UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
Department of Political Science

ETHNIC – CIVIC DISTINCTION: DOES IT DISTINGUISH RADICAL RIGHT PARTY FAMILY?

The Cases of Sweden and Turkey

Abstract

What we have seen in today's political conjuncture in Europe is that radical right parties are applying to a civic discourse more and more everyday. The more they seem civic, the more they get legitimized in the sight of people. The more they get legitimized, the more they become successful in elections. However, despite a civic discourse, these parties continue their exclusionary agendas. Therefore, this study asks if ethno-nationalism, *in contrast to civic nationalism-,* is the distinguishing ideological trait of radical right party family. The main problematic of this study is if ethnic nationalism – civic nationalism distinction should be considered as a good analytical tool to distinguish radical right party family from other party families. In order to answer these questions, Sweden Democrats and Moderate Party from Sweden, and Nationalist Movement Party and Republican People's Party from Turkey were chosen to assess over a comparison. Radical right and non-radical right parties were identified according to party family methods and their party programs were interpreted and compared to find out the convergences in terms of nationalist appeals. The convergences of different party families that were found out both in civic and ethnic discourses pointed out the fact that ethnic – civic distinction might not be a sufficient tool to distinguish radical right party family.

Keywords: Ethnic – civic distinction, ethnic nationalism, civic nationalism, party family, radical right, Moderate Party (M), Nationalist Movement Party (MHP), Republican People's Party (CHP), Sweden Democrats (SD)

Table of Contents:

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Subject – Radical Right Party Family

"Zeitgeist" is a metaphorical term in political philosophy that is used to state the political tendency or culture dominating a political context in a particular period of time. The term that is claimed to be the zeitgeist of a particular period shapes general political climate and affects agents within that context. One can argue that the period between the end of 18th century and first half of 19th century characterized by revolutions worldwide. Therefore, the "spirit" of the era, or the zeitgeist, could be named as revolutions for this period. Or it can be argued that the zeitgeist of the period between 1930 and 1945 is comprised of fascism and authoritarianism.

Some scholars claim that the main political climate of recent decades in liberal democracies has been shaped by a "civic zeitgeist" (Halikiopoulou et al., 2012) while other scholars name the dominant spirit as "populist zeitgeist" (Mudde, 2004). The ones named it civic zeitgeist implied that the main values of current liberal democracies are tolerance, diversity, civil rights, minority rights etc. On the other hand, the ones named it populist zeitgeist implied that the main ideology or strategy of parties in current liberal democracies is populism. Both sides, which depicted the core characteristic of modern democracies in different ways, problematized one common phenomenon in regard to content of the spirit of the era: "Radical right parties".

Radical right is a rising phenomenon in modern day politics in Europe. Along with the rise of radical right, issues like nationalism, xenophobia, racism, anti-semitism, Islamophobia, Christianophobia and exclusion are dominating political agenda more and more every day. There is a common perception that the radical right parties apply to radical, exclusionary discourse that is based on ethnic nationalism or racism so that they are cognate with the extreme right of 1930s. However, when we look at the arguments of parties regarded as radical right, we mostly see that they renounce racist or fascist heritage. This argument is twofold. On the one hand, it can be insincerity. The ones which still embrace the heritage had to obfuscate this opinion even though they still embrace it due to the fact that such a heritage is not welcome and mostly not regarded as legitimate in the political culture of today's world. On the other hand, renouncement of racism indicates a real fact. Most of the contemporary radical right parties denounce fascism, racism and superiority arguments based on biological reasons.

I argue, however, the fact that they denounce fascist heritage, racist claims and embrace mainstream liberal values might not prevent these parties to be as exclusionary as an old extreme right party is.

1.2. Contribution of the Study

It has been widely considered that the ideology of far right parties is exclusionary by nature. Therefore, ethnic nationalism, which is considered as the exclusionary one in contrast to civic nationalism, is regarded as the core element of far right party ideology. Due to this reason and a heavy emphasis on exclusionary discourse, these parties' legitimacy has always been at stake. Therefore, the more they emphasized on ethnic factors such as race, blood and creed, the more they got marginalized in the sight of people. On the other hand, the ideological element in terms of national identity in parties that are closer to center –*left or right*- considered to be based on civic elements. Roughly speaking, ethnic exclusionism has been considered as the core ideological element which distinguishes far right party family from other party families. Such an approach resulted in the idea that civic nationalist discourse and ethnic nationalist discourse correspond to the distinction between liberal and illiberal party families.

What Halikiopoulou et al.(2013) observed is that the radical right parties that have become successful in elections and even took part in governments are the ones which apply to civic nationalist discourse rather than ethnic nationalist discourse. However, this has not prevented them to maintain an exclusionary agenda at the same time. Therefore Halikiopolou et al.(2013, p.112) claim that what radical right parties do is to frame "ethnic values – which can be perceived as violent, irrational and hence anti-systemic – in civic terms, which are perceived as inclusive, tolerant and democratic". Thus, such a trick made them to be perceived as mainstream, civic, liberal and legitimate instead of radical, ethnic, illiberal and illegitimate. However, Halikiopolou et al. (Ibid, 125) concludes that "construction of a civic-type identity does not 'shelter' a country from radical right presence. On the contrary, 'civicness', if effectively appropriated, may account for radical right party success".

In their study, Halikiopolou et al. revealed concretely the strategic "tricks" radical right parties made to be perceived as civic while they maintain their exclusionary agenda. They focused on the successful appropriation of the civic nationalist discourse of the Swiss

SVP and Dutch LPF and PVV in their exclusionary policies. They compared these parties to the French Front National, British National Party and National Democratic Party of Germany to show that the ones which "effectively deploy the symbolic resources of national identity through a predominantly voluntaristic prism tend to be the ones that fare better within their respective political systems". (Ibid, p.107)

My purpose in this study is not to reveal such tricks over other examples to show other radical right parties which are becoming popular. Rather, my purpose is related to a more theoretical level. Despite the fact that civic-ethnic distinction is an important analytical tool that can be used for many reasons, it might not be a sufficient tool to distinguish radical right party family in my opinion. To be frank, the common view that radical right parties being ethnic nationalist and non-radical right parties being civic might not be an accurate distinction. As Halikiopolou et al. showed, due to electoral success, there is a growing trend to be/to look civic among the parties that are considered within the radical right party family. However, this fact does not detain us to perceive them within radical right party family.

This study aims to contribute to the fields of party family studies and theories of nationalism by filling two gaps. Firstly, I will check if there are convergences between radical right party family and non-radical party families in terms of their nationalist appeal which is supposed to be the distinguishing criterion of radical right party family from other party families. If the prediction that radical right wing party family and other party families converge on nationalist discourses is true, then it will be revealed that ethnic-civic distinction of nationalist discourse, which was considered as an ideological trait that separates non-radical right party families from radical right party family, might not be a sufficient tool to use in determining party families. Secondly, my study will focus on Sweden and Turkey. Four parties will be assessed: Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) and Republican People's Party (CHP) from Turkey; Sweden Democrats (SD) and Moderate Party (M) from Sweden. In this sense, it aims to expand the field empirically in due subject.

At this point, it should be further explained why I chose two different countries and why I compare radical right party family with different party families. First of all, Sweden and Turkey can be considered as contrasting cases. Sweden is a developed country with its high GDP per capita, industrial and sophisticated capitalist economy, high urban population, well-established liberal democracy and civic values. In addition to that, radical right debate in Sweden is roughly made over "immigrant issue". Turkey, on the other hand, is considered as

a developing country with its growing economy, comparatively average GDP per capita, high amount of social cleavages and a developing liberal democracy and civic values. In contrast to Sweden, radical right debate is roughly made over "indigenous" groups such as Kurds since the country does not have a massive immigrant population. By analyzing two contrast cases, I will assess if the theory, convergences of different party families on nationalist discourse, works in different political conjunctures. In addition to that, whatever the outcome is, different contexts are expected to propose a broader perspective about the subject. Despite these advantages of two contrasting cases, it is necessary to make an intra-country assessment. The reason is that radical positioning of a party is only "relative" to some other parties in the same country. In this sense, non-radical right parties chosen in this study are expected to represent the political center/median voter of "only" that particular country which can be compared to radical right. Two parties that represent non-radical party families CHP and M are generally considered as center-left and center-right respectively. In this sense, two different party families will be compared to radical right party family.

In order to fulfill the tasks, this study aims to bridge two literatures mainly: "Radical right party family" and "theories of nationalism". In the theory part, previous research on these literatures will be revealed elaborately.

2. THEORY

2.1. Radical Right Party Family

The study of party family and radical right is a challenging one since grouping, sub-grouping or ungrouping parties are a difficult job that should be done rigorously. First of all, there are so many concepts that have been used to define the topic that I called "radical right" so far. Extreme right, far right, radical right, right, radical right-wing populism, right-wing populism, national populism, new populism, neo-populism, exclusionary populism, xenophobic populism, populist nationalism, ethno-nationalism, anti-immigrant, nativism, racism, racist extremism, fascism, neo-fascism, postfascism, reactionary tribalism, integralism and anti-partyism are the concepts that Mudde (2007) was able to collect among the studies he examined. Therefore, I find it primary to make a conceptual discussion in order to clarify the question which parties are taken as what in this study. Besides, such a discussion is necessary since the empirical part of this study is comprised of parties from very different contexts. To

be more precise, for instance, immigration –*not migration*- is not a developed policy issue for radical right parties in Turkey while it is a core issue for radical right parties in Sweden. Therefore, in order to reveal in what ways these parties from different contexts can be studied together and in what ways they cannot be, a discussion of concepts of the topic is necessary.

Secondly, a discussion of how the parties that are being examined should be chosen is also an important question. When radical right, issues of nationalism and exclusion are being problematized, it becomes difficult to see parties identifying themselves with these labels.

2.1.1. Which Concept?

"Right"

The left-right political spectrum has been one of the most popular models of classifying parties and ideologies. According to Bobbio (1996), the main difference between left and right is their perception of equality. Left wing, from a Rousseauan perspective, considers most of the inequalities as "social", hence eradicable. On the other hand, right wing, from a Nietzschean perspective, considers most of the inequalities as natural and ineradicable. Therefore, the struggle between left and right on moving towards further egalitarianism or less egalitarianism is the core of this distinction. However, the problem with Bobbio's broad definition is that it is too abstract to be operationalized in party family studies since it includes many issues ranging from gender equality to economic equalities between social classes.

Albright (2010) claims that the ability to summarize the party behavior in uni-dimensional assumptions, i.e. left-right dimension, is diminishing due to the increasing number of issues parties have to deal with. He claims left-right dimension could not capture positions on questions related to regionalism, nationalism and ethnicity in 20th century. Similarly, Bornschier (2010) criticizes scholars who cannot distinguish between positions on the economic and the cultural axes for using a single left-right dimension. For instance, one party can be classified as left wing due to its economic agenda, i.e. pro-state involvement in economy for egalitarian reasons; and as right wing for its agenda in cultural issues, i.e. strong emphasis on "duties" of woman in family.

Since an imprecise left-right distinction would only further complicate the analysis, I will clarify how this study deals with this distinction. Left-right distinction can be considered

in terms of socio-economic politics, i.e. degree of state involvement in economy. Left fringe represents ultimate state-run economy, i.e. economic socialism; right fringe represents ultimate market-run economy, i.e. economic liberalism. Left-right distinction can also be considered in terms of socio-cultural politics, i.e. issues of family values, abortion, gender equality, minority rights. Left fringe represents libertarianism and right fringe represents authoritarianism. (Rydgren, 2007)

The positions of radical right parties in economic left-right axis are very diverse. While Austrian FPÖ is more state-interventionist, the French Front National changes frequently its position on economic axis in terms of redistribution policies. (Bornschier, 2010) Therefore, the term "right" in "radical right party family" taken in this study refers to the "socio-cultural" connotation of the word since what makes them "radical" is their radical positioning on the right fringe of this axis.

The reason why these parties are on the right fringe of the axis is their "ideological core" that is shaped by a radical understanding of nationalism, namely "nativism". (Mudde, 2007, p.17) The content of this nativism in practice is comprised of a rejection of individual and social equality, opposition to the integration of marginalized groups and xenophobic appeals. (Art, 2011, p.11) Ethno-nationalism is rather popular term to signify this common denominator core.

"Radical"

Art (2011) uses "far right" term as an umbrella term for any party that differentiates itself from "mainstream right". The term, for instance, can be used when the difference between mainstream right and far right is mentioned. However, the term radical also corresponds to the same meaning.

The term "extreme", i.e. extreme right, is mostly used in literature to depict the "anti-system" parties and movements (Ignazi, 2003) which are hostile to main institutions of democracy and even having a tendency for violence or terrorist attacks. Extreme right concept in this study refers to parties and groups that tend to go beyond "legal boundaries" of democratic politics. (c.f Norris, 2005) Extreme right parties, as in the example of Nazis, can be identified with a perception that disdains democracy, democratic constitution and liberal

institutions of rule of law and civil rights. (Bornshier, 2003) They can be contrasted in this sense to "moderate" parties. (Bobbio, 1996)

One should notice the difference between extreme right and populist radical right parties at this point. Even though the populist radical right parties today would be skeptical or even hostile to the "liberal" component of liberal democracy, they are different than extreme right parties since they accept democracy as a core institution of today's politics. (Bornschier, 2010) Their difference from mainstream parties can be found in the way they appeal democracy, i.e. preferring referenda to encourage clear yes or no answers for solving political questions. Such an understanding of democracy perceives democracy as "majoritarianism" that can be contrasted to "deliberativism" in which compromise is enhanced. Nevertheless, having such a perception of democracy still keeps them among the parties which accept the "democratic game". (Rydgren, 2007)

"Populist"

The term far right evokes populism in most people. The reason is populism is a very popular word used in radical right party studies today and it is sometimes used interchangeable with the term radical right. Therefore it deserves an attention here to clarify the relation between populism and radical right.

Populism was primarily used to point at a particular political "style" or "strategy" that parties use in order to attract voters. (Mudde, 2002) Frequently it is almost equated to an agitative propagandism. However, Mudde (2004, 2007) perceives it as a "thin-centred ideology" that can combine with other ideologies. This ideology considers society as antagonistically divided between "pure people" and "corrupt elite". In this distinction, populism argues that politics should be an expression of general will of people, which is what I call majoritarianism, rather than elites.

Mudde (2004) argues that the political climate of today's liberal democracies is shaped by a "populist zeitgeist". This argument is shared by other scholars as well mostly because of the electoral success and rise of the "new" radical right. The recent electoral success is due to successful appeal to populism which became the defining characteristic of new radical right parties. However, even though populism is becoming popular among radical right parties in contemporary politics, not every radical right party has necessarily populist appeals.

Therefore, I will choose not to limit my definition of radical right to this term and perceive populist radical right parties as a subgroup of radical right parties. In addition to this stance, as Art (2011) argues, such a bifurcation of society, i.e. pure people vs. corrupt elite, is already a critique of parliamentary democracy and should be taken within the radical nature of these parties. Therefore, even if Art's argument is the sound one, it is still radical right term which would comprise the term populist.

2.2. Nationalism

Radical right literature is the first line this study aims to assess as mentioned above. The second line that I aim to bridge with this party family literature is comprised of "theories of nationalism". National identity perceptions and nationalist appeals of parties as an ideological trait that is expected to be one of the divergences of radical right party family from other party families will be problematized in this study. In broad terms, "ethnic nationalism" as the radical understanding of nationalism is considered to be the common denominator of parties in radical right party family. Therefore, ethnic nationalism vs. civic nationalism, as being one of the most common analytical divisions in theory of nationalism literature, will be discussed in this part.

2.2.1. Civic Nationalism vs. Ethnic Nationalism

Nationalism in everyday language is considered with two connotations roughly, one being positive and one being negative. Positive connotation is considered in relation to "democracy, self-determination, political legitimacy, social integration, civil religion, solidarity, dignity, identity, cultural survival, citizenship, patriotism, and liberation from alien rule" while negative connotation is considered in relation to "militarism, war, irrationalism, chauvinism, intolerance, homogenization, forced assimilation, authoritarianism, parochialism, xenophobia, ethnocentrism, ethnic cleansing, even genocide". (Brubaker, 2004, p.132)

Such two-sided understanding of nationalism is cognate with two ideal types of nationalism in today's liberal-democratic public opinion: "civic" or "political" nationalism as being the positive one and "ethnic" or "cultural" nationalism as being the negative one. These two types of nationalism have two different perceptions of "national identity". As Calhoun

(1997, p.89) puts it for civic type, "national identity is understood to be something established by legitimate membership in a constituted political state; members of the nation are understood first and foremost through their political identities as citizens". For ethnic type, on the other hand, "national identity is defined on the basis of some cultural or ethnic criteria distinct from, and arguably prior to, political citizenship."

Civic perception of national identity is characterized as "liberal, voluntarist, universalist, and inclusive" while ethnic perception of national identity is characterized as "illiberal, ascriptive, particularist, and exclusive" (Brubaker, 2004 p.133). Therefore, in the era of what Halikiopoulou et al. (2012) calls "civic zeitgeist", civic national identity is the type that dominates over liberal democracies. Yet, one point should be further clarified here. Even though the civic perception of national identity is defined with such positive terms, it is not inclusive or universalist in the strictest sense of the word. First of all, even in the most paradigmatic cases of civic definition of national identity such as France or USA, a cultural component for the definition of identity is involved. Therefore, it can be claimed that "a purely a-cultural understanding of nationhood has never been widely held." (Brubaker, 2004, p.137) Secondly, the very notion of "citizenship" is already exclusionary to some extent in a broad perspective regardless of its inclusion of ethnic/cultural components. On a global scale, nation-states that are based on citizenship comprise a major social closure. In this sense, people who would possibly flee from their countries to prosperous parts of the world due to suffering from war, hunger, environmental problems, diseases and death risk etc. in their countries cannot do so since borders of nation-states are only open to certain people called "citizens". Considering on a global scale, Brubaker (Ibid, p.141) claims that exclusion based on civic identity, –*citizenship*-, is far more effective than any kind of exclusion based on ethnic identity.

Such a discussion, if exclusion based on citizenship of civic nationalism is more exclusionary than exclusion based on ethnic nationalism, is a sound one. However, this discussion should be made over a global scale and problematize the whole "international system of nation-states". Therefore, it is not within the scope of this study. The scope of this study is within single "nation-states". More precisely, the perception mentioned above, *civic national identity is liberal, voluntarist, universalist and inclusive* in comparison to ethnic-based national identity that is *illiberal, ascriptive, particularist, and exclusive*, should be considered in regard to politics within single nation-states.

3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Thus far I discussed two literatures that I wanted to bridge in order to put my research questions. These two literatures I discussed were "radical right party family" and "theories of nationalism". It is accurate to sum up the discussion of these two literatures to bridge them in the research questions clearly.

The discussion of radical right party family helped me to "clean out the way" before anything else. I discussed meanings, approaches and definitions in a field where there are too many concepts which results in constant confusion. In this way, I made it clear what I call radical right and why I take this term –*let's say, rather than populist right*-. Secondly, the discussion of radical right revealed one common denominator of this party family: Ethnic nationalism. Their exclusionary agenda is associated with the perception that they have an ethno-nationalist agenda which is the reason of their exclusion.

Second literature I discussed was theories of nationalism. In this discussion, I revealed one of the most popular distinctions in the literature: ethnic nationalism - civic nationalism distinction. I put their main features and expressed my appropriation of them since the distinction is rather an abstraction.

In the light of the theoretical discussion, the questions that I will try to answer in this study are:

1. Is ethnic nationalism/ethnic perception of national identity a distinguishing ideological trait of radical right party family?

2. Does radical right party family converge with non-radical right party families on ethnic or civic nationalist discourses?

3. Is ethnic nationalism - civic nationalism distinction an effective analytical tool to distinguish radical right party family from other party families?

4. METHOD

4.1. Party Family

Four major methods addressed in the study of Mair & Mudde (1998) to identify party families. Each of the methods has some strengths and weaknesses. In this part, contents and problems of these methods will be assessed.

The first method Mair and Mudde (1998) identified is "genetic origin" or "historical development". This method is a sociological explanation of party families that are categorized on the basis of social cleavages in society. Accordingly, parties that emerged in similar historical circumstances and/or parties intending to represent interests of similar social groups (Ibid, 215) are grouped together. In the classic study of Lipset & Rokkan(1990), four primary cleavage structures identified to grasp party systems in Europe. These cleavages are "subject vs. dominant culture" and "churches vs. government" as the products of "National Revolution"; "primary vs. secondary economy" and "workers vs. employers" as the products of "Industrial Revolution". In line with these cleavage divisions, Von Beyme identified ten different party families: liberals, conservatives, worker parties, agrarian parties, regional parties, Christian parties, communist parties, fascist parties, protest parties, and ecological movements. (Mair & Mudde, 1998, p.215) Sociological reason and historical explanation is one of the most comprehensive methods to understand party systems and party families in general terms. In this sense, this method should be included in a party family research. However, it has some weaknesses too. Firstly, the method could limit a research geographically. Since the countries which have similar historical cleavages are the ones that had similar modernization processes in similar time periods, many parties outside this context could be excluded. For instance, one could argue that the cleavage between workers and employers may reflect the historical situation in Western Europe but exclude most of the Eastern Europe including ex-communist countries or Turkey. Secondly, parties grouped in same category due to the fact that once they represented same social groups of a certain cleavage might change their ideologies, discourses and strategies in time in order to maximize their votes in different contexts of competitive party systems.

Second method is to identify a party's family in regard to its "membership to transnational organizations". It is a very straightforward and easy method to apply. Besides, it pays attention to party's self-identification. In this sense, it excludes possible biases of researcher. However, the method has some major weaknesses. First and foremost, not all parties are members of transnational federations. Therefore, this method, used alone, can be insufficient to identify party families in a broad sense. Secondly, some parties are members of different federations at the same level which makes it difficult to decide which federation

should be taken as basis of categorization. Thirdly, parties may change their memberships from one international organization to another one due to a change in party ideology or some other strategic reasons. In addition to these, parties that could be considered as radical right might want to obfuscate their ideology in order not to seen illegitimate in the context of their countries so that they might prefer not to be a member of the transnational organizations that they would feel close to.

Third method is to group parties according to the "name" they take. This method, similar to the membership to transnational organizations method, is a very easy and straightforward one that pays attention to party's self-identification with ideologies. However, this method also has some problems. First of all, there are parties from different countries that embraced same names such as "social democratic" with claims of representing same social groups of same cleavages, i.e. "Swedish Social Democratic Party" and "Social Democratic Party of Austria". However, parties from some other countries which have the same claim to represent the same social bloc might have taken different names, i.e. "Spanish Socialist Workers' Party" or "Labour Party" of Norway. This example shows that not all parties that mostly placed in "centre-left" party family have the same name. Secondly, names like "liberal" could be embraced by parties that were emerged out of different sociological and historical circumstances. Similarly, parties emerged out of same cleavages with same names can go towards different ideological directions in time. Thirdly, there are parties whose names are not relevant to any ideological stance such as "The Pim Fortuyn List" in the Netherlands or "The Five Star Movement" Party in Italy. Due to these reasons, "name" method, *per se,* is not a sufficient method to identify party positions even though it can be a crucial auxiliary method due to reflecting party's self-identification.

Fourth method, which is expected to be the core method of this study, is the assessment of "policy and ideology". Accordingly, expert judgments, mass survey data and party literature are the major sources that can be used in order to determine party positions in regard to party families. This comprehensive method has many advantages. First of all, the method takes account of "self-perception" and self-statements of parties. Documents like bylaws, programs, manifests, election bulletins, legislative activities, speeches of party members of competent body etc. can be assessed to grasp how parties present themselves. Secondly, these party documents as well as other communicative events, conversations or speeches can be analyzed as an "external perception" of parties.

4.2. A Framework for This Study

In order to answer the question if radical right party family converge with non-radical right party family in terms of ethnic-civic nationalist discourses, firstly the party families of the four parties should be assessed. There are four basic methods to do that as discussed in the previous part. Mair & Mudde (1998, p.226) argued that all these methods or a combination of these can be used together for a more comprehensive outcome. They personally recommend "genetic origin" and "ideology and policy" to be used together. Another prominent scholar in the field, Von Beyme, prefers to combine "name" and "policy and ideology" method to group parties. (Bruter & Harrison, 2011, p.29) Therefore, in this study, I prefer to use a combination of these methods to be able to reveal a comprehensive perspective about party families of the parties being assessed here.

Transnational organization and history methods will be used in the analysis part besides the policy and ideology method. However, these two methods are expected to be able to mostly answer the question which party belongs to which party family. Therefore, since I particularly assess if ethnic-civic distinction has a role in the distinction of radical right party family from other party families, I will rather need "policy and ideology" method. This is the only method to classify parties according to ideological traits; note that nationalism is the ideological trait radical right party family is analyzed. Among the expert judgments, mass survey data and party literature options of this method, only party literature will be used in this study. The party literatures that I will use for my comparison are parties' recent party programs.

All in all, my core level analysis to answer the research questions will be party literature while transnational membership and historical development will rather comprise auxiliary-complementary level.

First of all, I believe the outcomes of auxiliary-complementary methods might also propose some information about party positions in relation to nationalism.

Secondly and more importantly, this auxiliary-complementary level is expected to reveal the control group for comparison. According to ideology and policy method, to have the same ideological traits is the criteria to group parties. In this sense, if my expectation-*there are convergences between radical right party family and non-radical right party family*

in terms of nationalism (ethnic-civic) - is true, then one should classify all the parties under radical right party family according to ideology and policy method. However, other methods might show that such a classification according to ideology and policy method is wrong if they reveal the parties assessed belong to different party families. By means of this control group, the overarching research question of this thesis - *is ethnic nationalism-civic nationalism distinction an effective analytical tool to distinguish radical right party family from other party families?* -can be answered.

Table 1 shows a summary of party family assessment that will be applied to MHP, CHP, SD, and M respectively.

Table 1: Party Family	
Auxiliary-Complementary Level	**Content**
Membership of Transnational Organization	Transnational organizations and their ideological positioning.
Historical Development (genetic origin)	Main cornerstones and shifts in party history in relation to represented social/political base and ideology.
Core Level	**Content**
Policy and Ideology	Ethnic-Civic nationalism in party programs (see table 2 below.)

Ethnic-civic nationalist discourse as the ideological trait that is considered to distinguish radical right party family will be analyzed in regard to some certain content. Table 2 offers this content that will be applied to the parties.

Table 2: Ethnic-Civic Nationalism	
Ethnic Nationalist Discourse	**Civic Nationalist Discourse**
Citizenship is defined on ascriptive ties such as ethnical, racial, cultural attachment.	Citizenship is defined on voluntary ties such as political, judicial, territorial, occupational attachment.
Historical references to achievements of race/ ethnicity.	Historical references to achievements of political system/ political values.

Emphasis in Various Issues on ethnicity/ race/ culture/ religion/ traditions etc.	Emphasis in Various Issues on "national" institutions such as politics/ judiciary/ democracy/ liberalism/ welfare/ solidarity/ civil religion/ laicite/ army/ economy etc.

5. ANALYSIS

5.1. Nationalist Movement Party (MHP)

5.1.1. MHP - Membership of Transnational Organization

MHP does not have any membership to transnational organization that could help us to assess its party position in regard to this method.

5.1.2. MHP - Historical Development

Turkey has been governed under single-party rule until 1946 when the first multi-party elections held. Therefore, during the "fascist zeitgeist" of 1930s and the first half of 1940s in the world, Turkey was under the rule of the founder party CHP. Due to this single-party rule, an autonomous fascist movement –like other ideological movements- did not develop. For this reason, fascist tendencies and pro-Nazi developments in the fascist zeitgeist in Turkey can be assessed in regard to the ruling party CHP's politics and mostly in regard to 2nd World War period. Turkey's main strategy in the 2nd World War was to stay out of the conflict. For this reason, president İsmet İnönü, the ultimate holder of power as the "National Leader" -Milli Şef-, always followed a balance policy among the bigger powers to keep Turkey out of the conflict. Therefore, he applied to a pragmatic strategy for which Turkey found close ties to different sides of the war in accordance with the developments in the war. When Germany seemed to be defeating the Allies, there was a resurgence of pan-Turkist propaganda. A pan Turkish committee was founded in 1941 and some pan-Turkists were taken into the cabinet. However, in 1944, the pan-Turkists and Nazi sympathizers were suppressed. (Zurcher, 2004, p.203-5)

Due to such genuine position of the country, an evident fascist movement or party did not develop in Turkey that could be assessed in comparison with the rise of classic fascist parties. Therefore, a grouping of radical right parties in regard to this first wave of fascism

does not include Turkey. However, an assessment of radical right party family in regard to historical development method is possible for the post-war period when Turkey made its transition from single-party rule to multi-party representative democracy in 1946.

As Hobsbawm(1995, p.282) put it, post-war consensus between Right and Left in most "Western" countries is based on elimination of fascist right by the 2nd World War and the communist left by the Cold War. Therefore, even though the 2nd World War resulted in the implementation of "denazification" policies in the Western bloc, one ideological element of fascism was not given up due to "USSR threat": "Anti-communism". Therefore, anti-communism was the strong ideological impetus in non-communist bloc around which post-war fascistic movements and parties could flourish.

Republican Villagers Nation Party (CMKP) in Turkey was founded in 1948 in such a conjuncture with the involvement of a series of small pro-fascistic parties and associations. (Bora & Can, 2004, p.53) It remained as an unremarkable party in Turkish political scene until Alparslan Türkeş, a defendant of the 1944 racism-Panturkism lawsuit an ex-colonel participated in 1960 coup d'etat and-, joined the party in 1965 and captured the leadership of the party same year. In the congress held in 1967, the party adopted "Nine Lights" –*Dokuz Işık*- doctrine and Türkeş was announced as "the leader" -*Başbuğ*- (*Compare it with the terms Führer and Il Duce*). Aftermath of a four years restoration period, party changed its name to Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) and adopted a new party bylaws in 1969. In sum, containing intelligentsia of racist-Panturkist line, comprising fascistic ideological impetuses and a fascistic social base, MHP emerged as a fascist strand in Turkish politics which owns its popularization to its main policy anti-communism in the post-war conjuncture where Turkey was an ally of USA in the USSR borders. (Ibid, p.52-4)

The fascistic tone composed of an anti-communist and pan-Turkist line declined in MHP movement towards the end of 1980s. This decline was further consolidated with the weakening of the USSR which meant the decline of "communist threat". However, two simultaneous developments followed this period resulted in the rise of a period that can be called "re-Turkism". One of them is the emergence of Turkic republics in central Asia aftermath of the dissolution of USSR. And the second one is the rise of Kurdish question and of PKK - the Kurdish armed organization. (Bora, 2005, p.77&88) Among these, Kurdish question has shaped the ideological area of interest of MHP since 1990s.

5.1.3. MHP - Party Program

<u>*Perception of the Nation/National Identity*</u>

MHP's definitions of nationalism and its perception of nation/national identity have elements from both civic and ethnic nationalism.

"*Nationalism… is the collection of ideas and sensibilities which aims to develop the sense of belonging to the Turkish Nation and taking its exclusive qualities as a fundamental reference in interpreting the world and the developments. Among the elements of the Nationalist thought system, the notions of national identity, national language, national culture, national sovereignty, national state and solidarity are very important… In a global scale, our nationalism proposes the equality and collaboration of the nations; and regards the existence and development of global justice indispensable. It is also our understanding of nationalism and humanism which makes us to contribute to the globalization process to include more moral and humane values by supporting the culture of compromising in political and social areas. We accept the existence, dialogue and collaboration of nations as one of the prerequisites for humanism and global harmony.*"(MHP party program, p.12)

The concepts "*national language*" and "*national culture*" belong to MHP's ethnic perception while "*national sovereignty*", "*national state*" and "*solidarity*" are elements from civic discourse. Overall, the emphasis on civicness is notable. MHP uses nation interchangeably with state in the expression of "collaborations of nations", hence it signifies the political side of it. The fact that MHP program puts an emphasis on global collaboration, globalization and the spread of moral and humane values etc. shows that MHP's civic discourse in its definition of nationalism overweighs ethnic emphases.

In some other part MHP explains the content of its nationalist appeal. Here, too, civic emphasis is obvious while ethnic emphasis, if any, is implicit:

There lies an understanding of Turkish Nationalism that appeals to Turkish people with national, spiritual and human references. The values such as human rights and liberties, rule of law and justice are the fundamental steps of Turkish Nationalism as well as the basic references of The Nationalist Movement Party. (Ibid, p.9)

Even though the references to the notions of "national", "spiritual" and "human" might imply an ethnic understanding of Turkish people, this part is rather ambiguous. On the other

hand, notions of "human rights and liberties", "rule of law" and "justice" are the civic elements MHP puts forward in its understanding of Turkish Nationalism.

"Moralism" is also one of the principles MHP puts forward for its envisioned Turkish identity:

"Moralism" which aims at preserving and transferring the highly qualified character of the Turkish Nation to the next generations, and is based on love, tolerance and justice in human relations…" (Ibid, p.10)

The discourse of "highly qualified character of the Turkish nation" is ambiguous here. However, the notions love, tolerance and justice in human relations are concepts that reflect a civic understanding.

Besides nationalism, the program also has a definition for "nation":

"Our party considers the nation as a social wholeness that manifests the common will and desire to live together on a ground provided by a common historical background carries the sense of sharing a common destiny and future ideals and believes to have specific qualities and identity in the League of Nations." (Ibid, p.11)

The notions of "common will" and "desire to live together" are terms to point out political attachment to a certain political entity, hence can be considered within civic discourse. Even though the terms "common destiny" and "future ideals" are ambiguous here, one can argue that they are not ethnic-based beliefs but might rather imply shared political history and future political ideals. Besides, making a reference to the League of Nations also points out the political side of the nation.

The part where MHP indicates its vision of education to raise desired future generations also a good reference to its envisioned national identity:

"The main purpose of our education policy is to raise generations who have proud and consciousness of belonging to Turkish Nation and internalize and digest spiritual and cultural values, whose thinking, perception and problem solving ability are developed and who are open to new developments, whose sense of responsibility and social sensitivity are high, who are inclined to science and technology production as well as democrat, intelligent and religious." (Ibid, p.51)

The emphases on so called "spiritual and cultural values" and being "religious" imply the ethnic character of envisioned Turkish identity. On the other hand, being democrat, being inclined to science and technology production implies the civic character of envisioned Turkish identity.

Historical References

Civic, ethnic and even racist references, I claim, coexist in MHP's party program.

One part these references can be observed in the program is the part that MHP puts its vision for foreign policy:

"Turkish world is a prioritized and privileged area of interest in our foreign policy. Improving relationships with Cyprus, Caucasia and Middle Asian Turkic Republics and Balkan countries, mainly in economic, social, political and cultural areas, is one of the main goals of our foreign policy." (Ibid, p.66)

Such a goal for foreign policy might seem as part of MHP's civic discourse where the neighboring territories are aimed to develop relations with. However, the reason of such a "special interest" in the foreign policy vision is better revealed in the following page of the program where MHP puts an emphasis on history:

"Bearing in mind the fact that our country has an important strategic deposit such as the common history and cultural values shared with the countries in a vast geography from Balkans to Caucasus, and from the Middle East to the Central Asia in the historical process…" (Ibid, p. 67)

The paragraph reveals that the special interest on the "*geography from Balkans to Caucasus, and from the Middle East to the Central Asia*" is not simply a part of civic nationalist interests in regard to foreign policy but rather a matter of a "*deposit*" for the country. The emphases on Cyprus, Caucasia, Middle Asian Turkic Republics and Balkan countries imply that the historical heritage MHP is interested in is concentrated mainly on two lines: Ottoman Empire and ethnic/racist Turkishness. One should pay regard to the fact that Ottoman Empire and Turkishness are also two intertwined phenomena despite all their differences. Hence these two things are sometimes used interchangeably without paying regard to their differences and sometimes used alongside of one another.

Cyprus, Caucasia and Balkans are the territories where Ottoman Empire achieved dominance for centuries. In addition to this dominance, the empire settled ethnic Turkish groups in these lands as part of the policy to keep these lands loyal to the emperor. Moreover, local ethnic groups in these occupied lands such as Bosnians and Albanians converted to Islam. Therefore, due to the "historical ties" Turkish state as the successor of Ottoman Empire has, MHP can be said to bear such a special interest in these territories. These historical ties are based on first, the Turkish minorities living in the countries in these territories, and second, the non-Turkish Muslim peoples who are considered to have a common history with the other subjects of Ottoman Empire.

In addition to the connection founded due to historical reasons based on Ottoman Empire, the reason of the special interest in Middle Asian Turkic Republics can be said to be MHP's "ethnic/racist" nationalist perspective of foreign policy. The connection with these Turkic nations of central Asia can only be founded on a racial ground.

Such a racial perspective which is hidden behind a civic discourse can also be observed in the historical reference MHP gives to Turkish army:

"Respectability of the Turkish Army, with its long history of two thousand years, will not be allowed to be tarnished by random daily polemics in domestic and foreign public opinion." (Ibid, 64)

Here it is seen that MHP mentions the respectability of Turkish army and put it as an important value for the nation. This can be considered as part of a civic discourse. However, the reference to its history, which is claimed to be "two thousand years", perceives Turkish Army having continuity since the Turkic states that are founded in central Asia hundreds years ago. Therefore, it reveals MHP's racial/ethnic mindset.

The special interest on Turkic and Islamic world that are revealed both in ethnic and civic forms gives a clue about the ideal citizenship character of Turkish state MHP envisages. Apparently such an ideal citizenship might not address to the expectations of all Turkish citizens and for this reason it can be exclusionist. To make it explicit, for example, one can expect that Kurdish citizens of Turkey might question the interest in Turkic world in the absence of interest on Kurdish world. In addition, a Christian Armenian citizen of Turkey might question the interest on Muslim world in the absence of an interest in Christian world.

MHP's approach to religion also gives its ethnic nationalist perception of identity which is comprised of Islam religion. Some important Islam philosophers who lived in Turkey in Medieval times were referred in the program:

"Our perception of the world and humanity will be shaped by a vision of the synthesis of human based material and spiritual realms of Ahmet Yesevi, Mevlana, Yunus Emre, Hacı Bektaş-I Veli." (Ibid, 69)

Issues

Issues of multiculturalism, mother tongue-language, foreign policy and political values of republic and democracy are worth to assess to grasp MHP's content of nationalism.

One of the emphases of MHP's program is to make Turkey a powerful country in the World:

"Our vision is to make our country a super power and a "Leading Country" both in her region and in the world with a new concept of Turkey centred civilization and world order by providing the transition of the country into information society and its development in economy, culture and technology." (Ibid, p.11)

Nationalism, in its civic appeal, pays regard to advance in the competition between nations in terms of "objective", non-ascriptive fields. The emphases on economy and technology here stems from such a nationalist perspective. To make Turkey a "super power" and a "leading country" or founding a "Turkey centred civilization" can be regarded as ethnic-free desires of a civic nationalist perspective.

However, this civic nationalist perspective in foreign policy vision becomes ethnic/racial when the program is further assessed:

"A close care will be provided for kin and relative societies outside Turkey in the scope of the principles leading international law and interstate relations, and necessary institutional cooperation will be initially formed." (Ibid, 66)

Such an ethnic interest becomes concrete on "Turkmen" issue:

"The basis of our Iraqi policy involves that the territorial integrity of Iraq and the rights of Turkmen population there must be protected, and that Iraqi lands must not pose security threats against Turkey."(Ibid, 67)

Political institutions such as democracy and republic as proposed before are also elements of a civic nationalist discourse which MHP also partly emphasizes:

"Our party sees the common values of nation with republic and democracy as political, cultural and social basis of our national unity and integrity, and accepts the republic and democracy as inseparable and indispensable values for Turkey."(Ibid, 14)

It is also possible to see a multicultural emphasis on MHP's party program:

"With a belief and conscience regarding the local and traditional differences in our country as the richness of our national life, we accept all colors of society mobilized for common goals with justice and freedom and the mutual understanding and cooperation, in a great tolerance as has been throughout our history, to be the guarantee of our national unity and integrity." (Ibid, p.14)

However, it is ambiguous what is implied by this "justice and freedom" and "great tolerance" since MHP seems to be very intolerant in terms of education in mother tongue:

"Education language is Turkish at every stage of education. No other language can be instructed and taught in training and education institutions as mother tongue to Turkish citizens." (Ibid, p.51)

It is clear that MHP is strongly against any mother tongue to be used in education. One common language as the medium for the communication of citizens of a state can be proposed by any party. However, MHP seems to be against bilingual education by rejecting any other language to be instructed and taught in education institutions. In this sense, such a strict stance seems to be a part of the "assimilation to Turkish" policy. One could argue that Turkish is a civic element as the official language of the Turkish state. However, its ethnic/racial content in MHP's mindset is revealed in MHP's view of relations with "Turkish states and communities" in terms of language:

"Relations with Turkish states and communities will be based on principle of 'Unity in language, idea and work.' Linguistic and cultural studies about the countries and communities where Turkish is spoken will be given particular importance as primary factor of

economic and cultural cooperation and conditions will be created to make Turkish understandable and usable with all dialects." (Ibid, p.54)

5.2. Republican People's Party (CHP)

5.2.1. CHP - Membership of Transnational Organization

CHP is a member of the "Socialist International". Its membership in the organization is classified within "full member parties".[1] CHP is also a member of "Party of European Socialists (PES)". Its membership in this organization is classified within "associate parties".[2]

Socialist International presents itself in its official website as;

"The Socialist International is the worldwide organisation of social democratic, socialist and labour parties. It currently brings together 168 political parties and organisations from all continents."[3]

The Party of European Socialists (PES) presents itself in its official website as;

"The Party of European Socialists (PES) brings together the Socialist, Social Democratic and Labour Parties of the European Union (EU). There are 32 full member parties from the 28 EU member States and Norway. In addition, there are eleven associate and ten observer parties."[4]

5.2.2. CHP - Historical Development

CHP is the founder and the oldest party of Republic of Turkey. Its ideological roots certainly go even further than the foundation of the republic and can be found in Ottoman Empire. However, since the history of CHP is not the main issue of this thesis, here the main cornerstones in CHP's historical development will be assessed.

Following the defeat in the First World War and the surrender of the Ottoman Empire Government known as "Istanbul Government" in Istanbul, resistance groups managed to

---

[1] http://www.socialistinternational.org/viewArticle.cfm?ArticlePageID=928
[2] http://www.pes.eu/parties
[3] http://www.socialistinternational.org/about.cfm
[4] http://www.pes.eu/about_us

come together under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal and formed the "Defence of Rights" association. This association started the "Turkish War of Independence". This association was considered as a national defense front of all resisters. However, Mustafa Kemal started to consolidate his power and political position even during the war within the resistance. As a part of these policies, he found the "People's Party" by taking over the whole Defence of Rights organization. (Zürcher, 2004, p.166) The party announced the establishment of the Republic of Turkey in 1923 despite the disputes with pro-monarchy resisters and changed its name to "Republican People's Party" one year after.

The period till the end of 2nd World War was widely regarded as single-party period. In 1931, Turkey's political system was declared to be a one-party state. The main ideology of the party is called as "Kemalism". The main principles of Kemalism, as indicated in CHP program of 1931 were republicanism, secularism, nationalism, populism, statism and revolutionism (or reformism). These six principles were incorporated into the Turkish constitution in 1937. (Ibid, p.181-2) This one party rule period can be considered as an authoritarian attempt to transform a non-Western Muslim society from top towards positivist, secularist and modernist ideals. (Ibid, 193) In this sense, CHP, with reference to its unique foundation and development in an undemocratic environment, is difficult to make comparisons with other parties. However, the values it represents –secularism, modernization ideals etc. - have also characterized the party in its later journey.

The transition to multi-party system held after the 2nd World War. Democrat Party (DP), founded in 1946, started to challenge CHP's statism and autarkist economy policies by emphasizing free enterprise, the development of agriculture and agriculturally based industry *(instead of heavy industry)* etc. (Ibid, p.216) Besides, DP was not so strict as CHP in terms of secularism and it applied to populism over religion. DP got an immense popularization by the people and takeover the government in 1950. CHP lost all the provinces in the more developed west of the country to DP, while it won the provinces in the less developed east of the country due to the bloc votes delivered by the loyal notables, tribal chiefs and large landowners who were able to control people's votes. (Ibid, p.217)

CHP became unpopular compared to DP and DP's successor parties for a long time until 1970s. In 1960s it decided to choose new strategies that would make the party differentiate from its counterparts and reach new groups in society. In 1965, the party presented its position as "left of centre". (Ibid, 252) It could be argued from a broader

perspective that these ideological and programmatic changes which finally made people perceive CHP as a different party than the despotic CHP of the one-party period included the years between 1957 and 1972. Under the leadership of Bülent Ecevit "the party had established itself as a social democratic party dedicated to a welfare economy and society." (Güneş-Ayata, 2002, p.103-4) New social groups emerged as a result of structural changes in society such as urbanization, industrialization and developments in education level. Working class, the poor living on the periphery of big cities, market-oriented small peasantry in the most developed agricultural areas and young urban professional middle classes became the new support base of CHP. (Ibid, 104-5) It should be noted that CHP came to power two times in 1970s aftermath of this successful transformation.

One last milestone in CHP's long history that should be mentioned here is its "nationalist-secularist" turn under the leadership of Deniz Baykal towards 2000s. The rise of Islamist movement along with the deepening of Kurdish question (*the quest of identity rights and armed PKK*) marked the political conjuncture of 1990s. This political conjuncture resulted in a re-positioning of the social groups. In this conjuncture, neo-Kemalism emerged as a "civil" and "new" form to replace with the traditional Kemalism which was regarded as a statist, unpopular, authoritarian project imposed upon people. The essentials of this new discourse developed over "Ataturk nationalism", "secularism" and "modernity". (Erdogan, 2009, p.584-5) Neo-Kemalism can be said to have given character to CHP in the last two decades. CHP is perceived as "Atatürk's party" which would defend the country against the Islamic fundamentalists. In other words, Ataturkism, rather than social democracy, became prominent for the party. This perception is embraced by ethno-religious minority group Alevis and secular middle-class people living in cities who comprised the main support base of the party. (Ayata-Güneş, 2002, p.111) The cost of distinguishing as the secularist guardian of the country rather than the representative of lower classes was the rupture of the relations with the majority of the working classes. One last component that should be added to this picture of CHP's support base (Alevis and secular middle-class people) is "Turkishness". To say more clearly, due to the nationalist emphasis in this late period, CHP was not supported by Kurds which can be clearly seen by the election results. The party, along with MHP, could only get very little support in the elections in the southeastern cities where the majority of population is Kurds.

5.2.3. CHP – Party Program

Perception of the Nation/National Identity

CHP's party program starts with the part "Atatürk Revolutions and the Six Arrows Principles". As mentioned earlier, "Six Arrows" which is Ataturk's six principles and the main principles the party embraced are republicanism, secularism, nationalism, populism, statism and revolutionism (or reformism). The party program interprets each principle in the program. The fact that CHP has "nationalism" as one of its principles might sound bizarre for a party that also perceives itself as social democrat in the party program. However, CHP presents its nationalism something as civic, something as denying ethnic features:

"CHP embraces Atatürk nationalism: Turkey Republic was not founded on the ground of religion, language, race and ethnic background but on the ground of unity in political conscious and goals. Nationalism is to overcome race, background, religion, (religious) sect, territorialism and tribalism. Turkey has never been a country that has governed on the principles of race, blood and skull. We have to approach to problems of the country not on racial ground but on citizenship ground." (CHP party program, p.13)

In this definition of "Atatürk nationalism" CHP clearly gives an example of a civic definition of national identity that is based on "citizenship". Under the same principle, CHP emphasizes strongly on the notion of pluralism to differentiate the Atatürk nationalism from racial nationalism. Besides, it indicates Atatürk nationalism does not mean superiority of a particular ethnicity:

"Our nationalism embraces pluralism perception. No matter which background s/he comes from, which language s/he speaks, which belief s/he has, (our nationalism) is equality before law, and the perception whole citizens are the owner of the country.

(Our nationalism) *cannot be interpreted as a preference or discrimination among different ethnicities.*

...

(Our nationalism) *embraces the idea: State has no race, state the same distance to all ethnicities; it is the guarantee of cultural pluralism.* (Ibid, p.14)

In some other part in the program, CHP's perception of "nation" can be assessed:

"Our citizens having different ethnic backgrounds, different cultural, denominational, religious characteristics are not an obstacle to comprise a common nation and not an obstacle for their togetherness. These differences are our richness and source of power as a nation." (Ibid, p.47)

Such a statement implies that CHP has a strong emphasis on pluralism and accepts the nation to be about plurality of different cultural groups.

<u>*Historical References*</u>

One part where we can assess CHP's perception of national identity in regard to its historical references in party program is Turkish-Greek relations.

"An active politics will be followed to defend the rights and interests of especially our cognates in West Thrace that originate Lausanne Treaty and other international agreements." (Ibid, p.130-1)

The fact that CHP gives a reference to Lausanne Treaty when it puts forward its rights to protect some "cognates", it mentions a political right to protect a politically defined people. In this sense, one can argue that this statement can be considered under the civic discourse. However, especially the word "cognate" implies that CHP's perception of Turkish identity is based not only on citizenship as it is the case in other parts of the program but also on Turkish ethnicity.

Just like MHP, CHP also gives references to Islamic philosophers lived in Turkey in Medieval times. It is indicated that "cultural roots" of the party are partly based on these views:

"Our cultural roots are based on both 13th century's Mevlana, Yunus Emre, Hacı Bektaş-I Veli, Şeyh Edibali's, Anatolia's cultural richness, and moral and philosophical values of national independence war, Ataturk revolutions' modern, universal values." (Ibid, p.306)

<u>*Issues*</u>

Issues related to democracy, multiculturalism and Kurdish Question, mother tongue-language and foreign policy are worth to assess to grasp CHP's content of nationalism.

CHP has an explicit multiculturalist emphasis in its program:

"We propose integration, not assimilation. No one's race and background is superior to the other one. In this regard, our democracy should always protect itself from the solutions on the basis of race and traps of assimilation practices. CHP's perception of integration is not to remove different identities and beliefs, to protect the unity of the country on the basis of nation-state by showing respect to them." (Ibid, p.47)

In addition to this, it also explicitly indicates that state policies cannot be based on ethnic differences:

"CHP does not embrace that state bases its politics on ethnic differences. State's duty is to propound the values which make human the focal point by going beyond all ethnic, religious and (religious) sect differences, and to find common values" (Ibid, p.46)

Despite these entire civic, liberal, multiculturalist and tolerant emphases, when we assess the parts that are related to Kurdish Question and mother tongue, we see that things get a bit tricky:

"(Our priority is) to remove backwardness, unemployment, poverty and feudal order in the regions where our citizens of Kurdish origin mostly live." (Ibid, p.20)

It seems that CHP perceives Kurdish Question rather as an economical and underdevelopment problem due to the emphases on unemployment, backwardness, poverty and feudal order. In this sense, basic questions related to identity rights of Kurdish people were skipped. However, CHP's view of such identity questions of Kurds is revealed in its approach to "mother tongue" issue. CHP seems very liberal in terms of it except "education in mother tongue". In the relevant part of the program, the party supports mother tongue to be taught in "private courses". Besides this most important point of the mother tongue question, CHP indicates its support in the usage of mother tongue in publication of press, magazines, books etc and in broadcasting in TV and radio. (Ibid, p.48)

CHP approves mother tongue to be taught in private courses rather than public schools. In this sense, it becomes exclusionist for non-Turkish speakers in the state level

despite all the multiculturalist emphases in the program. Such an argument of exclusionism is supported when the program is assessed in regard to Turkish language:

"It will be aimed Turkish language to be prospered in the direction of developments in science and universal culture… The process of making Turkish language … prosperous…, started by Atatürk, will be maintained in every field of literature, art and science." (Ibid, p.311)

It is obvious that Turkish language has a privileged position among others. Such an ethnic emphasis goes one step further when we assess some of CHP's view in regard to foreign policy:

"CHP is against the fact that Turkic republics, which became independent after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, to go under dominance or influence of some other foreign state again." (Ibid, 130)

Just like MHP, CHP seems to have a racial perspective in terms of its "special interest" of Turkic World in foreign policy.

5.3. Sweden Democrats (SD)

5.3.1. SD - Membership of Transnational Organization

Swedish Democrats succeeded to get in the European Parliament with two MPs in the elections of 2014. In the European Parliament, SD joined Europe of Freedom and Democracy group. This group is composed of 48 members from 7 different countries. Most of these seats belong to British UKIP (24) and Italian Five Star Movement (17). Small partners of the group are Order and Justice Party from Lithuania, Party of Free Citizens from Czech Republic, Union of Greens and Farmers from Latvia.[5]

There are four main arguments[6] the group proposes in its charter. It is accurate to focus on three of them here:

"1. Committed to the principles of democracy, freedom and co-operation among Nation States, the Group favours an open, transparent, democratic and accountable co-

---

[5] http://sverigedemokraterna.se/2014/06/18/sds-partigrupp-officiell
[6] http://www.efdgroup.eu/about-us/our-charter

33

operation among sovereign European States and rejects the bureaucratisation of Europe and the creation of a single centralised European superstate.

2. Convinced that the legitimate level for democracy lies with the Nation States, their regions and parliaments since there is no such thing as a single European people; the Group opposes further European integration (treaties and policies) that would exacerbate the present democratic deficit and the centralist political structure of the EU. The Group favours that any new treaties or any modification of the existing treaties are to be submitted to the peoples' vote through free and fair national referenda in the Member States. The Group does believe that the legitimacy of any power comes from the will of its Peoples and their right to be free and democratically ruled."

The first two arguments especially emphasize "nation states". Transferring the authority of nation states to European Union as the supranational authority is opposed. Besides, the "legitimate level" for democratic decision making is considered as national level.

"3. Peoples and Nations of Europe have the right to protect their borders and strengthen their own historical, traditional, religious and cultural values. The Group rejects xenophobia, anti-Semitism and any other form of discrimination. Furthermore the group subscribes to the concept of direct democracy believing it to be the ultimate check on political elites.

Third argument emphasizes on the "historical, traditional, religious and cultural values". The argument implies that peoples and nations of Europe have certain values which should be strengthened. This strengthening argument is put in relation to the protection of borders. Therefore, it is not so implicit that immigrants are perceived as potential threat to the certain values. The emphasis on elite is also significant since elite vs. people dichotomy reminds one of the main strategies of populism.

5.3.3. SD - Historical Development

Sweden Democrats was founded in 1988 as a successor to Swedish Party. Before assessing its journey from 1988 to present, it is accurate to focus on the process that led to the foundation of SD in 1988 to grasp its roots. Swedish Party was founded in 1986 through a merger of Bevara Sverige Svenskt –*Keep Sweden Swedish*- (BSS) movement and

Framstegspartiet. BSS, founded in 1979, was considered as a movement in the neo-fascist wave of 1980s. Framstegspartiet, on the other hand, was a party founded n 1968 that distinguished as a populist discontent party. In 1987, internal conflicts between the factions within the party led to a split. BSS, the extreme right faction, triumphed over other factions in these conflicts and had the command of Swedish Party. In the end, it was out of this group that SD was formed when Swedish Party changed its name to Swedish Democrats. (Widfeldt, 2008, p.266-7)

Due to such a formation history, it is not surprising to describe this first period of SD as fascist. Apart from the triumph of BSS in the formation of party, some prominent figures in the party such as the first party leader Anders Klarström, Leif Zeilon, Gösta Bergqvist, Gustaf Ekström had racist or Nazi backgrounds even though some of them denied this. (Ibid, p.268) Besides, the party publicly announced its international allies in a bulletin in 1989 some of which are composed of the "the Front National in France, pro-apartheid newspapers in South Africa, a Ku Klux Klan affiliated journal in the USA and the journal Spearhead, published by the notorious neo-Nazist John Tydall in England". (Hellström & Nillson, 2010, p.57)

It is widely agreed that this neo-Nazi/racist predominance in the party continued till mid-1990s. Therefore, this period of Nazi predominance can be regarded as the first period in periodization in party's history. 1995 was regarded as a breakpoint in party's history as Mikael Jansson elected as president. He aimed to block the extremist Nazi groups in the party. (Ibid, p.58) He prohibited wearing of uniforms during manifestations which connotates Nazis. Besides, the party's anti-immigration policies toned a bit down after the adoption of the 1999 party program. (Witfeld, 2008, p.272) This process continued till 2001 where two prominent figures, Anders Steen and Tor Paulsson, were expelled with 150 sympathizers from the party. This group founded Nationaldemokraterna. It is observed later that Nationaldemokraterna was the more radical one between the two parties since the faction that left the party was composed of extremist wing. (Ibid, p.270) This split paved the way for SD to do further reforms and distance itself further from Nazism/racism that made it more popular.

The ongoing 'modernization' process under Jansson's went even further when he lost the chairman position in the party to Jimmie Akesson in 2005. In their competition, it is claimed that Jansson was supported by "traditionalists" who were more tolerant to the extremism in the party and rather moderate in the modernization process. Therefore, Akesson's triumph was a relative success for pro-modernization group. Today, SD is rather

considered as a populist party which has a nationalist-conservative agenda with the immigration issue as top priority. (Demker, 2012, p.243) (Hellström et al., 2012, p.201)

5.3.3. SD – Party Program

Perception of the Nation/National Identity

Sweden Democrats' nationalism and the perception of national identity as it is observed in its party program has elements from civic and ethnic nationalist discourses just as other parties assessed above.

According to the program, nationalist ideology states that *"...national interests must be put in priority, to one's own nation should be free and sovereign in relation to other nations and states, and that the state's borders as far as possible must coincide with the nation's distribution area."* (SD party program, p.13)

The implication every nation-state should be sovereign and free is a typical expression of civic nationalism which accepts the international system of nation-states and emphasize on the "political" side of nation. However, the coincidence between nation and state mentioned in the definition has the premise that nations are distinct entities all of which should have its own nation state. Such a perception is revealed better in the definition of nation in the following paragraphs:

"Sweden Democrats' nationalism is open and non-racist. Since we define the nation in terms of culture, language, identity and loyalty, and not in terms of historical nationhood or genetic group membership, it is our national community is also open to people with backgrounds in other nations." (Ibid, p.14)

SD wants to dissociate itself from racist explanation of nation. However, it attributes an ethnic character to it within a citizenship (civic) argument. It claims that citizenship *-our national community-* is open with backgrounds in other nations which can be considered as part of its civic discourse. However it already indicates that it is not a simple civic citizenship but one that has particular "culture, language and identity".

Cohesion, security and stability seem to be SD's ideal features of a political system which can be considered in regard to SD's civic nationalism. However, once more, SD

defines a national identity comprised of ethnic premises of language, culture and religion as a condition for these civic results:

"(A) strong national identity and a minimum of linguistic, cultural and religious differences have a beneficial effect on cohesion, security and stability within a society." (Ibid, p. 8)

Civic reasons, as argued, are put forward in SD's perceptions within a relation to ethnic background. However, the perception of nation as a natural and an enduring entity is emphasized in some other paragraph. This is also an implicit mindset of ethnic nationalism:

"Sweden Democrats view the nation as the most important, oldest and most natural human community after the family. Empires, political groupings and others across national communities have come and gone over the past millennium, but nations that form the human community has persisted." (Ibid, p.15)

Such a perception of nation can be considered within the "primordial" explanations of nation which find the "essences" of nations in the ethnicities of pre-modern period in contrast to modernist explanations.

Historical References

SD uses the discourse of "Swedish history" many times in the program. However, there are not many concrete references. One of the references to history is about deliberation, equality and democracy culture:

"An old Swedish hallmark - the civilized conversation - has dating back to the councils in pre-Christian times. The old landscape Act Västergötland decreed that "The Swedes own the King take so also to evict." Sweden is one of the few countries where the peasants never been serfs and where the people, in the form of peasantry, always been represented in the parliament and our first press law was passed back in 1776, as the first in the world."(Ibid, p.5)

Here SD gives civic references to parliament, representation and equality between the classes in the society.

There are some certain issues in SD's party program that gives an idea about its nationalist perspective. These are democracy, religion, economy/welfare.

Democracy, as one of the embraced civic values of the Swedish society, is proposed as something that is only compatible with one common culture:

"(T)he existence of a common national and cultural identity among population of the state as one of the most basic elements of a strong and well-functioning democracy." (Ibid, p.6)

In this regard, SD defends the civic value of a strong and well-functioning democracy. However, the implicit ethnic nationalism here proposes that different cultures than SD envisages distort Swedish democracy.

Religion is also an issue SD proposes with both civic and ethnic perspectives within an exclusionary discourse.

"We define religious freedom as the right of individuals to be free to believe in any god or what gods they like without on that account suffering negative discrimination or persecution." (Ibid, p.27)

In this sentence, it seems that there is not an ascriptive perspective that SD wants to have in Swedish people. It rather pays regard to the civic value of religious freedom as a right of a citizen. However, when we continue the same part, the ethnic interests come up:

"The Swedish government cannot and should not be religiously neutral. Sweden has been a Christian country for over a thousand years. Christianity is intimately interwoven with the Swedish culture and identity... Few other ideas and institutions have been equally important for the formation of the Swedish culture as Christianity and the Swedish Church. The Swedish language, art, literature, philosophy, morals, traditions, architecture, music, etc. are all examples of society that was and is strongly influenced by our Christian heritage." (Ibid, p.27)

In this part, SD rejects the civic principle of laicism and attributes an ethnic character to the Swedish state and Swedish identity. It claims that these are partly shaped by Christian

culture. Despite such an explicit ethnic vision, SD also points out a civic perspective in the following part for Christianity which is notable for my analysis:

"Many Christian holidays and traditions are still an integral part of our national culture and forms important elements in many non-believers' lives… The preservation of this heritage is thus a concern for all Swedes, believers and non-believers. In order to relate strictly religiously neutral state would have to alienate a significant portion of the Swedish heritage from government activities and public room and this is not a thing that the Sweden Democrats see as desirable. Christianity should by virtue of their history allowed to hold a special position in comparison to other religions in Sweden." (Ibid, p.27)

This paragraph is a part of SD's civic nationalist discourse which can be assessed in relation to a deeper ethnic vision. SD pays regard to government activities, public room and *(official)* holidays which are all parts of civic nationalist discourse (civil religion) that is related to Swedish state. Such ethnic-free character of these holidays are said to be also important for non-believers'. In this sense, rather than ethnic (Christian) background of these institutions, their civic values were put forward. It also embraces non-Christians (non-believers). However, Muslims are said to be incompatible with this civic culture:

"Islam and particularly its strong political and fundamentalist branch is, according to the Sweden Democrats' idea of religious beliefs, are proven to have the most difficulties to harmoniously coexist with the Swedish and Western culture. Islamism's influence on Swedish society should be to the greatest possible extent counteracted and immigration from Muslim countries with strong elements of fundamentalism should be very severely limited". (Ibid, p.27)

Another issue is welfare state that should be focused. SD seems to embrace welfare state idea, the "Swedish Model". Such an emphasis on a political institution can be regarded as part of its civic nationalist discourse:

"To be able to safeguard the welfare state idea and the welfare state in the long run, you must also preserve national cohesion. There must be a common identity as a foundation so that those who have more should be prepared to share it with those who have less." (Ibid, p.34)

The functioning of welfare state is related to have a common identity. And this common identity is related to culture in the following line:

"For this reason, there is also an inherent contradiction between welfare and multiculturalism." (Ibid, p.34)

5.4. Moderate Party (M)

5.4.1. M - Membership of Transnational Organization

M is a member of European People's Party. M's deputies are in the group of the Europen People's Party in the European Parliament. The party introduces itself as follows:

"The European People's Party (EPP) is the political family of the centre-right, whose roots run deep in the history and civilisation of the European continent and which has pioneered the European project from its inception… Founded in 1976, the EPP strives for a democratic, transparent and efficient Europe that is close to its citizens. The EPP wants a prosperous Europe through the promotion of a free market economy with a social consciousness."[7]

M is also a member of worldwide International Democratic Union (IDU). The party introduces itself as:

"International Democrat Union (IDU) is a working association of over 80 Conservative, Christian Democrat and like-minded political parties of the centre and centre right"[8]

5.4.2. M - Historical Development

Moderate Coalition Party (Swedish: Moderata Samlingspartiet, generally just referred to as Moderaterna), M, exists with this name since 1969 when its processor the Rightist Party changed its name to M. The historical lineage of the party dates back to the beginning of 20th century. Two conservative parties from two different chambers of parliament, the National Party and the Ruralist and Citizens' Party, merged in 1935 as "the Right" (Högern), a term known to designate Conservatives since the mid-19th century. (Hancock, 2003, p.373)

---

[7] http://www.epp.eu/who-are-we
[8] http://www.idu.org/history.aspx

Roughly speaking, Swedish politics in 20th century developed over two main political lines: On the one hand, there is the "socialist bloc", composed of the Social democrats as the prominent party of the bloc and the communist party line, on the other hand, the "bourgeoisie bloc" composed of non-socialist lines of conservatives, liberals and center. The long triumph of the Social democrats and the socialist line gave a character to what is called "Swedish Model". One reason the Conservatives were not so successful in the first half of the century was its opposition to the economic and social policies of the socialist bloc which seem to be attractive to more voters. By the 1920s, the Conservatives embraced the ideas of economic liberalism and opposed the Social Democrats' ideas of controlling and regulating the business sector. (Lewin, 1998, p.125) Secondly, the reason why bourgeoisie parties could not appear as an alternative bloc to the socialist bloc was because the disputes they had with each other. In the beginning of the century, the conservatives were against the universal suffrage and got only convinced for it in exchange for proportional representation. Therefore, credibility of the Conservatives as "democrat" in the sight of other non-socialist parties to build a unified bloc could not be provided for a long time. Besides, the urban-rural cleavage in society has been effective on the dispute between more urban Liberals and the rural Agrarian and Christian parties till 1960s. (Hancock, 2003, p.373) (Einhorn & Logue, 2003, p.110&118) These two reasons, success and popularity of socialist policies and the disputes among non-socialist parties, are keys to understand the long triumph of the socialist bloc between 1932 and 1976.

1969 was a break in the Conservatives' history. The name of the Conservatives was changed from Rightist Party to Moderate Party. This change was not only about image but also ideology. M seem to be convinced after the long triumph of the Social Democrats that it started to perceive government intervention in the economy and society more positive while defending private ownership and political decentralization. (Hancock, 2003, 373) Besides M, other parties of the non-socialist bloc also embraced a vision of a welfare state that "rested on the belief that social policy is limited by resources, and that redistribution was becoming increasingly difficult." (Einhorn & Logou, 2003, p.111) Textbook liberalism was left and state was not perceived as passive as the theory suggested. Rather, it is perceived as an important actor to intervene in at the points where the markets fail, such as at labor market and employment. (Lewin, 1922, p.162)

Consequently, the two reasons why non-socialist bloc could not appear as an alternative to the dominance of the Social Democrats started to erode. And in 1976, the first non-socialist government since 1936 was founded. M was the second biggest partner of this

coalition. The general election of 1976 was again a triumph of the non-socialist bloc. In this election, the major partner of the coalition government was M. Since then M managed to protect its position as the largest party of non-socialist bloc.

The period under Reinfeldt's leadership in 2000s can be regarded as the most successful period of the party. M's traditional economy politics even went further towards center in this period. Even though lower taxes were retained as an objective of the party, M's tax-cutting policies were reduced in order to attract more lower and middle income groups. Such a centrist policy was also reinforced by further developing the relations with other non-socialist parties. (Aylott & Bolin, 2007, p. 625) In 2004, Moderates, The Liberals, the Center Party and Christian democrats announced the Alliance. It was an alliance strategy to work together and come to power in general elections. The Alliance has accepted the basics of the "Swedish Model". Therefore, unlike the American or British right, welfare state was not planned to be overturn. (Einhorn & Logou, 2003, p.307) Such a move towards center by M increased its votes to 30% for the first time in its history while the alliance won two consecutive elections in 2006 and 2010 in the leadership of M. Though it should be noted that the party is popular mostly among businessmen and higher-and medium level civil servants and the party is closely aligned with Association of Employers (SAF) (Hancock et al, 2003, p.378)

5.4.3. M – Party Program

Perception of the Nation/National Identity

In terms of the definition, M seems to have a civic tendency. The values which are called as "Swedish" are expressed as modern, open and cohesive. Sweden is considered as tolerant, welcoming new technology and utilizing talent. M explicitly indicated that ethnic background is not important here:

"The Conservatives want to build Sweden on the values that many recognize as typically Swedish. Sweden to be modern, open and cohesive. Here we will welcome new technology, be tolerant and utilize talent. It should always play major role where you are on the road than where you come from. People will be drawn on what they can and what they are willing to supply, not based on which god they believe or do not believe in, what ethnicity or ancestry they have, who they love or what gender they are." (M, party program, p.17)

M does not have much significant references to history in its "idea program" that can be assessed in regard to nationalism. "Swedish welfare" is mentioned as one of the few references that can be considered as part of the civic nationalism:

"Jointly funded welfare is an important part of our modern history and a springboard into the future. Preschool helps learning and makes it possible to combine parenthood with active participation in the labor market. The school must equip with skills for the future. Health care heals, soothes and makes it possible to come back. Assist helps to physical constraints in the least possible extent limiting people from living a rich life. Elderly care should provide security and quality of life. It is the essence of our Swedish welfare." (Ibid, p.6)

Issues

Issues regarding multiculturalism and immigrants are noteworthy to assess M's perception of nationalism/national identity.

The importance of multicultural character of society is emphasized in the programme:

"Composite and open-minded societies are more competitive than homogeneous and exclusionary societies. It commits to constantly work against discrimination, xenophobia and other injustices. It encourages an open Sweden, a country to seek out the people who want to do research or work. An inclusive labor market is the best integration and there are many hurdles left to clear. There must be a Swedish dream about respecting diversity, security for those who need and rewards to those who make the effort." (Ibid, p.17)

The Sweden that M desires is depicted as a heterogeneous rather than homogenous. It is considered as open to anyone who wants to work or research and as rewarding for the ones who make an effort. In this regard, citizenship seems to be based on people's relation with the country. "Swedish dream" is identified with diversity and security.

M also reveals its civic views in its approach to immigrant people:

"A society that encourages diversity must be clear with what is in common. Swedishness is an identity that becomes available through living and working here. The integration is based on a mutual curiosity. It is ultimately through their own work that people become a part of their new country and acquire knowledge about the language and culture. In Sweden, men have the same rights as women, believers have the same rights as non-believers, homosexuals and heterosexuals have the same rights as bisexuals, with these and other equality values no compromises are made." (Ibid, p.18)

Here, too, M's perception of Swedishness does not comprise any exclusionist views. Rather it emphasizes the respect to diversity and the importance of mutual effort in order to find common grounds. Rather than putting the superiority of a certain identity and shaping the citizens according to it, it puts forward the importance of personal effort.

6. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

6.1. A Discussion of the Outcomes

- ***Membership of transnational organization is not useful to assess MHP's party family since such a membership does not exist.***

- ***Transnational affiliation signifies SD as a populist radical right party.***

Membership of transnational organization is a method to group parties on the basis of its "self-identification". In this regard, SD can be put in the same group with British UKIP and Italian Five Star Movement. However, the name of the group, "Europe of Freedom and Democracy", does not comprise a party family name in party family studies in my opinion. Therefore, a classification only in accordance with the self-chosen name is not possible. However, the main principles of the group as it is indicated in their official website can also be considered as self-image. These principles give an idea about how the group can be called in party family studies.

In a nutshell, euroscepticism, immigration and "national values" issue, and populism are three elements that can be mentioned in regard to self-presentation of the Europe of Freedom and Democracy group as discussed above. Due to SD's membership to this

organization, the party can be said to embrace the principles and the overall image. I would name this image they all embraced as "populist radical right" family.

- *Historical development method signifies MHP's position as radical right.*

In terms of its emergence, MHP can be compared to fascistic parties of cold-war era which emerged in the non-communist world with a main focus of "anti-communism". After the collapse of USSR and the simultaneous rise of the Kurdish question, MHP's anti-communist focus has replaced with Kurdish question. Besides the fascistic background, the content of the party's nationalism has had racist and ethnic elements. Historical development method signifies MHP's position in the political spectrum as radical right.

- *Historical development method signifies SD's position as radical right.*

SD's history shows that it is a party that has a Nazi-racist background that goes back to late 1980s' neo-Nazi wave. It could be grouped with the parties which belong to the same wave. However, it is also seen that it has constantly got rid of the most extreme factions in the party in the process of "modernization". The more SD went through this process, the more it got legitimized in the sight of people. The more SD got legitimized, the more it got popular. Today, SD is considered rather as a populist party which has a nationalist-conservative agenda with the immigration issue as top priority as discussed. In this sense, the method signifies SD's position in the political spectrum as radical right.

- *SD and MHP belong to different party families. However, they cluster under the large umbrella of radical right party family.*

SD and MHP belong to different party families according to the outcomes of the auxiliary level. SD's emergence is with the rise of neo-Nazi wave of late 1980s. MHP's emergence, on the other hand, is with the fascistic/anti-communist wave of early post-war period. Later in its historical development, SD seems to have faced its fascist/racist past. It denounced racism and Nazism, expelled Nazist-racist figures from the party. MHP has never faced its pan-Turkist and racist past. Yet, it denounces fascism and racism. SD has a radical

right position in terms of immigrant issue. MHP has a radical right position in Kurdish issue. Euroscepticism is a main issue for SD while MHP does not have such a concern naturally since Turkey is not in EU. Populism is a significant element for SD, but not for MHP. Nationalism/national values issue is main policy for both parties. I would consider SD as part of populist radical right party family. And MHP would be in single-issue radical right party family. Overall, SD and MHP belong to different party families, yet they cluster under the large umbrella of radical right party family.

- *Transnational affiliation signifies CHP as a social democrat party.*

CHP identifies itself with the Socialist International and Party of European Socialists. Both organizations define itself as the meeting point of "socialist, social democrat and labour parties".

Due to the facts derived from this particular method, CHP can be considered within "social democrat" party family. However, this method can only be an auxiliary to identify CHP's party position in my opinion. Without considering CHP's historical background and ideological positioning in addition to this method, one cannot claim a full grasp of its party family in my opinion.

- *Transnational affiliation signifies M as a centre/center-right party.*

M is a member of the European People's Party (EPP) and International Democratic Union (IDU). As pointed in the relevant part, the party family of EPP is introduced as "centre-right". The emphases on the "free market" and "social consciousness" are also significant. To sum up, the global affiliation of M also indicates its affiliation to conservatives, Christian democrats, centre and centre right.

- *Historical development method signifies CHP's position as something unique between social democracy and nationalism.*

What has been observed in CHP's historical development is that the party experiences the contradictions between nationalism, secularism stemming from Kemalism, and liberal,

labor values stemming from European socialism. In this sense, it has a unique position that makes it difficult to simply group it with the social democrat/socialist parties of Europe. On the other hand, it cannot be simply grouped with the radical right party family.

- *Historical development method signifies M as a centre/center-right party.*

M's history shows that M represented a strong conservative ideology in the beginning of its journey. This includes suspicion about democracy as well. However, it has constantly made shifts towards the center and can be considered as a center-right or perhaps as a center party currently. Economy seems to be the issue M determines its main ground on.

- *CHP and M do not belong to radical right party family.*

Party families of CHP and M are secondary to this study. The crucial point was to check if these parties could be grouped in radical right party family. Such an outcome would mean to compare radical right parties (MHP and SD) with some other radical right parties. However, CHP and M do not belong to radical right party family. Yet, CHP's nationalist emphasis is notable even though this is not sufficient overall to consider it in radical right party family.

- *MHP and CHP converge on ethnic discourse. Many explicit ethnic elements exist in MHP's program while CHP has only few.*

The parties converge on their reference to Islamic philosophers who were said to partly comprise the cultural values. MHP's explicit ethnic emphases are conspicuous. It identifies "national language", "national culture", "spiritual and cultural values" and "being religious" as the features of Turkish nation. Especially its foreign policy vision reveals its ethnic perspective. Among these, "kin and relative societies outside Turkey", "Turkmens" in Iraq are noteworthy to see MHP's explicit ethnic-racial foreign policy perspective. Moreover, MHP's emphasis on Turkish language is also noteworthy. The party is clearly against any mother tongue to be taught in education institutions. Moreover, it emphasizes the unity with "Turkish" states via language. CHP's extra interest on "Turkish language" is also notable as

shown. But it also has clear statements that pluralism in languages is a main principle of the party's nationalism.

- ***SD and M do not converge on ethnic discourse. It is only SD which has explicit ethnic discourses.***

M does not have any ethnic emphases in its party program. In this regard, it differs from the other parties assessed here, including the other non-radical party CHP. SD, on the other hand, has explicit ethnic emphases. A denouncement of laicism of state and putting forward Christianity as the prominent religion of Swedish state is significant. Besides, SD explicitly indicates that the nation is defined in terms of culture and language.

- ***MHP and CHP converge on civic discourse. Civic discourse is prominent in the programs of both parties.***

CHP's and MHP's civic tendency is significant in their programs. This is especially noteworthy in the assessment of perception of the nation/national identity part. CHP frames its Atatürk nationalism on political citizenship ground and puts a heavy emphasis on the notion of "citizenship. CHP clearly denounces racial and ethnic perspectives in the definitions of nation. Rather, it enhances the importance of ethnic and cultural plurality in its definition of nationalism. MHP's civic tendency is also conspcuous in the program. It puts forward the political side of the nation, uses it interchangeably with state in its definition of nationalism, mentions dialogue and collaboration between nations for humanism and global justice. It also has multicultural references in the parts where it considers "*the local and traditional differences in* (the) *country" as the richness of* (the) *national life"*. Both parties stress on republic, democracy, tolerance, justice, rule of law in relation to nationalism. Overall, CHP's extra emphasis on pluralism and clear denouncement of ethnic and racial grounds are more significant. Such a clear ground does not exist in MHP's program. MHP seems more aggressive in its civic discourses for stressing on getting better in economy, international relations, technology etc.

- ***SD and M converge on civic discourse. Civic discourse is prominent in the programs of both parties.***

M does not have much nationalist appeal in its program. Besides, the nationalist discourse used is all civic. In this sense, it distinguishes from all parties assessed in this study. It explicitly denounces ethnic definition of citizen, discrimination, and xenophobia. Religious, ethnic, ancestral and gender backgrounds are said to be out of debate. "Swedishness" is explained only with civic terms such as being modern, open, cohesive, tolerant, welcoming to new technology and it is identified with welfare. Moreover, the program encourages diversity, heterogeneity and multiculturalism as part of the "Swedish dream".

SD's civic discourse overweighs in the program as well. SD expresses its nationalism only in civic terms, in relation to political sovereignty of a nation state. It denounces racism and genetic group membership. The national community is said to be "*open to people with backgrounds in other nations*". Its historical references enhanced only deliberation, equality, and democratic culture. A civil religion culture also including non-believers, well-functioning democracy, welfare, solidarity and sharing with the ones who have less are enhanced.

- ***Both CHP's and MHP's ethnic perspective is partly implicit in their civic discourses. However, the difference between the parties is MHP has many implicit ethnic emphases while CHP has only few.***

Despite all the civic emphases, CHP has few implicit ethnic elements that can be found when the program is assessed rigorously. CHP has a civic discourse over political rights of the state based on an international treaty that is about the "cognates" living in West Thrace. As I discussed, this includes an implicit ethnic nationalist perspective that pays extra attention to Turkish ethnicity among others. This argument is also supported by CHP's special interest on Turkic republics of central Asia. CHP's approach to mother tongue as part of Kurdish Question is also ambiguous. The program clearly denounces assimilation policies and expresses its support in the usage of mother tongue in publication of press, magazines, books etc, and in broadcasting in TV and radio as part of its vision of a neutral state to all ethnic backgrounds. These seem very civic and open to diversity. However, the program keeps silent in terms of mother tongue in public education. In addition to that, it emphasizes on the scientific developments especially in Turkish language. Such an emphasis on the Turkish

language might be seen as a civic since it is the only official language of the state. However, it is exclusionary considering the other ethnicities whose mother tongue is not Turkish. Moreover, CHP perceives Kurdish Question rather as an economical and underdevelopment problem and skips identity questions.

Even though the civic discourse is more conspicuous overall, MHP has many implicit ethnic and racial perceptions. Moreover, ambiguous terms and expressions that remind ethnic nationalism are also noteworthy. The expressions *"Turkish people with national, spiritual and human references"* and *"highly qualified character of the Turkish nation"* which were used in sentences together with civic emphases might point at an implicit ethnic/racist perspective that MHP does not want to signify. MHP seems to have a "special interest" on Cyprus, Caucasia, Middle Asian Turkic Republics and Balkan countries as seen in many parts of the program. These can be considered as civic ambitions of a nation state about neighboring regions. However, it reflects MHP's Muslim and Turkish/Turkic ethnic/racial perception of the nation as being discussed. Likewise, its emphasis on the "respectability of the Turkish" army sounds something civic. However, the reference of its history of "two thousand years" reveals the racial/ethnic perspective as discussed.

- ***The difference between SD's and M's civic discourses is SD's civic discourse has many related ethnic emphases in it which makes that civicness exclusionary.***

SD's and M's only convergences are on civic discourse. However, there is a significant difference in their civic discourses. Most of SD's civic nationalist discourses are related to exclusionism. This exclusionism is made over an ethnic perspective that is in the background.

SD's party program says Swedish nation is open to all ethnic backgrounds. It is also how M defines Swedish nation as shown above. Such a discourse defines Swedish nation only as a political entity. In this regard, it is an explicit civic discourse. However, then, it puts preconditions of "culture, language and identity" to be a member of that political community. In some other part SD enhances civic values of cohesion, security and stability as the features of the Swedish society, just as M does. However, SD presents ethnic identity as auxiliary for these civic features. Even though SD's program says SD does not perceive the nation in terms of historical nationhood, it has primordial implications for it which can be interpreted as the

mindset of an ethnic perspective. SD puts forward the civic values of welfare, solidarity with the lower classes and democracy just as M does it. However, linguistic unity and Christianity were emphasized for the good of these civic values as being discussed.

To sum up, SD and M have many similar civic emphases on the surface. What distinguishes SD's civic emphases from M's civic emphases is that SD's civic discourses are somehow related to an ethnic premise or to ethnic preconditions that were put forward to maintain those civic aims. For this point, SD seems to be the prominent case of this study for matching Halikopolou et al.'s theory that claims radical right parties frame their ethnic perspectives within a civic frame.

6.2. Conclusion

The main problematic of this study was to find out if ethnic nationalism - civic nationalism is a good distinction to distinguish radical right party family from other party families. In order to find an answer to this question, I thought two empirical questions should be answered as well. First one was if ethnic nationalism is a distinguishing ideological trait of radical right party family. Second one was if radical right party family converges with non-radical right parties on ethnic or civic nationalist discourses. Obviously, two main literatures were required to be bridged for this study: Radical right party family and theories of nationalism.

I believe the outcome of the auxiliary level assessment revealed that MHP and SD can be considered within radical right party family despite all their differences. On the other hand, CHP and M can be considered as parties that do not belong to this family. This outcome allowed comparing radical right party family to other party families.

According to what I found in this study, ethnic nationalism does not only belong to radical right party family. CHP also has explicit ethnic emphases. M, on the other hand, does not have any discourses that we can infer an ethnic mindset. This is something valuable on its own. Yet, one should note that this study was only limited to party programs. Perhaps, other party literature besides the party programs might reveal ethnic convergences in Sweden as well. Overall, ethnic nationalism is not peculiar only to radical right family.

However, more important than this, what I observed is that civic discourse is significant for all the parties assessed in this study. In this sense, MHP and SD converged with CHP and M in terms of many civic discourses. MHP and CHP referred to state as the political perspective of nation in their definitions of nationalism. They both put forward democracy, republic, and rule of law as components of Turkish nation. CHP had an extra emphasis on multiculturalism, pluralism, importance of differences, and diversity in ethnicities and religions within nation. MHP also had emphases on tolerance, "local and traditional differences" and "colors of society". Yet, its multicultural emphases were rather ambiguous compared to CHP. In Sweden, the difference between M and SD could only be assessed in regard to civic nationalism since M does not have an ethnic emphasis. Both parties had an emphasis on citizenship as the political side of nation and claimed the Swedish community to be open to people from different backgrounds. Both parties enhanced welfare and solidarity, cohesion and security as Swedish features. However, SD's civic discourse was often exclusionist and mostly put in a relation with an ethnic mindset in the background. In other words, ethnic reasons were pointed as premises for the good of the prominent civic discourse. In Turkey, the parties converged on both ethnic and civic nationalism. Moreover, in contrast to Sweden, one could mention the exclusionism of the non-radical party (CHP) in Turkey as well. The reason of this exclusionism was better revealed in the assessment of CHP's historical development, taking CHP's late nationalist turn into consideration. Moreover, I argue that civic values are not well established in Turkey compared to Sweden. This would mean that CHP is in the center "only" according to political spectrum of Turkey. All in all, the difference between MHP and CHP is rather a matter of "volume". First of all, MHP has clear exclusionist perspectives which stem from explicit ethnic discourses. Secondly, even though it is civicness that MHP puts forward in the program, it is revealed that many of MHP's civic discourses stem from an ethnic-racial mindset. If not revealed, they remained as ambiguous terms, not reflecting any inclusionary civic discourse. The difference between SD and M, however, was something beyond a difference in volume. SD clearly denounces multiculturalism. Its civic discourse is prominent but an ethnic mindset at the background comprising the premises for the civic values should also be mentioned. Yet, their convergence on civic values is remarkable.

Finally, I believe that radical right parties appeal to civic nationalism more and more today. What is revealed in this study is that both of the parties belong to radical right party family has a significant civic discourse in their party programs in which they denounce racial

or ethnic superiorities. Moreover, despite their explicit and implicit ethnic discourses that would be considered as exclusionist, it is civic nationalism that overweighs in the programs. Note that I am not claiming that ethnic nationalism is not relatively remarkable in the radical right parties' programs assessed here. The more important findings of this study are, firstly the prominence of civic nationalism, and secondly ethnic nationalism being embraced by some non-radical right party. As a result of these findings, what I would like to claim is that a simple equation of ethnic nationalism- radical right family might not be very accurate. Radical right parties' relation to ethnic discourses is more ambiguous today and most of them put civic discourse forward as in the cases of this study. Ethnic nationalism - civic nationalism distinction might be replaced with some other analytical tools for radical right party family studies.

6.3. Beyond the Ethnic-Civic Distinction?

One of the arguments of this study was that civicness, *per se,* is not a sufficient condition to be a non-radical right party. On the other hand, ethnic nationalism is not also sufficient to easily distinguish radical right party family from other party families. What I claim is, performed in the right way, a party with a civic prominence in its discourse can be as exclusionary as a party that is explicitly ethnic nationalist. Moreover, in the era of civic zeitgeist, where non-ethnic nationalist political projects considered more legitimate than ethnic ones, I believe exclusionist right wing parties perform the exclusionary agendas over a civic discourse.

Therefore, I would like to point out that ethnic - civic distinction might not correspond to exclusionary – inclusionary distinction. Here I would like to offer another distinction for a possible future study that might go beyond ethnic-civic distinction and projects exclusionary – inclusionary distinction better.

Calhoun (1997, p.18) argues that "essentialist" thinking played an important role in the construction of identities such as race, gender, sexual orientation etc. Nationalism, as an effective ideology of the 19th century and onwards, was central in the development of essentialist perception of identities.

"Women are emotionally delicate", "gay men are good at arts", "black sportsmen play physical game -*instead of strategic game-*" are some of the stereotypical

discourses about the identity categories of gender, sexual orientation and race that reflect essentialist perception in everyday life. What is significant in all these stereotypes is the reduction of complex identity formations to some single characteristic that is considered to be the defining criterion of that formation. The defining criteria here can be considered as the "essences" of these formations. Calhoun defines "essentialism" in identity categories as:

"(A) reduction of the diversity in a population to some single criterion held to constitute its defining 'essence' and most crucial character. This is often coupled with the claim that the 'essence' is unavoidable or given by nature. It is common to assume that these cultural categories address really existing and discretely identifiable collections of people." (Ibid, p.19)

Such stereotypical discourses are also very common in the category of national identity. These stereotypes can sometimes sound favorable for the subjects mentioned: "Germans are punctual", "The French are good lovers", "Americans are liberal" and "The Japanese are hardworking". Nevertheless they can be unfavorable for same subjects mentioned as well: "Germans have no sense of humor", "The French do not care about their personal hygiene", "Americans are ignorant" and "The Japanese are inhumane".

Politicians might refrain from using such very explicit stereotypical discourses in their open speeches, especially the ones that might sound unfavorable by the subjects of the discourses. Yet essentialist perceptions of national identities are appropriated by different parties to varying degrees. Moreover, some of these might sound irritating to the subject of the discourse.

Racist discourses are not easily welcome in public opinion of liberal democracies in our time. Comments like "Jews are inferior race" do not dominate over public opinion nowadays, *-thankfully-*. However, this does not mean that racist discourses are completely over. Parties identified with radical right are often accused of being racist in public opinion. These accusations are mostly due to their ideology that is comprised of "ethnic nationalism" which is considered to be cognate with racism. In this regard, ethnic nationalism might be as exclusionary as racism against some groups once it is appropriated effectively.

In addition to the fact that ethnic nationalism can easily resonate with racism in terms of exclusion in an ontological level, this opinion is also valid for other kinds of essentialist definition of national identities. Such an essentialist definition of national identity can also be made over civic discourse. Therefore, civic nationalism, mostly appealed as a part of essentialist imagination of identities, can be as exclusionary as ethnic nationalism and also resonate with racism if appropriated effectively.

For this reason, ethnic nationalism - civic nationalism distinction, as proven by the rise of new, "anti-fascist" radical right in "civic, populist zeitgeist", might not correspond to exclusionary – inclusionary distinction in terms of defining national identity. Exclusion is not a phenomenon that is inherent to this distinction. Exclusion is always a potential when a population is defined with regard to some essential trait since such an essence, inherently, would be on the basis of exclusion of some people which does not comprise that essence, and on the basis of inclusion of some other people which comprise that essence. In this sense, a civic nationalist discourse, appropriated in the right essentialist way, can even be more exclusionary than ethnic nationalist discourse.

Therefore, if a distinction between definitions of national identity will be made in regard to exclusion, one having a negative connotation due to exclusionism and one having a positive connotation due to inclusionism, this distinction, I suggest, could be made between "essentialist perception of national identity" and "constructivist perception of national identity". (cf. Ozkirimli's grouping of theories of nations, i.e primordialists and ethno-symbolists as essentialist; modernists as constructivist, 2013, p.256) Here I suggest that ultimate essentialist discourse and ultimate constructivist discourse can be taken as two ideal types that are poles apart. Accordingly, ideologies of parties in relation to their national identity perception can be positioned at some points on the line between these two poles. My prediction is that radical right parties' discourses on national identity, *civic or ethnic*, are close to essentialist fringe of this line. In my humble opinion, essentialist-constructivist distinction can help us understand why civic identity perception is appropriated more and more everyday by radical right parties for their exclusionary politics. Such an analytical tool of essentialism - constructivism distinction on party families, if operationalized successfully, can be used to classify radical right party family better.

7. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albright, J. J. (2010). The multidimensional nature of party competition. *Party Politics*. 16 (6), 699-719.

Art, D (2011). *Inside the Radical Right - The Development of Anti-Immigrant Parties in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aylott, N & Bolin, N. (2007). Towards a two-party system? - The Swedish parliamentary election of September 2006. *West European Politics*. 30 (3), p.621-33.

Bobbio, N (1996). *Left and Right The Significance of a Political Distinction*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bornshier, S (2010). *Cleavage Politics and the Populist Right The New Cultural Conflict in Western Europe*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bora, T (1995). *Milliyetciligin Kara Bahari*. 2nd ed. Istanbul: Birikim Yayinlari. p34-56.

Bora, T & Can, K (2004). *Devlet, Ocak, Dergâh - 12 Eylül'den 1990'lara Ülkücü Hareket*. 7th ed. Istanbul: Iletisim.

Brubaker, R (2004). *Ethnicity Without Groups*. Harvard: President and Fellows of Harward College.

Calhoun, C (197). *Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Demker, M. (2012). Scandinavian Right-Wing Parties: Diversity more than Convergence?. In: Mammone, A & Goodin, E & Jenkins, B *Mapping the Extreme Right in Contemporary Europe - From Local to Transnational*. New York: Routledge. p.239-53.

Einhorn, C S & Logue, J (2003). *Modern Welfare States - Scandinavian Politics and Policy in the Global Age*. 2nd ed. Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.

Erdogan, N. (2009). Neo-Kemalizm, Organik Bunalim ve Hegemonya. In: Bora, T & Gultekingil, M *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Dusunce*. 6th ed. Istanbul: Iletisim. p.585-91.

Gunes-Ayata, A. (2002). The Republican People's Party. In: Heper, M & Rubin, B *Political Parties in Turkey*. Great Britain: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd. p.102-21.

Halikiopolou, D. & Mock, S., Vasilopoulou, S. (2013). The civic zeitgeist: nationalism and liberal values in the European radical right. *Nations and Nationalism*. 19 (1), 107-127.

Hancock, M D. (2003). Sweden. In: Miller, K *Politics in Europe - An Introduction to the Politics of the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Russia, and the European Union*. 3rd ed. New York: Chatham House Publishers of Seven Bridges Press. p.347-99.

Harrison, S & Bruter, M (2011). *Mapping Extreme Right Ideology - An Empirical Geography of the European Extreme Right*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. p34-56.

Hellström, A & Nilsson, T & Stoltz, P. (2012). Nationalism vs. Nationalism: The Challenge of the Sweden Democrats in the Swedish Public Debate. *Government & Opposition*. 47 (2), p.186-205.

Hobsbawm, E (1995). *Age of Extremes - The Short Twentieth Century 1914-1991*. Great Britain: Abacus.

Ignazi, P (2003). *Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Lewin, L (1988). *Ideology and Strategy - A century of Swedish politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lipset, M L, Rokkan S. (1990). Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments. In: Mair, P *The West European Party System*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p.91-111.

Mair, P & Mudde, C. (1998). The Party Family and Its Study. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 1 (-), 211-29.

Mudde, C (2002). *The ideology of the extreme right*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mudde, C. (2004). The Populist Zeitgeist. *Government & Opposition*. 39 (3), 541-63.

Mudde, C (2007). *Populist radical right parties in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, P (2005). *Radical Right Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ozkirimli (2013). *Milliyetcilik Kuramlari - Elestirel Bir Bakis*. 4th ed. Ankara: Dogu Bati.

Rydgren, J. (2007). The Sociology of the Radical Right. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 33 (-), p.241-62.

Widfeldt, A. (2008). Party change as a necessity – the case of the Sweden Democrats. *Representation*. 44 (3), p.265-76.

Zurcher, E J, (2004). *Turkey - A Modern History*. 3rd ed. Hampshire: I. B. Tauris.

Party Programs:

Moderate Party (M) Party Program, (2011), Available at (In Swedish):

http://www.moderat.se/sites/default/files/attachments/ideprogram_-_ansvar_for_hela_sverige_2013_2.pdf [Accessed: 17 Aug 2014].

Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) Party Program, (2009), Available at (In English):

http://www.mhp.org.tr/usr_img/en/the-nationalist-movement-party-program.pdf [Accessed: 17 Aug 2014].

Republican People's Party (CHP) Program, (nd), Available at (In Turkish):

http://www.chp.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/chpprogram.pdf [Accessed: 17 Aug 2014].

Sweden Democrats (SD) Party Program, (2011), Available at (In Swedish):

http://sverigedemokraterna.se/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/principprogrammet2014_webb.pdf [Accessed: 17 Aug 2014].