

7. The Disruption and (Re)creation of Party-Cleavage Linkages

権利	Copyrights 日本貿易振興機構（ジェトロ）アジア 経済研究所 / Institute of Developing Economies, Japan External Trade Organization (IDE-JETRO) http://www.ide.go.jp
シリーズタイトル(英)	Occasional Papers Series
シリーズ番号	41
journal or publication title	Electoral Volatility in Turkey - Cleavages vs. the Economy
page range	83-96
year	2007
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2344/00010603

7


The Disruption and (Re)creation of Party-Cleavage Linkages

This chapter qualitatively analyzes two questions that emerged from the previous chapter: (1) why did the relatively short period (1980–83) of suspension of party politics in Turkey seriously damage the embryonic link between political parties and social cleavages that had formed by the late 1970s? and (2) why did the recent party system in Turkey gain the capacity to better represent Sunni religiosity and Kurdish ethnicity? The answers can be sought in institutional changes as well as endogenous and exogenous factors that induced these changes.

7.1. The 1980 Military Intervention and the Disruption of Party Politics

The military government during the 1980–83 period, led by the National Security Council, attempted to institute a stable two-party system by purging the system of the current parties and politicians. First, major politicians were arrested and the parliament was dissolved. Then, all political parties were disbanded in 1981 under Law 2533, which was approved by the National Security Council on October 16, 1981. It banned the reopening of the disbanded political parties as well as the formation of any new political party with the same name as a party disbanded in 1981. Second, the military introduced the 1982 constitution, which was more authoritarian than the 1961 constitution. In particular, Provisional Article 4 under the new constitution prohibited the cadres of the disbanded parties from political activities for ten years (until 1992) and other parliamentarians of these parties from forming parties or becoming party cadres for five years (until 1987) after its promulgation. Third, for the transition election in 1983, the National Security Council was given the authority to screen candidates and political parties. Consequently, only three of the newly formed parties were allowed to compete.¹ The other parties that applied for candidacy were

Fig. 7-2. Rise and Decline of Political Parties in Turkey, 1983–2002



Source: Compiled by the author from Appendix III.

Note: Major successor parties for pre-1980 parties include the DYP for the AP, the SHP/CHP for the CHP, the MÇP/MHP for the MHP, and the RP/FP/AKP for the MSP. The positions of the parties on the left-right continuum are based on voters' party positions reported in Kalaycıoğlu (1999, p. 58).

cians and parties⁵ were long enough to force former politicians into retirement and to weaken the organizations of the disbanded parties as well as to encourage factional splits within them. This long interruption weakened the embryonic ties between societal groupings and political parties that had begun to appear by the late 1970s. It can be recalled from Figure 6-9 and Figure 6-10 that the relationships between social cleavages and cleavage-type volatilities had shown signs of stability, but that after 1980, the relationships first regressed into instability.

7.2. The Protracted Development of the Religiosity-Party Nexus

The growing level of representation in the Turkish political system in the late 1990s, especially on the basis of Sunni religiosity and Kurdish ethnicity, poses a question: why and how were these pro-Islamic and pro-Kurdish parties created, in 1970 and 1990 respectively, and allowed to exist in Turkey despite the strict principles of secularism and the unitary state?⁶ The following two sections examine the emergence of the two parties in light of internal and external factors.

Fig. 7-3. Percentage of Religious Associations to Total Associations, 1946–68



Source: Compiled by the author from Yücekök (1971, p. 133, tab. 1).

Regarding the emergence of the pro-Islamic party, the liberal 1961 constitution and the freedom of association it guaranteed opened political opportunities⁷ in two ways. First, the number of religious organizations and their activities grew. Religious groups formed associations, rather than political parties of their own, to exert political influence (Özek n.d., p. 560). In particular, there was an expansion of the percentage of religious-education associations, whose objective was to support private Koran courses and *imam-hatip lisesi*s and to promote mutual support among *imams* and *hatips* (Figure 7-3) (Yücekök 1971, p. 146). These associations were more politically motivated than those organized for the construction of mosques, as they sought to promote Islamic values in society by spreading Islamic education. These political religious associations formed an important social base for the emergent pro-Islamic party.

Second, the 1961 constitution, in Article 56, defended political parties as “an essential element for democratic politics” and allowed political parties to be founded without prior permission and to act freely. Although political parties that violated the principles of secularism and the unitary state were to be disbanded (Article 57), the fundamental rights of political parties became constitutionally guaranteed for the first time in Turkish history.⁸ This freedom of association provided impetus for the creation of 11 new political parties in 1961 alone,⁹ including the TİP, which later gained 15 parliamentary seats in the 1965 general election.

The internal factors that led to the formation of the pro-Islamic party in Turkey involved internal struggles in the AP and among Turkish capitalists. The establishment of a pro-Islamic party was initiated by a few religious conservatives of the AP but was later led by Necmettin Erbakan. In 1967, A. Tevfik Paksu (Senator from Kahramanmaraş Province), Hasan Aksay (Representative from Adana Province), and Arif Hikmet Güner (Representative from Rize Province) tried to move the party toward a more religious line (Çakır 1994, p. 19). After their attempt failed, they chose to create a religiously oriented political party together with Necmettin Erbakan.

Erbakan's emergence partly reflected a power struggle within the Union of Chambers and Exchanges in Turkey.¹⁰ Within the union, the largest business organization in Turkey, small capitalists in Central Anatolia had intensified their criticism of the AP government for being close to large capital in Istanbul. In the 1969 election for the union's president, they supported Erbakan. After his victory was annulled through the intervention of the prime minister, Erbakan entered politics. Since his application for candidacy on the AP ticket was rejected, he ran as an independent and was elected from Konya Province in the 1969 general election.

In 1970, he founded Turkey's first pro-Islamic party with any organizational basis, the MNP.¹¹ After the MNP was disbanded for anti-secular propaganda under a decision of the Constitutional Court in 1971, it was succeeded by the MSP in 1972. While the first pro-Islamic party was said to be a brainchild of Mehmet Zahit Kotku,¹² leader of one of the largest Nakşibendi factions (İskender Paşa Dergâhı), who advised Erbakan to establish the party, it was in effect supported by a coalition that included other Nakşibendi factions as well as the Nurcu (its Yazıcı group in particular) and Kadiri factions (Çakır 1994, p. 21; Yalçın 1994, pp. 51–54).

It took a long time, however, to consolidate support among devout Sunnis for the pro-Islamic party. This was primarily due to the pragmatic party choices of religious organizations and voters. Since its foundation in 1970, the pro-Islamic party had to compete with center-right or rightist parties¹³ for the votes of devout Sunnis. During the two coalition governments (First Nationalist Front government (1975–77) and Second Nationalist Front government (1977–78)) composed of center-right and rightist parties, both the center-right AP and pro-Islamist MSP competed with proposals for the expansion of religious education (Duman 1997, p. 162). The policy differences between these two groups of parties appeared narrow. In addition, the direction of bloc votes from Sunni religious organizations had an important impact on the electoral outcomes. In the 1973 general election, a large coalition of religious organizations supported the pro-Islamic MSP but in the 1977 election the Nurcu faction's Yazıcı group, in reaction to the Nakşibendi control of the party leadership, withdrew its support (Yalçın 1994, pp. 106–12, 124; Çakır 1994, p. 21; Duman 1997, p. 94).

As a result, the MSP's initial euphoria in the 1973 election receded in the 1977 election. The party's vote percentage declined from 11.8 in 1973 to 8.6 in 1977. Provincial voting patterns seem to indicate that between 1973 and 1977, devout Sunni voters defected to other parties (Table 6-8). The correlation between the indicator of Sunni religiosity at the provincial level and the vote for the MSP, which was statistically significant in 1973 ($r = 0.236$, $p = 0.054$), became nonsignificant in 1977 ($r = -0.053$, $p = 0.668$). On the other hand, in 1977 the largest center-right party, the AP, regained part of its devout supporters lost to the MSP and the splinter Democratic Party (Demokratik Parti, DP)¹⁴ in the 1973 election. The correlation between the indicator of Sunni religiosity and vote for the center-right AP moved from nonsignificance ($r = 0.084$, $p = 0.500$) in 1973 to statistical significance ($r = 0.364$, $p = 0.003$) in 1977.¹⁵

During the 1980s and early 1990s, not only the supporters but also the former members of the MSP split into ANAP and the RP. After the abolition of all existing

political parties in 1980 and the suspension of political activities, many religiously oriented politicians were absorbed into the newly formed ANAP, which ruled Turkey from 1983 to 1991. The major part of the (dominant) religious wing of ANAP came from the İskender Paşa faction. Even after the RP entered electoral competition in 1984, the İskender Paşa followers in ANAP did not return to the pro-Islamic party (Çakır 1990, p. 38).

After the 1995 general election made the pro-Islamic RP the largest party in the parliament (with just 21.4 percent of the vote), however, prominent members of the religious wing of ANAP, such as Abdülkâdir Aksu, Ali Coşkun, and Cemil Çiçek defected either to the RP or to its successor, the FP. Thus, starting in the mid-1990s, religious votes began to move toward the pro-Islamic party from ANAP, which in the 1980s had secured a large part of the bloc votes of religious organizations, most notably various subgroups of the Nakşibendi sect. At the same time, devout Sunni Kurdish voters in southeastern Turkey shifted their support away from the pro-Islamic party to the pro-Kurdish party that had been newly formed in 1990, thus making the pro-Islamic party less influential than previously in that region.

7.3. The Emergence of the Pro-Kurdish Party

The first pro-Kurdish party, the People's Labor Party (Halkın Emek Partisi, HEP), was formed on June 7, 1990 by 11 former-SHP parliamentarians. Seven were of Kurdish origin and had been expelled from their party for having participated in a conference in Paris on the Kurdish issue in October 1989. At first, the party aimed to achieve the integration of Kurds and Turks. The 16 ex-SHP deputies who initially participated in the preparatory body, New Democratic Formation (Yeni Demokratik Oluşum), included Turkish parliamentarians as well who had belonged to the left-wing faction of the SHP and had been, together with the Kurdish parliamentarians, sidelined by the right-wing faction that had won the intra-party struggle. When the Kurdish inclinations of the prospective party increased, however, most of these parliamentarians of Turkish origin chose not to join the new party. As a result, HEP's color became more Kurdish than originally planned (Ölmez 1995, pp. 54–103).

There were both endogenous and exogenous factors that enabled HEP to take part in the October 1991 general election on the SHP ticket, eventually gaining 22 seats.¹⁶ Endogenously, the expulsion of the parliamentarians from the SHP aroused, from inside the party, sympathy for them and their claims. The SHP leadership could not neglect the change of tide within the party. In order to demonstrate its interest in the issue, it published in July a report on the southeastern (Kurdish) area, prepared mostly by Hikmet Çetin, a mainstream SHP parliamentarian of Kurdish origin, recommending greater freedom in identity, expression, and language.


At a deeper level, Turkey's lingering war with the Kurdistan Workers Party (Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan, PKK)¹⁷ and harsh security measures toward local "collaborators" made the Kurdish population more expressive of their grievances. Qualitative change became obvious by 1990 when there was a marked surge in civil protests

against the security forces. In addition to a rapid increase in the number of protest participants and deaths caused by the security forces, for the first time, the bodies of PKK guerillas were collected from the authorities by their families for public funerals (McDowall 2004, pp. 428–29). Such incidents became more frequently reported in the press after martial law and the press ban for the region was lifted in 1987, to be replaced by the less restrictive emergency rule.

Turkish public opinion thus became more sympathetic toward the Kurdish issue, which the Turkish state had long denied, stating that the people in southeastern Turkey were “Mountain Turks.” Kirişçi and Windrow (1997, p. 113) found that there were an increasing number of publications by the late 1980s that explicitly dealt with Kurdish ethnicity. A review of the mainstream daily *Hürriyet* from 1984 to 1998 by Somer (2005; 2004, p. 247) showed that 1987 saw the first perceptible increase in the number of articles referring to domestic Kurds in Turkey, before news and discussion on the Kurdish issue became full-fledged in the 1990s (Figure 7-4). Although in the late 1980s the press primarily associated the Kurdish issue with terrorism by the PKK, leading columnists also mentioned the problems of underdevelopment in the region and maltreatment of the local population by security forces (Gençkaya 1994).

There were three interrelated exogenous factors. First, the Halabja massacre by Saddam Hussein in 1988 led to the first wave of approximately 110,000 Kurdish refugees from northern Iraq to southeastern Turkey. Local Kurds visited and helped the Iraqi Kurds in the refugee camps. This development strengthened the sense of Kurdish identity in the region (Kışlalı 1996, pp. 181–82). At the same time, Turks witnessed the calamities experienced by the Kurds and came to feel increasing sympathy with them.¹⁸ Second, President Turgut Özal took the initiative in changing state policy toward the Kurds, initially by acknowledging in June 1989 that he had Kurdish

Fig. 7-4. Number of Articles on Domestic Kurds That Appeared in the *Hürriyet*



Source: Compiled by the author from the data provided by Murat Somer. The data was used for Somer (2005).

blood (Kirişçi and Winrow 1997, p. 113). Özal realized that the Kurdish issue required a realistic solution that incorporated not only military power but also the recognition of Kurdish identity. Third, international pressure due to the Gulf War accelerated the process of liberalization that Özal had started (Somer 2004, p. 248). The Turkish parliament lifted the ban on the Kurdish language in April 1991, “immediately after more than one and half million Kurdish refugees from Iraq poured into Iran and Turkey” (Kirişçi and Winrow 1997, p. 113).¹⁹

In the long term, however, HEP failed to take advantage of the unfolding political opportunities. As the PKK began to use HEP for its own political cause, HEP pushed for more liberalization and concessions from the state. In November 1991, two of its parliamentarians gave their parliamentary oath in Kurdish, angering the Turkish establishment as well as the public. During the “bloody (Kurdish) Nevruz [New Year] celebration” in March 1992, serious clashes occurred between the security forces and local Kurds, supported by HEP members, who demanded more freedom in the Kurd-populated region. These militant actions backfired and turned the state and public opinion against the Kurdish aspiration for cultural freedom. The state prosecution sued HEP for separatist acts. Before the constitutional court disbanded the party, its members joined the successor party, the Democracy Party (Demokrasi Partisi, DEP). The new party did not last long, either. After its leader, Hatip Dicle, defended the PKK’s killing of military cadets in January 1994, saying that they had been wearing military uniforms and thus had been military targets, the government swiftly passed a motion lifting the immunity of DEP parliamentarians. Six DEP parliamentarians were immediately arrested and jailed. Four were sentenced to 15 years in prison, and the party was disbanded by the constitutional court.

Despite these pressures from the state, the pro-Kurdish party persisted, with DEP being succeeded by HADEP and then DEHAP. Although DEHAP’s national vote percentage in general elections never reached the 10 percent minimal requirement for gaining parliamentary seats, it rose gradually but steadily to 6.2 percent in 2002, while the party consolidated its electoral base in the Kurd-populated region. It participated in a general local election for the first time in 1999, gaining 36 mayoral posts mainly in the Kurd-populated region. While it was the first party in 5 of the 23 eastern and southeastern provinces²⁰ in 1995, it became the first in 11²¹ and 13²² of the said provinces in 1999 and 2002, respectively. The magnitude of DEHAP’s strength in the Kurd-populated region was evident especially in 2002 compared with the AKP, which won the general election with 34.3 percent of the vote but came first only in 10 provinces in the east and southeast (Tuncer, Kasapbaş, and Tuncer 2003, p. 321).

7.4. Party Dissolution and Succession

The previous descriptions of the pro-Islamic and pro-Kurdish parties mentioned instances of party closures. The present 1982 constitution, in the fourth paragraph of Article 68, virtually bans parties that aim for separatism or communism, or parties that violate secularism or democracy:

The statutes and programmes, as well as the activities of political parties shall not be in conflict with the independence of the state, its indivisible integrity with its territory and nation, human rights, the principles of equality and rule of law, sovereignty of the nation, the principles of the democratic and secular republic; they shall not aim to protect or establish class or group dictatorship or dictatorship of any kind, nor shall they incite citizens to crime.²³

If political parties violate the above article, they can be disbanded by a court decision following prosecution (Article 69). The law regulating political parties contains more detailed stipulations for disbanding parties. Accordingly, failure to account for revenues and expenditures as well as failure to participate in two consecutive elections are among the grounds for disbandment.

One might argue that closing down political parties is a serious infringement of democratic rights. This claim can be disputed, however, for the following reasons. First, both the 1961 and 1982 constitutions guaranteed the rights of political parties as an essential element of democracy, though they were not permitted to violate the fundamental principles of the republic. The explicit recognition in the Turkish constitutions of political parties as actors in democracy as well as the limitation of their rights was inspired by the German constitution (Basic Law) that adopted the idea of "militant democracy" (Özbudun 1993, p. 66). The denial to antidemocratic forces of access to the public sphere is elaborated in Article 21 (2): "Parties which, by reason of their aims or the behavior of their adherents, seek to impair or abolish the free democratic basic order or to endanger the existence of the Federal Republic of Germany are unconstitutional. The Federal Constitutional Court decides on the question of unconstitutionality."²⁴

Second, it is not simply the judiciary but only its highest organ, the constitutional court, that can disband a political party that has been prosecuted.²⁵ Party closure thus cannot be easily manipulated by the government. Although the judicial bureaucracy enshrines secularism and the Turkish nation-state, the decisions of the constitutional court are based on specific clauses of the constitution. Kaboğlu (1994, p. 110) argued that the constitutional court's decisions on party closure secured the rights of political parties to the extent that the decisions did not depart from the criteria of legality. More generally, public opinion also regards the constitutional court as the guarantor of Turkish secular democracy.²⁶

Third, party closure has affected only a few parties in the parliament. Between 1964 and 2004, 31 closure suits were filed by the prosecution, leading to the disbandment of 22 political parties (Table 7-1). If the CHP is excluded from this list of disbanded parties since it was soon legalized by an amendment of the law of political parties,²⁷ only 5 of the 21 disbanded parties had seats in the last parliament before the closure suit was filed. Moreover, four of the five, the pro-Islamic RP and FP as well as pro-Kurdish HEP and DEP, were succeeded by new parties with almost the same members and organizations.

Party closure is not a death sentence for a political party. Parties with a strong social basis such as the pro-Islamic and pro-Kurdish parties were disbanded but repeatedly reemerged, being succeeded by the same parties but with different names. In contrast

TABLE 7-1
 CONSTITUTIONAL COURT'S DECISION ON PARTY CLOSURE SUITS, 1962–2004

Party ^a	Date ^b	Closure ^c	In Parliament ^d
Workers and Peasants Party	Oct. 15, 1968	×	
National Order Party (MNP)	May 20, 1971	×	
Progressive Country Party	Jun. 29, 1971	×	
Turkish Labor Party (TİP)	Jul. 20, 1971	×	×
Great Anatolian Party	Dec. 19, 1972	×	
Turkish Workers Party	May 8, 1980	×	
Supreme Duty Party	Aug. 25, 1983		
New Order Party	Sep. 28, 1983		
Peaceful Turkey Party	Oct. 25, 1983	×	
Our Party	Nov. 1, 1983		
Conservative Party	Nov. 3, 1983		
True Path Party (DYP)	Nov. 9, 1984		
Flag Party	May 2, 1989		
Socialist Party	Dec. 8, 1988		
United Communist Party of Turkey	Jul. 16, 1991	×	
Republican People's Party (CHP)	Sep. 24, 1991	×	×
Nationalist Work Party (MÇP)	Sep. 24, 1991		×
Socialist Party	Jul. 10, 1992	×	
People's Labor Party (HEP)	Jul. 14, 1993	×	×
Green Party	Feb. 10, 1994	×	
Freedom and Democracy Party	Nov. 23, 1993	×	
Socialist Turkey Party	Nov. 30, 1993	×	
Democracy Party (DEP)	Jun. 30, 1994	×	×
Democrat Party ^e	Sep. 13, 1994	×	
Socialist Union Party	Jul. 19, 1995	×	
Labor Party	Feb. 14, 1997	×	
Revival Party	Feb. 18, 1997	×	
Democratic Peace Movement	May 22, 1997		
Welfare Party (RP)	Jan. 16, 1998	×	×
Democratic Mass Party	Feb. 26, 1999	×	
Virtue Party (FP)	Jun. 22, 2001	×	×
Total	31	22	6

Sources: Compiled by the author from Aliefendioğlu (1996, pp. 272–73, 288–89) for the 1962–95 period and from the Constitutional Court's web site (<http://www.anayasa.gov.tr>) for the remaining period.

^a Acronyms are shown only for the parties referred to in the body text.

^b Dates of disbandment for the 1961 constitutional period and dates of decision for the 1982 constitutional period.

^c × signifies a closure decision and a blank a rejection of the charges. The CHP was legalized after the amendment on the law on political parties, enacted on June 19, 1992.

^d The party, or individuals that later joined the party, gained parliamentary seats in the last election before the party closure suit was filed.

^e Formed in 1992 by those who tried to revive the DP that had been disbanded in 1960.

to the bans stipulated (but abolished in 1987) in the 1982 constitution on former parties and politicians for five or ten years, there are loopholes in the provisions relevant to party dissolution. For instance, Article 84 of the constitution originally stipulated that parliamentarians of the disbanded party would lose their seats when the dissolution suit was filed (in the case of parliamentarians who became the reason for

the dissolution) and when the dissolution decision was submitted to the parliament (in the case of the other parliamentarians of the party). After the filing of the dissolution suit against the pro-Kurdish HEP on July 3, 1992, its parliamentarians joined the newly established successor party, DEP. In the end, although the party was disbanded and the four parliamentarians who became the reason for the dissolution lost their seats in the parliament, the other parliamentarians of the party kept their seats due to early exit (Ölmez 1995, pp. 255–56).

Articles 84 was amended in 1995 to limit the above-mentioned bans to the members who became the reason for the disbandment. When the RP was disbanded in 1998,²⁸ its parliamentarians were thus able to keep their seats as independents. Most of them later joined the successor party, the FP. When the FP was disbanded in 2001, a similar process was repeated. Almost all of its former parliamentarians first became independents and soon joined either the AKP or the SP, its two successor parties.

Finally, more recent constitutional amendments for democratization in 1995 and especially in 2001 made the disbanding of political parties more difficult. The amendment, enacted on October 3, 2001, of Article 69 limited party disbandment to cases where unconstitutional activities had been carried out intensively by party members and were publicly acknowledged by the party leadership or parliamentary group, or when those activities were carried out by the above party organizations out of conviction. Previously, unconstitutional activities of any intensity by any member of the party could be grounds for disbandment. The amendment of Article 69 also introduced as an alternative to party closure the suspension of state subsidies, where previously disbandment had been the only form of punishment. The 2001 amendment of Article 149 increased the necessary votes for party closure by the constitutional court from half to three-fifths of the judges.

7.5. Summary

This chapter began with the questions of: (1) why the relatively short period (1980–83) of suspension of party politics in Turkey seriously damaged the embryonic link between political parties and social cleavages and (2) why the recent party system in Turkey became better able to represent Sunni religiosity and Kurdish ethnicity. Qualitative analysis was made into institutional changes as well as endogenous and exogenous factors that induced these changes. The answers to the questions are as follows.

First, the military government's plan to make a radical break with the past and to institute a stable two-party system not only failed but in the short run had a negative effect on party-system institutionalization. The bans on the former politicians and parties, though lifted early in 1987, were nevertheless sufficiently long to force former politicians into retirement and to weaken the organizations of the disbanded parties as well as to encourage factional splits within them. This long interruption weakened the embryonic ties between societal groupings and political parties that had begun to appear in the late 1970s.

Second, while both the pro-Islamic and pro-Kurdish parties consolidated their

support in relative terms by the late 1990s, there are important differences between them in the internal and external factors that facilitated the process. The pro-Islamic party had to go through more severe electoral competition than the pro-Kurdish party, which also benefited from external factors. The pro-Islamic party, which was formed in 1970, was unable to quickly consolidate its support among devout Sunnis, who tended to vote for the largest center-right party that seemed capable of forming a government. Only after the pro-Islamic party became the first party in the parliament in 1995 was it able to stabilize its relationship with devout Sunnis. The institutional opening since 1961 played an important role in encouraging the creation of the pro-Islamic party, but this did not help the party to meet a strong challenge from the center-right parties later on.

For the pro-Kurdish party, both the Turkish public's recognition of the Kurdish issue and international attention to the Kurds prior to and during the Gulf Crisis/War opened political opportunities for organizing a pro-Kurdish party in 1990. Since that time, the party has continued to be supported by Kurdish voters, reemerging under a new name each time it was disbanded by the state. In contrast to the pro-Islamic party, it swiftly consolidated its relationship with its core supporters since no other party could compete with it seriously for the same constituency. In sum, both internal and external factors were favorable for the pro-Kurdish party compared to the pro-Islamic party. This difference accounts for the pro-Islamic party's longer struggle to forge a party-cleavage nexus. Although the secularist and unitary-statist constitution led the constitutional court to disband the pro-Islamic and pro-Kurdish parties in the parliament, these parties overcame the challenges by forming successor parties of their own.

Notes

- 1 The military had planned to institute a two-party system consisting of the center-right Nationalist Democracy Party (Milliyetçi Demokrasi Partisi, MDP) and the center-left Populist Party (Halkçı Parti, HP). Following the application by ANAP, founded by Turgut Özal, who had worked for the World Bank in the 1970s and served during the 1980–82 period as vice minister in the military government, the State Security Council allowed ANAP to take part in the election since its members, consisting of businessmen and former bureaucrats, did not have strong ties to previous political parties.
- 2 In the 1983 general election, ANAP won the largest share of votes, with 45.1%, trailed by the HP (30.5%) and MDP (23.3%), which the military government explicitly supported.
- 3 According to Provisional Article 4 of the 1982 constitution, the ban on party leaders was to be lifted in 1992.
- 4 All major political leaders including Süleyman Demirel, Bülent Ecevit, Necmettin Erbakan, and Alparslan Türkeş legally became heads of successor parties.
- 5 While the ban on former political parties was lifted by Law 3821, approved on June 19, 1992, which abolished Law 2533, the practical significance was limited to allowing existing parties to use the names of parties disbanded by Law 2533. For more details, see note 27.
- 6 The principle of the unitary Turkish state rejects federalism and bans separatism.

- 7 On political opportunities as a decisive factor for the emergence of social movements, see McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald (1996) and Tarrow (1998).
- 8 Özbudun (1993, pp. 20–21) cited the articles on political parties as the most important measures under the 1961 constitution for creating a pluralist society.
- 9 For a list of political parties, see the following section of the Turkish Grand National Assembly's homepage: <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/partiler/partiler.htm>.
- 10 Ahmad (1977, p. 245) asserted that the pro-Islamic party represented the small bourgeoisie such as small shopkeepers (*esnafs*) and artisans (*sanaatkars*) in Central Anatolia, who felt increasingly neglected by the AP that represented the interests of large industrial capitalists.
- 11 The other splinter party from the AP was the Democratic Party (Demokratik Parti, DP), which represented the declining large landowners (*ağa*) who at the same time were from the families of tribal leaders (*aşiret reis*) or religious leaders (*şeyh*). The party was formed in reaction to the land reform and farm taxation proposed by Prime Minister Demirel of the AP. See Ahmad (1977, p. 247).
- 12 Some of the people surrounding Kotku later became not only politicians but ministers (Korkut Özal, Lütfü Doğan, and Fehim Adak), a prime minister and president (Turgut Özal), and other prime ministers (Necmettin Erbakan and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan) (Yavuz 2003, p. 141).
- 13 In particular, Alparslan Türkeş, who took over the leadership of the CKMP, shifted its ideology from secular nationalism to religious nationalism by the late 1960s, although nationalism was its primary feature. The party's name was changed to MHP in 1969. In the 1965 election, the party program and Türkeş's speeches defended secularism. As he later developed an anti-communist campaign, however, Türkeş tried to supplement Turkish nationalism with Muslim identity (Bora and Can 1991, p. 45).
- 14 See note 11.
- 15 Although MHP, which increased its vote percentage from 3.4 in 1973 to 6.4 in 1977, may have attracted some of the former voters for the MSP, the MHP's relationship with devout Sunni voters in 1977 ($r = 0.226, p = 0.066$) was weaker than in 1973 ($r = 0.299, p = 0.014$) and was weaker than the same relationship for the AP in 1977 ($r = 0.364, p = 0.003$).
- 16 Since the 1983 electoral law required political parties to gain 10 percent of the national vote to gain seats in the parliament, the HEP joined the SHP, which was also seeking to buttress its electoral chances in the southeastern region.
- 17 The PKK was established in 1978 with the aim of attaining Kurdish independence from Turkey. In 1984, it began an armed insurgency in southeastern Turkey, targeting both the military and civilians.
- 18 The author's interview with Ruşen Çakır, August 3, 2004, Istanbul.
- 19 Özal in effect achieved this change because despite his formal political independence, which was constitutionally required, he had a great deal of influence over Prime Minister Yıldırım Akbulut and thus the incumbent ANAP.
- 20 From 1995 to 2002, there were 14 Eastern Anatolian provinces and 9 Southeastern Anatolian provinces in Turkey.
- 21 HADEP's vote percentage in these provinces was 46.1 in Hakkari, 45.9 in Diyarbakır, 43.4 in Batman, 35.7 in Van, 33.7 in Ağrı, 31.8 in Muş, 29.8 in Iğdır, 25.3 in Mardin, 24.1 in Şırnak, 22.1 in Siirt, and 17.5 in Kars (Tuncer 1999, p. 317).
- 22 DEHAP's vote percentage in these provinces was 56.1 in Diyarbakır, 47.1 in Batman, 45.9 in Şırnak, 45.1 in Hakkari, 40.9 in Van, 39.6 in Mardin, 38.1 in Muş, 35.1 in Ağrı, 32.7 in Iğdır, 32.6 in Tunceli, 32.2 in Siirt, 29.6 in Bitlis, and 19.6 in Kars (Tuncer, Kasapbaş, and Tuncer 2003, p. 461).
- 23 The English translation was found in the web site of the Turkish Grand National Assembly.

- <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/english/constitution.htm> (accessed July 20, 2006).
- 24 The citation is from the English translation found in the University of Wuerzburg's International Constitutional Law Version, <http://www.jurisprudencia.de/jurisprudencia.html>.
 - 25 Özbudun (1993, p. 71) emphasized that not simply the judiciary but its highest organ made the decision.
 - 26 On a questionnaire survey of 85,000 respondents in 55 provinces in Turkey conducted by Dokuz Eylül University, in response to the question of who could defend the principles of a democratic and secular state and the rule of law, the most frequent answer (31.8 percent) was “the constitutional court” (*Hürriyet*, February 15, 1997).
 - 27 Article 96 of the law on political parties (Law 2820) was amended on June 19, 1992 by the same law (Law 3821) that abolished the aforementioned Law 2533. Whereas the old article prohibited parties from using the names, emblems, and symbols of disbanded parties, the new article replaced “disbanded parties” with “parties disbanded by the constitutional court,” thus exempting the parties that had been disbanded by the military government after the 1980 military intervention.
 - 28 The party lost time forming another party before the dissolution suit was filed.