society constructed in the economy pages of the daily *Hürriyet*. When the views of a number of businessmen groups were reported in the daily, YASED (Foreign Investors’ Association) was generally included in them. They were almost treated equally with the businessmen’s clubs. In the news “Civil Organizations Demanded Head” the association of foreign businessmen YASED stood together with workers’ union, and businessmen clubs. It can be even argued that it was generally difficult to recognize that they were the “foreigners” in civil society. Like the local businessmen, they criticized the national government and made policy suggestions. For example, YASED head said that the adverse effects of the political chaos on the economy would continue in coming months, and the structural reforms should be implemented immediately.⁸⁰ Besides, they brought the interest of the foreigners to the agenda and posed it in the same platform with local businessmen. For example, they argued that the devaluation would bring burden on the foreign companies.⁸¹

⁸⁰ “Sizi Barıştıralım,” *Hürriyet*, February 21, 2001.

⁸¹ “Sivil Örgütler Kelle İstedi,” *Hürriyet*, February, 23, 2001.

Thus, the demands of the foreign capital became also one of the concerns of the economy.

Besides being represented with their associations, foreign businessmen also appeared on the economy pages personally, as high-level officials of the foreign companies. Similar to the associations, they were asked about their opinion on the Turkish economy. For example, just like an expert, Jacques Nasser the head of Ford Motor Company, “writes prescription” for the Turkish economy; the article read “prescription from automotive giant for crisis.”⁸² He said that the exchange rate and interests rates should be competitive, and the real interest rates should be parallel to the rates in the world.

It should also be noted that the foreigners were treated as if they were very important guests in the country that should be entertained. Their exit from the country seemed to be a very important concern. It was reported that “it is very difficult after the recent crisis that international investors, who had run away from Turkey, would turn back” just one day after the tension between the President and the Prime Minister.⁸³ YASED head said that the foreigners postponed their investments in Turkey or shifted them to other countries; to restore the confidence of foreign investors the government should take some actions.⁸⁴ The daily *Hürriyet* generally qualified them with the adjectives such as giant, mega, “Giant American detergent manufacturer PG,”⁸⁵ “mega boss.”⁸⁶ This showed the importance attached to them, and also presented them as very powerful actors. They were also presented

⁸² “Ford: Türkiye İçin En İyisini Biz Yaptık,” *Hürriyet*, April 21, 2001. Original quote: “*Otomotiv devinden krize özel reçete.*”

⁸³ “Piyasalar Bombalandı,” *Yeni Şafak*, February 20, 2001.

⁸⁴ “Sivil Örgütler Kelle İstedi,” *Hürriyet*, February 23, 2001.

⁸⁵ “Amerikan Deterjan Devi PG,” *Hürriyet*, April 23, 2001.

⁸⁶ Ertuğrul Özkök, “Bu Mitinge Torunum Da Katılır,” *Hürriyet*, April, 26, 2001. Original quote: “*mega patron.*”

as the actors, who would help with solving the problems of Turkey, thus they were zealously welcomed as the title “An opening that boosts moral”⁸⁷ (regarding the opening ceremony of Italian Ford’s factory in Turkey) indicated.

Victimised Society/ Interesting People

Regarding the representation of the society, the so-called ‘third-page news’ should be underlined here. We see many news on people committing suicide, or committing crime “due to the crisis” in *Cumhuriyet* and *Yeni Şafak* similar to the case in *Hürriyet*. The news item “Crisis May Give Way to Suicide” read “according to the scientists the suicides and attempts to commit suicide spread like a virus due to the economic problems.”⁸⁸ The news also gave the examples that a pensioner committed suicide because he/she could not accept the regulation about the deputy pensioners, and a “*offshorezede*” woman, who had deposits in a failed bank attempted to commit suicide. The suffix “-zede” is generally used for people who experienced disasters, big accidents, such as “*kazazede*” (person who had accident) or “*depremezede*.” (person who experienced earthquake). Inventing of the new words such as “off-shorezede” or “krizzede” pictures the crisis or off-shore issue as a natural disaster, and people as victims in those events. For example in the news “Three murders as a result of the economic crisis”⁸⁹ starts with the sentence that “The adverse effects of the economic crisis over the citizens ended up with murder.”⁹⁰ In the news, we see people who were said to be “depressed” due to the

⁸⁷ “Kriz Günlerinde Moral Veren Açılış,” *Hürriyet*, April 20, 2001.

⁸⁸ “Kriz İntihara Sürükleyebilir,” *Cumhuriyet*, Feb 24, 2001. Original quote: “Bilim adamlarına göre, maddi sorunlar nedeniyle yaşanan intiharlar ve intihar girişimleri bir virüs gibi yayılıyor.”

⁸⁹ “Ekonomik Kriz Sonucu Üç Cinayet,” *Cumhuriyet*, April 25, 2001.

⁹⁰ “İbid. Original quote: “Ekonomik krizin yurttaşlar üzerinde yarattığı olumsuzluklar cinayetle sonuçlanıyor.”

economic problems, and killed other people. It is interesting to note that in the same news there was also the report of a man who was killed due to an unknown reason. Thus, it can be said that the crisis and its effects on society were not the main concern. These reports rather intend to attract the interest of the readers with this “frightening stories” of an “insecure world.”

There were “interesting” experiences of society as well as the frightening ones, according to the articles of the newspapers. For example, Cumhuriyet reported a barber who provides service to his customers free of charge to protest the crisis.⁹¹ A similar example can be found in *Yeni Şafak*.⁹² The article about farmers started with the sentences that “Economic crisis, and high interest rates caused some people to look for *interesting* ways out while caused some others commit suicide.” The news furthered “before the state resorted to legal ways to collect its receivables, we put up for sale everything in the village except our honour...A person, who gives 1.5 trillion liras could buy everything in the village from needle to thread. And, we will take our coats and head for another country.”⁹³ This was a news item which mentioned about the problems of low-income people. However, they were the people, which cannot be representative of the farmers in general. They were rather eccentric people, and the article in a may makes fun of their way of acting. It is not usual to sell out a village; to sell it with everything except the honour makes it seem as an eccentric case rather than a real experience.

⁹¹ “Krizle Bedava Traş Tepkisi” Cumhuriyet, April 22 2001.

⁹² “Köyleri Satıp Göçeceğiz” *Yeni Şafak*, April 20, 2001; emphasis mine. Original quote: “*Ekonomik kriz ve faizlerin yüksek oluşu bazı vatandaşları intihara sürüklerken bazılarını da ilginç çıkış yolu aramaya itiyor.*”

⁹³ Ibid. Original quote: “*Devlet icraya vermeden biz köyümüzü namusumuz hariç herşeyiyle satılığa çıkardık....1.5 trilyonu veren bir şahıs köyü iğneden ipliğe herşeyiyle alır. Bizler ise sırtımızda bir ceketle buralardan başka ülkelere gideriz.*”

CHAPTER 5

COMPARISON OF DISCOURSES ON THE ECONOMIC CRISES OF 1979 AND 2001

In this chapter, the discourses on economic crises together with the general construction of the field of economy in 1979 and 2001 are summarised. While the general characteristics of the discourses are highlighted, they are compared to each other, and the distinctive features of each period are emphasized.

Change in the General Conception of Economy

The change in presentation of economic developments in mass media together with the management of economic issues at the state level clearly put the change in conception of the economy from 1979 to 2001. Looking at the newspapers and magazines, we see that the news, which were considered to be “economic” in 2001 were dispersed under different headings in 1979. Similarly they were under the supervision of various different ministries. In the pre-1980 period, the price increase in oil was discussed in the energy section of a weekly magazine, while the protests of the taxi drivers demanding higher service prices were thought to be a primarily traffic-related issue. With regard to the state management, it should be noted that the Forest Minister spoke on the rise of paper prices and the Energy Minister on oil shortage.

When coming to the 2000s, we see that all those issues were brought together under the hat of “the economy,” both in the mass media and state management. This new ordering of the things in the field showed that according to the new conception of economy, the issues of oil shortage and rise of paper prices should be categorized under the same heading, and managed together. The issues newly considered to be “economic” were considered to be interrelated somehow, thus should be coordinated. The economy appeared as a unity, which had its internal coherence.

The issues in this specific sector of reality were now considered to be so complicated that could not be under the full control of a political authority in detail. In the pre-1980 period it was mainly the Finance Minister handling economic issues, which showed that the management of state budget consisted core of the economy field. The management of economy by an “Economy Minister” in the 2000s indicated that the thing to be governed was much more complicated than the state budget. More importantly, the economy was considered to have its own dynamics, thus it could not be under the full control of a political authority, indeed any human agency. As far as it was represented in the newspapers in 1979, the economy was perceived to be a field that could be regulated, arranged, and rearranged by the political authority in detail to a great extent with bureaucratic mechanisms. In 2000s it turned into a sphere, which had its own dynamics, thus should be governed from a distance, supervised, and coordinated.

Thus, in its new form, the field of economy became a sphere where the experts had a right to say. Since the particular dynamics of economy could not be known by the people participating in economic processes, experts were given the highest priority. Related to this point, it may be interesting to note the replacement

of *ilgililer* (the people concerned), or *yetkililer* (people who have authority - officials), with the experts.

“To be concerned” implies to be somehow engaged in an issue, and to have experiences somehow regarding the subject matter. As for “official”, when somebody is called official, this means that he/she has authority stemming from position related to the issue. It was either the experience or the authority that gave someone to have a right to say on an issue in the pre-1980 period. In the economy news of 1979, people speaking on a subject were called generally “the people concerned” or “officials”. For example, it was the general manager of a bank, who was called as the person concerned or official, who could speak on the situation of public banks. Yet in 2000s, an expert, who seemed to have no engagement to the banking sector, who seemed to be no side in operations was given more space in the economy pages. As an outsider, the expert was presented to be making more sound evaluations, as he/she had particular knowledge, which a non-expert could not have.

This conception of economy, which was treated as something that had its own dynamics that could not be understood by the participants, but by the experts, gave way to a very technical language. This language abstracted developments from its daily context, so it became quite different from the daily language that had been used in the economy news in 1979. It should be added that the economy news in 2001 included many words borrowed from foreign languages. This put a further distance between an ordinary newspaper reader and the articles.

As a result, while economy transformed into a more separate field, it was detached from its social context. The economic and social realms were separated from each other. The economy seemed to be taking place in a world apart from the

world of ordinary person. The change of the title “Our Economy World” in newspaper in 1979 to titles such as “*trend analiz*” (“trend analysis”) “*finans hattı*” (“finance line”) in 2000s can be taken to be a symbol of this change. “Our Economy World” indicated a three-dimensional world, which had deepness, and could also cover human being. On the other hand the headings in 2001 called to mind lines with one-dimension, into which a person could not penetrate.

Detaching the economy from the daily lives made it possible and facilitated the treatment of economy in isolation, detaching it from other facets of life. In daily life, experiences cannot be considered to be merely economic, or social. For example, a news item in 1979 reported that bodies of people who had died abroad could not be brought to Turkey due to the foreign currency shortage. As the foreign currency shortage was placed in a such a context, it could not be evaluated only from an economic point of view. The context made one think the human, social and national facets of the issue, as well as the economic one. However, in 2000s, as the narration in economy articles got far away from daily lives, the issue was taken up only from the economic point of view.

The differences in the representation of economy in 1979 and 2001 could be read in the replacement of *pahalılık* (being expensive) /*hayat pahalılığı* (cost of living) in the pre-1980 period with the “inflation” of the 2000s. The change in discourse indicated an entirely new perception and representation of the economic facet of life. In 1970s, the word “inflation” was rarely used; the economy officials, politicians, and authorities as well as the people used the word *pahalılık* instead. The word “*pahalılık*” treated prices in their real environment, in the field, in the daily life. According to this conception, the prices by themselves did not mean anything; they should be evaluated together with many other factors, mainly the economic

situation of the people. Think about the case that the number of unemployed in a household increased (or income of a person declined), yet the price level remained the same. In that case, inflation, treating the prices in isolation, would be zero, which sounded good. On the other hand when the situation was evaluated within the parameters of “cost of living,” the result would be on the opposite direction. This viewpoint does not focus only the prices, but the experiences of people related to those prices, and takes into account also net income of people. In the case that price levels remained same, yet the income of a household declined, this would mean more difficult living conditions.

I also would like to say a few words about the economy field’s being an expertise area. Making the field of economy an area of expertise means objectifying the economic processes and real economic actors. This is similar to the inevitable distance that Dirlik draws attention between the historian and the subjects of history via the abstractions “since their very purpose is to objectify human agency in history... human agency must be reconstituted in accordance with the ‘scientific principles’ as understood by the ‘social scientist’.” He furthers that “the consciousness of the comprehending object, in other words takes the precedence over the consciousness of the historical agent,” and constitutes the latter as its object in accordance with its own discourse.” The problem here is that the historian (or the expert in the field of economy) gets the license to speak in the name of the people in flesh, and claims to be true in the name of science.¹

The distinction that Nora makes between the history and the memory can also help in understanding different conceptions of economy. Nora argues that there

¹ Arif Dirlik, *The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism* (Colorado; Oxford: Westview Press, 1997), p. 23-51, p. 35.

are no more “the real environments of memory” since our relation to the past changed;² the history substituted the “real memory,”³ he argues. A parallel can be established between the change in the way our relation to past changed, and the way our relation to economy facet of life has changed. Just like the history we visit in the museums, or read in history books, (in place of the “memory entwined in the intimacy of a collective heritage”⁴), the economy becomes something we watch on the television, and learn from the experts. In this way of representation “the real environments” of economy, for example, the coffeehouses where the unemployed sit, the kitchens where the women try to cook economical meals, the land where the farmers grow tomato disappears from the site. Relations between a farmer and the tomato he/she produces, a shoe and a child who would like to wear it, and the currency and a nation were reduced to the technical language of “agricultural production,” “prices in shoe sector,” or the “devaluation of currency,” and treated as merely economic phenomena. Construction of the field in this way strips it from its social, human and national context, conceals the experiences. The field of economy becomes more self-enclosed, and less permeable for the other facets of life.

At this point, I would like to note here that just as there had been experts in the pre-1980 period as well as in the 2000s, there were some continuities in the construction of the economic field from the 1970s to the 2000s. However, what I argue in this thesis is that the economy was represented less as a field of expertise, and a self-moving entity, more something that was operating in the world of ordinary person in the 1970s. The technical terms and abstractions were interpreted

² Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire,” *Representations:26 Special issue: Memory and Counter-Memory*, (1989), p. 7.

³ Nora, p. 8. “The real” Nora uses here should be cautiously watched. It is not possible to speak about a real site, which can be mirrored in any representation. Yet, this “real” can be used as the “concrete” or tangible” sites of the economic processes.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

many times to the language of the daily life to bridge the gap between economic and social realms.

As the economy became more a field of expertise, the people were attributed less authority to have a say on it. The articles on economy, discussions, terms that should be confined to the scientific journals, appeared in the daily newspapers, whose readers were the ordinary person. Those experts told experiences of ordinary person with a technical abstract language. The economy where the experts reigned was represented as the economy that the people experiences. The readers faced with a conception of economy in daily newspapers, which was so different that they experienced in their daily lives.

Differences in Discourses on the Economic Crises

The Crisis

With regard to the differences in crisis discourses in particular, first we see that the phenomena called crisis changed. Rather than the difficulties faced in daily lives-as it was the case in 1979-, the sharp moves in financial markets, and banking sector were presented to be the crisis in 2001. This indicates the contraction of economy to a very narrow sphere, or projection of the financial developments to the whole of the economy.

The pace of developments in daily lives, the concrete places where economic processes took place determined the temporality and spatiality of the crisis in 1979. It was the culmination of difficulties in daily life that determined the pace of crisis.

The bazaars came often on to the agenda as the site of the crisis. The borders of the nation determined the geography of the crisis, while there were articles from various cities of the country. On the other hand, the financial markets were determining the pace and space of the crisis in 2001. The crisis also took start all of a sudden and evolved in a panicky atmosphere parallel to the time of markets. The space where the crisis took place turned out to be the international finance centres from the spaces of daily experiences. The effects of the crisis to Brazilian Real or Nikkei Index were reported. İstanbul was also important, as it was the centre of the financial economy and big-sized business, yet other parts of the country could not find a place in the economy pages.

The representation of economy in this way in the 2000s both obscured and disregarded larger economic processes and their social and human context. First, it obscured the fact that the economy operates in a larger sphere (in factories, in offices, in groceries, and in homes). The banking sector and the financial markets were presented to constitute the bulk and most crucial part of the economy sphere – if not the whole of the sphere. The other economic operations were not visible; they were left out of the sphere of economy.

It should also be noted that this narrow sphere (the banking sector and financial economy) was stripped of actors in it. They seemed to be operating automatically. There seemed to be no actor in this narrow sphere of economy, but only the abstract “markets” or “system,” which behaved like a human being. The markets were said to be “upset,” or “disturbed,” or the “bond market became fevered.” The people, who sold bonds or bought foreign exchange, were obscured. The sentence “interbank limits did not work either” veils the fact that there were bankers who refused or accepted providing loan to another bank, and in fact they

were the actors who lock the system. At another level, the human, social and political content of the economy was veiled again.

Second, this representation is a result of a governmentality, which by-passed the social. This way of governing does not need to introduce economic policies to govern people; instead leaves them to the hands of market, which is itself a governmental mechanism. Thus the problems of the low-income people drop from the agenda of economic sphere. The elimination of unemployment does not take place among the goals of the economic policies, so unemployment is not an important matter in the economic sphere. Therefore, in defining what is the economy, and in calling a phenomena as economic crisis the economy-related experiences of large segments of society were not a matter of concern. This was the government mentality determining the conception of economy an imagination of society in the 2000s.

The nation which had defined the geography of the crisis and one of the main concerns in 1979 crisis disappeared from the pages of the newspapers in 2001 to a great extent. The crisis was not considered to be a national matter. In 1979, the crisis meant an obstacle in the way of Turkey's reaching to the level of developed countries, and falling back of the historical rival Greece. The foreign loans obtained were immediately thought together with the dependency relation that they would result in, and even the government was reluctant in resorting the help of the IMF. However, in 2001, the crisis was not thought to be in relation with national issues at first hand. All foreign loans were zealously applauded. Furthermore, in some newspapers, Turkey was called as "the sick man" without any reservation, and was left itself in the hands of the doctor-like IMF.

The Society Imagined throughout the Crisis

With regards to the society imagined throughout the crisis, abstract market players took place of the tangible economic actors to a great extent. They became the main concern and central actor of the economic crisis, as far as the economy articles in the newspapers are concerned.

In the 1970s, it was usual to see ordinary people expressing their views on economic matters. The readers were acquainted with people, from the low and middle classes together with their photographs. Feelings, thoughts and experiences of those people were reported. A vivid picturing of society, from the laboratory workers in movie sector, to the taxi drivers was made. At the organization level, the unions of those lower classes, workers and civil servants were able to raise voices in the dailies to a significant extent. They had a significant place in the picture of civil society. The daily *Cumhuriyet* went further to bring up to the voices of mining sector workers, railway workers and even the archaeologists. However, in 2001, rather than the low and middle class people, we see that businessmen started to speak much more. Their problems, their views came up to the agenda more often. Also at the level of organizations, TÜSİAD seemed to be the most important, most respected, and strongest part of the civil society. On the other hand, the statements of workers' unions were reflected in just a few sentences.

It should also be noted that in the early 2000s there were hardly any news showing the life fragments of people, and most of them made their way to the so-called third pages. In those news, frightening stories of suicides or murders were reported. As Gürbilek argues, the subjects of the third-page news, are the people

from “another world.”⁵ They are the people from a world we find frightening, and we do not sympathize, an insecure world where there is murder, and horror. In addition, during the 2001 economic crisis, “the interesting people” showed up in the newspapers with the eccentric experiences, such as trying to sell their village with everything in it except their honour. Those were the articles which made people laugh, but did not reflect the experiences of large segments of society similar to the stories on the murders and suicides. .

In her article on tobacco law, İslamoğlu clearly puts that the social is also a field for political struggle.⁶ In the formation of so-called autonomous boards, the representatives to take place were a matter of struggle. In the tobacco board, there was no representative from tobacco platform, which would defend the rights of tobacco farmers. Yet the tobacco board was said to have no political engagements, representative of no side, but the body, which aims the benefit of all. However, in fact “benefit for all” here meant a healthy working market mechanism which is only to the advantage of some. The “public interest” was replaced by “market health.” While market took the place of the public, the social was reconfigured once more.

It is important which segments of the society are included in a picture of civil society, the voice of which associations are taken seriously, and which ones are disregarded. Indeed the civil society, which was said to be strengthening after the 1980s generally, brought onto the agenda the voice of high-classes. İslamoğlu draws

⁵ Nurdan Gürbilek, *Kötü Çocuk Türk* (İstanbul: Metis, 2001).

⁶ Huricihan İslamoğlu, “Yeni Düzenlemeler ve Ekonomi Politik: IMF Kaynaklı Kurumsal Reformlar ve Tütün Yasası,” *Birikim* 158, (June 2002), p 20-27.

attention that to the fact that 68% of the civil society organizations were the organizations of businessmen.⁷

Similarly, in the crisis discourse, the society represented in the newspapers, brought to the agenda the interests of so-called investors. It should be underlined that those investors could also be foreigners. On the other hand, the lower classes, in the form of both ordinary person in blood and flesh and the unions/associations were less visible compared to the pre-1980 period. They came up to agenda with only eccentric experiences, or third page news. The news on interesting experiences made fun of those people, while third page news turned them into victims. The resisting people of the 1970s who protested the economic situation disappeared in the new society constructed by the mainstream media in the 2000s.

⁷ Huricihan İslamoğlu, "Mücadele Alanlarını Genişletmek," *Postexpress*, 21, (January 2003), interview by Yücel Göktürk, Asena Günel, p. 15-19, p. 18.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

To summarize the findings of this study, the distinction between bazaar and market Insel draws attention to could be helpful.¹ He notes that both the terms *pazar ekonomisi* (bazaar economy) and *piyasa ekonomisi* (market economy) in Turkish were used in place of *market economy* in English. However, there is an important distinction between them. Bazaar refers to a concrete marketplace where all people participating in the exchange see each other. On the other hand, market refers to an abstract phenomenon, where the participants cannot be identified. He gives the example that we can talk about the bazaar of slaves, where the participants can be seen. On the other hand, we talk about labour market, which is an abstraction that refers to a totality of employees and employers, who cannot be identified.

Indeed, the economy represented in the newspapers through the end of the 1970s was similar to a bazaar, while what was referred as the economy in the 2000s looked like to a market. In 1979, the economy was represented in the media as a total of operations, which had a concrete place, tangible actors, and understandable stages. According to the articles in the late 1970s, the daily life experiences had a central position in the total of economic developments. When coming to the 2000s, we see that economy discourse get far away from the daily life experiences, and

¹ Ahmet İnel, "Piyasaların İdeolojik İşlevi," *Birikim* 170-171 (June-July 2003), p. 21-27.

turned into a field of abstractions, actors that could not be identified, and processes which could only be understood by the experts.

Getting far away from the daily experiences and the economy's culminating into a field with bold lines facilitated each other. Within the world of practices, it is not possible to treat an experience as merely economic. At the point of experience, social, cultural and economic are immersed in the same nexus of relationship, as E. P. Thompson suggests.² Yet, when the representation refers less to those practices, the economic becomes to be disembedded of its human, social and national context. In addition, the economy turns into a more self- enclosed sphere, with less permeable borders. This serves to economy's being considered to be a field, which has its own dynamics, and can only be understood by experts.

This change in the conception of economy was concomitant with the emergence of a new governmentality, and reconfiguration of the social after the 1980s. The welfare state regimes of the 1960s and 1970s were replaced by neo-liberal policies in the following two decades. The society, as a unity, lost its importance as subject of government. Under the national developmentalism model of the 1960s and 1970s, the society contained within the national borders, had constituted the entity to be governed. The disadvantaged segments of the society should be cared for the well-being of society in general. Yet in the era of globalization, the national no longer constituted the playground of economic activities, thus the society determined within the national borders lost its importance. After Turkey's further integration to the world economy in the 1980s and the 2000s,

² Edward P. Thompson, "The Peculiarities of the English," in *The Poverty of Theory* (London: Merlin Press, 1978), p. 245-302, quoted in Harvey J. Kaye, *The British Marxist Historians An Introductory Analysis* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995).

the national government had fewer tools to govern the society via economic policies. The new subject of the government was the market itself.

The conception of economy, which had its own dynamics, to which the state should not intervene overlapped with this new governmentality. According to this mentality, individuals should not codify themselves as members of a society cared for by a national government. Rather they should pursue their interests in the market economy. The unemployed, who waited for the state support, previously, should redefine his/her position as active jobseeker in the labour market.³

Crisis is defined in the dictionary as the times of “great difficulty,” but also the “critical moments in illness, life, history.”⁴ It is because of that feature of being a critical moment, a point of a possible rupture that crisis deserves special attention in historical study. As they are the times that the status quo is seriously shaken, the crises open up a room for resistance. However, the crises may end up with the further strengthening of the status quo as well as opening up new horizons.

The results that the crisis would produce are closely linked with how people perceived the status quo, how their maps of meaning were constructed by that time, and how they positioned themselves in the system. People perceive, and make sense of the crisis according to those maps. For example, the people may either think that it is the moment where the structural problems of the system come up in a visible form, and the best time to change the structure. Or they may deem it as the dooms day and wait for the bad things to happen to them and authorities to take action.

³ Mitchell Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* (London; California, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001).

⁴ *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, edited by A. P. Cowie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 282.

Indeed, the two severe economic crises towards the end of the 1970s, and in the early 2000s gave way to two quite different reactions. These differences can be roughly put as the rise of the leftist wave in the pre-1980 period, and a very weak organized opposition movement in the 2000s. Many factors were effective in those dissimilar reactions, yet how people perceived economy by that time, how people made sense out of the economic crises, and how they positioned themselves in the economic processes should have also played an important role in their responses in those critical times. Deeming the economy something that was detached from the world of people, beyond the reach and out of the control of people can be argued to be one of the important factors in the absence of an organized resistance to change the conditions.

However, two reservations should be noted at this point. First, it should be underlined that both in 1979 and 2001, the economic and the social as they appeared in the newspapers were the *representations*. They were not the reflections of the real on to the pages of the dailies. None of them could be considered to be closer, or more far away from the “reality”. Both had their gaps and excesses, both emphasized some issues while gave back seats to other issues. Those representations made visible some parts, and left out of the scope some others. For example, the economy discourse in 1979 presented the economic actors in blood and flesh, contrary to the abstract market players in 2001. However, the news in 1979 also pictured society as composed of men to a great extent. There were more men than women speaking on the economic issues, and expressing their views. The representation of the society in the newspapers in 1979 can be said to have silenced women. As every representation it had its gaps and excesses.

Second, I would like to note that the main aim of this thesis was spotting the main tendencies in the two different periods, and putting the difference between them. To this end, variations within a period, and similarities between two periods were given less emphasis. Indeed, when looking at other newspapers one can find notable deviations from the economy discourses pictured in this study, and similarities in 1979 discourse to the conception of economy today. Needless to say that there were other newspapers than the three analyzed here, which could open up space for new findings.

Moreover, some can argue that the deviations from the dominant discourses as a subject of analysis would be more precious in showing the room for resistance, especially for 2001. However, I would agree that the comparison of the discourses in two different periods offers a perspective which historicizes those discourses, and indicates that they were not static, unchangeable phenomena. Rather, reading the mainstream discourses from a comparative perspective indicates that they come into being under particular historical and social conditions, and thus subject to change.

I also would like to note that the representation of politics in the media was left out of the scope of this analysis. In this study, the crisis periods were used to understand how the economy and society was imagined in two periods, yet they also open up fertile ground for reading the change in perception of the politics. Just to note the first findings, I should state here that politicians showed up in the daily pages more with their personal traits and psychological problems in the 2000s. Just in the opposite direction that economy was detached from daily experiences, the politics started to be discussed without any abstractions and just as a matter of

personality. In general this tendency may be called as the caricaturisation of politics, and deserves further elaboration.

Turning back to the findings of this study, the economy pages of the newspapers that most of us find boring, and perplexing today, even did not exist 25 years ago in Turkey. The field of economy came into being as a historical and social construct, and took different shapes throughout the following period. Representation of economy as a technical field, which can only be understood by the experts, and where particular agents are silenced, is a result of the governmentality of neo-liberal era, and has served to particular political ends.



APPENDIX

ORIGINAL TURKISH TEXTS QUOTED IN MAIN TEXT

Page	Footnote	
1	1	Hazineden defterler getirildi. İrad ve masraf muvazene edildi. Görüldü ki Devlet'in masarifi varidatını haylice aşmış. Maliye işi sahihen fenalaşmış. Hazine bir <i>crise</i> haline düşmüş. Bak belaya ki <i>crise</i> lafzının lisan-ı türkıde terümesi yok. Ana mukabil bir kelime bulmak dahi bir mes'ele oldu. Bir gece Fuad Efendi'nin yalısında bulunduk bu mes'ele dermeyeran edildi. Led'et-taharri <i>buhran</i> lafzı bulundu ve <i>crise</i> 'in tercümesi olmak üzre kabul olundu. Hatta bu hususa dair takdim olunan arz tezkiresinde <i>Hazine-i maliyyenin hal-i buhran</i> diye tahrir kılındı be andan sonra <i>crise</i> makamında <i>buhran</i> kelimesi isti'mal edilir oldu.
27	38	Ulusal hasılda artışları toplum içinde sosyal adalet ilkelerine göre dağıtarak daha yüksek bir yaşam düzeyi sağlamayı amaç edinen bir az gelişmiş ülkede, kıt olan sermaye yerine olanak ölçüsünde işgücü kullanmanın önemi açıktır. Bunun için işgücünün üretim işlemine en çok yardım edecek biçimde katılmasını sağlayacak işbirliği ruhunun sınai gruplar arasında yerleşmiş olması gerekir. Böyle bir işbirliği ise sosyal adalet ilkelerinin uygulanmasına ve sanayinin bir bütün olarak topluma hizmet ettiği gerçeğinin anlaşılmasına ve huzurun yerleşmesine bağlıdır
32	43	Sosyal adaletçilik sadece belirli ideolojilerin peşin hükümlü, kalıplaşmış formüllerin inhisarında değildir ... Hakiki ve gerçek sosyal devlet anlayışına sahip hükümetimizin ilk hedefi, enflasyonla her ne pahasına olursa olsun mücadele etmektir... Nihai faturası daima dar ve sabit gelirliye yüklenen müdahalecilikten kaçınılacak, para ve döviz değerlerinin serbestçe teşekkül ettiği ekonomik politikalara geçiş hazırlanacaktır... İthalatta kademeli olarak liberasyona gidilerek tüketicinin ucuz ve kaliteli mal alması temin edilecektir... Üçüncü olarak, Ortadireğin tek gelirini arttırıcı tedbirlere ağırlık verilecektir. Bu istihbarla, tasarruf eğilimin arttırılması için her türlü tedbir alınacaktır. Tasarrufların bankalar yanında, hisse senedi, kar ortaklığı senedi ve tahvil gibi menkul değerlere de kaydırılması suretiyle sınayi mülkiyetin geniş bir tabana yayılması temin edilecektir... Sosyal güvenlik ve sosyal yardım politikamız, çalışmamayı teşvik edici değil, muhtaçların korunmalarına, gelişmelerine yararlı hale gelmelerine yönelik olacaktır

41 48-49	1 13	<p>Aksaray Meydanı'nda eşyle birlikte Pazar alışverişinden dönen Denizcilik Bankası'nda memur olduğunu sonradan öğrendiğimiz Mahmut Atilla'ya soruyoruz, "Siz nasıl geçiniyorsunuz?"</p> <p>"Kırk yıldır İstanbul'dayız. Aslen Boluluyuz. Dört çocuğum var. Hanımla pazara çıktık. ... Altıyüz liraya şu iki fileyi dolduramadık bile. Aldıklarımız da fasulye, domates, biber, salatalık... Şaşırdık. Zaten sinema, tiyatro, gazino bilmeyiz, Fatih Parkında oturup geleni geçeni seyretmek eğlencemiz. İki gece aygaz kuyruğunda bekledim bir hafta hasta yattım. Emekli olsam perişanım. İkramiye ve mesai de gidecek. Bolu'ya dönemezsin, orası da burdan ucuz değilmiş. Ne olur bilemiyoruz"</p>
51	20	<p>İçimizdeki hırs o kadar büyük ki... Ortaokula giden bir çocuğumuz var ... Kendimizi herşeyden mahrum ettik. Üstümüzden başımızdan kısıtık. Gezmeyi unuttuk. Artık boğazımızdan kesmeye başladık. Haftada bir et alırken, 15'de bir et almaya başladık ... Allah yardımcımız olsun.</p>
55	30	<p>Halkın en önemli ihtiyacı olan konut giderek büyük bir yük ve çözümlenmesi zorlaşan bir sorun haline gelirken yapılan incelemelerde inşaat maliyetlerinin son 10 yıl içinde %1200 oranında arttığı saptandı. 10 yıl önce 100 metrekarelik bir sosyal mesken 90-100bin liraya mal olurken aynı sosyal konutun günümüzde 1 milyon 1 milyon 200bin liradan aşağı mal olmadığı ve 2 milyon liardan aşağıda satılmadığı bildirildi. Yine yapılan araştırmalarda 10 yıl önce 25-30 yıllık bir memur ve işçi emeklisi eline geçen toplu para ile sosyal mesken sahibi olurken günümüzde aynı paranın ancak iki katı ile mesken sahibi olabiliyor.</p>
61	43	<p>Kapalıçarşı'daki mobilyacılar kesiminde dükkanlar sokaklar, yazıhaneler tıklım tıklım mobilya ile dolmuştur. Mobilya satışlarındaki gerileme sadece çarşıda değil Pendik'ten Çatalca'ya, Osmanbey'den Bakırköy'e bütün semtlerde görülmektedir.</p>
86	40	<p>11.04 Gecelikler yükselip yüzde 400'e ulaştı 11.50 Gecelik repo yüzde 1000'e çıktı 13.25 Piyasada faiz yüzde 1400'lere kadar çıktı, ortalama yüzde 864 13.35 Repoda gecelik oran %1600'e günlük ortalama yüzde 975'e vurdu</p>
87-88	46	<p>... kur çıpası sona erecek. Açıklanan kur sepeti değerleri geçersiz olacak. ...Dalgalı kur sistemine geçilecek. Bu sistemde döviz kurları</p>

		<p>serbest piyasada oluşacak.</p> <p>Merkez Bankası Kanunu değiştirilerek piyasayı desteklemesi sağlanacak. Fiyat ilan etmeyecek.</p> <p>2001 için Tefe'de yüzde 10 Tüfe'de yüzde 12 olan enflasyon hedefi yükseltilecek.2002 hedefi değişmeyecek.</p> <p>Yeni sistemde ilk aşamada sancı çekmesi muhtemel bankalar olursa bunlara anında destek çıkılacak.</p>
89	47	<p>10.00 Son gelişmelerin belirsizliğiyle piyasa satış baskısı altında 7bin 37 puandan açıldı</p> <p>10.05 Borsadaki çok yoğun satışlar endeksi 6 bin 796 puana indirdi</p>
94	57	<p>Ekonomik kriz insanları boğuyor.</p> <p>Herkes çektiği geçim sıkıntısını bile unutmuş geleceğinin derdine düşmüş.</p> <p>Dar gelirliler insanları bir ruh çöküntüsü içindeler.</p> <p>Çocuklarının ne olacağını kara kara düşünüyorlar.</p> <p>İşsizlik bir çığ gibi insanı yutup götürüyor.</p> <p>Esnaf çiftçi perişan.</p>
95	58	<p>Bu felaketten ülkeyi çıkartmak isteyen insanlar var.</p> <p>Çırpınıp duruyorlar.</p> <p>Kendi çıkarlarının bozulmasını istemeyenler ise bu insanlara çelme takmak için uğraşıyorlar.</p> <p>Örneğin Bayındırlık Bakanı kendi elindeki siyasal erkin azalmaması için Devlet İhaleleri Kanunu'ndaki değişiklikleri engelliyor. Bakanlığının ihalelerdeki güç ve yetkilerini devretmek istemiyor.</p> <p>Ulaştırma Bakanı da öyle... O da THY ve Türk Telekom'daki gücünü kaçırmamak için işi sürekli yokuşa sürüyor. Bakanın tutumu yüzünden bu iki kurumun özelleştirilmesi gecikiyor.</p> <p>Oysa bunalımdan çıkılması için bu iki kurumun hızla özelleştirilmesi gerekiyor.</p>
101	73	<p>(krizle birlikte) ilk kez işçi, işveren, sanayici ve esnaf örgütleri benzer talepleri ve yakınmaları dile getirdiler... eskiden demokrasinin taleplerini sadece çalışanlar seslendirir ve hükümetle birlikte işveren örgütlerinin tepkisini çekirdi. Artık TOBB ve TUSIAD, işçi sendikalarının dile getirmeye çekindikleri konularda hükümeti uyarıyor.</p>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Newspapers

Cumhuriyet, June 12-18, 1979; August 12-19, 1979; February 20-26, 2001; April 20-26, 2001.

Hürriyet, February 1-10, 1979; June 12-18, 1979; August 12-19, 1979; January 25-28, 1980; February 20-26, 2001; April 20-26, 2001.

Tercüman, June 12-18, 1979; August 12-19, 1979.

Yeni Şafak, February 20-26, 2001; April 20-26, 2001.

Weekly News Magazines

Yankı, 1979.

Other

Cumhuriyet 1978. İstanbul: Erdini Basım ve Yayımevi, 1978.

Cumhuriyet 1979 1980. İstanbul: Erdini Basım ve Yayımevi, 1980.

Cumhuriyet Gazetesi Fotoğraflarıyla Cumhuriyetin 80 yılı, yearly special edition.

Kumcu, Ercan and Şevket Pamuk. *Artık Herkes Milyoner, Hürriyet Sayfalarından Ekonominin 50 Yılı*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2001.

Secondary Sources

Ahmet Cevdet Paşa. *Tezahir 1-12*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1953.

Alper, Emin. "Bürokrasinin Parçalanmış Demir Kafesi." In *Birikim* 180 (April 2004), pp. 60-77.

Bali, Rifat N. *Tarz-i Hayattan Life Style'a Yeni Seckinler Yeni Mekanlar Yeni Yaşamlar*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2002.

Bali, Rifat N. "Piyasalar Veya Hayatın Gerçekleri." In *Birikim* 170-171 (June-July 2003), pp. 111-114.

Boratav, Korkut. *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-1985*. İstanbul: Gerçek, 1995.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Buğra, Ayşe and Gürol Irzık. "İnsan Doğası, İnsan İhtiyaçları ve İktisat." In *Sempozyum Bildirileri, Sosyal Bilimleri Yeniden Düşünmek, Defter ve Toplum ve Bilim Ortak Çalışma Grubu*. Prepared by Tanıl Bora, Semih Sökmen, Kaya Şahin. İstanbul: Metis, 1998, pp. 34-41.

Callon, Michel. "An Essay on Framing and Overflowing: Economic Externalities Revisited by Sociology." In *The Laws of the Markets*. Edited by Michel Callon. Oxford; Madlen: Blackwell Publishers, 1998, pp. 244-269.

Callon, Michel. "Introduction: The Embeddedness of Economic Markets in Economics." In *The Laws of the Markets*. Edited by Michel Callon. Oxford; Madlen: Blackwell Publishers, 1998, pp. 1-57.

Cemal, Hasan. *Özal Hikayesi*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1989.

Cogito 27. "Kriz: Daha Derin, Daha Eski, Daha Yaygın" (Summer 2001).

Comaroff Jean and John Comaroff. "Millennial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming." In *Public Culture*, pp. 291-335.

Coronil, Fernando. "Towards a Critique of Globalcentrism: Speculations on Capitalism's Nature." In *Public Culture* 12 (February, 2000), pp. 351-374.

Dean, Mitchell. "Sociology after Society." In *Sociology After Postmodernism*. Edited by David Owen. London; California; New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001, pp. 205-228.

Dean, Mitchell. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London; California, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001.

Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, *Kalkınma Planı, Birinci Beş Yıl*. Ankara, 1963.

Dirlik, Arif. *The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism*, Colorado; Oxford: Westview Press, 1997.

Donzelot, Jacques. "Pleasure in Work." In *The Foucault Effect Studies in Governmentality*. Edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 251-280.

Donzelot, Jacques. "The Mobilization of Society." In *The Foucault Effect Studies in Governmentality*. Edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 169-180.

Düşünen Siyaset 1. “Kriz” (February 1999).

Ercan, Fuat. “Ders Kitaplarına Girmeyen İktisatçılar, İktisatçı Olarak Kabul Edilmeyen Sosyal Bilimciler.” In *İktisat’ın Dama Taşları Ekoller-Kavramlar-İz Bırakanlar I*. Prepared by İ.Ü. İktisat Fakültesi Mezunları Cemiyeti İktisat Dergisi. İstanbul: İktisat Dergisi Yayınları, 2001, pp. 249-270.

Ercan, Fuat. “Kriz Üzerine Düşünceler-1 ‘İmparator Çıplak’ İmparatorun Terzileri de Kendilerini İyi Hissetmiyor.” In *İktisat Dergisi* 410-411 (January-February 2001), pp. 38-41.

Foucault, Michael. “Governmentality.” In *The Foucault Effect Studies in Governmentality*, Edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 87-104.

Foucault, Michael. “Preface.” In *The Order of the Things An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994, pp. xv-xxiv.

Foucault, Michael. *Lecture*. College de France. 5 April 1978.

Genelkurmay Başkanlığı. *Atatürkçülük Atatürk’ün Görüş ve Direktifleri*. Ankara: Genelkurmay Başkanlığı, 1983.

Gordon, Colin. “Governmental Rationality: An Introduction.” In *The Foucault Effect Studies in Governmentality*. Edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 1-51.

Gülalp, Haldun. “Popülizm İyi Birşey mi Yoksa Kötü mü?” In *Birikim* 155 (March 2002), pp. 20-22.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. *Kötü Çocuk Türk*. İstanbul: Metis, 2001.

Gürkaynak, Refet and Ali Burak Güven. "İktisat ve Toplum Bilimleri: Bir Katolik Evliliğinden Kenar Notları." In *Toplum ve Bilim* 95 (Winter 2002-2003), pp. 6-22.

Gürsel, Seyfettin, Ahmet Kuyaş, and Zafer Toprak. "Açıkoturum Yerli Malı Yurdun Malı; Her Türk Bunu Kullanmalı." In *Cogito* 21 (Winter 1999), pp. 186-218.

Hall, Stuart. "The Work of Representation." In *Representation Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Edited by Stuart Hall. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1997, pp. 15-74.

İnsel, Ahmet. "Milliyetçilik ve Kalkınmacılık." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce Vol 4 Milliyetçilik*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2002, pp. 763-776.

İnsel, Ahmet. "Piyasaların İdeolojik İşlevi." In *Birikim* 170-171 (June-July 2003), pp. 21-27.

İnsel, Ahmet. *Düzen ve Kalkınma Kıskaçında Türkiye*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 1996.

İnsel, Ahmet. *İktisat İdeolojisinin Eleştirisi*. İstanbul: Birikim, 2000.

İslamoğlu, Huricihan. "Mücadele Alanlarını Genişletmek." Interview by Yücel Göktürk, Asena Günel. In *Postexpress* 21 (January 2003), pp. 15-19.

İslamoğlu, Huricihan. "Sınıf Mücadelesinin Alanı." Interview by Yücel Göktürk, Asena Günel. In *Postexpress* 22 (February 2003), pp. 20-25.

İslamoğlu, Huricihan. "Yeni Düzenlemeler ve Ekonomi Politik: IMF Kaynaklı Kurumsal Reformlar ve Tütün Yasası." In *Birikim* 158, June 2002, pp. 20-27.

Kaye, Harvey J. *The British Marxist Historians An Introductory Analysis*. New York: St.Martin's Press, 1995.

Keyder, Çağlar. *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1993.

Keyder, Çağlar. *Ulusal Kalkınmacılığın İflası*. İstanbul: Metis, 1996.

Madra, Yahya, Ceren Özselçuk and Kenan Erçel. "Bir Tabu Olarak Ekonomi." In *Toplum ve Bilim* 95 (Winter 2002-2003), pp. 104-139.

Mitchell, Timothy. "Society, Economy, State." In *State Formation after the Cultural Turn*. Edited by George Steinmetz. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999, pp. 76-97.

Mitchell, Timothy. *Rule of Experts Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 2002.

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire," *Representations: 26 Special issue: Memory and Counter-Memory*, 1989.

Offe, Claus. *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. London: Hutchinson, 1984.

Owen, Roger and Şevket Pamuk. *A History of the Middle East Economies in the 20th Century*. London: I.B. Taurus, 1998.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Edited by A. P. Cowie. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Özbek, Nadir. "Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Sosyal Devlet." In *Toplum ve Bilim* 92 (Spring 2002), pp. 7-33.

Polanyi, Karl. *Büyük Dönüşüm Çağımızın Sosyal ve Ekonomik Kökenleri*. Translated by Ayşe Buğra. İstanbul: İletişim, 2000.

Procacci, Giovanna. "Social Economy and the Government of Poverty." In *The Foucault Effect Studies in Governmentality*. Edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 151-168.

- Sallan Gül, Songül. *Sosyal Devlet Bitti, Yaşasın Piyasa! Yeni Liberalizm ve Muhafazakarlık Kışkacında Refah Devleti*. İstanbul: Etik, 2004.
- Sönmez, Mustafa. *100 Göstergede Kriz ve Yoksullaşma*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2002.
- Sunar, İlkey. "Demokrat Parti ve Popülizm." In *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Volumes 7-8, pp. 2076-2086.
- Talas, Cahit. *Bir Toplumsal Politika Belgesinin Yorumu: Toplumsal Anlaşma*. Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1982.
- Talas, Cahit. *Türkiye'nin Açıklamalı Sosyal Politika Tarihi*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1992.
- Thompson, Edward P. "The Peculiarities of the English." In *The Poverty of Theory*. London: Merlin Press, 1978, pp. 245-302.
- Toprak, Zafer. *Milli İktisat-Milli Burjuvazi*, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları. İstanbul, 1995.
- Yeldan, Erinç. "İktisat ve İktisatçı Nereye?" In *Toplum ve Bilim* 95 (Winter 2002-2003), pp. 147-150.
- Yeldan, Erinç. "İstikrar Kim İçin." In *Birikim* 163-164 (November-December 2002), pp. 97-119.
- Yeldan, Erinç. *Küreselleşme Sürecinde Türkiye Ekonomisi Bölüşüm Birikim ve Büyüme*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2001.
- Yenal, Zafer. "Dilsizliğin Karanlığında Piyasanın Terörü, Terörün Piyasası...." In *Birikim* 170-171 (June-July 2003), pp. 77-82.

Internet Sources

Central Government Budget. Available [online] <http://www.muhasibat.gov.tr>

Letter of Intent. Available [online]
http://www.hazine.gov.tr/standby/imf_standbyeng.htm

