Araştırma Makalesi
Research Article

ANALYZING SECULARISM MODELS: THE CASE OF TURKEY[i]

Kevser Hülya AKDEMİR*

Abstract: This paper based on the literature review discussion on secularism models, aims to categorize Turkish model during the republican era. Since secularism is an ambiguous term, this study first aims to draw a structure about the meanings loaded on secularism; and then classifies different secularism models that modern secular states practice. After making a core categorization on that arena, this study analyses the historical background of Republican Turkey and categorizes its secularism experience into three terms. Turkey as a country that has gone through many changes very quickly experienced and gave many different connotations to what secularism is. By dividing Turkey's history into three terms in this quest of giving meaning to what secularity should be, this paper investigates the stages and the theories together. While the first term is from the birth of the Turkish Republic to 1950 that is the date of transition to a democratic multi-party system, the second term involves the term from the 1950s to 2002 which witnessed the conflict of conservative parties and secular state bureaucracy with regards to the handling of secularism. This paper lastly, looks at AK Party period and how it transformed the notion of secularity into a passive and softer version of what it was before. The sphere of religious freedom and the close relationship it developed with secularity in AK Party period is also investigated and linked to Alfred Stepan's Twin Toleration model and Jonathan Fox's Separist Mode of Secularism.

Keywords: AK Party, Kemalism, Models of Secularism, Turkish Secularism.

SEKÜLERİZM MODELLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ: TÜRKİYE ÖRNEĞİ

Öz: *Bu çalışma geniş bir literatüre dayalı olarak dünyadaki laiklik modellerini incelemekte ve Cumhuriyet döneminde yaşanmakta olan Türkiye laiklik modellerini kategorize etmeye çalışmaktadır. Çalışma önce laiklik üzerine yüklenen anlamlar hakkında bir yapı çizmeyi ve daha sonra modern seküler devletlerde uygulanan farklı laiklik modellerini sınıflandırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu alanda çekirdek bir sınıflandırma yaptıktan sonra, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin tarihsel arka planını analiz etmekte ve laiklik deneyimini üç ana başlık altında toplamaktadır. İlk dönem, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin doğuşundan çok partili bir sisteme geçiş tarihi olan 1950'ye kadar iken, ikinci dönem 1950'den 2002'ye kadar olan dönemi kapsamaktadır. Bu dönem, laikliğin ele alınması ile ilgili olarak muhafazakar partilerin ve laik devlet bürokrasisinin çatışmasına tanıklık etmiştir. Son olarak, çalışmada, AK Parti politikalarının Türkiye'deki sekülerizm anlayışını, ikili hoşgörüye dayanan biçimde daha pasif veya yumuşak bir versiyona dönüştürdüğünü savunmakta ve bunu Alfred*

[i] Bu çalışma Kevser Hülya AKDEMİR tarafından Doç. Dr. Hüseyin ALPTEKİN danışmanlığında hazırlanan "Analyzing Secularism Models: the Case of Turkey" başlıklı yüksek lisans tezinden üretilmiştir.

* İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı Doktora Öğrencisi. e-mail: kevserakdemir@std.sehir.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0002-6278-8396

Geliş Tarihi: 08 Mayıs 2019 **Kabul Tarihi:** 25 Haziran 2019
Received: *08 May 2019* ***Accepted:*** *25 June 2019*

Stepan'ın İkiz Hoşgörü ve Jonathan Fox'un ayrılıkçı laiklik modeliyle ilişkilendirmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *AK Parti, Kemalizm, Sekülerizm Modelleri, Türkiye Sekülerizmi.*

I. Introduction

This article focuses on the question if secularism and democracy is compatible with religion or not and if it depends on the majority religion within the country. Even though the answers may vary, in the case of the relation between Islam and Democracy, we need to take a closer look at the basic juridical and political notion of Islamic thought. In Islam, rather than a particular person, a group, or an institution, Allah is the final authority and the ultimate source of law. In addition, having every human being as equals before God, and there is no priority of anyone over another no matter what their color, language or income, and anything else except for *takwa*. These features of Islam on the basis of authority and law, indeed, would create a free society, and set limits to the will of rulers and the state (Yılmaz, 2017, p. 32).

We can, clearly, say that the moral structure of Islam is not the reason of the absence of a pluralistic approach; therefore the lack of liberty, pluralism, and tolerance in Islamic States cannot be linked to Islamic principles springing from the holy book, the Quran. So, it can be stated that democracy is not an outcome of religious construction. On the other hand, democratic theory is a result of different ways of justifications, such as religion (i.b.i.d., p. 32).

This article also revolves around the question "How the AK Party has transformed the understanding and practice of secularism in Turkey?" by looking at different secularist models within the Western countries and Turkey in a historical accordance. This study tries to categorize secularism while giving a new perspective to the clashes that occurred in the name of dualities between religion and secularity.

As this questions' answers change whether you look from the religious perspective or cultural and historical perspective, the article will examine what "secularism" means and look at different connotations that are associated with it to criticize the "secular models" Turkey has experienced during the Republic Era. As mentioned above, secularism has many meanings. For instance; Samuel Huntington has a basic model that helps to label a state as secular or not. He shows in The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order how to make this labeling and how the relationship between religion and state should be. He also associates this with Christian religion as it can be understood from him saying: "Western Christianity … is historically the single most important characteristic of Western civilization" (Huntington, 1996, p.70). He also used Christianity as a starting point to criticize Islam as not being a democratic and secular religion because of the fact that Prophet Muhammeds' position as the the leader of military and religious affairs. Whereas another important scholar Talal Asad linked secularism and religion to one another just like Jose Casanova argued that secularism was an evaluation from Christianity that started with democracy. Finally to understand how this Western concept was brought together with the Eastern identity, Nurullah Ardıçs' views should be also taken into consideration. Ardıç supports the idea that "secularism", this Western born concept came with Industrial Revolution and modernization and

thus caused adaptation problems in Eastern countries. At the end it could be seen they made their own interpretation of secularism. As it can be understood it shows some considered secularism as an inevitable process while others considered it contingent.

This richness in meaning causes a lot of crisis and misunderstandings within every sphere of life as it is directly associated with politics and policy makers. To enlighten this duality, the article will be looking into different secular models in the democratic world states and then apply it to Turkey. Turkish Republic history will be divided into three periods to compare these secular models. The first period is going to look at the era from the beginning of the Republic system to the term in which more than one party was accepted into government. The second period is going to focus on the period between 1950s to 2002s which gone through conflicts regarding the fact that these multiple parties within the government had different stand points which affiliated one with conservatism whereas the other with secular state bureaucracy. The third and the final period will be examining policies of AK Party and the pacifying – softening effect they had on Turkish Secularity. Thus this will be linked with Alfred Stepan's twin toleration and Jonathan Fox's separatist mode of secularism conceptualization as the elasticity they brought in the religious choices compared with the other two periods.

II. Secularism Modelling According to World Literature

A. Twin Tolerations Model of Alfred Stepan

What secularism means differ from social, historical, religious and economic background a person or a country has. The period Turkey goes through with AK Party's taking over the role with the majority of the votes, experienced a kind of softening and a pacifying effect on its' policies and thus it helped with bringing the two sides (religious people and state bureaucracy) together. This freedom in expressing and living the religious choices can be linked with Alfred Stepans' Twin Tolerations Model. Stepan analyzes European countries' secularism models by looking at their attitudes toward religious civil groups in his study of "Religion, Democracy, and the Twin Tolerations". He focuses on the idea of "twin tolerations" to construct the freedom for religious organizations in civil and political societies in democratic Western European states. He argues that "the separation of 'church and state' does not describe 'secularism' and separation of church and state has no inherent affinity with democracy" (Stepan, Religion, Democracy and the Twin Tolerations, 2000, p. 43). He focuses in his studies how some UN countries have an established church and how some Christian Democratic parties were in power of some countries such as Germany, Italy etc.

However he also mentions quite opposite of this reflection too by pointing out that Portugal, as another UN country avoids using religious symbols. For Stepan, this too is a non-democratic decision just like misunderstanding what secularism means and trying to divide religion and state completely as it happened in countries such as Turkey. These crises countries gone through can be explained with a single event and that is the coup Turkey had in 1997. When a conservative Islamic based party was elected with the

citizens' votes, the bureaucracy considered this as a threat to country's democracy and secularity and the democratically chosen government faced with a coup. This was not just a coup to the democratic system, but it was also a coup to what society wanted and needed at that moment. It is like telling the citizens that they have no right to express their choices in religion because it is a threat to the government. This takes us to the understanding that secularity does not equals to democracy.

Table 1. Alfred Stepan's Twin Toleration Gap

TWIN TOLERATIONS (Relatively Stable / Democratic Patterns)	**TWIN INTOLERATIONS (Relatively Unstable / Nondemocratic Patterns)**
• Secular but friendly to religion • Non-secular but friendly for democracy • Sociologically spontaneous secularism.	• Unfriendly secularism • State Precludes Necessary Degree of Autonomy For Religion In Politics • The government imposed atheistic secularism and religion controlled by the elected government • Elected government's policies subject to veto by non-elected religious officials and theocratic anti-secularism • Religious groups preclude a necessary degree of autonomy for a democratic government.

Source: Stepan, 2000.

This understanding can be supported with Casanova's ideas that secularity is just a transformation of Christianity. When this transformation is traced back in Western countries, what one sees is that it is a continuity of Christian religion and these countries did not prohibited the religion to be divided from the state. That is why it can be said that secularism does not correspond to the separation of religion from the state bureaucracy. This realization takes us to Twin Tolerations and intolerations by Stepan. Stepan associates Twin Tolerations with democratic states and intolerations are non-democratic states. Relatively unstable patterns are seen in states which are unfriendly toward secularism. On the other hand, varieties of nondemocratic patterns are mainly divided into two categories: state proscribe a necessary level of self-determination for religion in politics and religious groups preclude a necessary level of self-determination for a democratic government. The first category includes two state models that are government imposed atheistic secularism, and religion controlled by the elected government or semi-democratic constitutional points. The second category deals with two other state models which are elected government's policies subject to veto by non-elected religious officials and theocratic anti-secularism. According to definitions of each category, Turkey can be listed under the state model that takes place in twin intolerations list. Different secularism models have been applied in Turkey at different terms, and it is difficult to put Turkey in one certain category. Therefore, Turkey should be looked into with these concepts and understandings (Stephan, 2000).

B. David Barret's Model: State Religion

This paper will also investigate David Barret's model in State Religion to understand the position and the role religious affairs have in secular states. Barret studies religion in constitutions of states and categorizes them in terms of religion (Barrett, Kurian, & Johnson, 2001). According to his findings, this categorization shows the constitutions that draw a line for an official state religion and forbid other forms of religion which shows itself when government favors a specific religion. For instance; the government might add religion classes to schools. This enlightens the fact that even though a state does not have a religion listed as the official preference of the country, it does not mean that it is free of any religious affairs. On the contrary, this is identified as "the state religion" (Robert & Rachel, 2005, pp. 2-3). As an example Italy and Spain can be considered with their Catholic State Religion. That does not mean a country can only have one state religion. Barret argues that in some instances one country might have more than one state religion just like in Cyprus, Belgium, Brazil etc (Barrett, Kurian, & Johnson, 2001).

C. Fox and Sandler's Model of Relations of Religion and State

Fox and Sandler are two of the main researchers who focus on the relation between state and religion and make classifications of states according to the dataset that evaluates the principle of secularism among the world countries. Their study classifies the relations between state and religion under four major groups: "separation of religion and state, discrimination against minority religions, restrictions on majority religions, and religious legislation" (Fox & Sandler, 2004, p. 387).

Tablo 2. Fox and Sandler's State-Religion Relation Gap

World Separation of Religion and State in the Twenty-First Century	
Dataset of Relation Between State and Religion	Models Of Religion-State Relations
• Separation of religion and state • Discrimination against minority religions • Restrictions on majority religions • Religious legislation.	• A country has one established religion • It has multiple established religions (Comprising Only Finland and the United Kingdom in Their Data) • It has a civil religion (unofficial state religion).

Source: Fox & Sandler, 2004.

According to them, there are three main model of religion-state relations: a country has one established religion, or it has multiple established religions (comprising only Finland and the United Kingdom in their data), or it has a civil religion, which Fox and Sandler view as amounting to an unofficial state religion (Robert & Rachel, 2005, pp. 2-3).

D. Veit Bader's Categorization on Secularism: Religious Pluralism

Another study that discusses how modern states can have more than one religion is by Veit Bader (Bader, 1999, p. 597). He studies the difference between religious pluralism and secularism in modern states by looking into England as a reference and his research shows him that England is a secular country because even though Christianity is directly connected with the crown

and thus the government, it does not prohibit the other religions and it does not show a strict partitioning between the government and the religion.

E. Fox's Separation of Religion and State (SRAS)

Fox serves some state models based on their constitutions. He analyzes the differences in the separation of religion and state in theory and in practice in three models (Fox, 2011). The first one is the Modeling based on Government Involvement in Religion which supports the idea that less state involvement in religious affairs causes people to be more religious as they don't have any fears that they are violating a law or facing a threat of a coup. This helps explain why countries such as the United States have low government involvement in religion (GIR) but high levels of religiosity. In addition, state religions linked to nationalism or past independence movements are linked to increased religiosity such as Poland and Ireland.

Table 3. Fox's Approaches to SRAS

Approaches about Separation of Religion and State and Secularism in Theory and in Practice	
Separationism	Secularist-Laicist Model
State policy is designed by the neutral attitude.	The state has a role in restricting the presence of religion in the public sphere (Turkey and France).

Source: Fox, 2011.

The second model is Modeling Based on the State's Constitution. In this model it can be seen that even though most states are declaring themselves as separationist or secular in their own constitutions. However there is a lack of state practice on this case, "the correlation between the presence of an official religion and actual state policy can be weak" (Fox, 2011, p. 384).

Table 4. SPRAS Models according to Esbeck and Fox

Absolute SRAS	**Neutral Political Concern**	**Exclusion of Ideals**
• The state neither support nor hinder any religion (the USA is a unique example).	• Government action should not help or hinder any life-plan or way of life more than any other • Consequences of government action should, therefore, be neutral.	• The state be precluded from justifying its actions on the basis of a preference for any particular way of life.

Source: Esbeck, 1988.

The third and the final model and the point Fox points out is the exclusion of ideals. The study indicates variables and measurements on states' secularization models, it claims and proofs that even democracy is the major necessity to establish a secular state system, not all democracies has a secular model; democracy is not a single-handed condition to structure secularism on a state (Madeley, 2004, p. 5).

III. Secularism in Turkey

As mentioned in the introduction, Turkey has experienced different secular movements within the historical period. When the transformation from

Ottoman Empire to Turkish Republic was made, the rules and the lines between religion and state were very rigid. The two were especially kept apart by each other. Women were allowed to get involved in the other spheres of life with the new accepted laws; however the fact that most of women in the nation wearing headscarves were not taken into consideration and thus their involvement in the social and political life were not actualized. That was because wearing hijab, headscarves or other forms of covering were considered as a threat to secularity of the newly formed nation. If we consider this kind of hegemonic attitudes, it is not surprising noticing that even if Turkish Republic made some reformist studies about their clothes (headscarf and veil were forbidden) and women educational rights (they were also to educate women according to their gender role; most of the education being given was to make women a nurse, a teacher or a cooker) we see that these so called political right very controlling and limiting. According to Zihnioğlu's studies (2003), a group of women established the Women's Union to joining the development process of the new women identity and thus they made some attempts to join politics at 1924 but it was blocked by the government for some reasons such as how Turkey was not ready of the women's contribution to political life. Also many women changed their attitudes and started to support the government after taking negative answer. . A women, a member of Women's Union, answered when journalists asked her why she was not candidate to be a deputy by saying that: "Why the government did not present a women as a deputy? The reason is that constitution is not available. So, it's mean that the time did not come for women." (Tekeli, 1981, p. 208).

After this term**,** Turkish people had wished to enjoy and practice freely their religious choices and this need and want showed itself in the period when more than one party was in the government. This need showed itself by the increase in the votes of conservative parties. However their need because of the rigid lines between bureaucracy and religion was not taken seriously and they were silenced with the threat of coup attempts and the coup itself. After this introduction, it can be thought that there is a parallelism between French-style laicism and Turkey's first term secularism. Even Ezan, the holy prayer of Islam was told in Turkish and the religious schools were closed. Talad Asad also argues that French secularism is the role model for secularism in Turkey because of the normative order (Asad, 2006, p. 496). The ideology of Kemalism also tried to regulate and control religious affairs which took the democracy out of secularity. This shows a clear example of Alfred's Twin Intolerations as the intervention was so clear and the lines were strictly partitioned.

It can be considered the election of Democrat Party started the second period in terms of secularity in Turkey. The ties started to get stronger with religion as the Ezan turned to its' own language, Arabic, again and the religious schools were reopened. This gives us Alfred's Twin Tolerations because dismissive secularism model was left behind. According to his twin toleration model, the state is secular but friendly to the religion (Stepan, 2000, p. 43). It could be seen that religion gained a wider space in the public realm. To this David Barret's secularization categorization can also be applied because Turkey turned out to be a country that has a constitutionally secular form without having a state religion on the one party term.

When Fox's analysis is applied to this change in democratic system and the transition to more than one party period, it can be said that Turkey and France could be seen as examples of the secularist-laicist model. Jonathon Fox also argues that Turkey is a country which declares itself secular in the constitution but it does not exist totally in practice. Lastly Ahmet Kuru's analysis of Turkish secularity should also be taken into consideration and should be analyzed (Kuru, A., 2006). Kuru generally focused on the restart of the one party term with 1997 Coup and argued that Turkey was under assertive secularism model until the early ages of the 21st century. The assertive secularism means the rigid separation between public and private sphere and it did not tolerate visibility of religion in the public space. He also looks into the period that starts with AK Party's election and argues that argues passive secularism that offers state neutrality and religious freedom was applied with AK Party for the first time in Turkish history even when AK Party could not reach full neutrality and religious freedom just yet.

All these take us to the understanding that the strict partioning between religion and bureaucracy was lifted step by step with the election of Democrat Party. However it is not correct to say that it stayed that way and everything went without a problem afterwards because the military threat was always there and it was used at the end in the form of a coup. Even though Turkish policy was tried to be normalized secularism on the social life of the public, the military did not let it happen.

IV. Transformation of Secularism During the AK Party Era

At this chapter, what AK Party has changed when it came to the power, in terms of perception of secularism will be investigated and explored. As it has been pointed out at the previous chapters, Turkey, as a nation in transition, experienced different types of secularism within its history. However the most common understanding of "secularism" and democracy was away from the sphere of religion. With this conception, Kuru's "Assertive Secularism" can be taken as reference because of the fact that citizens' religious choices were disregarded and taken as a threat in the name of secular systems (Kuru, 2006). This also has connotations with Alfred Twin Intoleration model and Jonathon Fox Laicist-Secularist Model.

Within the second period of Turkish Secular History (which takes place in between 1950s and 2002), one can say that "Dismissive Secularism" was common. In Dismissive Secularism, religion plays a significant role with being democratic. As opposed to world states' tradition, center-right and conservative parties were the main indicators of the second category of secularism in Turkey and AK Party is the strongest and most efficient center-right party that transform Turkey's secularism from the first approach of secularism to the second one.

Within the period of AK Party's government, it is easily understood that AK Party has given a new meaning to secularism by accepting being secular as a starting point and integrating it with the citizens' wishes and needs. They underlined the importance of accepting all religions and tried to get rid of the partitioning between religion and state bureaucracy. It showed a difference as the other parties were only familiar and close to the groups that were sharing

their own religion. This change in AK Party's policies created a more welcoming government which can be understood with not only the acceptance of religions but also with the acceptance of the other ethnic groups such as Alevi's etc.

A. Why Did Turkey Need a New Form of Secularism with AK Party?

What is important to point out is that conservative parties before AK Party was elected, they all faced an interruption by military forces. Kemalist ideology pushed people to live with fear of experiencing their religion, which is a human right, and that is why even though religion was considered with "*irtica*" and thus the losing democracy, what was not democratic was pushing these people to not live their religion freely. It is not surprising to see AK Party came to the role with very high percentage of votes, as citizens maybe for the first time ever believed that the system built by bureaucracy elites can be changed and their voices might be heard. Based on its programme, many scholars have defined the AKP as a centre-right party, Islamic liberal, conservative democrat, moderate Islam or passive secular (Öniş, 2001, p. 281-298).

B. Perception of "Conservative" Party and Definition of Secularism

From these explanations, it is not wrong to say that AK Party has changed secularism and carried it to a more liberal context. AK Party's secularism model was defined under different names such as liberal secularism, passive secularism or Anglo Saxon secularism (Kuru, 2006, p. 146).

While talking about the changes in the perception of conservative parties, we should mention some significant points. One of them is the declaration of army and the constitutional court. As it has been mentioned above, military had an important role in changing the democratic system. They intervened in the name of "secularism" and "democracy" to take the power from conservative parties many times. In 2007, when AK Party was in rule, they again tried to showed their power and the military declared:

"*Recently, the prominent problem during the presidential election process has been focused on debating secularism. This situation has been followed with concern by the Turkish Armed Forces. It should not be forgotten that the Turkish Armed Forces has a side in these debates and is an absolute protector of secularism. Moreover, the Turkish Armed Forces are absolutely against the ongoing debates and negative comments, and, when needed, will put forward its attitude and deed, openly and clearly. No one should doubt that … the Turkish Armed Forces are resolute in performing the duties assigned to it by the laws.*" (Aygenç, 2017, p. 74).

This shows us how military forces never intended to give up the powerful position they had within the hierarchy of the state. At this time, it can also be seen the constitutional court tried to help the military and get rid of the elected party of the government. However for the first time ever, AK Party and their supporters, citizens kept their place and their wishes and did not let the Party to be closed. Politics won against the bureaucratic tutelage for the first time in the history of the Turkish Republic.

Another important point that should be emphasized is that, AK Party could not achieve these changes within the first years of their election. However, Abdullah Gül's becoming president is quite significant as it points out the direction the country will be going with his veiled wife and his Islamic background. He was the first ever president that had background within Islamic tradition and his wife was the first headscarf wearing president wife (which is one of the most important symbols of Islam faith) in Turkish History. Considering women were not accepted in the education system or any governmental job, if they were wearing scarf, it shows how much of a big step it is and also what further steps AK Party will be taking in terms of this new secularity that has not strict partitioning with religion.

As it has been thought, one of the first steps AK Party took was to regulate the laws regarding headscarves. With this regulation, women were integrated into the social and economic life again and they did not have to fear or make a choice between getting educated and being religious because the years between 2008 and 2013, women were accepted into universities and public and civil services with headscarves. On the other hand, "Turkish society is such that the political decisions are seen to be the man's responsibility, and women are expected to obey and follow their husband's political choice" (Tekeli, 1981, 308).

Contrary to Kemalizm, AK Party tried to integrate all parts of society into one another. One of those attempts also included Alevis. In 2009, AK Party declared the Alevi opening as a first policy that aimed to integration on the Turkish Republic history. Until the AK Party time, Alevis has just faced with denial and impression policies. It was the first time that Alevi's demands were recognized and entered to the political agenda. Alevis have demanded equal recognition to their way of belief and recognition of the legal status of Cem houses. They also were against the compulsory religious education on the schools because syllabus was organized according to Sunni-Islam criteria. AK Party has organized seven workshops to regulate demands of Alevis since 2009. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has invited Alevi leaders to discuss and they also have served many photos from iftar organizations in the Ramadan. They all indicate an integration policy of the AK Party without discrimination or assimilation of one group which shows the importance AK Party gives to the freedom of belief.

As it could be understood from the definition of secularism for the AK Party, secularism did not symbolize non-religiosity. It also could be arguing that the AK Party did not mention the state control over religion. While AK Party has transformed passive secularism it did not remove religion from the public sphere yet it turned state policy as a neutral tone with respect to religious rights of citizens. While AK Party opened a broader area for the religion and led visibility of Islam in the public sphere it did not convert secularism into radical militant Islamization in the society; AK Party's reforms and studies were part of the process to turn passive secularism model from assertive secularism (Grigoriadis, 2009, p. 1201).

AK Party gave reference to European Union values when it transformed secularism in Turkey. Because AK Party was shown as an Islamist party to whole the world by Kemalist elites it always emphasized that changing on the secularism were not Islamic background; they are values of European Union.

Religious freedom and liberalization on the society were necessities of a democratic society according to EU principles and while AK Party broadens the visibility of religion on the public sphere it also argued that the AK Party developed democratization standards.

AK Party has transformed Turkey's secularism from French style dismissive secularism model to more closed form to more liberal form. It can also be argued that Turkey's secularism has transformed from twin intoleration secularism to twin toleration in terms of Alfred Stephan modeling of secularism. Because twin intoleration model includes government imposition and control over religion twin toleration model serves friendly attitudes toward religion and relation between religion and the state is developing in a sociologically spontaneous way (Stephan, 2000, p. 43).

Also, AK Party changed the structure of secularism from secularist-laicist model to separationist model according to Jonathan Fox modeling. In separationism, state policy is designed by a neutral attitude of the state over religion but in the secularist-laicist model, the state has a role to restrict the presence of religion in the public sphere (Fox, 2011, p. 390).

Fox also makes another categorization over state's constitution and argues states could be listed under four category that is Secular–Laicist States, States Declaring SRAS, States Whose Constitutions Do Not Address the Issue, States with Official Religions (Ibid, p. 391). Main variables to make these categorizations are based on the religious diversity, religious identity, population, regime, stability and economic development. Fox argues that Turkey is a democratic country that declares itself as secular by the constitution but in the practice, Turkey is not a secular country.

After the AK Party term, it would be wrong to say that Turkey is a country that aimed to show it secular just on the theory by the constitution. AK Party gave more importance to the practical life of the politics and tried to design politics according to citizens' needs. It was clearly seen that people got tired to be governing with a coup constitution and because of that constitution changing was occurred with a high level of participation in 2010. 57.9% of the participants said "yes" to change coup constitution. (Elections, 2017). After changing constitution individual rights and liberties has widened. It is indicated that to become secular is not an obstacle to permit different ways of living in a state after the changing of the Turkish constitution.

V. Conclusion

As it can be understood from its' definition secularism is not a term with a definition that is accepted by every country. It can even be seen that this definition changes within a country in different historical periods. It is usually considered as the separation of religion and state bureaucracy; however the reasons and the limits of this separation is not made clear. Such like in England even though religion is not playing a huge role it's known that the structure of government is shaped by it and only a very limited few can have a role in the government by being chosen with the votes of the community. Besides this integration of religion into state affairs, it is also seen that some countries might strictly prohibit this integration of two spheres.

There are certain types of secularism models in theory, it is seen that every state aims to harmonize its secularism model with its own cultural, economic and political context and values. Because empirical variation is abundant, it is hard to define secularism models. Especially Turkey as a fluctuating country in its political trajectory has changed its secularism policies in different periods of its history. While Turkey experienced stricter and harder tone of secularism at the beginning of its history with Kemalist secularism policies, it has seen much contestation in its multiparty era. In that sense, the latest phase of Turkey's multipart era is quite distinct. The major actor of this last phase, the AK Party should be analyzed deeply because it has carried out effective reforms to change the sense of secularism establishment.

Within this framework, this paper tried to analyse main secularism models in the literature. Twin Tolerations Model of Alfred Stepan, David Barret's model of secularism, Shmuel Sandler's secularism models, Veit Bader's secularism model over religious pluralism, Jose Casanova's secularism model and lastly Jonathon Fox's different categorizations about secularism were analyzed in this thesis. All these scholars have different views on what secularism is that got affected from the standpoint they are looking from. In this cases it might be economic, historical, politic etc…For instance, once we look at the two important secularity frameworks that was taken in the paper we see that Alfred Stepans' work does not imply a strict partitioning between religion and to make this clear, creates a model called Twin Tolerations and Twin Intolerations. Jonathan Fox, on the other hand, looks for the government involvement in religion (GIR), state's constitution and level of democracy on the countries by analyzing official support, official hostility, general restrictions, religious discrimination, religious regulation and religious legislation of the states.

In this paper, while offering this structure of what secularism is, Turkey's political history is also traced and divided into three parts: The first term was under the control of the single party system that can be called as dismissive secularism (1923-1950), the second term was designed by conservative right parties, which offered softer secular policies but also repressed by the centrist bureaucracy (1050-2002) At the last term it can be seen that it started with the AK Party's term as that was considered regulative secularism which means as a form of secularism that aimed to regulate the relations between the secular state and religious and non-religious people in a more religion-friendly, tolerant, passive way.

This paper tried to evaluate the literature of secularity and consider it in terms of Turkey's historical, political and sociological changes. Nevertheless, it would be better to use more concrete and quantifiable indicators to determine these modes of secularism. It should also not be ignored that every state creates its own identity with its historical, traditional, cultural, economic and political heritage and because of that it will require a deeper historical and comparative analysis.

Bibliography

Ardıç, N. (2012). *Islam and the Politics of Secularism*. New York: Routledge.

Asad, T. (2003). *Formation of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Asad, T. (2006). "Trying to Understand French Secularism.". In I. H. Vries (Eds.), *Political Theologies in a Post-Secular World*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Aygenç, H. E. (2017). (Post-) Kemalist Secularism in Turkey. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies, 19*(1), pp. 70-85.

Bader, V. (1999, October). Religious Pluralism: Secularism of Priority for Democracy. *Political Theory*, 27(5), pp. 597-633.

Barrett, D. B., Kurian, G. T., & Johnson, T. M. (2001). *World Christian Encyclopedia (2 ed.)*. Oxford UK: Oxford University Press.

Esbeck, C. H. (1988). A Typology of the Church-State Relations in Amerika Thought. *Religion and Public Education*, 15(1), pp. 43-50.

Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Grigoriadis, I. N. (2009). Islam and democratization in Turkey: secularism and trust in a divided society. *Democratization Journal*, 16 (6), pp. 1194-1213.

Fox, J., & Sandler, S. (2004). World Separation of Religion and State in the Twenty-First Century. *International Studies Association Conference.* Montreal.

Fox, J. (2011). Separation of Religion and State and Secularism in Theory and in Practise, Religion. *State and Society*, 39(4), pp. 384-401.

Kuru, A. (2006). Reinterpretation of Secularism in Turkey: The Case of the Justice and Development Party. In M. H. Yavuz (eds.), *In Transformation of Turkish Politics.* Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Madeley, J. T. (2004). European Liberal Democracy and the Principle of State Religious Neutrality. In J. T. Zsolt Enyedi (eds.), *Church and State in Contemporary Europe* Vol.26, pp. 1-22. London, Portland: Frank Cass.

Öniş, Z. (2001). "Political Islam at the crossroads: from hegemony to co-existence". *Comparative Politics*, 7(4), pp. 281-298.

Robert, J. B., & Rachel, M. M. (2005). *Which Countries Have State Religions?* Cambridge: Harvard University.

Stepan, A. (2000). Religion, Democracy and the Twin Tolerations. *Journal of Democracy, 11*(4), pp. 37-57.

Tekeli, S. (1981) 'Women in Turkish Politics', in N. Abadan-Unat (eds.), *Women in Turkish Society*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill).

Yılmaz, A. (2017). Deconstructing a Dilemma. In Salman, A. & Kamali, M.H. & Adil, M.A.M. Democratic Transitions In The Muslim World. Kuala Lumpur: MPH Group Printing. pp. 27-41.

Zihnioğlu, Y. (2003) *Kadınsız İnkılap* (Revolution without Women), İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp. 120-212.