Political Leaders and Democracy in Turkey

Edited by Metin Heper and Sabri Sayari

O

Chapter Thirteen

Conclusion

Metin Heper

The preceding chapters support the initial assumption that informed the planning of this volume—that in Turkey political leaders have played a primary role in the achievements and shortcomings in democracy. Turkish democracy with its successes and failures has been virtually the handiwork of political leaders. It was primarily the political leaders, rather than the historical, social, and economic forces that led to the transition to democracy in 1945, the semibreakdown of democracy in 1997, and to the full breakdowns of democracy in 1960, 1971, and 1980. Values, strategies, and the statecraft of some of the political leaders made possible the transition (and re-transition) to and maintenance of democracy while the inability of others to negotiate, accommodate, and compromise rendered democracy in Turkey somewhat fragile.[1]

For a long time now democracy in Turkey, to use Juan Linz's terminology, has been the "only game in town."[2] Except for some marginal extremist groups, there is a consensus that no other political regime is better than democracy. Since 1950, Turkey has had several national elections when power changed hands. However, some of the major players in Turkish polity, including the military and more recently the judiciary, continue to have different opinions regarding the procedural rules of democracy. In the 1950s and later, İsmet İnönü tried to institutionalize those rules of democracy, but his efforts were largely of no avail. Today the military recognizes the ultimate authority of civilian government, but, at the same time, considers itself constitutionally empowered to come into the picture when, in its opinion, the Republic faces a grave danger.[3] It was for this reason that on four different occasions since 1960, the military intervened in politics in different degrees and manners. Similarly, recently the Constitutional Court has begun to see it saddled with the responsibility of protecting such Republican premises of the political regime in Turkey as secularism. In January 2001, the court strongly protested against the government's in-

tention of clipping its wings in regard to closing of the political parties, arguing that it could not sit still if a party challenged the fundamental principles on which the Republic rests. The government obliged.

Thus, as noted in the introductory chapter, in the present volume we have addressed the questions of (1) the extent to which political leaders in Turkey have contributed to the flourishing of democracy in Turkey and (2) the degree to which they have played a part in the continuing and, at times, worsening problems of democracy. As also indicated in the introductory chapter, we have attempted to analyze the impact of major Turkish political leaders on democracy by investigating their origins and political careers; their personality; their leadership styles, skills, and strategies; and finally their beliefs, ideologies and goals.

Origins and Political Careers

The majority of political leaders in Turkey had modest origins. Exceptions are Adnan Menderes, Bülent Ecevit, and Mesut Yılmaz. Menderes came from a local notable family. Ecevit's father was in academia, later becoming a parliamentarian. Ecevit's mother was a well-known painter. Yılmaz is the scion of an upper-class family that produced prominent politicians. In contrast, Atatürk's and Turgut Özal's fathers were low-ranked bureaucrats, and İnönü's father was a middle-ranked bureaucrat. Celal Bayar was the son of a mufti. Süleyman Demirel came from a peasant family and Tansu Çiller from a middle-class family. Little is known about family backgrounds of Alparslan Türkeş and Necmettin Erbakan, which can be taken as evidence that their families, too, did not have a high social standing.

That, on the whole, political leaders in Republican Turkey (from 1923 to the present) had modest beginnings should not come as a surprise. In the post-fifteenth-century Ottoman Empire, family was not a determining factor for ascendancy to power. The Ottoman Empire lacked both an aristocracy and a bourgeoisie with political efficacy. At least until the recent decades, the situation had not been different in the Republic of Turkey (from 1923 to the present). In both the post-fifteenth-century empire and the Republican Turkey, education played a far more important role than family background for someone to attain a position of power.[4]

Our knowledge of the socialization these leaders received from their parents is also rather sketchy; in the case of some leaders it is altogether absent. Consequently, in regard to the socialization patterns in their family environment we can only make some conjectures. Concerning Atatürk we know only that his father enrolled him in a school with a secular curriculum instead of one with a religious orientation. We may thus assume with Andrew Mango that this was instrumental in Atatürk's coming to have an open mind. In the case of Bayar, his uncle played a role in his having a lasting antipathy for the Ottoman Sultan

Abdülhamit II (1876-1909). It is not clear what kind of an impact his hatred toward that sultan had on Bayar's personality. Perhaps Bayar loyally supported Atatürk's Westernizing reforms because of his dislike for Abdülhamit II, and that for the same reason, Bayar and Menderes did not think of setting up a state based on religion, although Menderes used religion for garnering votes and Bayar did not object to it.[5] As for Demirel, one may assume that his longing for "Great Turkey" had its origins in his witnessing constant droughts in his native village, İslamköy, and observing his fellow villagers organizing prayers for rain. Moreover, his village did not have electricity, and as a boy Demirel must have gazed enviously at the distant lights of the city of Isparta, the provincial capital. Similarly, one may arrive at the conclusion that Demirel's extensive use of political patronage most of his political life was an upshot of the fact that his father as the headman of İslamköy used to mediate between villagers and the state. In Erbakan's case, his insistence that he should always have the last word was probably the result of his previous experience as a disciple under various religious sheiks. Turning to Özal, his approach to Islam might have its origins in his father who was a religious person. Also, there may be a link between Özal's inclination toward one-man rule and his mother being a strong-minded woman. As for Çiller, one can plausibly suggest that her father passed his unfulfilled ambitions on to his daughter, and, for this reason, Çiller attributed overriding importance to wealth, perceiving it as the only means to political power and social status.

That we have scant evidence about the origins of even major political leaders and that there are not extensive studies of their early socialization patterns are not astonishing, since in Turkey, education as well as socialization outside the family rather than within have been important factors in the crystallization of Turkish leaders' political values and attitudes.[6] Most Turkish political leaders were the products of elite schools in Turkey. Many of them also studied in advanced Western countries. In the process they were exposed to modernity.

Atatürk and İnönü graduated from the Ottoman military academy. In the late-nineteenth-century, the military schools in the Ottoman Empire were greatly modernized. Their graduates became not only *objects* but also *subjects* of modernization.[7] In terms of attending reputable institutions of higher learning, Bayar was an exception. Bayar did not have a formal education beyond the secondary level; he tried to make up for it through private instruction. On the other hand, to improve his French, Bayar attended for some time College Francais de l'Assomption in the city of Bursa, not far from Istanbul. Menderes graduated from the American College of İzmir, later completing his education at the Law School of Ankara University. Demirel, Erbakan, and Özal were the products of Istanbul Technical University (ITU); Erbakan later obtained a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from Aachen University in Germany and became a college professor. Ecevit studied at (American) Robert College in Istanbul, and later spent some time at Harvard University as a visiting fellow. Mesut Yılmaz

completed Ankara University's School of Political Science. Later, he attended
some graduate courses at Cologne University in Germany. Like Ecevit, Çiller
graduated from Robert College, obtained a Ph.D. in economics at the University
of Connecticut, and, like Erbakan, became a college professor.

The modernizing influence of these schools on Turkish political leaders is
unmistakable. Atatürk, İnönü, Ecevit, Demirel, Yılmaz, and Çiller were
Westernizers par excellence. It is true that Menderes made a distinction between
those Republican reforms approved by the people and those that were not, but
his government also enacted a law to protect Atatürk's legacy and his reforms
(1951). Erbakan introduced Islam into Turkish politics, but it is dubious whether
his was a political Islam or essentially an attempt to upgrade religious morality
in Turkey. In any case, from the National Order Party (*Milli Nizam Partisi*—
MNP) formed in 1970 to the present Virtue Party (*Fazilet Partisi*—FP) the
religiously oriented political parties in Turkey have gradually moved from the
periphery to the center of the political spectrum.[8] In the case of such leaders as
Erbakan and Özal an education along modern lines must have moderated the
impact on them of their religious origins. Despite his background of being a
disciple of a religious sheik, in politics Erbakan displayed pragmatism. His
formation of a coalition government with the secularly oriented Republican
People's Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*—CHP) was a case in point. Özal for
his part tried to use religion in public as no more than a prop for hard work and
as an instrument to soften the negative implications for the have-nots of the
rapid transformation in the economy that he tried to bring about. Turkish
political leaders' conception of modernity included an appreciation for
democracy, though they came to have different notions about it.[9]

In addition to education, their career patterns and/or certain events in their
pre-politics years also left their indelible marks on Turkish leaders' political
values and attitudes. Prior to the establishment of the Republic, Atatürk and
İnönü had been adversely influenced by the day-to-day involvement of the
military in politics and its deleterious effects on the military's professionalism as
well as on politics. Consequently, when in power, both tried to keep the military
from active politics. İnönü also played a crucial role in the relatively quick
returns to civilian politics following the 1960-61 and 1971-73 military
interventions. Bayar carried with him a revolutionary fervor from his days in
the Committee of Union and Progress (*İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti*).[10] That
political orientation must have led him to urge Prime Minister Menderes, as
president toward the end of the 1950s, to take harsh measures toward the CHP.
Because Menderes was left an orphan at a relatively young age, he came to have
some psychological problems. When he was prime minister, he displayed an
inferiority complex toward İnönü. It became apparent in his occasional resort to
too strong-worded attacks on the latter as well as in his humiliating behavior
during the trials of the Democratic Party (*Demokrat Parti*—DP) leaders
following the 1960 military coup. Özal's exposure to the American way of life
seems to have had an impact on his attempts to consummate a marriage between

tradition and modernity. Çiller's inheritance from her father of his feeling of unfulfilled ambitions led her to careless behavior in politics, resulting in various claims of corruption against her.

Turning to their political careers, one important point to note here is that all political leaders in Turkey except Bayar climbed to top political positions without adequate political experience. Atatürk and İnönü made a direct passage from top ranks in the military to the highest positions in politics. Menderes became prime minister after having spent years in Parliament as a back-bencher. It is true that Demirel and Özal had prior experience as higher civil servants, with Özal also having had a semipolitical experience some years during the 1980-83 interregnum,[11] but neither had a proper socialization to politics before becoming prime minister. Türkeş made a transition from colonel in the army and later a leading member of the 1960-61 military junta to deputy prime minister more than a decade later. Ecevit, Yılmaz, and Çiller were parachuted to ministerial positions from the private sector, academia, and journalism, respectively. The only exception is Bayar who had been in Parliament some years before becoming a cabinet minister, and later prime minister.

In the case of some political leaders, such lack of prior experience did not have adverse effects for the fortunes of democracy in Turkey, but in the case of others, it did. The lack of such experience on the part of Atatürk did not matter, because he basically played the role of a revolutionary charismatic, not that of an ordinary politician. İnönü made up for his lack of experience by his ability to quickly learn and adapt. Demirel had both an intuitive judgment and an innate caution, but they did not always help him. Ecevit and Türkeş, too, learned but it took them some time; the young Ecevit was somewhat utopian, and young Türkeş, strong-minded. Despite the transformation that his religiously oriented political parties went through, no such mutation could be observed in Erbakan himself. He continued to hold on tightly to his views. It is true that at times Erbakan displayed pragmatism, but his was not principled pragmatism; he acted differently as his interests dictated, not because changing circumstances warranted a change of tactics and policies. Bayar, Menderes, Özal, Yılmaz, and Çiller could not learn from past experience. Bayar and Menderes could not see the ominous ends that their resort to authoritarianism was drifting them toward. Bayar's case is interesting. Despite his prior experience as a cabinet minister and prime minister, he, too, could not take lessons from the past. During his presidency, he became a hard-liner, thus polarizing politics further and, with Menderes, preparing the grounds for the 1960 military intervention. Özal had no interest in learning, because he thought he already knew. Yılmaz made some effort, but so far he has not succeeded. Çiller began her political career by committing a host of blunders and kept repeating them.

Some political leaders' lack of experience before assuming critical political offices, and in the case of Bayar, not changing the way he conducted himself in politics despite his prior experience, resulted in the polarization of politics and, even more critically, in several regime breakdowns. Bayar and Menderes had

primary responsibility for the 1960 coup; Ecevit and Demirel for the military intervention in 1971; Ecevit, Demirel, Erbakan, and Türkeş for the coup of 1980; and Erbakan and Çiller for the active role the military played to oust the coaltion government formed by the Welfare Party (*Refah Partisi*—RP) and the True Path Party (*Doğru Yol Partisi*—DYP) from power in 1997.

The Personality of Political Leaders

In Atatürk we come across a truly charismatic leader. However, Atatürk placed emphasis on his value rather than natural charisma; he expected people not to be attracted to his physical characteristics or how he conducted himself in public, but instead to his ideas.[12] The basic message he wished to convey to the Turks was that in making decisions in the public space or in one's private life, one should use one's reasoning faculties and not be a slave of religious dogmas. Atatürk wished to create a new Turk that would think rationally. Demirel and Özal personified in themselves what Atatürk had in mind: both were men of reason and calculation. Demirel backed up his arguments with several facts and figures (which he knew by heart). Özal went one step further; he wished *policy* (measures to solve problems) to reign over *politics* (efforts to obtain and maintain power). He thought policy was the real stuff of governing, politics being only a distraction. Thus Özal saw no harm if the constitution was violated once. Özal's effort to prioritize policy over politics served democracy, because people began to vote by taking into account the services carried out and goods delivered rather than the endless debates on regime issues;[13] however, his giving short shrift occasionally to the procedural rules of democracy did a disservice to it.

In trying to bring about a fundamental change in people's thinking patterns, Atatürk also (unconsciously) attempted to institutionalize one of the important prerequisites of viable democracy—substituting functional cleavages for cultural cleavages. He wished to see a clash of *ideas* in place of *ideologies*—soft (religions or sects) or hard (Marxism, ethnic nationalism, and the like). Such a transformation was necessary for the consolidation of democracy, because at the heart of democracy lies the ability to compromise and thus arrive at a dynamic consensus. Another charismatic leader in Turkish politics was Ecevit, who also placed emphasis on his value charisma. Ecevit used his charisma to introduce and promote his left-of-center policy. The way Ecevit used his charisma contributed to the consolidation of democracy in Turkey; he made people trust in democratic politics by persuading them that under that regime, change for the better was possible, and there were political leaders who would bring it about. Another charismatic leader was Menderes who, using his oratorical skills, led a democratic movement in the early 1950s and gave people the hope that they would now be able to chart their own destiny. However, in the second part of the

decade, with Bayar, he increasingly resorted to authoritarianism and thus undermined trust in democracy.

In general, Turkish political leaders have tended to be quite sure of their judgments. Two exceptions here are İnönü and the mature Ecevit. As leaders, both were modest persons, never thinking they were infallible. They were candid about their mistakes. Both İnönü and the mature Ecevit changed their minds when they concluded that they were in the wrong. It is true that as he was interested in his value rather than natural charisma, Atatürk was open to new ideas. Furthermore, he read widely and debated what he read with his colleagues. However, once Atatürk made up his mind, nothing could change it. Özal made his decisions by obtaining data from others (usually his trusted lieutenants in politics and the civil bureaucracy), but he did not debate with them. Erbakan made his decisions by himself. Menderes had confidence that his decisions were most appropriate. Bayar believed history would prove him correct.

A related issue is that some leaders took themselves too seriously. Not unexpectedly, to the extent to which a leader believed in his/her infallibility, to that degree that leader thought of himself/herself as indispensable. Menderes, who had a strong sense of *personal* mission, was one such leader. Another example is Bayar, who even thought of physically eliminating the opposition in order to stay in power. Erbakan is another case. He always wanted to be in the limelight; he started spectacular and eye-catching projects, the bulk of which were never completed and some of those completed were utter failures. Erbakan nevertheless wanted to play the role of a world leader, claiming that there was no country better off than Turkey.

Under the circumstances it was very difficult for political leaders to arrive at a consensus even on critical issues. In any case, reconciling differences and making compromises were not the forte of Turkish political leaders. Again İnönü stands out as the champion of empathy and tolerance, though within limits. Among other things, when he became president, he reinstated all the leading politicians who were sent to political wilderness during the previous two decades. İnönü objected only to those ideas and acts that, in his opinion, were against the best interests of the country. Demirel and Özal, too, were leaders who had tolerance toward others and who displayed a certain degree of empathy. However, Demirel could never forgive General Kenan Evren, who had led the 1980 military intervention against the Demirel government. Özal came to have similar negative feelings against Yılmaz, because when Yılmaz had become prime minister in 1991, he had frustrated President Özal's hopes of running the economy and conducting foreign policy from behind the scenes. Bayar had little capacity for reconciliation and compromise; Yılmaz has been only a little better. The former was insistent in his enmities; the latter never forgave those, including his close colleagues, who let him down in the past. An extreme case is Çiller; not only bureaucrats, party officials, deputies, and ministers but also her close advisors and friends could not remain in her

entourage for long; after a while either she fired them or they themselves resigned.

Consequently, more often than not Turkish politics was primarily an arena for the clash of personalities rather than ideas. The end result was a set of two-way enmities—those between İnönü and Bayar, İnönü and Menderes, Ecevit and Demirel, Demirel and Özal, and Yılmaz and Çiller. The hard feelings on the part of both parties stood in the way of reconciling differences and diffusing political crises. In the end, in some cases those crises were "resolved" by military interventions.

Thanks to İnönü and Demirel, Turkey experienced a smaller number of military interventions than it could have faced. At different times, both political leaders played critical roles in preventing political crises from escalating to military interventions, and frustrating the development of military interventions into long-term authoritarian regimes. By a judicious mixture of cajoling and pressure, İnönü persuaded the 1960 and 1971 intervenors to return to their barracks in the shortest time possible. He also as prime minister single-handedly frustrated two coup attempts in 1962 and 1963. In 1973, Demirel, in cooperation with Ecevit, stopped the election of General Faruk Gürler as president. In addition, during his prime ministry in the 1960s and the 1970s, Demirel chose not to pick what he considered an unnecessary fight with the military. In 1997, as president and as the chairman of the National Security Council, he successfully blocked the deepening of the politial crisis arising out of the confrontation between the military and the True Path Party–Welfare Party.

Leadership Style, Skills, and Strategies

Political leaders in Turkey have always had a tight control over their parties. The leaders' close control over their parties rested on different rationales and took on different modalities. Menderes and Çiller wanted to hold the reins of their parties in order to maintain their personal rule in government. For Ecevit, close control over the party was necessary so that those with undesirable ideologies would not be able to infiltrate the party.[14] For some leaders, close control over their party was necessary because otherwise they could not realize their mission. Erbakan thought he should have absolute control in the party because in his conception a political party meant belief, direction, and order. For Türkeş, party activities needed to revolve around the mission of creating a strong Turkey and fighting communism, for Demirel around the task of creating Great Turkey, and for Özal around the goal of realizing a major transformation in the economy.

These different rationales and the intensity with which leaders subscribed to them resulted in different types of relationships between political leaders and other party members. In order to establish and retain their control over the party members, Menderes, Demirel, and Çiller resorted to political patronage and

nepotism. As compared to Demirel, Menderes and Çiller tried to cling on to power with greater fervor. Thus, if political patronage and nepotism proved inadequate to retain close control over the party, these two political leaders resorted to extra-constitutional and/or politically unethical means. When his government came under heavy criticism and he was forced to resign, Menderes saved the day by unconstitutionally asking for a vote of confidence only for himself and obtaining it. Çiller did not have the charisma Menderes and, to some extent, Demirel had over the party members. Menderes could establish emotional, and Demirel personal, ties with their followers. Çiller established neither type of links with the members of her party. Many who remained close to her either bided their time, hoping that they could take over the party when she fell from power, or had only instrumental motives such as materially benefitting from being in favor of the leader. As a consequence, in addition to political patronage and nepotism, perhaps out of desperation, Çiller blatantly resorted to the tactics of cooptation, divide-and-rule, and expulsion. Çiller was also not averse to such openly illegal practices as disregarding the results of election primaries for candidates and instead dictating her own candidates. In the Democratic Left Party, Ecevit solved the "problem" of establishing his hegemony over the party by exercising tight control over the entry to the party. To solve the "problem" in question, Türkeş created a very centralized party, and indoctrinated party members in his viewpoints. For the same purpose, Özal developed a core group in the party that comprised relatives and protégés. The members of this core group felt that their primary allegiance was to their personal mentor—Özal. Here it should also be added that another tactic to maintain party unity was that of the intensification of interparty conflict. In the 1950s, Menderes, and in the late 1970s, Demirel, made use of it.

In the multiparty period, for political leaders other than İnönü and Ecevit, the penchant for political office was very high. It was not important for İnönü because his primary goal was that of consolidating democracy in Turkey while safeguarding the Republican reforms. For this reason he considered losing elections in 1950 as his "greatest victory." In the 1950s, unlike Menderes, İnönü did not use religion to garner votes. In the early 1970s he put up a pitched struggle against Ecevit for the leadership of the party because he thought Ecevit would drift Turkish politics away from its Republican premises. It is true that Ecevit had a mission to carry Turkey to Bright Days (*Ak Günlere*), but Ecevit, too, readily accepted electoral defeat. In the late 1970s he even resigned from the prime ministry when his party did very badly in a by-election.

Other political leaders did not display similar inclinations and/or notions of democracy. Menderes, in particular, acted in accordance with a particular notion of "national will" (*milli irade*). He thought that because his party obtained the majority of the votes, whatever his government, that is, he himself, decided reflected the preferences of the people. He thus equated the criticisms of his government by other parties as opposition to what the people as a collectivity wanted and, therefore, considered those criticisms unconstitutional. Conse-

quently, in the late 1950s he saw no harm in unconstitutionally forming a par-
liamentary committee to investigate the "illegal activities" of the CHP.[15]
Menderes, who came to power to initiate a democratic movement in Turkey,
ended up resorting to authoritarianism in order to remain in power. As noted,
Demirel also had a mission—to create the Great Turkey. When he faced serious
challenges to his power in the 1970s, he was careful to stay away from such
illegalities, but Demirel adopted the fateful tactic of polarizing politics. In order
to realize his goal of substantially transforming the economy, Özal, when presi-
dent, tried to personally set Turkey's economic and foreign policy over the
heads of cabinet members. For a while he had his way. However, when he could
no longer manipulate those policies, he became a dejected man. The penchant
for political office was highest in Erbakan and Çiller. Power had an intoxicating
effect on both of these leaders. For the sake of staying in power, Erbakan always
made extravagant promises. With the same goal in mind, in regard to Turkey's
relations with the European Union and its predecessors, with NATO, and with
Israel, he made grand reversals of policy, and was engaged in politically risky
acts such as flirting with the Islamic fundamentalist regimes in the Middle East
and North Africa. Not unlike Erbakan, Çiller, too, tried to stay in government at
all costs by shifting her policies and discourse as the situation warranted. She
fluctuated between fierce militarism and antimilitarism and between efforts to
make Turkey part of Europe and defying European norms and standards in the
name of acting responsively to the nationalistic views and religious sensibilities
of the people. She shifted from liberal to conservative and back to liberal dis-
course. Like Bayar and Erbakan, she never accepted responsibility for the crises
she had a hand in creating.

Under the circumstances, most of the political leaders in Turkey contributed
little to the flourishing of the politics of harmony, a sine qua non for viable de-
mocracy. There are a few exceptions. Both before and after the transition to
multiparty politics, İnönü was a champion of this type of politics. As already
mentioned, while president (1938-50) he reinstated in politics those who, in the
previous decades, were sent to political wilderness, and later showed an inclina-
tion for pardoning even his archrivals. He also tried very hard to institutionalize
in Turkey the procedural rules of democracy. One of the reasons why he thought
this was important was his reasoning that respect for rules promoted harmony.
In certain periods in his political career, Demirel, too, contributed to harmonious
relations in Turkish politics. Except during the 1980s, he had cordial relations
with the military. The role he played during his presidency (1993-2000) was
particularly critical. He attempted to maintain social unity in the country and
promote agreeable relations among the political parties on the one hand, and
between the military and political parties on the other. And, as already noted, by
acting as a buffer between the military and the Welfare Party–True Path Party
coalition in 1997, he prevented that crisis from further escalating into a full-
scale military intervention. The last political leader who also had a part in the
development of harmony in Turkish politics has been the Ecevit of the 1990s.

The present Democratic Left Party *(Demokratik Sol Parti*—DSP)–Nationalist Action Party *(Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi*—MHP)–Motherland Party *(Anavatan Partisi*—ANAP) coalition formed in 1999 under Ecevit's leadership has displayed significant internal concordance.

Beliefs, Ideology, and Goals

Turkish political leaders have had different notions of democracy. This was the case even during the single-party years of 1923-45. When Atatürk wrested sovereignty from the sultans, he gave it not to the people but to the nation. In his opinion, the Ottoman Empire had collapsed because the state in that empire had become subservient to the sultans, serving only their personal interests. The state was now to serve the nation—that is, the long-term interests of the community; it was not going to serve the people—that is, the particularistic interests of different social groups. Political responsiveness remained an alien concept to Atatürk; he equated liberalism with the demise of the Republican reforms. The French Revolution had left a deep imprint on Atatürk; he adopted from it his progressive ideas. He thought of progress as the emergence of a single universal culture as well as civilization. Thus there was a need for unity of purpose, which could be realized only under a single-party regime.

İnönü, too, attributed to the long-term interests of the community far greater significance than he did to particularistic interests. Where he differed from Atatürk was that while Atatürk was after a new culture, İnönü longed for a more rational administration. Consequently, while Atatürk wished to see in Turkey *consensual* politics, İnönü's preference was for *adversarial* politics. İnönü thought that better ideas could emerge only from a clash of ideas. When in 1930 the opponents of the Republican reforms began to coalesce around the Free Republican Party *(Serbest Cumhuriyetçi Fırka*—SCF), Atatürk became rather concerned. He told the leader of the party, Fethi Okyar, whom he had asked to form the party in the first place, that he could no longer maintain his equal distance to his party and the Republican People's Party. Thereupon Okyar closed the SCF. At the time, İnönü objected to the closure of the SCF, thinking that people had common sense and the capacity to learn and, therefore, it was possible to maintain the Republican reforms in the multiparty period, too. After becoming president in 1938, at the first opportune moment—right after World War II— İnönü introduced multiparty politics to Turkey.

Despite the fact that Atatürk had second thoughts about the transition to multiparty politics, he nevertheless contributed immensely to the institutionalization of change in Turkey. Among other things, Atatürk hastened the emancipation of women in Turkey. He insisted that religion should have no role in the community and the polity; however, he did not attempt to suppress religion altogether. Religion had to be free but only in the private domain.

Atatürk had respect for the religious sensibilities of the people, although he himself came to have a purely naturalistic explanation of the universe. Atatürk was against "isms" of any kind. What later came to be known as Kemalism or Atatürkism was a worldview that preached the use of intellect, and not an ideology that prescribed set formulas.[16] Since he was not interested in closed systems of thought, Atatürk subordinated political party to the state, and not vice versa. Furthermore, Atatürk subscribed to cultural-defensive rather than ethnic-irredentist nationalism. His toying with such unrealisitic views as exemplified in the Sun-Language Theory and Turkish Historical Thesis in the early 1930s were no more than attempts to enable the Turks to regain their self-confidence, which had been badly shaken during several centuries of decline and the eventual collapse of the Ottoman Empire.[17] The nationalism Atatürk had in mind was informed by patriotism rather than a belief in the superiority of Turks to other peoples. Both Atatürk and İnönü believed Turkey should have a Western orientation. Neither opted for a political regime other than democracy; they thought that democracy was an integral part of Western civilization.

In 1945, İnönü did not hesitate to launch multiparty politics in Turkey, because, in addition to his belief that people had the potential to learn, he thought that if an authoritarian regime lingered on for too long following the transition to an open regime, all that was achieved earlier would be swept away. He had also suspicions that if the transition would not be realized while he was still in power, other leaders might not be willing to liberalize the regime.

Celal Bayar and Adnan Menderes, who came to power as leaders of the Democratic Party in the first free elections of the multiparty period (1950), perceived themselves as the saviors of the people from what they conceived as an authoritarian state. Consequently, as already noted, Bayar and Menderes adopted a populistic and majoritarian version of democracy. Bayar thought that those who came to power through elections should have the widest scope of action. Similarly, Menderes saw no need for elite consensus over critical issues. Also, he had no respect for the rights of political minorities. In Menderes's opinion, those who were attacking the government were in fact resisting the national will. These two political leaders also saw in the cadres of higher civil servants they had inherited from the previous decades their most critical rivals. They were not wrong in this particular diagnosis. While the bureaucrats in question considered themselves as the protectors of the Republican reforms, Menderes thought some of reforms were offensive to the people. Menderes, along with Bayar, took upon himself, the task of promoting the cause of the common man.

In the 1960s and the 1970s, as leader of the Justice Party (*Adalet Partisi*— AP), Süleyman Demirel kept alive the antistate posture of Bayar and Menderes. He took issue with the 1961 constitution that had created such institutions as the Consititutional Court and the National Security Council, strengthened the hand of the Council of State (the Turkish version of the French *Conseil d'Etat*), and granted autonomy to the Turkish Radio and Television Agency and universities,

with the hope that the first three would exercise political tutelage over Parliament and government and the last three would contribute to the emergence of an enlightened public opinion against "unenlightened rule." Demirel also defended civilian rule against the military's increased tendency to intervene in politics. From the late 1960s onward, Demirel was joined by Bülent Ecevit who, first as the secretary-general of the CHP and later as its chairman, also opposed the dominance in Turkish politics of the intellectual-bureaucratic elite in general and the military in particular.

As compared to Bayar and Menderes, Ecevit and, in particular, Demirel were more circumspect in their relations with the military. It is true that in 1973 the two leaders cooperated to block the election by Parliament of General Faruk Gürler as president, but then they acquiesced in the election of the more moderate Admiral Fahri Korutürk to that post. Ecevit challenged the military in a provocative manner only once[18] (in the wake of the 1971 intervention); Demirel never acted in that manner. Not unlike Bayar and Menderes, both Demirel and Ecevit had a concern for the people on the street and a sensitivity to their religious propensities, but, unlike Bayar and Menderes, neither opted for policies that would have seemed tinkering with secularism—the most important Republican principle. Particularly during their later years in politics, both Demirel and Ecevit arrived at the conclusion that the fortunes of democracy in Turkey depended first and foremost upon mutual respect between civilian government and the military.

Türkeş in his later years and Özal from the beginning, too, thought along the same lines. Türkeş's patriotic struggle against communism in the 1960s and 1970s must have been viewed by the military with sympathy. However, until the post-1980 period, in the eyes of the military Türkeş could not have had a "clean" record. For a while Young Türkeş had toyed with the idea of ethnic nationalism, which clashed with the military's cultural nationalism. Also Türkeş's earlier interest in "external Turks" and his authoritarian tendencies in politics could not have been approved by the military that always believed in Atatürk's dictum of "Peace at home and peace abroad" and in the ultimate supremacy of civilian government. However, in the post-1980 period, Türkeş's political beliefs and ideology went through a significant transformation. He began to consider the Turks and the Kurds as brethrens sharing the same culture, warned against adventures in international relations, and placed emphasis on harmony in politics and civilized relations among political parties.

From the very beginning, Özal's interest was the economy, and not politics. Not unlike Demirel and Ecevit, Özal, too, had an antimilitary approach. However, in order to realize his primary goal of rendering the Turkish economy competitive in international markets, he prioritized political stability. Consequently, he was against unnecessary confrontation with the military. He *did* confront the military by, for instance, not appointing the military's candidate as Chief of General Staff. He did this only after gaining the military's

confidence in him, in this case by considerably improving Turkey's balance of payments.

He took advantage of the sympathy the military came to have toward him and became an open advocate not only of freedom of thought and entrepreneurship but also freedom of religious conscience. Özal could act in this manner and even occasionally declare that in the last analysis he felt responsible to Allah, or God, implying even if unconsciously that he did not feel responsible to the people via Parliament, also because his conduct in politics was not informed by religion. For Özal, Islam remained a matter of personal belief and a source of ethics in interpersonal relations.

In the case of Erbakan, at least as it seemed to the military and the Constitutional Court, this was not the case. In politics Erbakan came to have a double discourse. On the one hand, he gave the impression that he valued the secular and democratic Republic. On the other hand, he kept making ambiguous references to the Shari'a and *cihad*. He never made clear whether he thought of Shari'a, the Muslims' law code, as positive law that all Muslims should abide by or as a set of Islamic ethics that could contribute to the moral development of people. Similarly, he left open whether he attributed to cihad its usual meaning in Islam—regular warfare against the unbelievers and infidels—or considered it as an instrument of moral struggle to win back those coreligionists "who lost faith and thus lived in ignorance." Such a stance did not endear him to the military. Furthermore, until he was banned from politics for the last time in 1997, the question of democracy and human rights had not become a priority for Erbakan. He had always given the impression that for him democracy was only a means, and not an end.

Given their political beliefs, ideologies, and goals, there was no reason for Mesut Yılmaz and Tansu Çiller to be on a collision course with the military. Özal had subscribed to democratic political principles, conservative social norms, and liberal economic policies. Yılmaz inherited from Özal the latter's eclecticism. Yılmaz wished to promote in Turkey (1) liberalism checked by nationalism and conservatism so that it would not lead to cosmopolitanism and a rootless admiration of the West, (2) nationalism kept in bounds by conservatism and liberalism so that it would not turn into chauvinism, militarism, and xenophobia, and (3) conservatism controlled by nationalism and liberalism so that it would not end up in Islamic reaction and fundamentalism. Yılmaz equated democracy with the dynamism of civil society. He called for the enlargement of the area of individual rights and liberties in order to provide a further push for democratization in Turkey. He supported a Muslim–Turkish identity, arguing that there was a need to reconcile the premises of the Turkish state (including secularism) with the religious beliefs and moral values of the people. Yılmaz denounced attempts to divide the nation into believers and unbelievers; according to him, real unbelievers were those who exploited religion for political ends. These views fit well with the global trends of the time as well as with those in Turkey. In general, they also did not clash with the views of the

military. On the other hand, Yılmaz's views on some specific issues differed from that of the military. Following the February-June 1997 political crisis, as the new prime minister, Yılmaz declared that from that moment onward only his government was responsible for dealing with the threat of political Islam in Turkey. The military disagreed, indicating that it would go on monitoring that problem, because according to the (1982) constitution the military was responsible for defending the country against its *internal* as well as *external* enemies. A less critical disagreement between Yılmaz and the military developed after Yılmaz became deputy prime minister in the Democratic Left Party–Nationalist Action Party–Motherland Party coalition government and was given the task of coordinating Turkey's efforts to become a full member of the European Union. While Yılmaz thought that Turkey should take all the necessary steps so that its economy and democracy would fit the criteria set forth in Maastricht and Copenhagen, the military expressed doubts about the wisdom of some of those steps, such as education and broadcasting in Kurdish.

Çiller started off with a free-market orthodoxy, thus deviating from her predecessor Demirel's policy of free market coupled with social welfare. Initially, she also introduced herself as a champion of secularism. However, Çiller was not consistent in her beliefs and goals either in the economy or in politics. She made several reversals in both spheres. When she saw her electoral fortunes in danger, she substituted a conservative–populist discourse for her initial free-market orthodoxy discourse, and replaced the discourse of "secular Turkey" with "a Turkey which is both secular and Muslim." She started as a democrat; soon she turned over all responsibility to the military concerning the armed struggle with the separatist PKK (Kurdistan Worker's Party), and following her latest fall from power in 1997, sharply criticized the military for the latter's intervention in politics.

Impact on Democracy

Atatürk was virtually solely responsible for initiating the Republican reforms with the intention of enabling the Turks to catch up with Western civilization. They included reforms that prepared the ground for democracy. First, secularism enabled people to have an open mind. During the multiparty period, the electorate did not vote for ideological parties. And many of those who voted for the religiously oriented parties did so not because they were religiously oriented but because they promised higher ethical standards and because the municipalities these parties controlled efficiently delivered services to the people. Second, the alphabet reform—the replacing of the Arabic alphabet with the Latin alphabet, which could be learned far more quickly—facilitated communication among the people, and such reforms as women's emancipation raised the general level of equality in society. By means of these reforms

Atatürk began to prepare the ground for the democratization of the political regime in Turkey. He carried out these reforms by resorting to his charismatic authority.[19] Whether he could have managed what he achieved by democractic means is open to question.

For his part, İnönü almost single-handedly introduced multiparty democracy in Turkey. He chose a gradual passage to democracy so that in the process the newcomers to the political scene would come to appreciate the Republican premises of the state and internalize the procedural rules of democracy. In the 1970s, such a transition to democracy in Spain ensured the successful consolidation of democracy in that country.[20] In Turkey, the passage *was* gradual, but in particular the socialization to the procedural rules of the game did not go very far. As already mentioned, even today, although democracy is the only game in town there is little consensus on the rules of that game. In the post-1945 multiparty period, İnönü continued his efforts to instutionalize in the Turkish polity the procedural rules of democracy. However, again he did not have much success; the general tendency on the part of Turkish political leaders to seek power at all costs stood in the way of respect for those rules.

İnönü strongly opposed military interventions. He always discouraged officers to intervene, although he thought that sometimes they had a good reason to intervene. When in 1962 and 1963, a handful of officers attempted to intervene, according to İnönü with good reason, he quickly sent them back to their barracks. When in 1960 and 1971, the military intervened, and, according to İnönü, with good reason İnönü first facilitated and then hastened the military's withdrawal from politics. Other political leaders shared İnönü's opposition to military rule. It became a datum of Turkish politics. However, some political leaders never thought that sometimes the military intervenes with good reason, and, therefore, it did not occur to them that if they conducted themselves in politics differently the military would not have a good reason to intervene.

İnönü was open to new ideas and policies. He adopted wholeheartedly the left-of-center policy suggested by Bülent Ecevit, then the secretary-general of the CHP. Many of the political leaders who came to power after İnönü did not follow suit.

İnönü resigned from the chairmanship of the CHP (1972). In this regard, too, except for Ecevit, post-İnönü leaders did not take him as a role model. Among other things, despite the fact that they lost several successive elections, most leaders chose to stay on at the head of their political parties.

İnönü placed emphasis on the general interest, as he himself interpreted it, at the virtual expense of particularistic interests. İnönü was not unresponsive to particularistic interests. However, he first and foremost considered himself as the guardian of the Republic. Except for the mature Demirel and Ecevit, other political leaders tended to equate the emphasis on the general interest with authoritarianism. In the process, the idea that a politician should also double as a statesperson, that is, a politician should act responsibly as well as responsively,

did not take root in Turkish political culture. Instead, there emerged two distinct categories of actors in Turkish politics—state elites and political elites. The former specialized in the long-term interests of the country and considered themselves as the guardians of the Republican premises of the state, whereas the latter focused their attention on sectional interests and undertook unto themselves the task of defending the interests of the people against the "authoritarian state." When the military came to the conclusion that the cadres of the former had become thinner and less efficacious, they attempted to fill the void so created.

During the 1970s, when İnönü as opposition leader considered Prime Minister Menderes only a "political elite" without the traits of state elites, he began to constantly and harshly criticize him. Menderes reciprocated. This led to the polarization of politics, and eventually to military intervention. That intervention started off a confrontation between the military and "the democrats." In this conflict, which still lingers on, political leaders and others took their sides. Those on the side of the state accused others of acting irresponsibily; those on the side of the people criticized their detractors of acting unresponsively.

Celal Bayar led the efforts to found the Democratic Party, which in 1950 ended the twenty-seven-year-old one-party rule in Turkey. By his smooth and calm personality he gave confidence to İnönü and some of the latter's colleagues for the future of the Republican regime. Once in power as president, however, Bayar began to display an altogether different behavior pattern. He backed Prime Minister Menderes in the latter's tendency to suppress the opposition and played a leading role in the eventual efforts to get rid of the opposition altogether.

In the second part of the 1940s, Menderes helped Bayar put an end to the one-party rule in Turkey. He was particularly instrumental in expanding the organizational network of the new party that opposed the long-time single party in power by mobilizing popular support for democratic politics. Menderes thus had an important role in integrating the rural masses into the political and economic life of the country. On the other hand, with Bayar, Menderes attempted to restrict the rights of the political oppostion—a strategy which played a major role in opening up an era of a series of military interventions. By giving short shrift to the procedural rules of democracy, Bayar and Menderes almost totally negated the significant role they that played at the start of multiparty politics. For several decades, Turkey felt the adverse effects of the political turbulence created by the 1960 military intervention. Among other things, that intervention intensified enmity among political leaders, thus making the forging of political consensus impossible. Consequently, when democracy came under a serious threat, political leaders found it difficult to stage concerted action to deal with the crisis.

While Bayar and Menderes integrated the rural masses into Turkish politics, Demirel did the same thing for the economic middle classes, and Ecevit for

labor. Not unlike Menderes, Demirel injected a new dynamism into the Turkish economy. Thus, following in the footsteps of Menderes, Demirel completed the spadework for the gradual emergence of civil society in Turkey. Ecevit introduced to Turkish politics social democracy, which he thought was compatible with democratic freedoms. In his view, by peaceful reform one could forestall social upheaval. However, a number of factions in his party, which were further to the left than Ecevit, began to drift the party to extreme platforms. This prepared the end of social democracy in Turkey. When the military intervened in 1980, it perceived Ecevit's CHP as a threat to the democratic and Republican state and, along with other parties, closed the CHP.

Not unlike Ecevit, Demirel, too, acted as a defender of the peripheral groups against the intellectual and bureaucratic center, including the military. He thought one could promote the interests of the said groups by decreasing the role the bureacratic center played in Turkish politics. Demirel thus became a champion of political participation. He tried to realize this goal by forming a broad coalition of allies, which included the various shades of the left. Yet, Demirel's primary goal was to consolidate civilian rule in Turkey; he paid less attention to widen the scope of civil liberties. He remained silent when certain restrictions were placed on basic rights and liberties following the 1971 and 1980 military interventions. As a consequence, not only could he not prevent further military interventions, but at the same time he could not maintain intact the democratic front he had formed.

In the 1970s, as Demirel and Ecevit saw each other as the number one threat to the country, they could not join forces against the increased political violence that erupted in the wake of rising political fragmentation and polarization. Demirel formed coalition governments with political parties to the right of his Justice Party; Ecevit flirted with the Confederation of Revolutionary Workers' Unions (*Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu*—DİSK). These moves on the part of Demirel and Ecevit sealed the fate of democracy; in 1980 the military took power into its own hands for the third time since the launching of multiparty politics in 1945.

Yet Demirel and Ecevit had one trait which clearly distinguished them not only from Bayar and Menderes but also from most of the political leaders who came to power in later years: both of these politicians had lofty ideals for Turkey, and they clung on to those ideals throughout their careers, including the turbulent 1970s. Demirel was the realist and Ecevit the utopian. However, for both, politics was a means to realize their commendable goals; Demirel wished to create a Great Turkey, Ecevit a Turkey where humane values came to have salience.

Özal, too, had a grandiose goal—a fundamental change in the economy.[21] And Özal was more successful than Demirel and Ecevit in bringing about large-scale change. Yet in pursuing his goal he was not as consistent as Demirel and Ecevit had been in realizing their goals. Özal watered down his efforts to realize his own goal when ANAP lost votes in the 1987 national elections.

In the multiparty period, leaders other than Demirel, Ecevit, and Özal not only made several U-turns regarding the targets they set for themselves, but also their targets were not as grandiose as their goals. The Bayar–Menderes project of democratization ended up in an authoritarian regime. Yılmaz's political liberalism was diluted by nationalism and conservatism. Çiller's orthodox market economy was hampered by cheap populism.

In addition, as compared to the earlier periods, from the early 1990s onward both Demirel and Ecevit displayed a considerable degree of political prudence. Demirel as president and Ecevit as prime minister made significant contributions to the flourishing of harmony in Turkish politics. Thanks primarily to Demirel and Ecevit, what İnönü wished to see finally began to take hold in that polity, particularly among the coalition partners.

Earlier, Türkeş, Özal, and Yılmaz, too, had made some contributions to this new pattern of politics. From the early 1980s onward, Türkeş increasingly emphasized the need for consensus in political life and civilized relations among political parties. In the 1980s, Özal made efforts to leave behind the polarized and conflict-ridden politics of the 1970s. He tried to develop a political cohabitation among liberalism, nationalism, and Islam within the Motherland Party. In addition, in order to bring about a rapid transfomation in the economy he made efforts to sideline conflict in the polity. For his part, Yılmaz adopted a politics of persuasion within ANAP.

While Türkeş, Özal, and Yılmaz made these contributions to democracy at the same time they were responsible for some of the difficulties Turkish democracy faced then and later. In the 1970s, Türkeş's strong ideas, which at times were tinged with ethnonationalism, and his authoritarian tendencies, which were coupled with militant tactics, constituted a serious setback for democractization in Turkey. In the 1980s, Özal's longing for a one-man show, his (occasional) flouting of the procedural rules of democracy, and his sometime careless statements with negative moral implications did harm to democracy. Yılmaz's dithering on some critical occasions and his inclination to come up with strong-worded comments in an already tense situation did not help the cause of democracy in Turkey. From time to time, Yılmaz was also accused of corruption. Although none of those claims was proven valid, they must have exacerbated his frequent inability to take initiative and were perhaps another cause of his occasional flare-ups.

The claims of corruption made against Yılmaz and, in particular, against Çiller adversely affected the legitimacy of democratic politics in Turkey. The claims against Çiller were particularly damaging because many people in Turkey as well as abroad had come to have less confidence about her integrity than that of Yılmaz. Çiller had joined the political scene with great fanfare, many in Turkey and elsewhere having considered her election as the leader of a major political party a great leap forward for Turkish democracy. However, her conduct in politics—her political opportunism in general and her forming a coalition government with the Welfare Party when Turkey was considered to be

facing the threat of political Islam in particular—turned out to be great disapointments to many.[22]

Erbakan topped other political leaders in inflicting damage to democracy in Turkey. It is true that he made possible the articulation of religious demands in the public space and, further, saw to it that the movement he led gradually came up with more pro-Republican definitions of secularism. Yet his ambiguous stand concerning such key issues as the Shari'a and cihad, his occasional provocative statements, and his packing the bureaucracy with his religiously oriented supporters led in 1980 to a full and in 1997 to a semimilitary intervention. Moreover, although being banned from active politics since June 1998, he has continued to block the transformation of the Virtue Party in a Muslim-democratic direction.

Since the establishment of the Republic in 1923, Turkey has made considerable progress toward modernity, with democracy having no rivals though it still has not been consolidated. Turkey has left behind consensual politics and is trying to make a transition from populistic-majoritarian to adversarial democracy while maintaining a necessary degree of harmony in the polity. This is to a great extent dependent upon the widespread acceptance of the procedural rules of democracy and the replacement of the cultural cleavages by functional cleavages. During the recent decades, on both accounts Turkey has registered considerable though less-than-adequate progress.

Political leaders in Turkey have had primary responsibility for the achievements and failures of democracy. They opened the way for people to primarily think rather than believe, chart their destiny via politics, and pass judgment on political parties in terms of services delivered and not extended debate on grand issues. At the same time some of them slowed down or frustrated further developments in democracy. Several did not have adequate preparation before coming to top political posts. Most of the leaders had a penchant for office. They could thus easily violate the procedural rules of democracy. They stayed in their posts for too long. Many were too sure of their judgment, and took themselves very seriously. With one or two exceptions, the ability to reconcile differences was not their forte. They preferred a clash of personalities to that of ideas. Almost all of them held tight control over their parties. To cap it all, only a few changed over time. However, among those who did change and adopt characteristics appropriate for adversarial but harmonious politics were Demirel and Ecevit, who occupied critical posts in recent times. This has boded well for the future of Turkish politics.

Notes

1. See Arif T. Payaslıoğlu, "Political Leadership and Political Parties in Turkey," *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* edited by Robert E. Ward and Dankwart A.

Rustow (Princeton,N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1964); Frederick W. Frey, *The Turkish Political Elite* (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1965; Frey, "Patterns of Elite Politics in Turkey," in *Political Elites in the Middle East* edited by George Lenczowski, (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1975); Arsev Bektaş, *Demokratikleşme Sürecinde Liderler Oligarşisi: CHP ve AP, 1961-1980* (Istanbul: Bağlam, 1993).

2. Juan Linz, "Transitions to Democracy," *Washington Quarterly* 13 (1990) 156.

3. Metin Heper and Aylin Güney, "The Military and the Consolidation of Democracy, The Recent Turkish Experience," *Armed Forces and Society* 26 (summer 2000), 635-657.

4. Şerif Mardin, "Power, Civil Society and Culture in the Ottoman Empire," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11 (1969) 258-281, and Metin Heper, *The State Tradition in Turkey* (Walkington, U.K.: Eothen Press, 1985).

5. The Republican elite in Turkey, including Atatürk, thought that Abdülhamit II's policies were informed by Islam and that this was the primary reason for the decline and fall of the Ottoman Empire.

6. Frey, *The Turkish Political Elite*, and Metin Heper and Ersin Kalaycıoğlu, "Organizational Socialization as Reality-Testing: The Case of the Turkish Higher Civil Servants," *International Journal of Political Education* 6 (1983) 175-198.

7. Frederick W. Frey, "Education [in Turkey]," in *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* edited by Robert E. Ward and Dankwart A. Rustow (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), and Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961) 181-183.

8. Bülent Aras, "Turkish Islam's Moderate Face," *Middle East Quarterly*, 5, no. 3 (1998) 23-29; Metin Heper, "Islam and Democracy in Turkey," *Middle East Journal*, 51 (winter 1997) 32-45; Ümit Cizre Sakallıoğlu, "Parameters and Strategies of Islam–State Interaction in Republican Turkey," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 28 (1996), 231-251, and Jenny White, "Pragmatists or Ideologs: Turkey's Welfare Party in Turkey," *Current History* 94, no. 588 (1997) 25-30.

9. See further below.

10. This committee was made up of officers and some important civilian personages, and played an important role from behind the scenes from 1912 until 1918.

11. In the government formed at the behest of and closely monitored by the Junta, he acted as deputy prime minister responsible for the economy.

12. On this distinction between value charisma and natural charisma, I draw upon Arthur Schweitzer, "Theory and Political Charisma," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16 (1974) 155-166. On Atatürk's charisma, see Metin Heper, "Transformation of Charisma into a Political Paradigm: Atatürkism in Turkey," *Journal of the American Institute for the Study of Middle Eastern Civilization* 1 (autumn-winter 1980-1981) 52-82.

13. Üstün Ergüder, "The Motherland Party, 1983-1989," *Political Parties and Democracy in Turkey* edited by Metin Heper and Jacob Landau (London: I. B. Tauris, 1991) 156.

14. This has been true for his present leadership in the Democratic Left Party (*Demokratik Sol Parti*—DLP), but it was not necessarily the case when he led the CHP.

15. Feroz Ahmad, *The Turkish Experiment in Democracy, 1950-1975* (London: C. Hurst, 1977), 64.

16. During Atatürk's lifetime, civics textbooks did not make reference to Kemalism or Atatürkism with the suffix "ism." See Türker Alkan, "Turkey: Rise and Decline of Legitimacy in a Revolutionary Regime," *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies* 4 (1980) 37-48.

17. According to the Sun-Language Theory and Turkish Historical Thesis the first language on earth was Turkish, and other languages were derived from it; Turks had made significant contributions to the flourishing of civilization; there was a continuous thread of history in Anatolia dating back to the Sumerians and Hittites; and as a race Turks were not inferior to others. See Büşra Ersanlı Behar, *İktidar ve Tarih: Türkiye'de "Resmi Tarih" Tezinin Oluşumu, 1929-1937* (Istanbul: Afa, 1992).

18. In the wake of the 1971 military intervention, Ecevit several times violated the ban on active politics.

19. On Atatürk, also see Dankwart A. Rustow, "Atatürk's Political Leadership," *Near Eastern Round Table* 1 (1967-1968) 143-155, and Rustow, "Atatürk as an Institution-Builder," in *Atatürk: Founder of a Modern State* edited by Ali Kazancıgil and Ergun Özbudun, (London: C. Hurst, 1981).

20. See, inter alia, Metin Heper, "Transitions to Democracy Reconsidered: A Historical Perspective," in *Comparative Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives*, edited by Dankwart A. Rustow and Kenneth Paul Erickson (New York: Harper-Collins, 1991), 202-205.

21. Dankwart A. Rustow has suggested that Republican Turkey experienced three major revolutions—the cultural revolution of Atatürk, the democratic revolution of İnönü, and the economic revolution of Özal. See his "Turkey's Liberal Revolution," *Middle East Review*, 12 (1985) 5-11.

22. On Çiller, also see J. H. Meyer, "Turkey's Leaders: Çiller's Scandals," *Middle East Review* 4, no. 3 (1997) 27-31.