

Gökçer Özgür

Economics, Hacettepe University, Turkey

Hüseyin Özel¹

Economics, Hacettepe University, Turkey

Paper presented at the 13th International Karl Polanyi Conference, "The Enduring Legacy of Karl Polanyi," Concordia University, 6-8 November 2014

The Double Movement, Global Crisis, and Reclaiming Humanity: The "Gezi" Resistance in Turkey

Abstract

The "Gezi Resistance," aiming to protect Taksim Gezi Park from destruction started in the 28th of May, 2013, and quickly spread to the rest of the country and transformed into a widespread resistance against government policies aiming at destruction of nature and humanity, and lasted until it was brutally suppressed through police force. The present paper is an attempt at evaluating this "countermovement" and devising a narrative about it along Polanyian lines. It is argued that the Gezi Resistance can be seen as an instance of the double movement, a "protective countermovement" on the part of the society against the commodification of all aspects of human existence, including nature itself.

JEL Numbers: B14, B15, B16, B24, B25, B31

Keywords: Polanyi, double movement, Gezi Resistance

It was an illusion to assume a society shaped by man's will and wish alone. Yet this was the result of a market-view of society which equated economics with contractual relationships, and contractual relations with freedom. The radical illusion was fostered that there is nothing in human society that is not derived from the volition of individuals and that could not, therefore, be removed again by their volition (Polanyi 1944, 257-58).

Introduction

In June 2013, there occurred a massive and widespread resistance movement in Turkey, almost in all cities, against government and its neoliberal policies that have destructive effects on both nature and society. It is argued in this paper that this resistance is a perfect example of the

“self-protection of the society” against the extension of the market that would eventually destroy both the social fabric and the natural human “habitat,” as lucidly analyzed by Karl Polanyi with his notion of “double movement.” The paper uses the conceptual framework developed in Özgür and Özel (2013), derived from Polanyi, that argues that the process of financial globalization and its recent crisis can be explained by Karl Polanyi’s notion of the double movement and, in tune with this notion, that capitalist market relations depend on certain institutional arrangements and yet the development of the market forces deteriorates these institutions’ arrangements to such extent that even the “capitalist business itself had to be sheltered from the unrestricted working of the market mechanism.” According to this framework, the double movement should be conceived as formed by three interrelated dimensions, namely, the institutional, the class, and the ideological dimensions, which also represent the three “fault lines” of the capitalist society. These are, respectively, the disembedded market against the society, the classes or sections, whose interests depend on the market and “globalization”, against the working classes in general, and the neoliberal ideology against the belief that human beings are “political animals. It will be argued in the paper, first, that the “Gezi Resistance” represents the social forces that are hurt by the neoliberal policies and the extension of the market, and, second, this resistance is not an isolated one, but an instance of a global “self-protection” of human society throughout the world, directed to the danger of disintegration of the human fabric resulting from neoliberal “reforms” and globalization. The paper is organized as follows: first, an analytical framework based on the double movement notion is developed, second the Gezi resistance and underlying causes are examined, and third, some future trends are tried to be identified.

1. Double Movement and The “Fault Lines” of the Market Society²

Following Polanyi, we argue that the institutional structure of the market system can be characterized by three important strains, or ‘fault lines’ that give rise to the unstable character of the market society. First strain is the separation of the market sphere from the “rest” of the society. Even if such a separation is necessary for the market system to function, it will sooner or later become blurred because of continuous social and political interventions into the working of the market, which will prompt further interventions, unless they are prevented through some means, such as the liberal ideology or even sheer force. The second fault line that manifests itself essentially on an ethical plane is the contradiction between an individualist, self-interested behavior pattern that is necessary for the market to function, and a communal behavior pattern arising from the fact that a human being is also a social being whose basic aim is not maximize her gain, but to reach a “good life” through realization of human potentialities. Since the system is based entirely on the principle of self-interest, the individual is forced to become an isolated “atom.” That is to say, the individual is forced to live through a double life. As a ‘Dr. Jekyll,’ who is a social being, and as a ‘Mr. Hyde,’ who is an atom. This contradiction between the two important human traits imposes a contradiction also in the institutional structure of the society. The third fault line, which results from the first and the second ones, is the “double movement” that is formed by two contradictory tendencies in the market society: the extension of the market into the “rest” of the society, and a protective

countermovement that tries to check this extension. The clash between these two contradictory movements tends to disrupt the functioning of the market. It is important to understand that these three fault lines are dependent to each other and they reinforce each other's effects. The separation between the economic and the political spheres, imposing a double life for the individuals will eventually force them to resist the market in the form of (mostly political) interventions. And this makes the reproduction of the market society an unstable process to the extent that it becomes a "stark utopia."

The market system, by breaking down the human "livelihood," to be seen as a whole, into economic and political spheres, and thus treating human beings as mere atoms and confine them within the economic sphere, also disintegrates the social bond based upon the directness of relations between individuals and replaces it with another one, the bond of exchange, or of money, this "alienated capacity of mankind" (Marx 1975, 377). In this "mystical" world in which the individual is imprisoned within some "alien," reified social relations, and loses the control over her own life, rather than realizing her essence. This occurs because her immediate environment and even herself is reduced to a bearer of commodities and to a "functional" unit, or to the "personification" of the reified social relations.

However, this process of fetishism, or "petrification" in Weberian terms, will also create a reaction on the part of the society against being imprisoned in an "iron cage" (Weber, 1930). This process is conceptualized best by Polanyi's notion of "double movement," which presents an important framework to understand the contradictory character of the capitalist society. In this regard, two aspect of this framework can be stressed: First of all, the capitalist society, characterized by the institutional separation between the economic and the political spheres, is unstable because the institutional strains inherent in the organization of the system are further aggravated by the tensions between social classes which arise out of these strains and which make it difficult to maintain the economic-political separation for these tensions are constantly carried back and forth between the two spheres. In this perspective, different agents, such as social classes and sections, interact or struggle with each other, which makes the whole process a dynamic one that need to have a definite end, such as collapse or inevitable revolution. In a sense, then, the double movement is a continuous struggle between the "economic" interests of one stratus of the society, embodied as the extension of the market, and the general interest of the society as a whole, embodied as the protective countermovement. More accurately, the double movement, seen from a "societal" perspective, refers to the struggle between those forces that represent the "disembedded" economy and those that represent the attempt to "reembed" it into the society. That is to say, the protective countermovement refers to a social, or institutional, tendency to resist to, or to rebel against, the inhumane, reified conditions of the market system.

With the establishment of the fictitious commodities, an individual is forced to live through a double life. She must behave as a "*homo oeconomicus*" within the market while s/he must act as a "*homo reciprocans*" (Gintis 2000, ch. 11) and affirm her sociality in the political sphere. However, this institutional structure is untenable because a human beings is not just an individual who act on the "motive of gain and fear of hunger," (Polanyi *et al.* 1957, 68) but she

is also a social being, who even develop her identity through a dialogue with other members of the society. Yet, the liberal vision requires human beings to exist and act just for the sake of the functioning of the market, a fact that shows that individuals' own power to make a difference in the world, or the "agency" power is violated. This, however, leads them to assert their own sociality, or solidarity with other people, so as to affirm their own "connectedness", which in turn create institutional strains in the reproduction of the system, for it takes the form of interventions into the functioning of the market. And this contradiction between two important human traits, namely between individuality and sociality, eventually will create tensions, strains and even disruptions in the functioning of the system. That is to say, even if the market society represents a social design that corresponds to the "discovery" of both individuality and the sociality of human beings, for the first time in human history, simultaneous emphases of these traits make the functioning and the reproduction of the market society a contradictory process. Such an argument reveals the utopian elements of the market system as envisaged by the liberal system of thought. The liberal's reliance on the "invisible hand" simply assumes away these contradictions without giving any satisfactory answer to the question "why should unintended consequences always result in a desirable social order?" In this respect, current economic thinking falls even behind the position of Hobbes.

According to Polanyi, a "double movement" characterized the history of the market system: "the extension of the market organization in respect to genuine commodities was accompanied by its restriction in respect to fictitious ones" (Polanyi 1944, 76). Therefore, two simultaneous tendencies that exist in the capitalist society constitute this double movement: the process of commodification, i.e., extension of exchange relations to the fictitious commodities, on the one hand, and society's "response," i.e., the resistance carried out by different classes and organizations within the society to the extension of the market on the other. In fact, these two contradictory movements give the capitalist society an unstable character: the protective countermovement as an attempt at restricting or at least slowing down the extension of the market will eventually impair the working of the self-regulating market. Since the system is organized on the basis of these commodity fictions, any intervention from the part of the social classes or state, or both, into the markets, for these fictitious commodities create impairments in these three markets. These impairments will in turn intensify the tensions already inherent in the society which will obstruct the working of the market as a whole. Therefore, the double movement actually signifies a circular process. Since the social classes themselves and their conflicts emanate from the economic sphere in a capitalist society and since this society is subordinate to the market, conflicts among these classes will necessarily have social dimensions even when they are purely economic in character, and this in turn will cause further disruptive effects on the economic sphere whose impairment will intensify the tensions existing in the society (Polanyi 1944, 201). In other words, since the protectionist countermovement is a direct intervention to the working of the self-regulating market, which inevitably has political consequences, it will tend to break the institutional separation of the economic and the political upon which the market system is built. The result of such a process would be the disintegration of the society, for the attempt to reestablish this institutional separation requires eradication of every form of social opposition against the market by any means, including the use of overt force as the fascist period has

shown: "Fascism, like socialism, was rooted in a market society that refused to function" (Polanyi 1944, 239).

In other words, Polanyi's critique is directed to the invisible hand paradigm of the social order: market society is inherently unstable because of the antagonistic elements in the organization of the market system, which manifest themselves as the conflicts between social classes or groups. Here, first, the causal "agents" in the double movement are classes, and second, as an implication, state appears as a platform or an "arena" of the class struggle, a concept with the help of which capitalist society can be analyzed. Nevertheless, the double movement should not be reduced to a simple clash between the classes in the society, even though both of these movements were conducted mainly by classes and the principles they represent, even when these principles are not compatible, from time to time, with their immediate "interests." And it is the existence of this struggle between the classes and its effect on the economic sphere, the market, which makes capitalist society inherently unstable.

Therefore, from a social-theoretical point of view, Polanyi's overall account of the market system provides us with three important points. First, Polanyi's argument is that market society is inherently unstable; in other words, his critique is directed to the invisible hand paradigm of the social order. What makes market society unstable is the antagonistic elements and conflicts between social classes or groups, and since the market operates on the basis of the principle of self-interest, not on solidarity, social disintegration is inevitable (Hechter 1981, 411). However, as the second point to be stressed, the double movement should be taken to mean a clash between the two institutional spheres, as the embodiment of the two opposing principles characterizing the human condition. While the "fear of hunger and hope of gain" underlies the extension of the market, the countermovement is induced by the fact that human beings are basically "political animals." In other words, the protective countermovement against the extension of the market sphere represents a moral resistance against 'dehumanization' created by the commodity fictions, rather than representing a class struggle driven by 'economic' interests. Last, but not least, even if this protective countermovement can be seen as a form of 'reclaiming humanity,' it may not always create desirable outcome for the humanity. The paradigmatic example for this, is of course, the rise of fascism. The morale that can be inferred from this fact is that the protective countermovement can also have disastrous consequences, if we do not consider the ethical importance of it for the whole humanity. For the basic problem of the market economy is not just economic, but it is basically social and moral. Market economy was doomed to failure because "its purpose was to create profits and welfare, not peace and freedom" (Polanyi 1944, 255). Therefore, the market economy was from the very beginning, a "stark utopia" (Polanyi 1944, 3), because it is "an illusion to assume a society shaped by man's will and wish alone" (Polanyi 1944, 257-58). And this process is an "emergent" one in the sense that it is not possible to predict what kind of disruptions will occur during the reproduction process of the capitalist society. The interplay, strains and conflicts among the three interrelated aspects of the double movement, namely the institutional dimension, the class dimension, and the ideological dimensions (Özgür and Özel 2013), will shape the course of this reproduction process, and the "fault lines" underlying this society give rise to different movements, cycles, pendular swings, and even institutional transformations,

each of which could be unique. This framework, we believe, is also capable what happened in Turkey in the 'Gezi' movement.

2. The Gezi Resistance as an Attempt at Reclaiming Humanity

The "Gezi Resistance" (or, the "June Resistance", as is sometimes called), started in the 28th of May, 2013, and spreaded with increasing intensity throughout Turkey in the 30th of May until it was brutally suppressed by the police with excessive violence that claimed eight young lives, and left many wounded, most of whom were shot by the police with gas canisters and rubber bullets, some of which caused, in many cases, losing of eyes of individuals. The resistance was at first an attempt of protecting "Taksim Gezi Park" against the İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality's plans of "urban transformation" (i.e, cutting the trees and turn the park into a building complex), but it quickly become a massive opposition movement against the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP). But in fact, we believe, it was a kind of a "countermovement" on the part of the society against "dehumanizing" forces that take the form of neoliberal policies aimed at "embedding the society into the market", to use Polanyian notions. The present paper is an attempt at evaluating this countermovement and devising a narrative about it along Polanyian lines. The paper argues that the Gezi Resistance can be seen as an instance of the double movement, a countermovement against the commodification of all aspects of human existence, including nature itself.

First of all, some interesting observations can be made about this resistance. First, the "subject" that carried out the resistance was young people, especially those who were born in the 90s, in the "golden era" of the Globalization process. Unfortunately, even they were born in a growing world economy, when they become "adults", they have encountered with the global crisis and quickly become a part of the "precariat" with increasing insecurity and decreasing future prospects of having well-paid jobs, and aa "good life". In other words, this generation has come to realized that they lived through the destructive effects of the globalization and the accompanying neoliberal assault against the whole of humanity. Of course, neoliberalism not only creates unemployment and insecurity through the "flexible production" processes, but even more importantly, it brings all aspects of humanity, including the "natural habitat" of human beings, to the mercy of the market. And this generation is vulnerable, in the first place, to all the destructive effects of neoliberal assault. Another interesting property of these people is that they have grown with the development of, information technologies, and mastered them to an extent no other demographic group has such an advantage. An interesting sign of this was the creative and effective use of the social media and other forms of information technologies during the resistance. Such abilities presented this generation the opportunity to become truly "world citizens," a fact that caused the resistance to become an international movement since its beginning. A spontaneous emergence of international solidarity was an important property of the resistance since the very first night. Such internationalization, coupled with the openness to world, to different traditions and cultures, and respect of other "life choices" is a hallmark of this generation, and therefore the resistance. A very striking feature of the resistance, for example, was the participation of women, and the LGBT communities, and other gender-conscious movements and this distinguishes the June

resistance from other forms of oppositions in Turkey which are more organized. Still such an emphasis on differences and tolerance should not be taken simply as a form a “post-modern” appreciation, but as the acknowledgement of the fact that differences among different groups or life choices should not prevent them from coming together and opposing to injustices and the assaults by the “dehumanizing forces” of the market. That is to say, respect for human rights is another important aspect of the resistance. In this respect, the resistance was able to establish a joint platform, through the local “forums,” that allows different groups and life choices to express themselves freely, and at the same time to resist together to a common threat against humanity. In a sense, the resistance become a setting for “education” for this generation that taught them to realize that what unites them are more important than what divide them. In other words, they refused to be guided by what may be called as “identity politics”.

Still, this generation lives through a “dystopia”, which has become even more apparent with the global crisis. The crisis threatens not only unskilled labor, but even more severely skilled labor that is familiar with the IT technologies, and able to use these technologies in a creative way. Since they are relatively well-educated, they expected to climb upper in the ladder of social stratification, but they were disappointed because of the conditions of the “global economy.” Such facts that urban unemployment is much higher (22%) than the overall unemployment in Turkey (something around 10%); unemployment rate for the young people has risen from 20,6% to 23,2 % between 2012 and 2013, overall unemployment rate has increased between the 90s and 2000s; one in every four people has no social security, the proportion of those who work on the average between 50 and 72 hours is well over 40%; the increase in job insecurity and also decrease in work safety in general, increasing numbers of work accidents etc., show the extent of this dystopia (Gürbüz 2013).

Another dimension of this dystopia is that the neoliberal transformation undergoes not only in the productive apparatus *per se*, but in the health, education and environmental sectors through the financialization processes. The massive “proleterianization” or joining to the “precariat,” has been a result of this commodification.

The Gezi resistance was first of all against the “commodification” of urban areas through the “urban transformation programs” and the accompanying “gentrification” processes, and “commodification” of nature in general. Such a transformation has been the hallmark of the “globalization process” in Turkey, since the 1980s. In this respect, three important sources of capital accumulation in Turkey are worth mentioning. First, throughout the period of the Turkish Republic, an important, if not the most important, source of capital accumulation was the state, for controlling the state apparatus, or at least some parts of it, such as government agencies, and institutions through political processes, was of utmost importance in accumulating capital. Second, even if there have been important advances in industrialization, speculation over land has always been an important source of accumulation (Buğra 1985, 1994). In particular, for the last 10 to 15 years, the “urban transformation projects” have been basic source of “rent-seeking” behavior, especially on the lands owned by the state that are to be used as sites of big construction projects. Thus, a “safe” strategy for accumulating capital has

been to exploit public resources (including natural ones, such as land and mines) in collaboration with state officials and local government agencies. Of course, as is well known, some “communal” relations are also used as useful vehicles to this end in recent years. The importance of these communal relations within the political processes is a key to understand these kinds of land speculations and overall rent-seeking behavior in Turkey. If one is excluded from these relations, it is very hard for one to become “successful” (not only in business, in other areas including universities). Of course, the “fuel” of this “perpetual motion engine” is the “cheap” money that has become available through the financialization process.³ In other words, there is a close collaboration and strategic alliances between the “traditional” or “communal” structures and the international institutions and processes representing the neoliberal agenda, for the market “reforms,” privatization, commodification of land, health, education have been integral parts of this process. As long as this process that is fuelled by the financialization process throughout the world. However, since the young people who are not affiliated with these “communities” are excluded from this process, it was only natural for them to resist. Thus, the Gezi resistance was carried out by the least privileged in the Turkish society, even if they want to see themselves as the “elites” of the society, for they have, more or less, a good education.

In sum, the Gezi resistance can be read as a form of a protective countermovement on the part of people who are hurt by the extension of the market, carried out by the AKP government. In this respect, it was a reaction against the dehumanizing forces represented by the neoliberal assault on the lives of real human beings. Since young people from different orientations and political views are the real victim of this assault, for they will live in this “brave new world,” together with other young people throughout the world, who are also resisting to this assault in different parts of the world, such a countermovement is also necessary. In this regard, Polanyi’s own words provide us with a real objective:

But the true nature of man rebels against Capitalism. Human relationships are the reality of society. In spite of the division of labour they must be immediate, ie., personal. The means of production must be controlled by the community. The human society will be real, for it will be humane: a relationship of persons (Polanyi 1935, 375).

3. Crisis and the Future of Resistance

Since the Gezi resistance was suppressed in a most brutal way, it is worth to ask what’s coming next. In this regard, different tendencies, not only in the Turkish society, but also in the world, can be conceived. In the international sphere, it can be argued that even if neoliberalism attempts at devising a new institutional setting (Gür, Canpolat, and Özel, 2011), that is based on a new organization of the human society along the “dualistic lines” (separation between the economic and the political spheres) once again, this project has been hardly successful so far which has become obvious after the global crisis. Furthermore, these days things seem getting even worse. Economists in the first half of the 2000s seemed confident about the future path of

the capitalism and importance of their discipline in terms of tackling with problems of the *past*. Markets had proved to be stable and the business cycles were thought as moderate. Market reforms, greater integration of economies and financial deepening were seen major forces of economic tranquility and prosperity. Yet, as subprime mortgage crisis started in the U.S. it quickly spread to other parts of the world through financial markets and the decline in international trade. What seemed as the solid foundations of the Great Moderation turned out to be house of cards.

Market fundamentalism have been questioned, and since then a there is a renewed interest for regulation of financial markets, economic inequality and *inclusive* capitalism. For example Mark Carney, the governor of the Bank of England, is calling for inclusive capitalism that will supply equality of outcomes and blaming the market fundamentalism of earlier years as the major reason for the recent crisis: "Market fundamentalism...contributed directly to the financial crisis and the associated erosion of social capital." And it is not a coincidence Thomas Piketty and his famous book *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (Piketty, 2013) is becoming a best-seller in the U.S., in country with a very high income and wealth inequality. Similarly there is a renewed interest for Marx, Schumpeter, Keynes and Minsky; or in short for theories that emphasize intrinsic market instability.

In fact, even before the crisis theories on income inequality, financialization, global imbalances and asset bubbles were widely studied by heterodox economists, yet these studies were not noticed by the mainstream of the discipline. And now it looks there is an opportunity for replacing market fundamentalism with higher degree of regulation, and macroeconomic policies that directly address income inequality and an equitable growth. We all know catastrophic consequences of the Great Depression shaped the economic regulations and interventionist policies of the Post-war era; and as market fundamentalism is questioned again can we expect similar changes in the economics and policy-making?

Even though there is an opportunity for such changes, it is still too early, if not impossible, to expect a paradigm change in the discipline of economics and policy-making. One reason is, even though the recession has been a long and severe one, it has not been as catastrophic as the Great Depression. And secondly, financial markets and their influence on the economy and politics did not collapse similar to the Great Depression. As a result of this second factor, market fundamentalism is very alive and strong among the decision-makers and mainstream economics.

After the crisis erupted the monetary policies of the U.S. Federal Reserve have focused on preventing a financial meltdown first, and then supplying liquidity for financial markets. And the crisis spread to Europe first through the banking sector and secondly through the highly indebted governments of the Eurozone. European policies have been similar to the U.S. in terms of the needs of the financial markets. There have also been some attempts to regulate financial markets in the U.S. such as Sarbanes-Oxley and Dodd-Frank acts, and in the E.U. through attempts for a unified banking regulation. These attempts may be considered as steps for further regulations, but these are highly complex regulation and as a result, this

complexities can create loopholes for financial institutions to bypass the intended regulations (Kregel and Tonveronachi, 2014).

In sum, monetary policies have been very aggressive and to some extent there have been regulatory attempts. Yet matching fiscal policies did not take place neither in the U.S. of the E.U that could directly aim unemployment and economic growth. Emergency measures prevent financial meltdowns and ironically this pseudo-success of these policies is limiting governments' ability to combat unemployment and recession. Unlike the Great Depression financial markets strength have been restored, and this restoration also meant the restoration of market fundamentalism.

As Keynes had strongly argued in his *General Theory*, as deflationary pressures emerge in an economy, markets ability to reverse this limited. Only a coordinated effort through a government's direct spending can be successful in terms of stimulating economic growth, and such policies are non-existent as in the case of Europe or too weak as in the case of the U.S. The European economies, especially the Eurozone, is on the edge of deflationary spiral and the U.S. suffering from weak economic growth with increased income inequality.

In the aftermath of the crisis there was a possibility of establishing a regulated financial markets with government intervention, but this possibility has disappeared as a result of developments mentioned above. And the attempts to save financial markets, stimulate asset prices without giving similar boost to employment or median household income in the U.S. The European experience has been more severe as austerity programs were used in countries with high government debt.

In the *Great Transformation*, Polanyi mentions four institutions that the market society of the nineteenth century was built upon. These were international balance of power, liberal government, the gold standard and the free market. And the collapse of these institutional foundations, starting from the gold standard, led to the collapse of nineteenth century civilization. In the Post-war era a new tamed market system was founded in the West with regulation and direct government intervention. And finally the institutions of Post-war era were replaced with new ones similar to nineteenth century that focus on liberal markets and market fundamentalism. Even though this new market system came very close to collapse, it was saved as a result of macroeconomic policies. Financial markets and the idea of market fundamentalism is saved but the problems of inequality and unemployment remained intact unlike the developments of the Post-war era. These aspects of the problem raises a legitimacy issue for market system; i.e. if the anti-crisis policies do not improve and often worsen the living conditions of the majority of population the polarization will take place in these societies.

As manifested Polanyi's double-movement the expansion of the market is taking place since the last crisis and is becoming more destructive; as a result the need for a countermovement is increasing. However, the expansion of market both before and after the crisis left no room for such measures. In the nineteenth century civilization the free market was one of the institutions of the system, but now it is above all three others. Markets used to be disembedded in the social life but now they are disembedded in the international political

system as well. In the past there was a possibility of seeking shelters against the expansion of market forces through labor unions, protective policies, welfare state, ...etc.; but these are no longer a possibility.

On the basis of this brief discussion, we can identify different, and contradicting, tendencies that could occur in the immediate future. First of all, in Turkey, as in different parts of the world, the “education” process through which young people undergo may convince them to change “the rules” of the game. Even after the Fed’s quantitative easing policies, things are not getting well, and the world economy becomes a “hostage” of the financial system as a whole. That is, capitalism and neoliberal ideology can no longer offer viable solutions for the livelihoods of people. For this reason, it can be conceived that the future must be different, for since human social fabric and humanity as a whole is once again on the verge of extinction, a new institutional setting may be on its way. But in this regard, the world today resembles the conditions that are prevalent in the 1930s, in which different “solutions” were created, namely, socialism, fascism, and the welfare state. To remember Polanyi once again, “fascism, like socialism, was rooted in a market society that refused to function” (Polanyi 1944, 239). Second, as to the ideological dimension of the double movement, the TINA (“There is no alternative”) formation dictated by the neoliberal ideology may have well been entrenched firmly in the minds of people. As Keynes has warned us in the Preface of his *General Theory* (Keynes 1936), “The difficulty lies, not in the new ideas, but in escaping from the old ones, which ramify, for those brought up as most of us have been, into every corner of our minds.” If this is the case, then the future may be as dark as the neoliberal past itself. If capitalism will be successful to create a new “techno-economic paradigm”, then the reign of the market, and therefore its dehumanizing effects, will continue. Yet, this also means more insecurity, unemployment, inequality, exploitation, etc. And third, which is most imminent danger in our minds, a growing dissent with the market society may encourage populist, and fascist views that seek to establish their own “utopias” with violence. Increasing xenophobia, racism, exclusion of differences suggest that the “barbaric” days of humanity will not come to an end in the near future. Once again, “socialism or barbarism” slogan seems to apply.

References

- Buğra, Ayşe, 1985, *Devlet ve İşadamları*, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Buğra, Ayşe, 1994, *State and Business in Modern Turkey: A Comparative Study* (SUNY Series in the Social and Economic History of the Middle East, State Univ of New York Press.
- Gintis, H. 2000, *Game Theory Evolving*, Princeton University Press: Princeton NJ.
- Gür, T. H., N. Canpolat, and H. Özel, 2011, "The Crisis and After: There Is No Alternative?" *Panoeconomicus* 58(1): 113–133.
- Gürbüz, B., 2013, "Bir Gezi direnişi yorumu üzerine" <http://haber.sol.org.tr/yazarlar/burak-gurbuz/bir-gezi-direnisi-yorumu-uzerine-74406>. *Sol Haber Portalı*, June 9, 2013.
- Hechter, Michael (1981). "Karl Polanyi's Social Theory: A Critique," *Politics and Society*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 399-429.
- Keynes, J. M., 1936, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, London: Macmillan (reprinted 2007).
- Kregel, J. And M. Tonveronachi, 2014. "Fundamental principles of financial regulation and supervision," Working papers 29, *Financialisation, Economy, Society & Sustainable Development* (FESSUD) Project, <https://ideas.repec.org/p/fes/wpaper/wpaper29.html>.
- Marx, K. 1975, *Early Writings*, translated by R. Livingstone, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Özgür, G. and H. Özel. 2013, "Double Movement, Globalization, and the Crisis," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, vol. 72, No. 4 (October), 892-916.
- Piketty, T. 2014, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, translated by A. Goldhammer, Cambridge, Mass., The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Polanyi, K. 1944, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, New York: Rinehart & Co.
- Polanyi, K., C. M. Arensberg and H. W. Pearson (eds.), 1957. *Trade and Markets in the Early Empires: Economies in History and Theory*, New York: The Free Press.
- Weber, M. 1930, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by T. Parsons, London: Harper Collins.

Notes

¹.

² This section is based on the discussion in (Özgür and Özel, 2013: 894-8).

³ For globalization and financialization, see (Özgür and Özel, 2013)