

Tendency of Centralization and New Constitution Efforts in Turkish Political System

Türk Politik Sisteminde Merkezileşme Eğilimi ve Yeni Anayasa Çalışmaları

Devrim ÖZKAN*
İzmir Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi

Abstract

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the tendency of centralization in Turkish political system has played a significant role in all the problems related to politics, economics and culture. This study addresses the causes of the tendency of centralization in Turkish political system because centralized political mechanisms are the main obstacles to solve many problems such as actual and structural ones. Certainly, individuals should be treated as necessary agents in modern politics. Therefore, the place of individuals in a political system has a vital importance. As individuals construct their identities coordinately with other individuals, they behave coordinately with others in politics, as well. In a society where individuals connect with each other via state makes totalitarian regimes inevitable. In this regard, how individuals and communities will be provided with freedom, welfare and stabilization in political mechanisms is one of the most crucial issues of Turkish political system.

Keywords: Counterweight, Turkey, centralization, new constitution, community.

Özet

Türk politik sistemindeki merkezileşme eğilimi, yirminci yüzyılın başından günümüze kadar, ortaya çıkan tüm politik, iktisadi ve kültürel problemlerde, başat bir önem arz etmektedir. Bu çalışmada, öncelikle, Türk politik sistemindeki merkezileşme eğiliminin sebepleri ele alınmaktadır. Zira gerek güncel, gerekse yapısal pek çok sosyal problemin çözüme kavuşturulmasının önündeki başlıca engel merkezileşmiş politik yapılardır. Kuşkusuz birey, modern politikada, vazgeçilmez bir biçimde, dikkate alınması gereken bir öznedir. Bu nedenle, bireyin politik sistemde nasıl konumlanacağı, hayati bir önem arz eder. Birey, şüphesiz, kimliğini diğer bireyler ile eşgüdümlü bir biçimde inşa ettiğinden dolayı, politikada konumlanırken de diğerleri ile koordineli davranır. Birbiri ile bağlantısını devletin vasıtası ile sağlayan bireylerden oluşan bir toplumunda, totaliter yönetimlerin egemen olması kaçınılmazdır. Dolayısıyla gerek bireylerin, gerekse komünitelerin, politik sistemde, özgürlük, refah ve istikrarı temin edecek

* Yrd.Doç., İzmir Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi, Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Fakültesi, Medya ve İletişim Bölümü, e-mail: ozkandev@hotmail.com

bir tarzda nasıl konumlanacakları Türk politik sisteminin en önemli meselelerindedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Karşı ağırlık, Türkiye, merkezileşme, yeni anayasa, komünite.

Introduction

In Turkish political system, the centralization of the dynamics of all administrative mechanisms is an important issue. As a result of this centralization, institutional mechanisms become clumsy and the periphery is de-functionalized. Every country has naturally one center or a few symbolized centers. However, the situation is so different in Turkey that political, economic and cultural activities are subject to the administration of a single center. The attention of all is on what happens in the center. While the center is absorbing the energy of the periphery, it also assimilates these places in terms of political and cultural aspects. At the recent stage of the experience of republic in Turkish society, it becomes a necessity to reconstruct the existing political system thoroughly. The Turkish society could not function as an active agent in determining its fate in twentieth century but it needs to make a decision about the future while reconstructing the current political system. How administrative mechanism will be managed fairly is one of the most important issues in Turkey. Furthermore, the function of society in administrative mechanisms should be discussed. In addition to this, how administrative mechanisms should be constructed to work effectively is another matter. Certainly, these three matters are so interwoven that the connections between them should be considered while dealing with one matter.

All sectors and segments of Turkish society are in agreement with the need of a new constitution. The results of 2011 general elections are often perceived as the reflections of the demand for a new constitution. On the other hand, writing a new constitution has been oversimplified to a technical process. This issue is about how constitutional jurists handle the issue in terms of its essence. Writing up a new constitution by revising internationally accepted rules will ingender problems concerning validity and legitimacy. As Montesquieu stated (1989 [1748]), laws have their spirit, and they live on the traditions which communities formed through experiences. In this framework, centralist tendencies of Turkish political system must be exposed in detail and solutions should be suggested for providing the stability of welfare and peace in Turkish society.

A Criticism on Modern State and Centralization

The centralization tendency of modernity is considered to be the most significant problem that the Turkish political system has encountered in the modernization process, because centralization is related not only to the structure of the political system but also to the construction processes of the society itself. Centralization transforms the structural characteristics of all actors and factors that form a society. On the other hand, modernization causes individuals and institutions to shape their social roles based on political centralization. While

individuals find their positions in a society, they consider the positions of other individuals and institutions. The individual who form its functions and behaviors through reflexive observation, analyze the structure and operation of the society perpetually as a member of this society. How agents reflect themselves in daily life is shaped by this humanistic reflexive action (Goffman, 1958). Therefore, modernity which causes governmental mechanisms to operate in a centralist manner, deeply affects the life styles and social roles of individuals and institutions.

The tendency of centralization is one of the major characteristics in modern politics. On the other hand, the result of the same modern politics is to constitute a uniform society by gathering the members of a society around common ideals. Centralization have been first observed in the totalitarian tendencies of Machiavelli (2003 [1532]), Hobbes (1991 [1651], Rousseau (2012) and Hegel (1977 [1807]), and it has found the opportunity to be established all around the world through the French Revolution. In spite of objections of Locke (1988 [1689]), Hume (1985 [1739]), Burke (2009 [1790]), and Tocqueville (1856), modernity has developed by connecting all locations and establishing a governmental system as a power center. In doing this, modernity has created mass media tools in order to establish an indirect communication between individuals. Thus, society is centrally structured around a governmental mechanism in which the face-to-face communication is replaced with mass communication.

Nisbet (1953; 1969; 1980; 1986) is one of the 20th century philosophers who criticize centralization tendencies harshly. Nisbet who follows the philosophy of Burke and Tocqueville criticizes the social results of centralized state mechanisms. Modernization which produces traditional intermediary institutions between individual and state leads to the rise of individualism. Therefore, egoism and selfishness become widespread between individuals. Social structure is affected negatively when individuals prioritize their subjective aims. According to Nisbet (1988: 41), this situation can be observed best in the USA. He suggests that the framers of American Constitution did not aim to establish a "*Leviathan*" which would provide central and political integration impeccably as central government keeps everything under control in such as system. One of the important characteristics of modern politician that originated from the French Revolution is that it establishes a social environment which assures subjectivist behaviors of individuals. Thus, the individuals and the government can communicate without intermediaries. However, individuals are ineffective to have a political effect against the modern governments which seized great power and size. It is not possible for individuals to have a political effect when they are isolated and their social relations broken off. Therefore, the government grows increasingly stronger. As the government continues to grow, its dominance becomes the agent of all operational dynamics as an intermediary which enables the interaction between all the actors in a society.

It is certain that all these developments do not only originate from political reasons. Economic developments also play a significant role in the development of political centralization. Modern industrial capitalism has to

connect a host of factors in order to sustain the mass production. For this reason, all social components of modern society [in a way individuals can connect with the other agents which they do not share the same location] are designed in a style which has the characteristics of connectedness. It is necessary to gather a great number of raw materials, and process them in order to sustain every industrial facility. Furthermore, the coordination of individuals who have different religious and cultural characteristics is necessary for the operation of modern industrial capitalism. To actualize these, all interaction types between individuals should be restructured within the framework of laws. For this, transcendental references which are beyond humanistic experiences have to be abandoned because humanistic experiences are adequate to build and evaluate when compared to the transcendental references.

While the political and economic structure of modernity leads to the empowerment and centralization of the government, they induce the degeneration of social structures. Because the dynamics of mutual relationship weaken as modernity enables the realization of interpersonal relationships through intermediaries. The most significant characteristic of human communication is that individuals carry out coordinated actions through face-to-face communication (Tomasello, 2008: 152-153). As communication takes place through mass media tools with the effects of modernity, the cooperation between individuals weakens. Societies start to have a single-shape structure with these developments which increase the possibility to define the places and roles of individuals in societies. Thus, the diversity in societies decreases gradually. Local characteristics have many effects on individuals. The people in small communities have more mutual interaction which cannot be compared to large social structures built in a fictional way. The social effects of direct interaction between individuals are destroyed with modernity in which all communicative operations become subject to the decisions of government authority.

In this regard, Nisbet (1988: 58) points out that the lives of modern individuals are being exposed to state influence which is structured in a totalitarian way. Nisbet compares middle ages with modern times in terms of their political structure and states that modernity has more opportunities to define and affect the lives of individuals. When individuals need the government to sustain their life, their interests also become similar with the ones of the state. To have and sustain freedom and justice is not possible when the authority of the majority is established. In addition, in order to establish freedom and justice, the constitutional assurance should be provided for the intermediaries who enable different individuals to design their lives based on their identities.

For modern thought, Nisbet (1980) states, "*progress*" is more important than any other concept. Truly, modernity prioritizes development. Modernity, which encourages society to develop, has reshaped all constructs related to history, culture and economy. Therefore, it is becoming difficult to provide and sustain stability in modernity. Some certain constants are necessary for social structures to sustain sturdily. In modernity, constant change is an inseparable

part of social process and the structure of all constants breaks down. The possibility of collectivism wanes with the development of a social consciousness in which everything can change at any time. Individuals are isolated by the states through the breaking of social ties, and are pushed to shape their lives within the framework of a fictional development ideal. As the government and economy are structured in a centralist way, it becomes more difficult to have and sustain alternative understandings and types of life (Hayek, 1962). Social problems could only be solved in politics and economy, when the solution is produced by the interaction of different agents (Hayek, 1945: 530). But centralist governments make this kind of reflexive interaction impossible.

In his manuscript entitled *The Making of Modern Society*, Nisbet (1986) touches upon the main characteristics that play a significant role in the establishment of modernity. According to him, there is coordination between the popularization of societies and the establishment of absolute state power. Now, state and individuals can interact more directly than ever, as all the intermediary institutions between state and individuals are removed. This situation increases the state control over individuals. Therefore, through state, individuals contact with huge masses which they can never understand. The mass culture becomes dominant with the modern society (or nation) which is established through the integration of all collectivities. Thus, all mechanisms which enable state to control and guide modern societies become functionalized. Under these circumstances, society is constituted in an integrated way despite all types of laws which are preserved to protect diversity. This situation leads modern states to grow stronger politically and economically.

As a matter of fact, modern state has a stronger structure than traditional state models do, as seen in World War I. The modern state model grew stronger by defeating all traditional states, and has become the sole holder of political power, especially after World War II. For this reason, the criticism of Nisbet on the state and society should be considered, so that social life might have more ideal characteristics with the reconstruction of modern constitutions which are headstones of modern political system. For the stability in social life, a new constitution should establish a kind of institutionalization which assures individuals to connect with their communities by protecting their locality.

The Centralist Politics and the Centralized Community

Republic of Turkey has tended to centralize since the first years because it considers security as a basic issue. It has been a common belief that security can be provided and a strong and a stable administration can be obtained just by a uniform and monistic society. This belief was the main factor affecting the administrative structure of the Republic of Turkey. However, this kind of belief seems to have failed to achieve its objectives because we have historically experienced that ideally security, stabilization and freedom can be provided by an administrative organization which has the ability to reconstruct itself with the harmony of different centers continuously. Turkey centralizes its political and cultural energy into one center, and this causes it to neglect the dynamism that enables to increase its potential with other power domains.

In the Ottoman Empire, economy was constructed with the concern of supporting military structure (Mardin, 1969: 262). In Turkey as the successor of this tradition, it is not a coincidence to see such practices. Furthermore, the results of these practices that are carried out for modernization have led to the political and cultural centralization since "*The Edict of Gülhane*," and the equalizer counterweights which can be a buffer between state and society could not be institutionalized. Therefore, the agent who becomes individualized by isolating himself/herself from its community has encountered with state in the political arena. Certainly, it is a positive factor for a state to deal with individuals instead of communities. However, the incapability of individuals in relation to the state as a giant power can be just removed through political institutions which balance the power of the state and become institutionalized out of the center. As another measure, taking the individual rights under constitutional assurance might solve the problem. However, we should be suspicious that societies of law can take counterweight function on for the disparity between the state and individuals in line with the requirements of universal laws.

On the other hand, politics has become bipolar as a result of centralization. Turkish community which consists of isolated individuals on the edge of the dilemma "*either this or the other*" can be grouped in these two poles. It should not be noted that the agent who is in the center of politics benefits from this situation and make plans for its future in parallel with this bipolarity. As a result, the situation becomes inextricable. In a political sphere which has a black and white bipolarity, different tones of colors cannot be considered. Everyone agrees that all should behave as one, and this strong perception makes politics impossible. The political debate has focused on the question of which "*one*" to be preferred. In this regard, it is a remarkable phenomenon that center becomes unchangeable as centralization increases.

Many problems in Turkish political system are essentially the results of centralization. It is certain that the ones who cannot find a place in centralized political arena come together in a different center. If modernity can be realized in a way which opens a slot for the representation of differences as the balance function against the center, we would not have faced with these problems. The most important reason to come together against the political center is that the Turkish public sphere is not created for individuals and groups to take actions. At the same time, this situation indicates lack of self-confidence of the political center.

In the studies of recent years, Lewis (2007) stated that modernity is evaluated through all cultural qualities of social, political and economic modernity in addition to the cultural indicators such as literature. It is observed that centralization plays a significant role in modernity when modernity is attempted to be understood with social, political and economic indicators. Fixing modernity with centralization is expected to cause devastating political and cultural consequences. Bureaucracy deepens and broadens in a way which enables to control the whole society just with the help of centralization (Weber, 2008 [1908-20]). France and Germany are the examples which encountered the political devastation of such a centralization process. If the institutions of checks

and balances which are out of the center and effective in terms of politics, culture and economy become institutionalized, this will both secure individuals against the state and increase the dynamism of social development.

In the first quarter of 21st century, Turkey has had promising advances in providing freedom and welfare. However, the flaws in structural regulations are salient. It is essential that freedom should be assured institutionally with economic and cultural advancements. Therefore, some economic and cultural centers should have constitutional assurance against the overwhelming power of large masses which are clustered around state and in a bipolar political arena. These centers should be institutionalized in a way which creates a space for the activities of all communities in the society instead of being regional. Even if individuals have all rights in a social order in which state is the determiner in every field, they cannot be free. In addition to the state, the institutions need to create political, cultural and economic spaces for individuals. The interactions between such institutions will establish a ground for the economic, social and cultural advancements of the Turkish society.

Restructuring the Turkish Political System

In Turkish society, politics has degenerated into to the question how the resources controlled by the state will be distributed. Therefore, political actors appeal to force to the state with demands of more sources. However, gaining more state resources with political power might go against the other components of a society. Conflicts will grow up certainly when all classes and groups in a society want to go into politics in order to get more state resources and funding. The conflicts that occur in order to get more governmental resources lead to a kind of zero sum game. An advantage which is obtained through using power makes the sustainability of a fair administration impossible. In addition, the legitimacy of the individual who get resources is open to questioning.

In this regard, a restructuring is necessary to eliminate the idea that politics refers to the share of state resources. On the other hand, maintaining a life becomes dependent on political activity. As the other actors of a society get more resources and funding through politics, the individuals who are destitute of state sources become disadvantageous. Of course, these resources are not just in money. They are also about making bureaucratic operations more active for a certain group. In such a situation, state becomes an arena in which all actors of a society attempt to increase their welfare. It is not possible to keep welfare and peace in such a political system.

It is a vital question how a political system in which the state is not perceived as a source provider by society can be restructured. Unless the political culture in which the state is perceived as a guarantor of an ideal working, trade and production environment becomes institutionalized, it does not seem possible to find a solution for this problem. Therefore, state should give up being an actor which tries to designate every facet of social life. Without the intervention of central state, local issues can be dealt with more effectively,

inasmuch as the bureaucratic mechanism of central state will cause issues to grow up instead of finding solutions.

What distance should be between the state and the society is a primary concern in all political systems. In modern political systems, state encourages individuals to be active in politics through political freedom. However, how system will be maintained is problematic in a society consisting of individuals whose aims are to get more governmental resources due to the existence of other individuals who form society with political participation. In the political structures in which the state functions as a protective umbrella, the individuals exempt from high taxes both operate in a broader field and believe in their creative and productive potentials to keep their lives with the reduction of state activity field. Individuals and communities fill the space which is evacuated by the state. Society performs most of the state functions through "*intermediary firms*". Considering the local necessities, new techniques and practices emerge, and diversity as a result of this emergence nourishes welfare and peace.

A political system in which the state and the society are intertwined is an obstacle to realize all diversities, welfare and peace. Individuals are the members of various groups. Therefore, they might have some rights and privileges in addition to their fundamental rights.¹ Politics stops being a field in which more sources are obtained by power or rhetoric when the existence of individuals and communities are secured against any negative effect the states might have. If everyone thinks that they will get more welfare by eliminating others, this is not a kind of sustainable political system. The pecuniary resources of a state are comprised of taxes. By giving harm to some people, raising money with high taxes is a great obstacle for sorting out resources and realization of a legitimate administration. Therefore, it is necessary to consider states as mechanisms which provide a direct welfare to their citizens. We can have the opportunity to see that welfare, peace and happiness can be sustained through justice and legitimacy as state decreases its activity in our lives and functions just as a protective environment.

How administrative mechanisms become more active and productive depends both on the existence of a lawful and legitimate administration and the place of society in a political system. A lawful and legitimate administration cannot be realized when state is perceived as an institution responsible for finding a solution to all problems. In this sense, Goldstein and Rayner (1994) pointed out political conflicts in modern societies are basically related to interests and identity problems. The elements of a society mostly have different interests and benefits. The solutions of state might sometimes be advantageous for some of the individuals and disadvantageous for others. In such a situation, emerging conflicts have a negative effect on the activity and the productivity of administrative mechanisms. When a society forms political space with its elements, in other words, the gap between state and individual is narrowed

¹ Kymlicka (1995: 34) emphasizes that it is fallacious to claim that giving extra advantages to individuals belonging to different groups and communities is against liberal theory. Kymlicka asserts that some groups might have different privileges and rights based on their places in society.

down, the state which is a war arena for different interests and benefits cannot assure the welfare and peace of state.

Due to these reasons, states should stand back in some fields of social life to enlarge the levelled playing fields for citizens, groups and communities. Thus, all the elements which have indirect cultural, economic and social interaction through a state enable all dynamics of a society to emerge by having a direct interaction with each other. In this sense, political achievement stops being something against the welfare and peace of others. As political system and state become a mechanism which assures the best for all elements, both justice and legitimacy and welfare and peace will be guaranteed.

How State and Individual Should Be Located in the Turkish Political System?

The question of how state and individuals should be placed in Turkish political system should be at the top of the agenda in term of the debates carried out over the new constitution because it will directly affect how the social life of the Turkish society will be maintained. The issue should be touched upon directly. Unfortunately, constitution-makers deal with the issue based on the frame which social democrat standpoint, dominant in European Union, stated. However, a new approach is highly necessary to provide freedom and stability for a long time considering the traditions, history and characteristics of Turkish society.

Specifically, we need to touch upon the origins of social democracy which our constitutional law takes its inspiration. It is necessary to state that the EU's understanding of freedom and democracy is just one of the viewpoints in Europe. This philosophy, which was effective on the establishment of the EU, has become dominant by eliminating others for the last two-hundred years. The social democracy in Europe became a dominant philosophy day by day, especially after Second World War. Conservative and liberal parties have followed the guidelines which were defined by social democrats. The philosophy of these guidelines were formed by Habermas (1984 [1981], 1987 [1981]), and they were put into practice in the EU process. European Economic Community (EEC), which was established in 1956 by the Treaty of Rome, handed all functions to EU in 1992 by the Treaty of Maastricht, and EU currently attempts to provide unity and become United States of Europe. Charlemagne, Napoleon Bonaparte and Adolf Hitler were the ones who imagined uniting Europe under one state's sovereignty. It is not surprising for the people who are aware of totalitarian tendencies in the origins of social democracy that the social democracy in Europe undertakes this mission.

EU, principally, has an understanding which is nourished by the political theories based on "*social contract theory*" (Hobbes, 1991 [1651]; Rousseau, 2012; Habermas, 1984 [1981], 1987 [1981]). However, the political philosophies of the social contract theory are unsuccessful at providing freedom, welfare and stability. It is observed that the decision making mechanisms in the EU, the population of which is five hundred millions, become centralized. Centralized decision making mechanisms are inevitably insensitive to local issues. As they

tend to solve problems with centralized decisions, they are not able to respond to local needs. They even become the reason of a deadlock as general guidelines ignore local needs. The politics based on social contract is completely insensitive to individualism and locality but tend to minimize the distance between the individual and the state. Individuals are pushed to behave as an active agent of political life but they lack the mechanisms which will make them active. Isolated citizens are open to all manipulations of centralized government which has gained a devastating power.

This tragic situation is also the same for the national governments. As governments have difficulties in proceeding in the same vein with interests and benefits of the periphery, the center is insensitive to all local concerns. For this situation, the individuals and governments which are exposed to all decisions taken by center are in desperate straits. As the affairs in Greece, Italy and Spain indicate, people head towards nationalist and racist movements. It is inevitable that individuals, who find no way out, tend to turn towards this kind of quests.

All these issues are the results of the expansion of the domains of the centralized governments through international unions and treaties. Furthermore, the applications which isolate individuals from communities and societies make public benefit a matter in which only state is interested. Individuals do not have opportunities to interact with society directly, and they do not have a role in decision making processes of a overwhelming power. The daily life of individuals is shaped with the decisions which are taken by the technocrats and bureaucrats of the EU in Brussels. Individuals become desperate against this immense power which they cannot step in. The governments which are elected democratically are enforced to apply the decisions of the EU.

All these issues should be considered meticulously in the writing process of new Turkish constitution. In Europe, political systems are becoming centralized with the EU, and individuals also become subject to all applications of the central governments. Thus, the persistence of freedom and democracy becomes impossible, and the political and economic stability wane. To prevent this situation, the modern politics should be reinterpreted in its classic approach which tries to decrease the distance between states and individuals. A state which is composed of millions of people cannot be directed by the interests and benefits of a limited number of individuals. It is also impossible to compel individuals to be directed by the impositions made by the states. There is a need for a new institutionalized political system in which states function as a protective umbrella for individuals, groups and communities against the exposure of external effects. For the institutionalization, a new constitution is necessary to prevent any intervention to the lives of individuals and communities.

If a state is directed in a way which will affect the lives of all individuals, it can be considered as a negative side of political structure. If a state increases its power and legitimacy by providing a host of opportunities to certain groups, it can be said that this state does not use the resources gained by tax payers rationally. In other words, if it invests the money of the tax payers in conserving its legitimacy and power, this leads to the emergence of economic crisis in the

long run, and it also establishes a base for crisis in political legitimacy. Therefore, individuals should trust in themselves that they can qualify their life with trade and production, and they can stand high independently from states. If a community is left with a few opportunities which are provided by states, it cannot be expected that this community will embrace freedom, democracy and stability.

Balances of Power in the New Constitution

When a contract model has an overall validity, it does not mean that it is legitimized in a way that would be accurate at all times and conditions. Furthermore, these valid models can be results of a certain conjuncture. It is a great utopia to think on a contract model which will be valid universally. There are different historic processes, experiences and traditions which give a shape to the formation of a society. The applications which ignore these factors will fall short to satisfy the needs of Turkish society.

Since Hobbes, European politics is in search of the ways in which the individuals would be completely integrated to the states. The nation-state system of Europe which was affected deeply by the *Leviathan* of Hobbes (1991 [1651]) firstly isolates individuals, and, then, desires to reinforce its sovereignty by integrating them into the state. This desire survives although its regional scope has changed to some extent. The EU process just changed the definition of who are the centers of power and the ones that will be integrated into because prior experiences indicated that the political structures which integrate individuals to state in various ways are stronger and more effective than previous models. The power of central government increases through the coverage capacity of government center and the spread of its mandate.

The mandate of a state sovereignty extends when the whole society gathers around a single contract. As a short-term result, politics operates mechanically. Thus, the distance between society and state is removed before the modern times. The state which establishes its sovereignty in a certain center and limits its relation with society to levying taxes takes part in everything ranging from how an ideal life should be sustained to education. In this process, the balance of power in politics comes down to the division of executive, legislative and judicial powers. Thanks to the division, state is placed at the heart of society, and makes everything become addicted to itself. All kinds of practices of state start to affect life styles of individuals directly.

The republican practices in Turkey are just the transfer of the EU political system we essentially summarized above, and this ends up with problems of legitimacy and validity for the constitutional practices of republican era. The main reason is that even Europe tries to apply the problematic models. From now on, it is not possible to be contented with the models in which democracy and freedom are just procedures under the dominance of bureaucrats and technocrats. In politics, even if many discussions take place on globalization, theories are proposed as we live in a city state. Then, providing freedom is just possible at the narrow-scoped political structures as city states in a society in which decision making processes are limited with democratic mechanisms.

However, freedom should not be dependent on democratic decision making processes in international unions and the nation states in which population and interaction area expanded to a great extent. How individuals and communities sustain their originality inside the systems in which economic, cultural and political decisions are taken by affecting millions of people? It is not possible to sustain communities' originality in the political systems in which political and cultural order come down to standards. The technocrats and bureaucrats who attempt to create standards by eliminating ethnic differences in Europe do not care for the originality and freedom not only of individuals and communities but also of nations. Therefore, the most important issue is to guarantee the freedom of the individuals who are disadvantageous in the balance of power.

How the balance of power in political system and constitution can be provided in a way to assure freedoms is the basic question. Firstly, it should be in mind that everyone and everything has an origin, and they are ultimately shaped by their origin (Gillespie, 2008: 19) as Oedipus discovered tragically. In modern politics, some mistakes should not be repeated. Mistake is a subject of experience. After the experience, a new path should be formed. As Tocqueville (1856; 2010 [1835-1840]) described, French people experienced how the ideal of starting from the beginning ruined political order and stability deeply.² Therefore, new constitution of Republic of Turkey should be based on traditions and current developments. In this context, it is highly important to find a solution for the question of how the balance of power in political system will be established. If Turkish society desire to have freedom as a part of their life and be a dynamic society through the interactions among differences, the division of powers is not enough itself because the division of power is just functional for the conditions in which welfare and development is consistent. In a crisis, by giving some reasons, state transforms into a structure which threatens freedoms and differences. It will be a naïve viewpoint to think that nongovernmental organizations will play the role of counterweight for the disparity between state and society. Nongovernmental organizations show effort for their members to make them benefit from state resources more than others do. They try to be active in the process of distributing taxes which is the single income of states. Therefore, nongovernmental organizations cannot be considered as counterweights to provide order and stability as long as they try to manipulate the share of distribution of collective resources which are made of the payments of tax-payers.

² Societies have idiosyncratic characteristics. Therefore, there are discrepancies in terms of their political formation. In this respect, Mardin (1971: 198) states that Turkish Revolution is different from French Revolution as it does not include violence. According to him, Turkish Revolution has idiosyncratic characteristics because it is a kind of answer to the global developments at the end of 19th century. It is inevitable for these differences to reflect in modernization processes. Considering from this stand point, it will certainly result in failure if a social experience in a different time and space is attempted to replicate in another setting.

Conclusion

Modernity builds huge networks in traditional societies. Modern state expands their sovereignty by forming networks between all pieces in the dominated area. This situation arises from the complex structure of modern production mechanisms. Modern production requires many agents and factors to operate concurrently, and this comes out with an intricate structure for administrative mechanisms. The economic structure which tends to be end up with the centralization of political system should not lead to the removal of local characteristics and originalities. Otherwise, political system might face many legitimacy problems. It is certain that the effort to integrate all localities (in terms of political, cultural and economic) into central power will lead to political crisis. To prevent this, political system should be designed in a way which provides opportunities for localities to protect their originalities against the economic structure with centralization tendency.

Since the beginning of 21th century, Turkish society has progressed significantly to provide freedom and welfare by showing a great effort due to many problems. To make this situation sustainable, there is a need for a new constitution which assures the existence, property and future of individuals and communities. Political sustainability depends on legitimacy. To provide legitimacy, there is a need for a new constitution which decreases both the effect of state on individuals and communities, and the decisiveness of a certain active group on individuals and state. Otherwise, Turkish political system will be affected deeply by arbitrary practices of the EU which want to replace national democracies with "*community method*". Indicators show that Turkish society develops its decision making ability about how they will arrange their life so Turkish society should not be confined to the central practices of the EU. A state might have more effective protective power with the enrichment which individuals coming together in various institutional structures with different interests and benefits create. Individuals and communities standing on their own legs might experience the peace which is provided by freedom, welfare and stability. This is a difficult path to go. On the other hand, how next generations live depends on this issue.

State tends to extend to all layers of society, and this emerges the problem of how the balance of power will be assured in political system through constitution. This causes hierarchic power stratification which is secured by violence tools. To be able to solve this problem, the only solution is that individuals and communities should take over some activity areas of state. With the process of modernization, nonprofit organizations start to lose power as the state Turkey tends to control everything. All autonomous fields are subject to the sovereignty of the state so nonprofit organizations and communities start to lose their roles in social process. The traditions and culture of Turkish society have the necessary characteristics which state hands over its functions on health, education, culture, environment and city planning to nonprofit organizations. If new constitution is written by considering the potential of nonprofit organizations, Turkish political system might gain order and stability later in the forthcoming times because the individuals and communities are freer

if their welfare and lifestyle are independent from the activities of state. Therefore, it is so necessary that different actors who are in different fields mentioned above should operate in different styles. As long as the fields which take actions in cultural, economic and political activities independent from state, it is possible to become a more dynamic society. As a result, the coordination of different styles, models and legal structures might be the basis for welfare and stability.

References

- Burke, E. (2009) [1790]. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Montesquieu, B. (1989) [1748] *The Spirit of the Laws*. Anne M. Cohler, Basia Carolyn Miller and Harold Samuel Stone (trans. and edit.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Tocqueville, A. (1856). *The Old Regime and the Revolution*. John Bonner (trans.). New York: Harper & Brothers.
- De Tocqueville, A. (2010). [1835-1840] *Democracy in America*. Eduardo Nolla, (edit.) & James T. Schleifer (trans.). Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, Inc.
- Gillespie, M. A. (2008). *The Theological Origins of Modernity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goffman, E. (1958). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor.
- Goldstein, J. & RAYNER, J. (1994). The Politics of Identity in Late Modern Society. *Theory and Society*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 367-384.
- Habermas, J. (1984) [1981]. *Theory of Communicative Action Volume One: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Thomas A. McCarthy (trans.). Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987) [1981]. *Theory of Communicative Action Volume Two: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Thomas A. McCarthy (trans.). Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press.
- Hayek, F.A. (1962) [1944]. *The Road to Serfdom*. London: Routledge.
- Hayek, F. A. (1945). The Use of Knowledge in Society. *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 35, No. 4., pp. 519-530.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1977) [1807]. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. A. V. Miller (trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hobbes, T. (1991) [1651]. *Leviathan*. Richard Tuck (edit.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hume, D. (1985) [1739]. *Treatise of Human Nature*. London: Penguin Books.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Right*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, P. (2007). *The Cambridge Introduction to Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locke, J. (1988) [1689]. *Two Treatises of Civil Government*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Machiavelli, N. (2003) [1532]. *The Prince*. George Bull (trans.). London: Penguin Books.
- Mardin, Ş. (1969). Power, Civil Society and Culture in the Ottoman Empire. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 258-281.
- Mardin, Ş. (1971). Ideology and Religion in the Turkish Revolution. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 197-211.
- Nisbet, R. (1953). *The Quest for Community: A Study in the Ethics of Order and Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nisbet, R. (1969). *Social Change and History: Aspects of the Western Theory of Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nisbet, R. (1980). *History of the Idea of Progress*. New York: Basic Books.
- Nisbet, R. (1986). *The Making of Modern Society*. New York: New York University Press.
- Nisbet, R. (1988). *The Present Age: Progress and Anarchy in Modern America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rousseau, J. J. (2012). *Basic Political Writings (Second Edition)*. Donald A. Cress & David Wootton (edit.). Cambridge, MA: Hackett Publishing.
- Tomasello, M. (2008). *Origins of Human Communication*. London: The MIT Press.
- Weber, M. (2008) [1908-20]. *Max Weber's Complete Writings on Academic and Political Vocations*. John Dreijmanis (edit.) & Gordon C. Wells (trans.). New York: Algora Publishing.