

## **An Essay on the Relation between Democracy and the Modern State: The Case of Turkey<sup>1</sup>**

**Dr. Fatih Duman**

Hitit University  
Department of Politics  
Turkey

**Dr. İsmail Seyrek**

Hitit University  
Department of Economics  
Turkey

### **Abstract**

*On the one hand this paper deals with the definitions and historical developments of the modern state and the concept of democracy, and their interactions in terms of democratization of the modern state. On the another hand the paper analyses the historical developments of the democratic movement in Turkey in relation to the traditional state which has been surviving from the early Ottoman times to the young republic and so on. The paper claims that there have been a struggles to protect the classical structure of the traditional state in Turkey against civil demands for a liberal democratic state in general and basic human rights and freedoms in particular. Furthermore it is clear that the democratization of the state in Turkey has been taking place in terms of new regulations with respect to the values of liberal democratic state and the human rights and freedoms.*

**Key words:** Turkey, democracy, modern state, democratization, democratic political system

### ***I- Introduction***

Democracy and the state, which have been debated for 2500 years, are two basic concepts of the political science. Through historical process the concept of democracy has been loaded with different meanings, and has gone through different transformations from the direct democracy of the ancient Greek to the contemporary representative democracy of our time. Similarly the concept of the state has been also defined and debated in different forms in the historical process which reaches from the city states to the empires, and from feudal kingdoms to the modern states.

Democracy has been used as the concept related with peculiarities of the relationships between society and the state, i.e. a concept about political system, in the modern era. The basic problem of the modern world is how much the political system is democratic or not in some way. Nowadays changes and transformations lived in the Arab world have put a kind of demand for democracy once more on the agenda against the arbitrary governments. Alias, international interventions carried out have been put forward on behalf of providing the democratic rights and freedoms of people. In short, democracy and the view of a democratic state or struggle for democratization of the current political systems have been continuing to be basic political motivation.

This work concentrates on the mutual relationships between democracy and the modern state. In this context, in relation to the modern state, multisided relationships of the democracy, which is regarded as a positive value, and how it shows itself in the case of Turkey are handled. The first main section of the study includes the investigation of the concept of democracy and the modern state. The second main section aims to uncover the multidirectional relationships between democracy and the modern state in Turkey. The last main head line concludes the paper.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at the 10<sup>th</sup> Annual International Conference on Politics & International Affairs organized by ATINER (The Athens Institute for Education and Research), 18-21 June 2012 in Athens, Greece.

## ***II- The Concept of Democracy and the Modern State***

### **A- Democracy**

The concept of democracy has been defined in different forms throughout the historical process. In this respect, it is possible to mention about various models of democracy based on its different definitions: The classical model of democracy in the ancient Athens, liberal democracy, social democracy, pluralist democracy, developmental democracy, protective democracy, deliberative democracy and radical democracy and likewise in the modern time. Actually the most parts of those differences have been shaped within the framework of critiques towards the fundamental arguments of the modern liberal democracy and its working mechanisms which we will deal with later (Held, 2006; Dahl, 1989).

In the period after the Second World War that the democracy, which has gained a positive meaning and has been seen as the basic legitimate source of the state has let to that most states have shown or presented themselves as democracy. In other words, states have asserted to be democratic in order to prove that they have been based on public. This process which has reached to current time has led to the result which democratization has been adopted by states as target in principle. In the earlier times democracy did not have the popularity which it has got among the political thinkers at the present day. For example, democracy, according to great philosophers Plato and Aristotle in the ancient Athens where it emerged first time, is one of the mismanagements which allows the illiterate and poor people to rule the Police according to their own interests. On the other hand, current political scientists have perceived a democratic political system as an ideal which must be established and continuously developed. Even numerous decisions and realized actions in international field have been justified for the name of establishing and preserving democratic political systems. It has been often argued that international interventions to other states have been carried out with the perceived threats against democratic values, and to protect those values and make them settled.

With the current meaning democracy is a concept related with political system. How the relationships of state and public or that of ruler and ruled are established, determines whether political system is democratic or not. At this point state and political system must not be mixed with each other. State is an administrative device which uses in practice the command of power the so called sovereignty. It could be federal or unitary as its structure as well as monarchy or republic as its form. Those distinctions which are legal differences related with state, and they do not indicate whether political system is democratic or not. As we have mentioned democracy is a concept which refers to the network of relations built by the state with the public. Construction of this division will avoid mixing forms of state with political systems. For instance, European countries like the United Kingdom and Sweden ruled by constitutional monarchy are democratic countries. On the other hand, democracies of Iran and China which describe themselves as republic are controversial. Furthermore, the democratic feature of a political system is closely related with the political order in general meaning in there. In other words, while the democracy finds its meaning and practices in a political system, this political system is formed within the political culture, traditions, historical conditions and the economic state of that country. However, it is neither true that there is a deterministic relationship between those factors and the democratic political system. For example, economic development does not per se let to the democratic political system. Authoritarian or totalitarian political systems could have been established in even economically developed countries although they were not enduring.

State and people relationship could be set up differently within the framework of political system. As in the 'direct democracy' in the ancient Athens state and public could be almost interconnected to each other. Or as happening in the representative democracy applied in the modern times the public could be able to practice administrative function through the hand of representatives. It does not seem to be possible to apply the 'direct democracy' in countries which populations have increased. However, as a result of the criticisms which have been put forward against the representative democracy the semi direct democratic practices could have been applied in order to improve the relationships between the state and people. The basic principle which determines the characteristics of the political system is how the relationships between the state as a device of administration and ruled are regulated. If the political power is gathered in the hands of a particular person or a section it means that there is an antidemocratic political system. However, such a political system could have an absolute monarchy or an authoritarian republic as the form of state. If the political power is widened within the society and distributed through the devices of participation it means that there is a democratic political system. The state of such a system could be constitutional monarchy as well as a republic.

The main problem here is that how the people who own the power gained their positions, and what limits which they obey while they use the power of the authority are, and how the power changes hand. A privileged person or a section does not exist in a democratic political system; everyone has equal rights in front of the law, and the legitimacy of power depends on the will of the people. An administration which does not depend on people in a wider sense will not have a democratic political system. Furthermore, the government which depends on people must change hands through free elections carried out in certain periods. In other words, there must be mechanisms which allow the changes of political power without using oppression and shedding blood. Now days, the most secure way of this is to make free and fair elections repeated in short periods in democratic countries. If the elections are to reflect a real preference, it is only possible to recognize that citizens have basic political and economic rights and freedoms, in principle, especially the freedom of association, the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech and thought. The fairness and rightness of elections will be controversial in those countries in where these rights are not recognized or secured.

## **B- The Modern State**

In order to uncover the relationship between a democratic political system and a modern state it is necessary to determine the descriptive aspects of the concept of the modern state. With the formation of division of ruler and ruled in a social structure which has been exposed to a differentiation at certain level it can be said that an administrative device which has the political power has emerged. However, broadly speaking we have come across different types of this administrative device in the historical process. On one hand, for the Western world city states, city republics, tribe federations, kingdoms, empires, principedoms and likes, and on the other hand, for the Eastern world emirates, Khanate, sultanate, caliphate and managements like them can be exemplified for different types of political organizations. Within the context of this work ‘the modern nation state’ which has emerged in the Western world and has been exemplified by other countries in the historical process will be handled.

The modern state is not just a political fact, but it has also emerged to the stage of history as a product of economic, social and intellectual processes and factors. Within this context the following processes can be mentioned: the changing of the production structure from feudalism toward capitalism, increasing in urbanization, improvement of trade, changing meaning of having wealth, the beginning of formation of the new social and economic classes, the change of the warfare technology, important changes lived in the intellectual world (the Renaissance and Reform events). As a result of these processes which have constituted the historical conditions, the modern state which has emerged as a centralization and monopolization of the political power in one hand has taken the place in the stage of history. The direct result of this is that some political and social functions which had been used to be performed by nobilities and clerics were to be carried out anymore by the state. The state started to collect taxes, and ensure security and justice directly through the great bureaucratic mechanism which was owned by it. In another word, while the feudal institutions and webs of relationship of the old order were disappearing, the state emerged as a new centralized bureaucratic organization (Pierson, 1996; Poggi, 1978).

The most important foot of the centralization of the state power is constituted by fact that the state has taken the monopoly of practicing power into one hand. The state achieved the centralization of coercive power through standing and central armies. Within this context the basic feature characterizing the modern state is that it has the monopoly of using legitimate force. With Max Weber’s (1991: 78) words: “Today the relation between the state and violence is an especially intimate one. In the past, the most varied institutions –beginning with the sib- have known the use of physical force as quite normal. Today, however, we have to say that a state is a human community that (successfully) claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory”. The understanding of sovereignty which developed through the thoughts of thinkers like N. Machiavelli (1974), J. Bodin (1955), T. Hobbes (1995), J. J. Rousseau (1954), E. J. Sieyès (1963) provided the legitimacy which the modern state emerged at the factual level needed in order to carry on as a monopoly with its centralized political power. Through time it has been moved from the theoretical explanations which the modern state was the abstract public body of the king to the ones which it is equivalent with public or nation. During this process although the subject of the sovereignty changed, the concept of the sovereignty did not change much. Thereby, the modern nation state which has got the monopoly of using legitimate power as a sovereign authority (sovereignty), in certain boundaries of a country (territoriality), and centralized its power through various tools (centrality) and identified with a nation or public identity (nationality), emerged to the stage of history.

The modern state bases its legitimacy on nation at theoretical level. However, this struggle for democratic justification at the theory does not guarantee that the factual people participate in the governance of state in practice. The distance, which is hard to close, between the abstract nation and the factual people, shows that the modern state does not have a democratic functioning with the current meaning. In another word the theory of national sovereignty does not necessarily lead to a democratic political system, but it has got it within its body as an opportunity. Although it is described as absolute and limitless, the power of the modern state is not an arbitrary force in the theories of sovereignty either. However, how this is provided in practice or at factual basis constitutes a serious debate which is realized in the context of the democratic political system.

### **C- Democratization of the Modern State**

Although the modern state is regarded as suitable unit with respect to establishing a system of justice and security at national level, in one way or another it is necessary to avoid the misuse of this power which is seen unquestionable. In spite of all changes there always exists the risk of a despotism based on this absolute power which is still a Leviathan. Because there is no any guarantee that this mortal God always exhibits a fair administration within the context of common good and interest as designed both in practice and theory. When it is look at the history of the last three hundred centuries it is hard to say that the modern state has given a good examination (Minogue, 1995). At this point, from wherever it gets the legitimacy, the power of state or the actions and decisions of those who use this power must be restricted in one way or another. At this point democracy, which is a concept related with the nature of relationships between the society and the device of state, comes across the modern state. Moreover, it is necessary to mention that the transformation of the modern state into the part of a democratic political system did not happen abruptly. Political struggles, conflicts and changes within the historical process gave rise to the democratization of the state in the course of time. We can sequence applications suitable for this aim as following: 1- Constitutionalist movement, i.e. struggle for restricting the state with the principles in the constitution. 2- Securing basic rights and freedoms by placing them in the constitution, i.e. restricting the state with human rights. 3- The administration and control of all decisions and actions of those who rule the state within the rules of law, i.e. the principle of the rule of law. 4- Recognizing rights of political participation, control and association for all citizens and the provision of their functioning in practice. 5- The prevention of despotic propensity and arbitrariness caused by the concentration of the power through giving up the state force to different organs, i.e. the principle of separation of power.

Struggles toward making the modern state a part of democratic political system are not limited with those we have sequenced above. Democracy is not a closed and completed ideal. Because the increased power of the modern state has means to destroy individual rights and freedoms easily even by having support from improved technological facilities. In this point various critiques are put forward by depending on relationships among the nation state, capitalist economic order and liberal democratic system. The process of globalization which constitutes the historical context of these critiques has resulted in the discussion of structural changes in the social and the political order which are formed in the bases of national state. Within this context globalization, postmodernism and the crisis of liberal democracy has created interrelated problem areas. The process of globalization which constitutes the new context of the politics has opened discussions on the relations between the state and public and the concept of the democracy in this context and has put forward the new projects of democracy. These projects have been underlining the crisis of liberal democracy and have brought new suggestions from this point (Dryzek, 2002: 8-30). In this process the nation state's notion of sovereignty and the integrative constructions like 'national identity', 'national economy' and 'national culture' which found their meanings in this framework have been exposed to erosion.

Those interrelated critiques toward the liberal democratic system in this context can be handled in two categories. The first one is the critiques of difference which are stated with concepts like the politics of difference, the politics of recognition, multiculturalism or identity politics. Accordingly, the structure of the liberal democratic system and its working style don't reflect the pluralist structure which is formed by religious, ethnic, sexual, racial and cultural differences. Homogenization included by the national identity and the understanding of citizenship based on equal rights do not allow the representation of these differences. Individuals are not only marginalized due to their economic positions, but also due to their cultural identities i.e. differences (Grillo, 1998: 188-215). Moving from these critiques a democracy which carries pluralist identities in the social structure to political system namely the deepening of the liberal democracy has been demanded.

Second one is the participant critiques which could be generally gathered under the headline of radical democracy like ‘deliberative democracy’ of Jürgen Habermas (1996) or ‘an agonistic model of democracy’ of Chantal Mouffe (1999: 754-757). Accordingly, individuals are not able to participate in real terms into the process of taking decisions about themselves in the liberal democracy based on representative system. The liberal democratic system which functions as being disconnected from the interests of public and of different groups brings outcome for the benefits of strong sections. What must be done is deepening and radicalizing the democracy through creating mechanisms which provide more and direct participation of people into the public decisions (Trend, 1996; Lummis, 1996).

### **III- Democracy and the Modern State in Turkey**

When we look at the subject within the theoretical framework which we have dealt in the previous headline, the democracy and the modern state relationship in Turkey includes various processes realized in the modernization times with respect to historical perspective (Mandacı, 2012: 63-112). In this context it is possible to approach to the subject from moving through different perspectives. For example, with respect to period we can mention the Ottoman heritage, the republic periods with single and multi party times from the earlier years to the near time reaching to current days. From another angle, we can talk about a transition from an empire rule which includes various nations, religions, ethnic groups and cultures to a unique nation state, and the modernization struggles of the nation state. Furthermore, when it is handled in the bases of the constitutional order, it is possible to mention the lived transitions from absolute monarchy to constitutional one, from a single party authoritarian republic to a multi party democratic republic. The analysis we have been attempting to make here has been trying to determine the cornerstones of the existence and development of the modern state at political level and the democratic political system in Turkey. However, as we have mentioned above such a subject in Turkey is inevitably related with political culture, historical background and the world of mentality in a broad sense.

#### **A- Ottoman Heritage**

The traditional Ottoman political order is a centralized absolute monarchy in which the Sultan rules without sharing his power with anyone. The factor which keeps the system standing is the prioritization of state requirements above everything in every issue and area (*Hikmet-i Hükümet / Raison d’Etat*). This political structure which is Sultan based depends on the thought that nothing is worse than anarchy and there is no institutionalized methods of opposition. The political opposition required for democratic tradition has not been accepted as legitimate along the Turkish history. There have been some rules and values which drive the framework of the sovereign power of the Sultan in the Ottoman Empire, but there have not been nobility or clergy which has balanced his power as in the West.

With the dissolution of the traditional Ottoman order, rulers had looked for various solutions in order to avoid this trend. Some of those practices within this context have constituted the founding stones of the history of Turkish democracy. However, the process of state innovation and that of colonization have developed in parallel way. The Ottoman state which had fallen behind the West has made some important changes again to get the support of the Westerns. Generally these were realized with the forces of external dynamics, but in spite of all things they constituted the historical heritage of Turkish democracy. With the words of Özbudun (2011: 2), “the edicts of *Tanzimat* (1839) and *Islahat* (1856) were, in essence, unilateral declarations and a recognition by the Sultan of certain basic human rights for his subjects, including security of life, honour and property, the abolition of tax farming, fair and public trial of persons accused of crimes and the equality of all Ottoman subjects irrespective of religion, particularly as regards eligibility for government posts”. This Reform (*Tanzimat & Islahat*) period is considered the beginning of the constitutionalist movement in the Empire.

The period of the First Constitutional Monarchy started the experiences of the first parliament and constitution in the Turkish political life. *Heyet-i Mebusan* (the parliament) which was based on the principle of election was opened with *Kanun-u Esasi* (the constitution) which restricted the power of the Sultan. Despite the limited and indirect suffrage, it was the first time that basic rights and freedoms took place in the constitution and the power of the Sultan was restricted. However, these experiences of constitution and parliament lived very short and the Sultan prorogued the parliament indefinitely in 1878 and returned to absolutist rule for 30 years (Özbudun, 2011: 2-4). The second constitutional monarchy which started with Sultan’s call for parliament assembly in 1908 is a laboratory for the history of Turkish democracy.

It can be said that it was moved to a new constitutional order in real terms with changes made in the constitution in 1909. The most important institution was not the Sultan, but the parliament in the second constitutional monarchy as a different from the first one. In terms of basic rights and freedoms there were also important developments lived in this period which had a strong parliamentary system. It was first time that some public liberties, such as the freedom of assembly and association and secrecy of communications, were introduced into the constitution; a relatively liberal constitution was built; general elections were carried out three times; first time labour unions and leftist parties were established; and woman rights were started to be defended. The most important one is that a multi party experience in which opposition parties took place was lived. As a result of all these, in spite of its shortages a parliamentary system, a liberal constitution, an active civil society and a multi party political life were left as legacy to the republic. However, the same period was the time in which various wars entered and the empire started to break up after 1911.

### **B- Single Party Period of the Republic of Turkey**

The time between 1918 and 1923 is the period that depended on extraordinary conditions and a new political regime was established by giving a struggle for survival. However, the interesting point is that the Turkish independence war was carried out through the hands of a parliament which was depended on representation and was working with democratic methods. This system which based on the conventional government system in which all powers were accumulated in the hand of the parliament achieved the rule of the parliament consisted of the representatives of the people in a country which was under occupation. The Constitution of 1921 which was based on the principle of the national sovereignty and brought a regulation of decentralization also reflects this democratic understanding. The single party period between 1924 and 1945 put aside the democratic soul of the Constitution of 1921. Although the Constitution of 1924 established even a parliamentary political system, the single party period of the republic exhibited an authoritarian administration that the society were tried to accept the radical reforms through the state power in order to create a new nation (Özbudun, 2011: 5-7). In another word, the consensus around the principle of the national sovereignty among the different parts of the society at the beginning of the independence war ended with the authoritarian single party rule of 'soldier-civil and bureaucratic class'.

Especially 1930s which stamped the integrations of the state and the party (Republican People's Party) were the periods which the project of creating a new nation was implemented and the differences in the social structure were sidelined in this framework. Distance between the state and the society or the distance between the centre and the periphery with the concepts of Şerif Mardin (1975) widened, and the regime constituted increasingly an authoritarian political system. The process of modernization which was realized by the policies of statist elites brought into a paradoxical occasion with respect to the creation of democratic political system. On one hand while a modern state was being created, on the other hand this 'social engineering' project disregarded the development of democratic and civil components in the social ground. That the nation was seen as a classless and integrated mass undertook a function which avoided the political representation of the differences which were necessary for democratic system and assured the state power further. The regime of republic carried on the Ottoman's the concept of 'state oriented politics' within the framework of German and French statist traditions which were materialized in the theoretical arguments of Hegel and Rousseau. In this period statism carried on its sovereignty not only as an economic policy, but also as a political and philosophical preference. In another word, the statism was not a temporary or cyclical device in the economic field in this period. On the contrary it was the basic principle of establishing the authoritative governance in social and political grounds in the proper sense. The control of the society with all aspects by the new regime was provided through an authoritarian state (Hürsoy, 2012).

Narrowness of the political opposition's legitimate area and treatment of the oppositions as separatist continued in the period of republic. The lack of the mentality of a legitimate political opposition which is a very crucial for democracy has been a continuous part of Turkish political culture. The experience of the second constitutional monarchy was not continued in the republic period. In order to keep its authority permanent the state both constituted a strong centralized structure and avoided the emergence of alternative voices through blocking all focal points of potential opposition.

### **C- Multi Party Period of the Republic of Turkey**

The period of multi party republic started in 1946 reached to current days in spite of discontinuity from time to time due to coups d'Etat. This period constituted the background of the environment in which a democratic political culture could seat through abolition of earlier prohibitions and restrictive codes. However, democracy does not suddenly emerge and settle down as falling from the sky in any country. It develops as happened in the West as a product of long time historical experiences, and of trials with up and down, and of various factors. With this respect although Turkey has moved into a multi party democratic system, she could not achieved the democratization of its political culture in wide sense. However, changes lived in Turkey have occurred by depending on the impulsive force of both our own historical heritage and the external dynamics (Özbudun, 2000: 13-47).

Although the current constitution describes the state with its democratic role, the arrangements of this neither in the constitution nor in the laws do not meet the requirements of a pluralist liberal democracy. For example the criteria of restricting basic rights are quite away from the requirements of modern constitutions and the understanding of human rights. Especially the first state of the current constitution used to reflect an authoritative context of the state toward the aim of empowering the authority, not toward individual. The soul of the constitution, i.e. the main understanding dominated it, aims at protecting the state from individual and the society. Yet this in practice reflects the struggles of sections who dominate the state against the individual and social demands. In another word, it benefits the aim to get the society to accept the official view which finds its meaning in the state rather than ensuring individual freedoms and social differences.

This case explains places of political parties which are important components of the political system in determining the state policies, i.e. the limited horizon of being able to get power. In another words, political parties which govern are not able to change exogenously determined official political arguments of the state. For this reason, there are not important differences among the actions by governments which are set up by political parties reflecting different political preferences. This undemocratic practice which emerges as a conflict of state-government depends on struggles and dissociations between selected ones (civil governments) and appointed (bureaucrats). In short, the state is not an instrumental value which reflects the social demands in terms of establishment and functionality, but it is not an impartial organization which represents common interest either. On the contrary, it is a formation which tries to isolate itself from social demands and has got a transcendent existence independent from the society. This distance faced us at various levels between the state and the society avoids also the institutionalization of an original political system.

One of the reasons for the distance between the society and the state and failure of establishing a democratic political system is conflicted relationships between bureaucratic soldiers and elected civilians in the Turkish political life. Three military coups d'Etat (1960, 1971, 1980), a post modern intervention (28<sup>th</sup> of February 1997) and an e-memorandum (27<sup>th</sup> of April 2007) were carried out during the multi party period of the republic in which a relatively democratic life has started (Aknur, 2012). A well-rounded alliance in which some high level army officers, civil bureaucrats, big capitalists, universities and some intellectuals are among them in Turkey has been making the protectionism of the modern state, but it demands that this must be carried out under an authoritative republic form. This group and their supporters have been persistently supported the Western reforms and the modern institutions built by the Republic, but they have been resisting to the institutionalization of a liberal democratic republic in the Western term. In other words, it was demanded that the state protects its ideological and institutional structure in the single party period. Demands for pluralist democracy from various parts of the public were being tired to be blocked with a coup d'Etat if it was necessary, and it was done too. However, both the development of internal dynamics in Turkey and the conditions at global level could not make possible the continuation of this authoritative republic mentality and practices. For some results of these global developments Turkey has set up various democratization packages and has passed them from the parliament.

In spite of the long way which has been taken the legitimate area of the political opposition is still narrow in our day. Opposition has not been regarded as democratic value not only at the level of political system, but also in own structures of political parties. Authoritarian political structures within parties have been keeping their existence (Musil, 2011; Akman, 2012).

Although the constitution regards the political parties as a democratic and inevitable part of the political life, the undemocratic codes of the Political Party Act which puts the political parties into a homogenous and single form have not been changed yet. Until the last periods parties which were thought to be in conflict with the official ideology could have been easily closed. The lack of establishing a pluralist democratic system in Turkey is also related in general with the predominate position of a statist mentality in the society. Expecting everything from the state and trying to get to better position through the facilities given by the state are important parts of the political culture in Turkey. In other words, the power of the institutions built by individuals' free will apart from state, i.e. the development of civil society have been quite limited in Turkey. Along the Turkish history the dominant characteristics of the state or that of the people held the state in their hands prevented the development of the civil society structure in which individuals act freely. Consequently, a liberal democratic system which depends on that the social demands are reflected from below to above could not have been institutionalized (Tosun, 2012).

New social and political actors which are based on foundations of differences have emerged out in Turkey in the last 15-20 years. The debates of diversity and identity which took place in the West have also reflected to Turkish political life. One of the basic debate areas of the current time is whether this demand of diversity could be able to find a place in the political system or not, whether the political framework could change accordingly or not, or to where a change would take place. Turkey has been living a serious transformation process especially in the last period. The content of the classic statist mentality have been organized such that it could allow a democratic political system. If Turkey uses an opportunity to make a liberal and democratic new constitution which is not a product of coup d'Etat and if a social consensus is made, very important transformations will take place in the Turkish political life. However, although it seems so hard, this depends on that the new constitution has to be a short and liberal text which regards social demands and contents liberal pluralist values. Lastly it is necessary to mention that it is very important to make a new democratic constitution, but texts of law cannot transform political culture and traditions suddenly in a country. For this reason, there is also needed for a multi-directional transformation of mentality by using historical experiences.

#### ***IV-Conclusion***

Turkey has inherited the tradition of centralist state from the Ottoman Empire and has got a political culture which carried on this centralist tradition even though she has changed the text of law in the Republic period. With respect the geopolitical evaluation the geography puts the security concerns at the top priority and feeds up autocratic and centralist propensities. Although the effects of geopolitics are important on the relationships of the ruler and the ruled, it must not be seen as deterministic and inevitable interrelationships. The security is a prerequisite for a modern state and a democratic political system. As we have mentioned in the first section the modern state and the facts of democratic states developing in the later periods cannot blossom in an environment in which the security is not provided. However, behaving in the administration of the state only with a Hobbesian security manner and the understanding of Leviathan is very far from sustainability. For this reason, the political system in Turkey must institutionalize the democracy one way or another. We can approach to the changes made recently from this perspective.

Moreover, although developments toward democratization and changes in the economic and social structures of Turkey are significant, it is very important not to forget the changes in the global order. The Turkish political life has been rather open to the effects of the external dynamics since the times of deterioration of the Ottoman Empire. As we mentioned above most parts of the developments which we have seen as cornerstone of the democracy were made through the forces of conjuncture or the demands of rulers to benefit from this conjuncture. For this reason, it is necessary to pay attention to this real outcome of our historical experience in order not to be utopian or unrealistic in the evaluation of democracy in Turkey.



**References**

- Aknur, M. (2012). 'The Impact of Civil-Military Relations on Democratic Consolidation in Turkey.' In: M. Aknur (ed.), *Democratic Consolidation in Turkey*, 203-247. Florida: Universal-Publishers.
- Akman, C. A. (2012). 'Democratic Consolidation and Institutional Challenges for Political Parties and the Party System in Turkey.' In: M. Aknur (ed.), *Democratic Consolidation in Turkey*, 143-177. Florida: Universal-Publishers.
- Bodin, J. (1955). *Six Books of the Commonwealth*. M. J. Tooley (ed.), Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dryzek, J. S. (2002). *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics and Contestations*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grillo, R. D. (1998). *Pluralism and the Politics of Difference*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1996). 'Three Normative Models of Democracy.' In: S. Benhabib (ed.), *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, pp. 21-30. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Held, D. (2006). *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hobbes, T. (1995). *Leviathan*. Bristol: Thoemmes Press.
- Hürsoy, S. (2012). 'The Impact of the State on Democratic Consolidation in Turkey.' In: M. Aknur (ed.), *Democratic Consolidation in Turkey*, 115-141. Florida: Universal-Publishers.
- Lummis, C. D. (1996). *Radical Democracy*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- Machiavelli, N. (1974). *The Prince*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Mandacı, N. (2012). 'Turkey's Unfinished Transition to Democracy.' In: M. Aknur (ed.), *Democratic Consolidation in Turkey*, 63-113. Florida: Universal-Publishers.
- Mardin, Ş. (1975). 'Centre-Periphery Relations: A Key to Turkish Politics.' In: E. D. Akarlı & G. Ben-Dor (ed.), *Political Participation in Turkey: Historical Background and Present Problems*, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Publications.
- Minogue, K. R. (1995). *Politics: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mouffe, C. (1999). 'Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism.' *Social Research*, Vol. 66, No. 3, pp.745-758.
- Musil, P. A. (2011). *Authoritarian Party Structures and Democratic Political Setting in Turkey*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Özbudun, E. (1999). *Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation*. London: Lynne Rienner.
- .....(2011). *The Constitutional System of Turkey: 1876 to the present*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pierson, C. (1996). *The Modern State*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Poggi, G. (1978). *The Development of the Modern State - A Sociological Introduction-*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1954). *The Social Contract*. Chicago: The Henry Regnery Co.
- Sieyès, E. J. (1963). *What is the Third Estate*. London: Pall Mall Press.
- Tosun, G. E. (2012). 'Civil Society and Democratic Consolidation in Turkey.' In: M. Aknur (ed.), *Democratic Consolidation in Turkey*, 179-201. Florida: Universal-Publishers.
- Trend, D. (ed.). (1996). *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship, and the State*. New York: Routledge.
- Weber, M. (1991). 'Politics as a Vocation.' In: H. H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (ed.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, pp. 77-128. London: Routledge.