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Introduction

Democratic Consolidation in Turkey

Müge Aknur

Although Turkey began its transition to democracy as early as the 1950s, the democratic consolidation process has not yet been completed, with the country’s sixty year history of democratic politics being punctuated by numerous breakdowns and restorations of democracy. While some breakdowns were directly military coups, the others were indirect interventions through memorandums and warnings from the military. Various factors have contributed at different levels to promoting the consolidation of democracy in Turkey. Among these are included the state, political parties, civil society, civil-military relations, socio-economic development, and the European Union (EU) as an external actor. In addition, two internal threats—the rise of political Islam and separatist Kurdish nationalism—that have been high on the Turkish political agenda since the early days of the Republic have had a significant power to both hinder and enhance democratic consolidation. By examining all these factors, this book aims to analyze the reasons why the consolidation of Turkish democracy has still taking so long, although the transition to democracy began almost six decades ago.

As pointed out by Gerardo Munck, a country can be labeled ‘democratic’ as soon as it emerges from authoritarian rule, by having popularly elected authorities. Such a country, however, still lacks the characteristics associated with the consolidated democracy.¹ For example, in the aftermath of the third wave of democratization that was initiated by the fall of the Portuguese dictatorship in 1974, several countries in Southern Europe, Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Asia completed their transition from authoritarianism to democracy in a very short time. (Sometimes overnight, as was seen in some Eastern European examples). However, the process of consolidating their democracies took one or two generations.

Furthermore, the successful transitions from authoritarian rules do not always lead to consolidated democracies. Some of the countries that have made the transition to democracy have never actually managed to complete the consolidation process. They sometimes followed what Guillermo O’Donnell calls “delegative democracies.” They were not consolidated in the sense that they have achieved neither institutional progress nor much governmental effectiveness in dealing with their respective social and economic crisis, but at the same time they had no imminent threat of an authoritarian regression. For democratic consolidation, the first necessity is to eliminate the residues of the old system that are incompatible with the workings of a democratic regime. Once this is accomplished, the democratic government must build new institutions that reinforce the democratic rules of the game. As defined by Andreas Schedler, “democratic consolidation [is] a process that makes new democracies secure, extends their life expectancy beyond the short term, [and] makes them immune against the threat of authoritarian regression.”

According to Larry Diamond, it is “the process of achieving broad and deep legitimation, such that all significant political actors, at both elite and mass levels, believe that the democratic regime is better for their society than any other realistic alternative they can imagine.” That is, democracy is truly consolidated when it becomes the ‘only game in town’.

Throughout the 1990s, scholars examined the varied combinations of conditions and indicators that seem to enhance the democratic consolidation process, mainly in Southern, Eastern and

---

Central Europe, Latin America, and East and Southeast Asia. While Larry Diamond et al. examined political institutions, civil-military relations, civil society, socio-economic development and international factors as indicators of democratic consolidation in East and Central Europe, Latin America, Southeast and East Asia and Africa, Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan focused on the development of a free and lively civil society, a relatively autonomous and valued political society, the rule of law, a state bureaucracy that is usable by the new democratic government and an institutionalized economic society as the conditions for creating democratic consolidation in Southern Europe, post-Communist Europe and South America.

This book aims to apply a combination of the indicators of democratic consolidation examined by Diamond et al. and Linz and Stepan for European, Latin American, Asian and African cases to the case study of Turkey in order to analyze the long-lasting democratic consolidation process in the country. These indicators as already stated will include the impact of the state, political parties, civil society, civil-military relations, and the EU as an international actor on democratic consolidation in Turkey. In addition, it aims to analyze the impact of two internal threats that are particularly important in Turkish politics, the rise of political Islam and separatist Kurdish nationalism.

The introductory chapter will first start with an analysis of the main concepts of the book, democracy, democratization and democratic consolidation. Then it will outline the existing literature on democratic consolidation in Southern, Eastern, and Central Europe, and Latin America by concentrating on the factors that enhance or hinder the consolidation process in these countries. Following an examination of literature of democratic consolidation in other regions, it will focus on the democratic consolidation literature concerning Turkey, specifically by assessing whether each of the factors listed above promotes or impedes democratic consolidation. This section will be concluded with a detailed


8 Ibid.
consideration of each factor for Turkey, outlining the main themes and chapters to come.

Democracy, Democratization and Democratic Consolidation

The latest wave of transition to democracy started as early as the 1970s. The pioneers were the three Southeastern European countries, Portugal, Spain and Greece. Portugal and Spain particularly, following the deaths of the leaders of decades of authoritarian regimes, accomplished both the transition to democracy and its consolidation in a remarkably short time. According to Samuel Huntington, in the fifteen years following the end of the Portuguese dictatorship in 1974, approximately thirty European, Asian and Latin American countries replaced their authoritarian regimes with democratic ones. By the end of the 1980s, with the collapse of Communism when the Soviet Union allowed the non-Communists to come to power in Poland in August 1989, the democratization wave swept through Eastern Europe.\footnote{Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991), 21-26, 104.}

While some of the Latin American and Asian countries went back to some form of more moderate authoritarian rules (although some of them later returned to democracy), majority of the Eastern European countries not only maintained their new democratic regimes but also more importantly, they managed to consolidate them. In other words, they strengthened the new regime by establishing new set of rules and procedures, eliminating the leftovers of the old system and ensuring its permanence and efficiency.

What these cases show is that the transition from authoritarian rule to democracy is not sufficient to ensure the consolidation of democracy. A country may receive the label of ‘democracy’ as soon as it completes its transition from authoritarian rule by holding popular elections for its authorities. However, it still falls short of the requirements of consolidated democracy. It takes a couple of generations to strengthen the democracy by establishing and adapting to the new rules and getting rid of the residues of the old system that are incompatible with the workings of the democratic regime. Consequently, not all successful transitions from authoritarian rule lead to consolidated democracies because the democratic
transition is an easier process than democratic consolidation. That is why most new democracies are merely surviving.

In order to analyze why some transitions to democracy have never reached the level of consolidation, the following section will analyze the main concepts of this literature. It will first start by defining and identifying the concept of “democracy,” and continue by examining “the transition to democracies” or “democratization waves” before concluding with the definition of “democratic consolidation” and the complications hindering this process.

Democracy
The word democracy is derived from the Greek words demos which means people, and kratia which means government. Consequently, the fundamental idea of democracy is that the people have the right to determine who governs them. However, in the twentieth century so many dictators misused the concept to legalize their rule. For example, the Soviet Union and China used to identify themselves as ‘democratic’ states. Democracy has minimum and maximum definitions. As stated by Michael Sodaro, “[f]or some theorists of democracy, representation based on free, fair, and competitive election is the main defining principle of democratic governance.”

However, Terry L. Karl called this view the “fallacy of electoralism.” Elections can only be the part of democracy if they take place periodically. Consequently, free, fair competitive elections are only the minimum requirement of democracy.

According to Freedom in the World 2011 survey of Freedom House, there were 115 electoral democracies around the world by the end of 2010, representing 59 percent of world’s 194 countries.

However, the replacements of authoritarian regimes with multi-party elections do not always bring democracy to a country. Democracy requires legally protected rights and liberties. Huntington states that true democracy includes, “liberté, égalité, fraternité, effective citizen control over policy, responsible government, honesty and openness in politics, informed and rational deliberation, equal participation and power, and various other civil virtues.”13 Therefore, democracy cannot be defined by its minimum definition of “free and fair elections” but legally protected rights and freedoms should also be included in its definition.

Joseph Schumpeter, in his prominent study *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, defined the classical theory of democracy in terms of “the will of people” and “the common good”. He expanded his definition to include the “democratic method,” which he explained as the “institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people’s vote.”14 Today, since it is not possible to implement direct democracy such as Athenian democracy,15 whereby all citizens meet periodically to elect officials and enact laws because of the population factor, representative democracy has evolved as an alternative. People elect representatives who will do the ruling on their behalf.

Philippe Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl define democracy as “a system of governance, in which rulers are held accountable for their actions in the public realm by citizens, who are acting indirectly through the competition and cooperation of their elected representatives.”16 According to this definition, the generic concepts that define democracy are as follows: First there must be a regime or system of governance that determines the methods of access to the principal public offices and the strategies that actors may use to gain access. Second, there must be rulers who occupy specialized authority roles and can give legitimate commands to others. These rulers must come to power through fair, honest and periodic elections. They must obtain the support of the majority or a plurality of the votes cast and

---


15 Athenian democracy was not a proper democracy either. Women and slaves were excluded from voting. Only male citizens had the right to vote.

should be accountable to the public realm. If they govern badly, they can be voted out.\textsuperscript{17}

Third, there must be a public realm that includes “collective norms and choices that are binding on the society and backed by the state coercion.”\textsuperscript{18} Fourth, a democratic system needs citizens who vote in the elections. In semi-democracies, only a smaller portion of the population is eligible to vote or compete for office because of restrictions that are imposed according to criteria like age, gender, class, race, literacy, or taxpaying capacity. However, in a full democracy, all the adult population is supposed to be eligible for vote.\textsuperscript{19} Fifth, there must be political competition.\textsuperscript{20} Voters must have a choice of at least candidates or political parties who freely compete for votes. The parties must have time and civil and political freedom to speak, publish, assemble and organize and present their political debate and policies, for example, through electoral campaigns. There must always be an opposition and alternatives, with the former having the same freedoms as the latter. The opposition should not be harassed, nor opposition newspapers censored or closed down.\textsuperscript{21}

Sixth, there must be cooperation between the political actors. Various organizations and leaders must share a common commitment to cooperate with one another through bargaining and accommodation.\textsuperscript{22} Such a cooperation through autonomous group activity leads to the formation of civil society organizations. Seventh, there must be representatives, who act as legislators. Citizens elect political parties and the representatives of these parties do the real work by carrying out the wishes of the constituents. They should voice and protect the voters’ general interests.\textsuperscript{23}

Sodaro explains the purposes of democracy as follows. First, democracy aims to promote the quality of human life and the dignity

\textsuperscript{17} Michael G. Roskin, \textit{Political Science: An Introduction, 9\textsuperscript{th} ed.} (US: Prentice Hall, 2006), 74.
\textsuperscript{18} Schmitter and Karl, “What Democracy is,” 75-88.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 75-88 In the past, the South African system did not permit its 70 percent Black population to vote, the United States did not permit its 10 percent Southern Black to vote, and Switzerland did not let its 50 percent female population to vote. Huntington, \textit{Third Wave}, 7.
\textsuperscript{20} Schmitter and Karl, “What Democracy is,” 75-88.
\textsuperscript{21} Roskin, \textit{Political Science}, 76; Huntington, \textit{Third Wave}, 7.
\textsuperscript{22} Sodaro, \textit{Comparative Politics, Third Edition}, 175.
\textsuperscript{23} Roskin, \textit{Political Science}, 75-76; Schmitter and Karl, “What Democracy is,” 75-88.
of the individual by empowering ordinary human beings.\textsuperscript{24} To this end, democracy permits people to participate in the affairs of the community, to express their opinions and to have a say in the decisions of their government. Moreover, it provides space for individual freedom and promotes political equality (one-person one-vote).\textsuperscript{25} Second, democracy determines and fulfills the wishes of the community by promoting the open discussion of alternative programs and policies and by carrying out public opinion polls. Democracies, furthermore, permit their citizenry to be fully informed about the activities of their government and let them hold state officials accountable for their actions. Third, democracies constrain power by imposing legal limitations on the authority of the state and controlling the coercive capacities of the state. It also counterbalances the influences of well-advantaged social groups and organizations. Fourth, democracy reduces social antagonism when it permits “various groups that compose the society to have a chance to be heard and to share power through their votes”.\textsuperscript{26} Finally, it “provides incentives to replace confrontation with cooperation.”\textsuperscript{27}

Besides all these positive characteristics, as Sodaro examines there are dilemmas created by the democracy. He argues that “institutions and practices of democracy can be neglected, subverted or manipulated in ways that contradict its basic purposes.”\textsuperscript{28} Regarding the first paradox, he points out that political participation can fall short of its potential when people voting every four or five years feel that their voices are not heard and, therefore, retreat into apathy or cynicism. A second paradox he mentions is that democracy can create social divisions when no consensus is achieved by majority rule, as for example has happened in Turkey on Kurdish question. In this context, decisions may be imposed on people and a ‘tyranny of the majority’ can be created. As a third paradox, he demonstrates that there is, in democracies, the difficulty of constraining the power of the governing elites and their appointees, “who have the power to make unpopular or discriminatory decisions before facing the voters in the next elections.”\textsuperscript{29} It is in the nature of electoral democracy
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that “victorious politicians will favor the constituencies who voted for them and will pay less attention to the rest of the electorate.”

Concerning this issue, Huntington warns that political leaders may not exercise real power but they may simply be the puppets of some other groups. Wealthy donors who often finance political parties in elections may look for returns on their investment. In addition, “political influence of privileged social groups or giant corporations may also be hard to contain.”

For the fourth paradox of democracy, Sodaro refers to democracy’s effect of intensifying social conflicts rather than calming them. In democracies, freedom of speech gives social groups the opportunity not only to express their problems but also to criticize one another. Such criticisms made between ethnic and religious groups can strengthen a society’s divisions as can be seen between Turkish nationalists and Kurdish nationalists and secularists and religiously conservative community in Turkey.

Thus, democracy can be defined in various ways, and realized in different forms and to different degrees. It can also lead to paradoxical outcomes. The next section will examine the transition from authoritarian rules to democracy by examining the different waves of democratization.

**Democratization and Waves of Democratization**

In the simplest definition democratization is the transition from an authoritarian rule to a democratic regime represented by the fulfillment of the requirements of all the concepts outlined in the previous section. As defined by Schmitter and Karl democratization is accomplished when a country manages to establish a system of governance, where there are rulers who come to power directly through free, fair and periodically held elections, and act indirectly through the competition and cooperation of their elected representatives, and in which citizens can hold the rulers accountable for their actions in the public realm the democratization is accomplished.

Huntington identifies three main “waves of democratizations,” defining a wave of democratization as “a group of transitions from non-democratic to democratic regimes that occur within a specified
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