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Introduction
‘Global capitalism’ is one of many theoretical approaches to globalization. It emphasizes the economic dimension of globalization, while connecting to its political, social and cultural dimensions. So while it highlights the significance of economic production and consumption it also recognizes the significance of the state and society. This essay analyzes the impact of globalization on Turkey using a global capitalism approach, focusing on the development in Turkey of transnational production, a transnational capitalist class, consumerism and a transnational state apparatus. It argues that although there is some resistance from traditional practices and structures, capitalist globalization has transformed the Turkish economy, political system and society.

The conditions for a capitalist economy in Turkey were established in the 1920s within the republican political system, which supported the development of national economic capability for capitalist accumulation—albeit with strict government planning of the budget and control over the private sector and foreign trade and investment. After 1980, neoliberal economic reform weakened the statist system and, particularly since 2001, transformed Turkey into a transnational state better suited to the demands of a global economy. The Turkish economy is now linked to the global economy via transnational production forms such as subcontracting, outsourcing, mergers and acquisitions, while a growing Turkish capitalist class has been integrating with a transnational capitalist class and a new socio-economic class has emerged on the basis of consumerism. However, Turkey’s economic and social structures have a number of enduring characteristics that are inconsistent with capitalist globalization, such as family-run businesses, and bazaars, as well as strong kinship, friendship and neighbourhood support networks.
I aim to explore the relationship between Turkish capitalism and capitalist globalization by first outlining the theory of global capitalism and examining its economic, cultural and political dimensions, and then describing Turkey’s socio-economic system and development, before considering the consistencies and differences between Turkish capitalism and capitalist globalization.

**Global capitalism**

Global capitalism is a theoretical approach to the phenomenon of globalization which emphasizes the economic dimension of globalization while linking it to its socio-cultural and political dimensions. It therefore regards itself as a holistic and multi-dimensional approach which analyses globalization by way of production and consumption (the economic context), by way of socio-economic classification (the sociological context) and by way of state power and decision-making (the political context). Its multi-dimensionality is reflected in the advocates of the approach: sociologists (such as William I. Robinson, Leslie Sklair and Phillip McMichael) and political philosophers (such as Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri).

**The economic dimension of global capitalism**

The emphasis begun in the 1980s on globalization over internationalization can be explained by the process of transnationalization. Whereas internationalization involves the simple extension of economic activities across national boundaries and is essentially a *quantitative* process that leads to a more extensive geographical pattern of economic activity, transnationalization differs *qualitatively* from internationalization, involving not merely the geographical extension of economic activity across national boundaries but also the functional integration of such internationally dispersed activities. As such, the global capitalism approach describes transnational practices (TNPs).

Sklair asserts that TNPs are at the core of the global system. At an economic level, the agent of these TNPs is transnational capital, while the ‘institutional focus of transnational practices is the transnational corporation (TNCs)’. TNPs create global commodity chains as a network, while production relations occur by obscuring the country of origin, and they affect all national economies, in areas such as employment conditions, profit repatriation, currencies, and levels of local production.

While Sklair emphasises the importance of transnational capital and TNCs in a global system, Robinson’s emphasis is on transnational production, as well as an emerging transnational state apparatus. For Robinson, the globalization of production entails the fragmentation and decentralization of complex production chains and the worldwide dispersal and functional integration of the different segments in these chains. The reorganization of world production takes place through new, flexible-accumulation models that involve two distinct dimensions:
1. **New technologies** such as the convergence of computerization and telecommunications, the emergence of the Internet, containerization, intermodal transport, refrigeration, robotization, computer-aided design, computer-aided manufacturing and organizational innovations

2. **Novel organizational forms** such as vertical disintegration, just-in-time, small-batch production, subcontracting, outsourcing and formal and informal transnational business alliances.

Capital-labour relations also change as a result of transnational production. Flexible production modes entail flexible working forms such as casualization (or informalization). Flexible working forms become attractive features for TNCs to invest and manufacture in local markets worldwide. These forms can be seen as facilitating profitability and capital accumulation, around which forms a transnational capitalist class.

McMichael elaborates on TNPs and the operations of TNCs, identifying outsourcing, displacement, informalization and recolonization as the main characteristics of what he calls ‘the globalization project’. Automation and outsourcing contribute to structural unemployment, while displacement resulting from the active informalization and casualization of labour provides flexible and cheap labour around the world as labour migrates between and within countries.

The globalization project’s ‘mechanisms of accumulation, dispossession, and neglect’ constitute for McMichael a global recolonization whereby states do not control their institutional capacity and natural resources, and occurs under neoliberal policies and conditions of flexible production, profit repatriation, crippling debt repayment and a lack of financial and organizational aid.

**The cultural dimension of global capitalism**

The important feature of globalization is its multi-dimensionality and the complex connectivity between its various dimensions. The relationship between the economic and cultural dimensions of globalization is one of the leading modern sociological themes and is particularly observable in the process of consumption. So while transnational production is clearly an aspect of the economic dimension of global capitalism, consumption must also be considered in the cultural dimension.

Consumption has special significance in Sklair’s analysis in which he identifies consumerism as the main component in the cultural-ideological dimension of global capitalism. For him, hegemonic control in any societal system lies not in the economic nor in the political sphere but in the realm of culture-ideology, where it is realised in consumerism. Consumerism is shaped and institutionalized by a global cultural elite—the media, advertising industry and consumer goods manufacturers—with needs manipulated and goods imbued with a cultural meaning that signals elitism rather than providing economic meaning.
The political dimension of global capitalism

Both Sklair and Robinson identify the rise of a transnational capitalist class as being at the core of the political dimension of a global capitalism approach. Sklair asserts that this transnational capitalist class are not capitalists in the traditional Marxist sense. For Sklair ‘[d]irect ownership or control of the means of production is no longer the exclusive criterion for serving the interests of capital, particularly not the global interests of capital.’\textsuperscript{12} He identifies three ways in which members of this class can be deemed transnational:

1. They tend to have global rather than local perspectives on a variety of issues
2. They tend to see themselves as ‘citizens of the world’
3. They tend to share similar lifestyles, particularly patterns of luxury consumption. In this respect, the transnational capitalist class includes the following groups of people:
   • Transnational corporation executives and their local affiliates
   • Globalizing state bureaucrats
   • Capitalist-inspired politicians and professionals
   • Consumerist elites\textsuperscript{13}.

Robinson, like Sklair, identifies this transnational capitalist class as the principle agent in the political sphere of globalization. For him, the transnational capitalist class has been attempting to position itself globally as a new ruling class group and to bring some coherence and stability to its hegemony through an emergent transnational state apparatus. Robinson adds the following groups as members of transnational capitalist class:

• The owners and managers of the transnational corporations and private financial institutions
• Other capitalists around the world who manage transnational capital
• The cadre, bureaucratic managers and technicians who administer the agencies of the transnational state, transnational forums and the states of the North and the South
• Politicians and charismatic public figures
• Organic intellectuals who provide ideological legitimacy and technical solutions.\textsuperscript{14}

Robinson utilizes a Gramscian understanding of hegemony, developing this to argue that capitalist classes construct transnational hegemonic power by articulating with each other across state boundaries.

There is, then, a distinct difference between Sklair’s and Robinson’s views. Even though they have similar propositions about transnational capitalist
class formation, Sklair claims that transnational hegemony emerges via the culture-ideology of consumerism\(^\text{15}\), while Robinson underlines the core role of the transnational state apparatus for this hegemony.\(^\text{16}\) For Robinson, the aims of a global bourgeoisie to construct a single global market gives rise to this transnational state, which has two significant features: firstly, nation-states evolve so as to serve the interests of a global economy; and secondly, supranational economic and political institutions are prioritized over nation-states.\(^\text{17}\)

Using this analysis of the global capitalism approach, I will evaluate the development of Turkish capitalism in two parts: firstly, a descriptive outline of Turkish capitalism and secondly, an analysis of its consistencies with capitalist globalization.

**Turkey’s economic system**

Turkey has been articulating with a global capitalist system in many ways, in particular in the economic reform undertaken since the 1980s but with its roots in the economic approach established from the foundation of the Turkish Republic. The Turkish republic was established in parallel with two processes occurring on an international scale: the economic conjuncture before and after World Economic Crisis in 1929; and the socialist experiments of neighbouring states. In this process, Turkey was less influenced by socialism, despite geographical, political and intellectual affinities, than by capitalism as an economic system.

In the last decades of the Ottoman Empire, the governing class, with its military-bureaucratic viewpoint, believed that an economy based on capitalist accumulation would result in a powerful national economy and this view was kept in the age of the Republic of Turkey.\(^\text{18}\) But Turkey suffered from a lack of entrepreneurial and labour classes, a suitable legal system, and so on. As a result, a number of reforms were made in order to promote economic development: a legal system based on liberalism and private property; the establishment of ministries, chambers of industry and trade, research institutions and so on; the building of an extensive transportation network; and support for private capital accumulation.\(^\text{19}\)

However, a development strategy based on private property and entrepreneurship did not succeed due to both the world economic crisis and these unfavourable domestic social and economic circumstances. As a result, in the 1930s, the practice of statism emerged as a pragmatic approach to growing and modernising the economy. While there was ideological debate on statism, Ataturk explained the concept as it applied to Turkey\(^\text{20}\):

> The Statism of Turkey is not a system which is adopted from the ideations that socialist theoreticians assert. This is a system deriving from the needs of Turkey. Statism means to prioritize private entrepreneurship, but also to become responsible for the economy of the country. The state wants to realize all things that private entrepreneurs did not realize.
Given this framework, the Turkish economic system was neither purely capitalist nor purely collectivist. Capitalist principles and collective principles were hybridized and this eclectic model was formed from Atatürk’s view which did not accept the absolute ascendancy of either private or public property. However, under this model the significance and size of the private sector increased intrinsically as the economy developed.21 Industrial plans based on the principle of statism were made in 1930s with the establishment of state economic enterprises. State planning has continued on the basis of Five Year Development Plans ever since, however, the principle of statism has weakened since 1980 under neoliberal economic reforms such as the deregulation of foreign trade in 1980, the founding of a Capital Market Board in 1982, the opening of the Istanbul Stock Exchange in 1985 and the deregulation of the currency regime in 1989, which have opened up physical and financial capital flows. Moreover, state economic enterprises, fundamental institutions in the statist system, have been privatized in the context of neoliberal reform. This free market ideology is rationalized in terms of the Washington Consensus along with the collapse of socialist states.

**Turkey’s production structure**

The production structure in Turkey has four principal features: the role of small-to-medium enterprises (SMEs); the significance of family firms; a dependence on imported inputs, and a reliance on foreign investment. Approximately 99 per cent of Turkish firms are SMEs.22 This situation is seen as a favourable feature in terms of having a competitive market economy and a balanced distribution of income, however, these firms have a weak economic presence in terms of their shares of exports, production, credits and employment. While their share of employment is 56 per cent, SME’s share of exports is just 8 per cent, their share of production is 36 per cent; and their share of credits is 3 per cent.23 In this structure, the decisions and operations of large-scale enterprises dominate.

Another characteristic of the production structure in Turkey is the importance of family businesses. Today 99 per cent of all firms can be classified as family firms.24 The institution of ‘family’ is culturally very significant in Turkey. Family businesses are organizations which encompass both capital relations and traditional family relations, such that both may come into conflict. Research analysing these relations shows that first generation family members favour traditional values in their family business, while members of subsequent generations favour modern corporate values over traditional family values.25

A dependence on imports is another feature of the modern Turkish economy. While the increase in imports of production inputs has resulted in stable growth and an increase in exports in recent years, Esiyok’s findings highlight a dependence on imported inputs in production and export in
most sectors in Turkish economy. The fact that Turkey imports high-value-added goods and exports low-value-added goods results has meant deteriorating terms of trade, which have declined steadily since the 1990s.

**Transnational corporations in Turkey**

Another feature of the Turkish production structure is capital flow, which is important in terms of transnational corporations (TNCs). TNCs invest in various sectors in Turkey, with the customs union between the European Union and Turkey (which provides a facility to export to the European market without tariffs) a particularly attractive feature of the Turkish economy. Merger and acquisition are the most common investment forms and much of this collaboration between Turkish firms and TNCs occurs in the highly profitable banking, insurance and retailing sectors. As most of these collaborations are the result of TNC acquisition, TNCs are able to dominate in the most profitable sectors of the Turkish economy, while Turkish firms abdicate and invest in those sectors requiring smaller investment.

Other forms of TNC investment includes the construction of factories or shops in individual or joint ventures, including franchises such as McDonald’s, KFC and Starbucks. TNCs have also invested in privatized state economic enterprises. For example, the stocks of the former state enterprises TUPRAS, Petkim and Turk Telekom have been sold to TNCs such as Shell, Socar and Oger Telecom, in consortium with Turkish firms.

There are thirteen Turkish corporations in the Forbes Magazine list of The Global 2000 for 2009. Five of them are in banking, three are holdings groups, two are in the communications sector, and there is one each in the food, resources and construction sectors. Turkish corporations invest overseas, particularly in the textile and apparel sectors of nearby countries such as Egypt, Jordan, Romania and Bulgaria which have lower labour costs. However, Turkish corporations are multinational rather than transnational; while they make new investments to establish an overseas presence they are rarely involved in merger and acquisition, they operate on a smaller scale than TNCs and, with much of their profit coming from their domestic investments, are not global in their scope.

**Patterns of consumption in Turkey**

The growth of consumerism in Turkey is evident in three areas: retailing trends, the use of credit or credit cards and the consumption of imported goods.

Turkish consumers increasingly tend to shop in organized large-scale retailers rather than traditional retailers such as grocers, greengrocers, butchers, and bazaars. According to the Trade Council of Shopping Centres and Retailers in Turkey, the proportion of total retailing expenditure in organized retailing increased from 35 per cent in 2006 to 38 per cent in 2007, with a corresponding decline in traditional retailing. In food retailing, the
proportion for organized retailers increased from 22 per cent to 27 per cent.\textsuperscript{29} Other indicators in the 2006 to 2009 period, such as the employment index, receipt index, business volume index, and square meter index, indicate an increase in organized retailing.\textsuperscript{30}

Statistics from the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey for the period 2000 to 2008 show individual expenses paid with credit cards increasing by 44 per cent and by consumer credit increasing by 33 per cent, while income per person over the period increased by 16 per cent. This discrepancy between expenditure and income indicates a desire for goods which exceeds purchasing power.

Another trend highlighting Turkish consumption patterns is in the increased expenditure on imported goods. Since 2002, incomes have increased and Turkey’s currency has strengthened, resulting in an increased demand on imported consumer goods, such as luxury cars, new consumer electronics and global clothing labels. Statistics from the Turkish Statistical Institute on levels of imported goods show that since 2002 the importation of capital goods has increased by 23 per cent, the import of intermediate goods by 26 per cent and the importation of consumer goods by 29 per cent. While Turkey can not manufacture and export if it does not import intermediate and capital goods for production, the larger increase in imported consumer goods indicates an increasingly consumerist culture.

**The understanding of state in Turkey**

The concept of the state has a conventional meaning and value historically in Turkish society, and the principle of statism maintains a meaningful presence to this day.\textsuperscript{31} The Turkish state has regarded society as a whole since its constitution in 1923, with each sub-system—economic, legal, educational, bureaucratic, and so on—interconnected. Particular principles based on liberal ideology such as a secular legal system, a modern scientific education and a capitalist economy provided for this wholeness. Pluralism in this context hinged on the participation of various social groups in decision-making forums, such as the Izmir Economic Congress in 1923. Many farmers, tradespeople, craftspeople, labourers, merchants, and business people participated in the Congress to determine the economic principles and priorities of Turkey.\textsuperscript{32}

The Republican Society Party governed Turkey as a whole until the 1950s on the basis of constitutive ideas, with a pluralist political system formally founded in 1946. Since then, Turkey has been guided by liberal principles which have increasingly influenced the form of statism in the economic sphere. A number of processes, such as deregulation, liberalization and privatization have been gradually extended, intensifying under the economic reforms begun in the 1980s. These practices are not diametrically opposite to the principles and practices of the 1923 to 1950 period—a pragmatic economic order within statism based on the particular needs
of Turkey and neither purely capitalist nor pure socialist\textsuperscript{33}—however, the particular eclectic model of Turkey has shifted decidedly to a Western-style market economy since the 1950s and especially since the 1980s.

Liberal economic policies have transformed the understanding of the state with regards to planning and regulation, through the principle of laissez faire laissez passé. Five-year development plans are still made in Turkey, however, these plans are no longer effective in setting the direction of the whole economy. Rather, they are now considered simply research reports because they do not establish aims and targets. Private sector decision-making and individual plans take precedence over those of the state, while the government continues the process of deregulation.

On an international level the blueprint for national economies established by the Washington Consensus made it difficult for many states to set their national economic policies. In this process, the Turkish economy been linked to capitalist globalization through institutional and organizational forms such as the IMF, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization and the Customs Union Agreement. The prescriptions of the IMF in particular were a decisive factor in transforming Turkey’s eclectic economic model to a purely market model; a process unaffected by changes in government.\textsuperscript{34} In the political-legal sphere, compatibility with EU requirements has also weakened regulation, for example with decisions of the Human Right Court of Europe overriding those of the national legal system.

**Consistencies between Turkish capitalism and capitalist globalization**

According to the global capitalism approach, the prominent features of the economic dimension of globalization are global practices and the power of TNCs in terms of transnational production. The new technologies and novel organizational forms required for this transnational production are readily accessible in Turkey. Turkey can provide the technological infrastructure and facilities for a technology-intensive production technique required by global capitalism.

The Turkish economy is also compatible with global capitalism in terms of novel organization forms. TNCs cooperate with Turkish firms in such processes as outsourcing, subcontracting, merger and acquisition, and franchising. For example, TNCs such as Nike, Gap and Zara, outsource some of their business to prominent Turkish textile firms such as Yesim and Ceylan, and as a result Turkey’s textile sectors held the largest share of the country’s export market (19 per cent) in 2008. Public sector organizations, especially municipalities, also regularly outsource their services.

These relationships with TNCs are established by providing low costs, flexibility, velocity and quality of work. Increasingly, local firms apply production methods such as just-in-time, lean production, total management quality, and standardized management, environmental and social responsibility methods, which are learned via consultancy organizations
(enterprises working for profit and professional chambers supporting
their members) and university economics, business administration and
engineering departments.

Adopting these methods has two consequences for Turkish firms in the
process of integrating to the global economy. Firstly, an indigenous capitalist
class is growing in influence in the cultural-ideological and political spheres,
articulating with a transnational capitalist class, as described by Sklair and
Robinson, on the basis of consumerism. Secondly, local firms working for
TNCs have become dependent on them for decision-making and planning,
with TNCs setting production and service standards. For example, the
Ceylan Textile Company as a subcontractor to Nike is required to produce
its goods by fulfilling Nike’s conditions on social insurance, working
security and social responsibility.

New flexible organizational forms such as outsourcing and subcontracting
have resulted in casualization and informalization in the workforce, as well as
the displacement of workers both domestically—in moving from rural to urban regions to seek work—and internationally—with a
Growing immigrant workforce as well as overseas migration by Turkish
workers. The number of immigrant workers (legal and illegal) has
increased particularly since 2000 and especially from Russia and the Turkic
republics as the economic relations between Turkey and these countries has
intensified, providing a cheaper labour source for TNCs and local firms.
Informalization of the workforce can also be seen in Turkey’s public sector,
where the Turkish government plans to employ all formal officers under
flexible working conditions. Meanwhile, retirees, seeking employment
to supplement low pensions, are displacing younger workers by being
able to work ‘off the books’. The overall effect of this informalization and
Casualization is to increase unemployment and weaken wage bargaining.

Flexible production and working forms are attractive reasons for TNCs
to invest in the Turkish market. Another reason is the facility of profit
repatriation and capital mobility, which play an important role in the
recolonization process that McMichael defines as one of the key features of
globalization. Central Bank of Republic of Turkey (CBRT) statistics show
that profit repatriation increased approximately 4.8 per cent in the period

TNCs generally invest in Turkey’s service sectors. Based on CBRT
statistics, foreign investment was directed to the finance sector (47 per
cent), transportation, communication and warehousing (19 per cent),
manufacturing (18 per cent), and the wholesale and retailing sector (6 per
cent). The attractiveness of services sectors are in the high productivity
and profitability relative to investment. Moreover, these investments are
generally in the form of merger and acquisition, not new investment.
These changes in Turkey’s politico-economic circumstances on the supply side of the market equation have been mirrored in the rise of consumerism on the demand side. While there are new technologies and novel organization forms facilitating productivity, profitability and capital accumulation, it can be expected that consumers will demand more and cheaper products. As well as the influence of media and advertising, access to credit and government policies, such as a tax reductions on luxury goods, have increased consumption both quantitatively and qualitatively, while favouring some goods and services over others; there is still, for example, value-added tax on goods such as bread, cheese, olives, medicine and books. An increasing inconsistency between levels of credit and income indicate a rise in consumerism and the economic and political hegemony of a transnational capitalist class and TNCs.

**Inconsistencies between Turkish capitalism and capitalist globalization**

Turkish society has a number of features inconsistent with a theory of global capitalism in which there is a hegemonic formation of a transnational capitalist class. As previously stated, 99 per cent of all Turkish businesses are SMEs. These businesses cater largely to a domestic market, while those that do have global links either work for TNCs as subcontractors or work independently on imported inputs and so do not create their own special products and trademark. While SMEs can specialize they do not provide the economies of scale and market share which TNCs can provide on a global scale. Given the predominance of family-run businesses in Turkey, the destructive potential of TNCs on SMEs is, therefore, significant and extends from the economic to the social sphere in creating tensions between family values and those of capitalist globalization. However, while this has the potential to expose the livelihoods of local grocers, greengrocers, butchers and so on, Turkish consumers still favour traditional businesses and retailing over large-scale organized retailers, despite a shift towards the latter. A prominent example of this is the neighbourhood bazaar. The bazaar emerged as a historical and cultural institution in Eastern societies, outside of the market system of Western societies, and they continue to play an important role in offering an alternative to ‘McDonaldization’ — efficiency, calculability, predictability and control through nonhuman technology. Here, consumers are not enticed by standardized menus and time saving, nor is there any advertising. Another feature of the Turkish economy can be described as the Cuba Effect: the repair and re-use of second-hand goods instead of purchasing new. Motor vehicle manufacturers, such as Toyota, are concerned by the Cuba Effect, and the practice extends well beyond this sector. There are repair shops for clothes, shoes, electronics and so on in almost every neighbourhood. And almost every household has a box of tools to repair everyday items.

While it is apparent that this culture has weakened in the face of globalization and consumerism, there are historically conditioned behavioural patterns such as solidarity, thriftiness, avoidance of waste and
so on, especially in Turkey’s rural regions and urban suburbs, which run counter to a culture of consumerism and market individualism. The Week of Domestic Goods, for example, is a popular cultural institution celebrated since 1946 (with the new name ‘The Week of Thriftiness, Investment and Turkish Goods’ since 1983) and aimed especially at children to teach them to value thriftiness and locally made goods, a worldview with its basis in the foundation of the Republic of Turkey. Kinship and neighbourhood relations are another buttress against consumerism in reducing dependence on credit via sharing and solidarity. According to The Research for Life Pleasure of Turkish Statistical Institute, in 2008, 59 per cent of assistance that poor families received was from their relatives, friends and neighbours; 30 per cent from the state Fund for Supporting Assistance and Solidarity, and 21 per cent from municipalities.\(^6\) However, the proportion of assistance from relatives, friends and neighbours has fallen since 2003, while that from the state and municipalities has risen. So while it can be seen that traditional financial solidarity patterns hold sway over other other forms of financial assistance there is an increasing role for the state. However, the state’s role is now more about providing financial support to reduce poverty rather than developing national economic capability as it did in the statist model.

**Conclusion**

The consistencies between Turkish capitalism and the global system certainly outweigh the inconsistencies, even though traditional production and consumption patterns provided a greater equality of resources and income than the uneven growth occurring under the free market reforms initiated in the early 1980s. When in relationship (predominantly the result of merger and acquisition) TNCs coordinate and direct Turkish businesses via processes such as outsourcing and subcontracting, generating profits on the one hand and displacement on the other. In most respects Turkish businesses are unable to compete with TNCs, and certain sectors and businesses are in danger of being overwhelmed by global market forces. The rise of consumerism and market individualism is another feature of modern Turkish society, and while there are traditional and historical structures and behaviours working against it, consumerism has become an inveterate feature of Turkish society.
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