

Varieties of Neoliberal Communitarianism in the Cities of Anatolia-Turkey

Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Political Science Association,
27-29 May, 2009.

Evren Tok, Ph.D. Candidate

School of Public Policy and Administration, Carleton University.

Introduction

Studies focusing on the concept of neoliberalism from economic and human geography disciplines largely agree that there is a need to study neoliberalism with its variegated forms at a variety of scales of analysis. Hence, whether understood as a package of policies or institutions, as a form of social rule, an ideological tool for competitive globalization or a mechanism of rescaling and restructuring, neoliberalism has different variants. In the literature, different scholars have pointed out the need to better conceptualize these variants, or the need for more concrete and microanalyses of neoliberalism. This paper is an attempt to decipher the local forms of neoliberalism in the Anatolian cities of Turkey. The examples pertaining to the cities of Anatolia exhibit different forms of the embedded nature of the neoliberalization process in Anatolia, Turkey. These forms of embeddedness, in fact, become visible through a collective effort that is organized in the cities of Anatolia by a variety of actors imbued with communitarian values and strategies for the sake of making the city competitive, not only in the national, but also in international and global scales.

When neoliberalism is approached not as a monolithic bloc, which is reproduced by clichés such as more market less state and convergence to a monoculture framed by the interests of the Washington Consensus, we can see neoliberalism as a “range of institutionally mediated local, national and glocal neoliberalizations, which urges us to reconsider and reformulate the spatial and scalar assumptions of governmentality many of which had previously been anchored to nation state” (Ferguson and Gupta, 2002: 996). In brief, different localities may experience neoliberalism in different forms, and instead of a top-down implementation of neoliberal reforms, new identities, policies and governmentalities may be possible, and a bottom-up motion could be initiated by a variety of social and economic actors, even though they may exhibit contradictory forms. Given this analysis, it becomes possible to think of neoliberalism and its varieties, as having their own unique institutional legacies and balances of social forces that lead to different local neoliberal strategies.

The paper starts with the efforts, which aim at periodizing neoliberalism and emphasize the embedded nature in relation to the “roll-back” phase. While these periodizations bring crucial insights by analyzing the changing nature of neoliberalism, especially the so-called more inclusive, more social, human face of neoliberalism, it is also claimed that periodizations of neoliberalism in general fails to grasp the local neoliberal experiences because of being too abstract and general. Thus, it becomes rather difficult to recognize whether we are really in a more socially inclusive phase, or

neoliberalism is deepening and more strongly entrenching itself to the system as a disciplining mechanism? The next two sub-sections propose to approach neoliberalization by focusing more closely at its local manifestations, in relation to the ways through which these local forms of neoliberalization constitutes and establishes their relationship with other scales. This leads us to rethink globalization not as a top-down, but as a bottom-up process establishing the foundations for the emergence of local neoliberalisms by creating a fertile ground for the local actors to mobilize their economic activities in a variety of local institutional contexts. These contexts, as in the cities of Anatolia, exhibit different socio-spatial, economic and cultural characteristic which privilege the communitarian interest as opposed to others and provide key reembedding mechanisms. The final sub-section of the paper focuses on these reembedding mechanisms by centering the analysis on the concept of Anatolian Tigers, which is a transplanted concept borrowed from the cases of Asian Tigers, and denoting the cities of Anatolia, which spearheaded economic growth during the course of 1990s and 2000s. These cases of success stories reveal that Anatolian cities are now becoming Turkey's new spaces of modernity, which corresponds to the rescaling of the Secular-Kemalist nation-state centered development trajectory to alternative forms of modernity, which are instituted by actors who became visible in the neoliberal times, and exhibited uneasy articulations and coexistences between economy and culture.

Periodizations of Neoliberalism vs Localities of Neoliberalism

According to Peck, while the neoliberal discourses and strategies that have been put into practice in different settings have certain similarities, "local institutional context clearly matters in the style, substance, origins and outcomes of reformist policies" (Peck, 2004). This means that neoliberalism manifests itself not in a single "pure" form, but neoliberal transitions take different forms and are characterized by series of institutionally mediated hybrids. As Graefe (2005) notes, we need to recognize the diversity within neoliberalism, which also includes a bottom-up understanding. Hence, there is a need to closely monitor local instances of neoliberalism and relate them to broader neoliberal discourses. In order to recognize local instances of neoliberalisms, the way in which neoliberalism manifests itself through myriad forms, such as the emergence of "roll-out" neoliberalism as opposed to "roll-back" neoliberalism, should be taken into account. As Peck and Tickell (2002) indicate, neoliberalism has in itself a capacity for discursive adjustment, policy learning and institutional reflexivity. Thus, unlike the roll-back phase, identified with a roll-back of the institutions and policies of the post-war welfare state, the roll-out stage envisages a different form of neoliberalism that is more socially interventionist and more inclusive in terms of compensating the "losers" for the earlier and more destructive phase of neoliberalism.

Here, scholars such as Craig and Cotterel (2007) raise critical questions in relation to the dynamics of the roll-back phase and problematize whether the most recent phase of transformation is in line with a neoliberal direction or are the things more contested? As they have asked, "to what extent, for example, can shifts towards neoconservatism, nationalism or poverty reduction development be considered moves away from neoliberalism, or in a Polanyian sense, a part of the embedding of neoliberalism in social formations?" (Craig and Cotterel 2007). This quotation underlines that the most recent

phase of neoliberalism, that is a counter-movement in Polanyian terms to the earlier deconstructive neoliberal moments, paving the way for more inclusive, social forms of neoliberalism could not only be conceptualized as a systemic reflex moderated by neoliberal minded actors, but also other social and political projects, ideologies, value-sets could be drivers of this phase.

While the “roll-back” and “roll-out” stages of neoliberalism bring certain insights, they are in a way generalizations, and unable to capture variation in policies and strategies in space or time (Graefe 2005). Especially when we consider developments in the countries of the “periphery”, we need more concrete and ‘micro’ analyses of neoliberalism to better understand the changing and transforming nature of neoliberalism - including terms such as “inclusive” and “social”. Therefore, understanding the variations within the neoliberal spread becomes a theoretical, empirical and methodological challenge. More specifically, the most critical aspect of this challenge is to diagnose the ways through which the roll-out phase witnesses the variations by looking at how different localities respond or experience the former ‘roll-back’ phase. It should also be noted that, the implementation of the neoliberal principles to developing countries through the ‘Washington Consensus’ executed through the World Bank and IMF promoted reforms in developed countries as trade liberalization encouraged national deregulation in the pursuit of competitiveness. Hence, the roll-back phase was more or less implied changes and transformations at the national level. Whereas, the roll-out phase did not include the nation-state as an actor with any potential to reembed the market into the society. Instead, increasing decentralization during the course of 1990s, and the increasing visibility and vitality of city-based actors, collective efforts that are conceived as the emergence of Anatolian Tigers, the responses to the roll-back phase have been characterized as local responses, creating local variations, local neoliberal projects that are imbued with communitarian values.

Emergence of Local Neoliberalisms

Apart from those studies which focus on the varieties of neoliberalism by looking at different temporalities within the neoliberalization process, as Larner (2003) notes, “in the accounts of neoliberalism, regardless of geographical and scalar diversity, not much attention is paid to the different variants of neoliberalism, to the hybrid nature of contemporary policies and programmes, or to the multiple and contradictory aspects of neoliberal spaces, techniques, and subjects.” The possibility of thinking about neoliberalism as involving processes that produce spaces, states, and subjects in multiple forms and accordingly generates “freedom”, “empowerment”, and “choice” has rarely been acknowledged and even more rarely theorized (Larner, 2003). The assumption that neoliberalism is best understood as a top-down impositional discourse leaves us powerless to explain why people (sometimes) act as neoliberal subjects, and as in the case of Anatolian cities, why they sometimes act in accordance with communitarian values and exhibit traditionalist or conservative values at the local scale. A top-down understanding of neoliberalism, which ignores the scalar dynamics and nature of the issue, would be a partial one. In a similar vein, neoliberalism should be understood as a process that creates a significant degree of cleavage for some by increasing their horizon of freedom and capacity to maneuver. We need to be more reflexive about the multi-

scalar nature of neoliberalism, which is a more complex and productive task than reducing the issue to a “global-local” interaction.

An analysis of the evolving geographies of neoliberalism at the city scale and an examination of the political economy, institutional dynamics and socio-spatial impacts of neoliberalism at this scale that refrains from relying on a global-local dichotomy represents an important contribution to this field of study. As Brenner and Theodore argue, although neoliberal projects take place in different and tangled scales, it is cities and regions in which the contradictions and tensions of actually or already existing neoliberalism are manifested. Again, cities become the venues on which these tensions and contradictions of neoliberalism are concretized and managed (or attempts at management of these tensions and contradictions are made).

As Mahon and Keil highlight, it is the urban scale that is “socially produced and reproduced through myriad, sometimes purposeful, sometimes erratic social, economic, political and cultural actions” (Mahon and Keil, 2006, 5). Social and political structures, once established at different scales, are constantly (re)produced and challenged by multiple actors. In this case, it is the “city” scale that is socially produced and reproduced through the actions of various actors at various scales. As such, neither globalization nor the re-scaling of the state can be seen as automatic responses to certain external factors. Instead, the rise of cities and regions as political-economic actors and their socially and culturally embedded nature must be understood as a matter of local economic development.

The increasing emphasis on the rise of cities and urban centers as the new spaces of the capitalist accumulation process (Brenner 2004) also takes into account the role of a variety of actors that collectively produce and reproduce urban spaces. Thus, the rise of cities and the way in which cities are perceived as the new engines of neoliberal capitalism, should be seen as a product of agency (Cabus 2001). Perhaps, the role of agency could be better perceived if we were to take into account a sense of neoliberalism not only as prescriptions and strategies imposed from “outside” or “above”, but also as a push from below. The cities that are included in this paper demonstrates how the crises of Keynesianism and the combined effects of the “historical bloc” marginalizing the cities of Anatolia gave way to a new space that is characterized by the efforts of urban actors and in turn produces local neoliberal projects. Therefore, questions such as “how decisions about cities’ social and economic futures are made, which actors or institutions or actors are empowered to make these decisions, in whose interests are central to this analysis” gain importance.

While the spaces and institutions of nation state fade away, certain cities and city regions are emerging as powerful nodes in sub-national and supra-national political economies (Scott 2001; Brenner 1998; Peck and Tickell 1999). At the same time, public and private and various forms of coalitions and decision making bodies are formed and they reshape the political and economical landscapes of cities (Cox and Mair 1988; McCann 2001).

The emerging collective capacities and efforts of the actors at the urban scale vis-à-vis the effects of neoliberal socio-spatial transformations must, however, be understood in contextually specific ways. The ways through which actors mobilize their interests and build organizational capacities are conditioned by the “path-dependent interaction of neoliberal programs with inherited institutional and social landscapes” (Brenner and Theodore, 344). Neoliberal sociospatial transformations can be understood as essential to post-welfarist states in that they significantly destabilize ‘inherited landscapes of urban governance and socioeconomic regulation’ (Brenner and Theodore 2002: 28), and emphasize sub-national competition between cities and city-regions for investment from mobile capital, which results in geographic differentiation and uneven geographic development (Peck 2002). It would be feasible to understand from this perspective the path-dependency of regulatory and spatial change in a context where neoliberal programs have been imposed on different regulatory landscapes inherited statist and import-substitution growth strategies. Moreover, by tracking inherited institutional landscapes, it becomes possible to understand variations among different localities (cities), meaning that these inherited spatial characteristics define the emerging articulations between neoliberalism and the social, economic and cultural institutions of localities.

Furthermore, in a context in which the importance of national policy-making is significantly challenged and post-national searches to find solutions to economic, social, political and environmental problems emerge, the urban scale becomes crucial in order to resolve tensions and conflicts and function as a spatial fix. This involves a struggle implicating more than one scale and stretching the boundaries of local governance towards national, regional and global scales. Understanding cases of local neoliberalizations entails a perspective that recognizes the scalar and network architectures in which they are embedded. In other words, new forms of urban socializations of production and reproduction have emerged, and their deviation from the orthodox neoliberal mindset conveys the idea that spaces of actually existing neoliberalism involve the coordination and cooperation of urban social and economic actors. The coordination and cooperation of these non-market actors are understood by as socialization processes (Gough 2002).

Contrary to the discursive representation of neoliberalism, the processes of deregulation and privatization do not end up replacing state capacity with market mechanisms, but instead, necessitate ways of managing and policing neoliberal market mechanisms. Given the fact that markets are neither self-regulating nor spontaneously occurring, how are local neoliberalisms able to build new relations between market, state and society? Referring to Cox and Mair (1988, 1989, 1991), Park (2005) maintains that social agents that are dependent on certain place specific socio-spatial relations or organizations for their activities or reproduction may organize growth coalitions to pursue certain regulatory activities that are aimed at the growth of the place they are attached to. They involve in these activities because they want to secure, reproduce or enhance the socio-spatial relations that they depend on by channeling wider flows of value into and through the place.

The examples referred in this paper map some of the ways through which these forms of socialization mentioned by Gough (2002), such as the formation of business

associations to build institutional capacity, the role of Chambers of Trade and Chambers of Industry, the role of strong urban leaders, and the role of certain families who help to formulate the urban identity, all correspond to the articulation of communitarian values and neoliberalism in cities. The collective efficiency forged by these actors internalizes neoliberal ideas and at the same time complements these ideas all the while ending up with certain interdependencies. These interdependencies portray articulations of neoliberal and socialized relations.

Neoliberalism and Communitarianism

Jessop offers a theoretical opening to approach and grasp the nature and dynamics of the aforementioned articulations that crystallize at the city scale. Similar to what Brenner and Theodore have put forward, he argues that despite the fact that neoliberal projects are “being pursued on many different and tangled scales, it is in cities and city regions that the various contradictions and tensions of ‘actually existing neoliberalism are expressed...” (2002). What needs to be emphasized, according to Jessop, is that, these contradictions and tensions, that materialized in cities experiencing a neoliberal turn, also involve the critical existence of supplementary strategies and policies. As previously noted, neoliberalism does not exist in a pure form, but coexists with elements of other discourses, strategies and organizational patterns (Jessop 2002: 453). These discourses, strategies and organizational forms can stem from a variety of sources.

According to Jessop, one of the key means (such as civil initiatives or community), through which neoliberalism links itself to unorthodox measures, could work as a compensatory or adjoining mechanism to offset the inadequacies of market mechanisms. Since cities are the major venues for the organization of these civil initiatives and communities, they become the spaces on which economic and social tensions are accumulated, and yet may be resolved.

Cities then, can be seen as the scale of re-embedding or re-regulating the market in response to the crisis tendencies of capitalism, an argument put forward by Polanyi as a critique of late 19th century liberalism. In the present case, during times of neoliberal capitalism, “roll-back” neoliberalism is counter-balanced by a neoliberal market society. Jessop identifies three kinds of coordination and modes of policymaking necessary so that neoliberal tendencies can be compensated: neostatism, neocorporatism and neocommunitarianism.¹ The commonality of all these coordination and modes of

¹ While neo-communitarianism in Jessop’s picture shows how markets and community can be articulated, and communitarian values can foster community development, empower citizens and community/religious groups, and prioritize social value, neostatism refers to the guidance of the market by the state. This guidance is based on the state’s deployment of its own economic resources. Hence, in three ways actually existing spaces of neoliberalism can be (re)produced (1) market and community; (2) state and market; and (3) state, unions and corporations. While these three approaches have different weights at different scales, the first one is of more relevance for present purposes.

policymaking is that, they all signify the importance of the spaces of actually existing (local) neoliberalisms, and their “path-dependent contexts, competing discourses, strategies and organizational paradigms”. Moreover, they all involve interdependencies among distinctive institutional actors - facilitators around which different mixes of institutional complementarities and alliances occur. These modes of coordination and organizational forms, especially the role of community, have for the purposes of this paper a special responsibility in re-embedding markets. The existence of these mechanisms show that in understanding the relationship between cities and neoliberalism, and the role and locus of cities as the scale on which neoliberal tensions, conflicts and negotiations, as well as collective efforts, a communitarian spirit and urban coalitions emerge, we need to better understand the formation and dynamics of the embedding/re-embedding mechanisms that are internalized and conditioned by urban actors.

Thus, the embeddedness of state actors, non-state actors, community-based actors, and urban leaders, is crucial to understand if we are to grasp how conditions of localities produce progressive development, how the messages of certain hegemonic projects are mediated in cities through economic, political and social practices and how cities are no longer seen as only the sites of accumulation of capital, but also “lived” spaces (Pendas 2002). Remembering that city space is a “lived” space and not only reproduced for the accumulation of capital or the establishment of privileged positions in the global market place, the forms of embeddedness indicate that along with the increasing focus of the cities on economic development, social consequences should be taken into account too. As Stoecker suggested, development strategies are more effective when they are part of a community organizing strategy (1997: 13). This has crucial implications for the urban level, on which the simultaneous goals of attaining competitiveness and sustaining social cohesion are materialized. Despite the dominance of national and international levels attempting to pursue a neoliberal regime shift, the way in which these efforts are projected at the urban scale may exhibit different tones and varieties of neocommunitarianism. The urban becomes the scale that makes certain coexistences possible, that are seemingly not likely to coexist, formal opposites such as (neo)liberalism and (neo)communitarianism, market mentality and social cohesion...Hence, cities as the spaces of actually existing neoliberalism are not only engines of economic growth, but also venues of socialized relations conditioned and blended with cultural values.

The re-embedding of neoliberalism in society, then, becomes concretized in the city, which makes it more acceptable and legitimates it both socially and politically. The re-embedding of neoliberalism generates, however, local neoliberalisms that have different characteristics. They are constituted and framed by different actors and different cultural codes. Different inherited institutional forms influence them all; hence they are path-dependent. What is emerging then, as the title of this paper suggests, are “the varieties of neoliberal communitarianism” that are experienced in the cities of Anatolia.

The increasing number of city-based business associations plays a key role as part of the emergence of local neoliberal projects. They provide a sense of socialization that helps orient other actors toward some common collective goals. They are definitely at odds with the assumptions of orthodox neoliberalism, such as individualism and the

mobility of capital. Formation of a collective business voice, along with strong urban leaders, civil initiatives with a sense of community, strong/traditional family owned enterprises, strong connections with chambers of commerce, industry and trade, historically established relations with the state and certain political parties, cultural codes of the city, and universities all play a vital role in the emergence of a socialization process that work as a re-embedding mechanism in the city and offers a neoliberal communitarian variety.

Anatolian “Tigers” in Perspective

In Turkey, the concept of the “Anatolian Tigers” has been a popular one since the beginning of 1990s and there are many reasons for the increasing popularity of this concept. Perhaps one of the most intriguing reasons is the conceptualization of this term relative to the economic development and potential exhibited by the “Tigers” as they have become crucial players in the Turkish political economy. This concept has been explored in a number of ways in the literature on the subject, including through the lens of “Islamic capital”, “economic development”, “Green Capital”, and entrepreneurs embracing “Calvinist values”. In this paper, the concept of the Anatolian Tigers is understood in the broader sense as the cities of Anatolia, including Kayseri, Gaziantep, Corum, Konya, Eskisehir, and Denizli, which have shown striking economic performances since the 1980s.

An interesting facet of these rising cities of Anatolia is the adaptability between communitarian values/mindsets in general, such as religion, traditions, and locality as social institutions; and neoliberalism, which has been the prevailing economic school of thought since the 1980s. The coexistence of capitalism and religion, and neoliberalism and communitarian values, as well as the ability to articulate the local with the global make the Anatolia region and cities interesting and worthy of further exploration. In the cities of Anatolia, business practices centered on SMEs are embedded in business and social/community networks that help them improve business practices, learn “best practices” from each other, learn new technologies and seek out new markets internationally. Therefore, without support from the state, actors in the cities of Anatolia have been able to benefit from the advantages of openness brought about by neoliberal reforms.

The above-mentioned vitality of social networking triggered a process of production for external markets, and hence a process of capital accumulation. The collective efficiency in relations of local actors that crystallized at the urban scale also helps these actors stay in tune with the steps needed to compete internationally. What is emerging in these Anatolian cities, to varying degrees, is a collective capacity in the form of urban coalitions that are mobilized through city identities. This paper is an attempt to set the stage to make a political economy-based analysis of Turkish capitalism by focusing on the urban actors generating these collective efficiencies and recognizing the ways in which they develop their own societal visions, discourses and strategies that are not purely economic, but embedded in an historical articulation of economy and culture.

In these Anatolian cities, the embeddedness of actors and institutions and the different modes of economic coordinating mechanisms do point, however, to the attainment of a competitive edge, especially as these cities become more integrated in the processes globalization. The same mélange of networks, markets and hierarchies also shows us that acquiring competitiveness is more than just about mobilizing interests and building a communal spirit to establish better economic strategies for global markets. These sub-national embeddedness mechanisms also create leverage in the national economy. In the last two years, when the Top 500 firms were announced in Turkey by a joint study of Fortis Bank and Ekonomist Magazine, at least 150 of those 500 were Anatolian companies. The increasing economic potential and vitality of the firms of Anatolia, the “periphery”, shows that unlike in earlier periods, the marginalized, mostly excluded and under-emphasized Anatolian capitalists, have become key drivers of Turkish capitalism. Nevertheless, this presents a partial picture in the sense that it was not only the companies included in this list, but also Anatolian capitalists in general who were looking to get organized and reach global markets through SMEs.

It should be noted that not every Anatolian city is successful in this ranking. For all the cities examined here, one of the key questions is how did the sociological nature of the Anatolian family, and firm structure and local-institutional assets of these communities respond to the challenges as well as opportunities brought about by the globalization and neoliberalization processes?

Aspects of locality and social life in Anatolian cities in this context make a difference because socially embedded economic relations influence the perception of entrepreneurship. Moreover, it is argued that life in Anatolian cities has an influence on the emergence of industrial clusters, an indicator of the possibility of co-existence between Islam and capitalism, and the presence of collective efficiency stemming from networks revitalized by social or kinship ties based on traditional family relations.

This study shows that localities, especially the identities centered around cities, play a crucial role in the development of SMEs, and when appropriate conditions in other scales, such as the removal of national scale barriers, then local actors can benefit from the embeddedness of economic relations, since this turns out to help in the achievement of “collective capacity” that is vital to competitiveness in international markets. The nature of embeddedness differs from one city to another, and as will be demonstrated in the case studies, each city benefits from a variety of (multiple) embedding mechanisms and sometimes combinations thereof. The common denominator remains that the locally embedded relationships provide collective efficiency for cities and help them to gain a competitive edge, both nationally and internationally. How they become competitive is a multifaceted process, but for each city in this study, the commonality is that they all benefit from cooperation and coordination between various economic and political actors within the city. The Chamber of Commerce, Chamber of Industry and Municipal Leaders, SIADs, and universities all play a key role in this regard. The critical question, however, focuses on the role of multiple embedding mechanisms through which these actors are able to act together and end up with collective capacity.

Collective capacity in all three cities was attained through the compatibility and interplay of local determinants of networking, as well as interscalar impacts and institutional arrangements, that help actors at the local scale to jump scale and broaden their horizons. In the cases of Kayseri, Gaziantep and Eskisehir, jumping scale corresponded to integrating in global markets, increasing export volumes and benefiting from the dynamism of the international markets in terms of learning, and research and development.

These three cases all have similarities and differences. In terms of similarities, they all reflect the co-existence of economic liberalism, laissez-faire capitalism and conservatism. Rational, but at the same time communitarian values operate. They are all alternative modernities. In some cases the presence of traditional values, well-established families, religious groups, and social-democratic traditions indicate that there are multiple forms of conservative embedding mechanisms, depending on the communal spirit, and leading to the social production and reproduction of urban spaces. The same spirit also plays a vital role in determining the nature of articulation between the global and the urban, which manifests itself at various scales. For instance, while bypassing the nation-state and increasing exports to the world market is one side of the story, attracting foreign capital to the cities is another.

All the cities experience their transformations with reference to globalization and neoliberalization. Neoliberal reforms and the process of globalization are seen as providing leverage in terms of entrepreneurial opportunities, enlarging their opportunity space through the possibility of exporting to foreign markets, technology transfer, and so on. In general, all three cities are positively oriented towards neoliberalization and globalization.

Secondly, they all have a positive outlook on Turkey's bid to join the EU, because they know that the 1996 Customs Union Agreement, and the increasing share of the European market in their exports indicate that Turkey's membership in the EU is crucial to their urban transformation – some cities have established linkages such as 'twin cities programs' that enable them to exchange certain policies especially in the realm of urban restructuring.

Thirdly, all three cities represent a transformation at the city scale, that is carried out by SMEs, well established family companies, who have been to a large extent excluded from the Kemalist modernization project and received low levels of state support. While these SMEs and family-owned companies internalize the globalization process and benefit from neoliberal reforms, unlike the Istanbul capitalists, they remain suspicious of the IMF, and the macro-stability programs put in place through the IMF.

Fourthly, all three cities have a perception of economic development intertwined with culture, meaning that they all portray forms of articulation between economy and culture. These articulations have different manifestations in different cities. The nature of this articulation depends on the inherited social and economic institutedness of the cities and the existence of embedding mechanisms in the city. The common denominator is the

existence of an embedding mechanism that creates the ground for the articulation of economy and culture.

In almost all rising Anatolian cities, entrepreneurial activism, that helps them achieve competitiveness, goes hand in hand with cohesion. While we live in an era in which conceiving of social welfare and competition, and economic development - entrepreneurialism and community at the national scale is out of context, these pairs could each co-exist at the city scale. All the cities emphasize long term development plans, instead of short-term calculations, and invest in research and development. Another crucial element is the way these cities have linked themselves to political power, in other words, the ruling political parties. They all have a consistent pattern in this regard. While Kayseri has always lined up with the party in power, meaning that the political tendency in Kayseri has mimicked the national domain, in Eskisehir it has been opposite.

In general, the cities of Anatolia have inherited different socio-spatial and economic institutions, cultural symbols, norms, and codes, but have transformed themselves with reference to the processes of globalization and neoliberalization, by increasing their opportunity zones and capacity maneuvers so that they could produce their own spaces that allowed them to sustain competitiveness and cohesion and articulate economy and culture. The inherited geographies and institutional infrastructures nevertheless did make a difference (Brenner 2002, 2004). In this paper, this situation is labeled as varieties of neoliberal communitarianism, since all the cities reflect the importance of communal networks and relationships that crystallize at the city level and help the city to achieve collective efficiency, provide social support to each other, and define themselves as a member of the community, rather than as self-interest maximizing individuals. The community in this context produces a very strong urban-identity, and contributing to the city, creating employment, and investing in the city, are seen virtuous.

Bibliography

- Birch, K. and Myknenko, V. (2009) 'Varieties of Neoliberalism? Restructuring large industrially dependent regions across Western and Eastern Europe', *Journal of Economic Geography*, 9.
- Brenner, N. and Theodore, N. (2002) *Spaces of Neoliberalism*, Blackwell Publishing: Malden.
- Brenner, N. (2004) *New State Spaces*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Cox, K. R. (2004) "Globalization and the politics of local and regional development: the question of convergence," *The Institute of British Geographers*, pp. 179-194.
- Cox, K.R. and Mair, A.J. (1988) 'Locality and community in the politics of local economic development', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 78, pp. 307-325.

- Craig, D. and Cotterel, G. (2007) 'Periodising Neoliberalism?' *Policy & Politics*, vol.35 no.3.
- Graefe, P. 'Roll-Out Neoliberalism and Social Economy' Paper Presented at the CPSA Conference, University of Western Ontario, 2005.
- Jessop, B. (2002) 'Liberalism, Neoliberalism and Urban Governance: A State-Theoretical Perspective', *Antipode*, 452-472.
- Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Hollingsworth and Boyer, J. R. (1997) *Contemporary Capitalism: The Embeddedness of Institutions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hess, M. (2004) "Spatial Relationships: Towards a Re-conceptualization of Embeddedness" *Progress in Human Geography*, 28.
- Keyman, E. F. "Globalization, Alternative modernities, and the political economy of Turkey", *Review of International Political Economy*, 12:1 February, 105-128.
- Keyman, E. F. and Öniş, Z. *Turkish Politics in a Changing World: Global Dynamics and Domestic Transformations*, Bilgi University Press : İstanbul , 2007.
- Knaus, G. (2005), "Islamic Calvinists: Change and Conservatism in Turkey." *ESIWEB Report*, available at <http://www.esiweb.org>
- Larner W, 2000, "Neo-liberalism: policy, ideology, governmentality" *Studies in Political Economy* 63 5-26.
- Kosebalaban, H (2007) 'The Rise of Anatolian Cities and the Failure of the Modernization Paradigm', *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies*, 16:3, 229 – 240.
- Peck, J. (1998) "Geographies of Governance: TECs and the Neoliberalisation of local interests." *Space and Polity* 2(1): 5-31.
- Peck, J., and Tickell, A. (2002). *Neoliberalizing Space*. *Antipode* 34: 380–404.
- Polanyi, K. (2001, 1957). *Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Swyngedouw, E. (1997) 'Neither global nor local glocalization' and the politics of scale , in: K. Cox (Ed.) *Spaces of Globalization*, pp. 137-166. New York: Guilford Press.
- Theodore, N., and Peck, J. (1999). *Welfare-to-workfare: National problems, local solutions?* *Critical Social Policy* 61: 485–510.
- Tunali, I. and Filiztekin, A. (2002) "Anatolian Tigers: Are They for Real?" *Koc University Working Paper*.

Weber, M. (2001) Protestant Ethic and the Sprit of Capitalism, introduction by A. Giddens (London: Routledge).