

LIJPHART'S DEMOCRACY IDEA AND TURKEY

Ahmet Yiğitalp TULGA¹

Email:ahmettulga@hotmail.com

Abstract

This paper tries to apply Lijphart's way of description with ten factors for the two models of democracy to the Republic of Turkey. Turkey, with her essential location and a different political structure and social structure, can be added to Lijphart example. This research mainly analysis Turkish political system with Lijphart's majoritarian and consensus democracy idea. In this study, while examining the case of Turkey, the World Bank, IMF, and Freedom House reports and data were used.

Keywords: *Arend Lijphart, Turkey, Democracy, Consensus-majoritarian model of democracy*

Abstrak

Makalah ini mencoba untuk menerapkan cara deskripsi Lijphart dengan sepuluh faktor untuk dua model demokrasi di Republik Turki. Turki, dengan lokasinya yang penting, yang merupakan negara dengan struktur politik dan struktur sosial yang berbeda, dapat dijadikan contoh dari deskripsi Lijphart. Penelitian ini terutama menganalisis sistem politik Turki dengan ide demokrasi mayoritas dan konsensus dari Lijphart. Dalam studi ini, saat menganalisis kasus Turki, laporan dan data Bank Dunia, IMF, dan Freedom House yang digunakan.

Kata Kunci: *Arend Lijphart, Turki, Demokrasi, Model Konsensus- Mayoritas Demokrasi*

¹ Ph.D. student in Political Science in National Sun Yat-Sen University

INTRODUCTION

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica (2019), Democracy means rule by the people. Democracy term was coined by the combination of the old Greek words demos(people) and kratos (rules) (Dahl, 2019). Today, the term democracy is used similarly.

Huntington states that democracy is divided into two stages (Huntington, 1991). Scholars such as Huntington (1991) divided democracy into early and modern stages. Jonathan Sunshine thinks that there are two criteria of democracy in early-stage (Sunshine, 1972). First criteria are that 50 percent of Adult males have the right to vote. Second criteria is a responsible executive body that has to maintain the support of the majority in a selected Parliament or elected by the public in a periodic election (Sunshine, 1972). However, the most important stage of democracy is the modern democracy stage. Because, according to Huntington (1991), modern democracy is related to the improvement of the nation-state model.

In 1999 Arend Lijphart wrote a book and that book became one of the classics in democracy literature. According to Lijphart (1999), it is possible to define democracy as government by and for people. However, this definition reveals a fundamental question, according to Lijphart (1999). This question is, who will do the governing? As an answer to this question, he separated the democracy system into two. First democracy system is majoritarian democracy, and the second form is the consensus model of democracy (Lijphart, 1999).

According to Lijphart (1999), the majoritarian form of democracy means that a majority group or political party governs state or society. In majoritarian democracy, the majority should govern, and minority or losing group should stay in the opposition side. This democracy model excludes minority groups from participation in the decision-making process (Lewis, 1965). Sir Lewis thinks that this form of democracy violates the first aim of democracy.

Otherwise, “consensus model of democracy” includes all people inside the political process. So, all people should have the possibility to join in decision making or political process directly or indirectly (Lijphart, 1999).

Lijphart thinks that there are ten characteristics of majoritarian and consensus model of democracy (Lijphart, 1999). He separates these ten characteristics into two dimensions. In the first dimension, there are five elements. These elements are characteristics of the arrangement of executive power, the party and electoral system, executive, legislative relations, and interest groups. He calls the first dimension as executives-parties dimension. In the second dimension, there are also five elements. These elements are federalism or unitary, cameral system, constitution, judicial review, and independence of the central bank. He calls the second dimension as the federal-unitary dimension (Lijphart, 1999).

Lijphart explained these two models of democracy with examples of England, Belgium, and Switzerland. In addition to these countries, the European Union, which is a supranational organization, has also examined as one of the cases. However, the number of samples given by Lijphart can be increased. More

developing and "transitional" countries could be added to these cases as examples. Turkey, with its essential location and a different political structure and social structure, can be added to Lijphart example. This research mainly analysis Turkish political system with Lijphart's majoritarian and consensus democracy idea. In this study, while examining the case of Turkey, the World Bank, IMF, and Freedom House reports and data were used. The main research question in this study is how could we define Turkish democracy according to Lijphart's book?

LIJPHART'S MAJORITARIAN-CONSENSUS MODEL OF DEMOCRACY AND TURKEY

Turkey is a republic founded in 1923. However, the geographic, social and democratic history of the country traces to an earlier age. The history of democracy in the country began in 1876 during the Ottoman Empire period. Its geographical history dates back to 1071. The Turks had a powerful empire from 1071 until 1923, adopted a republic in 1923 and this date was the establishment year of the Republic of Turkey.

For a long time, Turkey was shown as an example to many Middle Eastern and North African countries because of Turkey's constitution based on secularism and her relatively secular social structure. A single-party regime governed the country from 1923 to 1946. However, within 23 years, new political parties were tried to be established, but they were not successful.

On July 21, 1946, the first multiparty elections were held, but these elections were not fair. The 1946 elections were based on the open vote, secret census and majority system basis. The shortcomings of 1946's general election were reduced in 1950 and the second general elections were held in the country. In other words, since 1946, general and local elections are held regularly in the country. Turkey is the Muslim-majority country with the most democratic experience. However, in history, Turkey faced with some periodic military takeovers. Turkey has faced with the presidential coup in 2017 (Center for systemic peace, 2017).

According to Freedom House data (2018), Turkey was in a free country category between 1974 and 1980. Between 1972-1974 and 1981-2017, Turkey was among the partly free countries. The first time in Turkish history, Turkey declined to not-free status in 2017. It was because the authoritarian character of AKP (Justice and Development Party) has been sufficiently strengthened since a failed coup in 2016 caused a more drastic crackdown on presumed management rivals. Since 2017, it has been among the not-free countries (Freedom House, 2017).

Turkish rank on political rights in recent years has declined from 4 to 5 (Freedom House, 2018). The civil liberties score decreased from 5 to 6 (Freedom House, 2018). The most important reason for this is the constitutional modifications taken in 2017 have focused authority in the president's hand, and the worsening voting circumstances have rendered it progressively hard for

government groups to contest president's control. This power of the president keeps the opposition press and opposition movements under pressure.

LIJPHART DEMOCRACIES MODEL AND TURKEY

It is possible to divide the democracy-Republic of Turkey relationship into five periods. The first period was from 1923 until 1946. This period started with the establishment of the Republic and ended with the “transition” to the multiparty system. From the establishment of the Republic until 1946, the country had one-party rule. Although efforts to conversion to the multiparty system from time to time in the first period, these efforts were not successful.

The second period was between 1946 until 1960. The second period began with the multiparty system and ended with the first military coup in the history of the republic. The second period started with the conversion to the multiparty system. It is known that the first multiparty election is unfair and there are many question marks about the first multiparty election. Because of that, the Republic of Turkey was not ready for a multiparty electoral system. However, the 1950 multiparty election, which took place four years later, were important because they were more fair and the power was changing peacefully.

The third period started in 1960 and it continued until 1980. The third period is the period between two military coups. The third period started with the 1960 military coup and ended with the 1980 military coup. After the 1960 military coup, the junta prepared one of the most democratic constitutions of Turkish

democracy history. In this period, the system was converted from a unicameral system to a bicameral system. 61.7% of the people approved this new system.

The fourth period started in 1980 and it ended in 2016. This period started with the 1980 military coup and ended with a failed military coup in July 2016. The 1980 military coup changed the constitution of the junta in 1961. The bicameral system changed and Turkey adapted unicameral system again. During this period, Turkish democracy had faced with many coalition governments but due to the economic crisis experienced by the government, these coalitions could not remain in power for a long time.

The last period started in 2016 and the last period still continues. After the military coup attempt failed in 2016, Turkey faced with several states of emergencies. In 2017, 51.41% of the Turkish citizens voted for the change of parliamentary system. Turkey adopted the new presidential system as a result of this referendum. General elections were held in 2018. This election was the first election of the presidential system.

Republic of Turkey's democratic history can be analyzed within these periods. The primary purpose of this study is to analyze Turkey with Lijphart's models of democracy. How is the democracy in Turkey base on the Lijpart model of democracy? This is examined in detail below. However, the fifth period was not included in this study since it was quite new.

- 1) *Executive Power;*

According to Lijphart (1999), a parliament with one party is an example of the majoritarian model. In the old democracy history (the 1920s) of the Republic of Turkey, there is usually a single-party dominance in parliament (Dal, 2015).

The assemblies in which minorities were included were generally seen after military coups (Lord, 2012). However, the life of these assemblies has been short-lived.

2) *Executive-Legislative Relations:*

Until the change of system in 2017, the leader of the “winner” party in parliament was the prime minister. In addition, until the failed coup in 2016, the army's interventions had negatively affected the legislative and executive duties of the parliament (Kalaycıoğlu, 2005).

Especially since 2002, the AKP government is the most majoritarian in Turkish history based on Lijphart's majoritarian model (Lord, 2012).

3) *Party System:*

Since 1946, Turkey has a multiparty system. This multiparty system continues after the system change in 2017.

However, there are two major and essential problems in the party system. The first problem is that the interventions of the army until the failed coup in 2016 harmed the party system (Özbudun, 2012). The second problem is that the 10% election threshold makes it difficult for small parties to enter the parliament

(Gönenç, 2008). However, the same election threshold is very beneficial for large parties.

4) *Electoral System:*

The electoral system in Turkey is based on "winner takes all" (Lord, 2012). In addition, the biggest problem of the electoral system is the 10% election threshold and the number of representatives sent by the regions. The basis of these two problems is based on the 1982 constitution prepared after the 1980 coup (Turan, 1994).

5) *Interest Groups:*

Scholars such as Özbudun noted that associations in Turkey, non-governmental organizations and trade unions were similar to the model of pluralist democracy (Özbudun, 2000). However, negative developments in the Republic of Turkey, in recent years (especially after system change), has led to a move away from the model of pluralist democracy. Lord argues that the policy-making process is quite central, and because of that, the interest groups cannot be institutionalized (Lord, 2012).

6) *Unitary and Centralized Government:*

The founders of the Republic of Turkey designed country based on the nation-state model. The Republic of Turkey does not have self-management principle. The Republic of Turkey is a completely centralized and unitary country (Heper, 1984).

7) *Cameral System:*

The Republic of Turkey has a unicameral system. During the Ottoman period and between the two coups, from 1960 to 1980, there was the bicameral system.

8) *Constitutional Rigidity:*

Turkey always has been a rigid and stable constitution. In particular, the 1982 constitution clearly defined the state as a republic, its shape, and character (Koçak, 2005).

The constitution of 1924, the first constitution of the country, the constitutions of 1961 and 1982 require the support of the two-third majority of the parliament for the constitutional change (Lord, 2012). The constitutional change required a three-fifths majority and after a referendum. However, this situation has been changed again in 2017 system change.

9) *Judicial Review:*

In the first period (1924-1946), the parliament controlled the legislative, executive, and judiciary. However, the government reduced its controls on the legislative, executive, and judiciary in the second and third periods, and it took significant steps towards democratization.

In particular, with the acceleration of Islamist parties, in the 1990s, the constitutional court became a "stronghold of secularism." (Belge, 2006).

This situation has changed again in the AKP(Justice and Development Part) period. With the change made in 2010 by the AKP, parliamentary control over the judiciary was increased. With this amendment, the judiciary was relatively controlled (Lord, 2012).

10) *Independent Central Bank:*

With the reform movement after the economic crisis in 2001, the Central Bank has become relatively independent. The independence of the Central Bank has some variables. These variables; The central bank has a consultative role and the central bank is the financial and economic advisory frame of the state. The central bank is the authority that implements the monetary policy (Lord, 2012). However, recent policies of Central Bank have raised doubts about the independence of the Central Bank. There are many discussions on this issue nowadays.

CONCLUSION

According to Bentley (1908) and Truman (1951), group pluralism theory, the processes and issues in politics are essentially based on the cooperation, conflict and the sharing of power of organized interests. The basic assumption of this theory is the assumption that all kinds of interests can be organized so that the decisions made would strike a balance between all interests. The common side of pluralist democracy with the classical liberal theory is that pluralist democracy wants to prevent a totalitarian rule and limit democratic execution with democratic legitimacy (Göztepe, 2011).

In parallel with these authors, Lijphart wrote a book in 1999, and in his book, he divided the democracies into two. He separated democracy into two as a “majoritarian democracy” and “consensus model of democracy” (Lijphart, 1999). Lijphart said that “consensus model of democracy” could be acknowledged more democratic than majoritarian democracy (lijphart, 1999). “Consensus model of democracy” could be called as a “negotiation democracy” as well (Kaiser, 1997).

After examining in detail above, it is seen that Turkey does not fit to the consensus model. However, it does not precisely fit the majoritarian model as well. Cabinet system has been approaching majoritarianism since the 1982 constitution. The cabinet system has not changed in the 2017 system change. However, the majority of the powers of the cabinet were taken away and transferred to the president. This situation has reduced the importance of parliament.

Since 1961, executive-legislative has been approaching majoritarianism (Lord, 2012). Turkey is in a dominant executive category (Lord, 2012). There is no approach to majoritarianism in the party system. Multiparty political life continues after the 2017 constitutional amendment. However, the 10% threshold impedes the effective functioning of the multiparty system. After the 2017 constitutional amendment, coalitions are formed between the losing and minority parties due to the 10% threshold.

Since the 1982 constitution, there is a majoritarian electoral system. There is a “first-past-the-post” electoral system in Turkey (Lord, 2012). The most

crucial problem of this system in the country is the 10% election threshold. Turkey has a majoritarian characteristic of interest groups. Interest groups are always in Turkey took place in majoritarian category (Lord, 2012).

Turkey is a unitary and centralized country. Turkey always has the majoritarian characteristic of the federal-unitary variable. There is no change about this topic in Turkish political history. After the military coup in 1960, the constitution was prepared by the junta in 1961. As a result of this new constitution, the bicameral system was adopted. From 1946 until 1960 there was a unicameral system in Turkey. This situation changed after the 1980 coup. Turkey has adopted a unicameral system again and the unicameral system continues in Turkey. So there is a concentration of power in unicameral in Turkey (Koçak, 2005).

Turkey has a rigid constitution and a consensus model of democracy characteristic about the constitution. After 2017 system change, Turkey still keeps and protect her characteristic of the constitution. Also, Turkey has a consensus model of democracy characteristic about judicial review. Legislature in Turkey does not have the final sentence about the constitutionality of legislation (Lord, 2012).

Until 2001, Turkey did not have an independent central bank. After the 2001 economic crisis, Turkey had an independent central bank. This situation continued like that until 2017. However, this situation starts to change with 2017 system change in Turkey. However, it is possible to say that Turkey still has a

relatively independent central bank. Nowadays, Turkey becomes closer to the majoritarian characteristic of the central bank. However, Turkey still has a consensus model of democracy characteristic about the central bank.

As a conclusion, it is seen that first (1924-1946) and the second (1946- 1960) democracy period shows that the majoritarian democracy characteristics in both dimensions (executive-parties and federal-unitary dimensions). During 1961- 1982 period, Turkey could be seen as a consensus model of democracy. During the 1982-2017 period, Turkey possessed the characteristics of both dimensions. However, it is seen that it is near to the “consensus model” in the fourth period. Today it is possible to define Turkey as a majoritarian model of democracy country.

REFERENCES

- Belge, C. (2006). "Friends of the Court: The Republican Alliance and Selective Activism of the Constitutional Court of Turkey." *Law & Society Review* 40(3): 653-692. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3840516?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Dahl, R. A. (2019). "Democracy." *Encyclopædia Britannica*.
- Dumiter, F. C. (2014). "Central Bank Independence, Transparency and Accountability Indexes: a Survey." *Timisoara Journal of Economics and Business* 7(1): 35-54.
- Eichengreen, N. (2012). "Central Bank Transparency and Independence: Updates and New Measures." FOMC.
- Freedomhouse (2018). "Turkey." Freedom House. Retrieved from <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2019/turkey>
- Garriga, A. C. (2016). *Central Bank Independence in the World: A New Data Set*.
- Gönenç, L. (2008). "Presidential Elements in Government: Turkey." *European Constitutional Law Review* 4(3): 488-523. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/4dce/d99d15ff13bcaca6c218c87f75c6fb1db221.pdf>
- Göztepe, E. (2011). "Cogunlukcu Demorasi Anlayisina Karsi Cogulcu Demokrasi Modelleri." TBB. Retrieved from http://www.kamuhukukculari.org/upload/dosyalar/Cogunlukcu_Demorasi_Anlayisina_Karsi_Cogulcu_Demokrasi_Modelleri_1.pdf
- Gross, B. M. (1950). "The Process of Government; A Study of Social Pressures." By Arthur F. Bentley. *American Political Science Review* 44(3): 742-748. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/processofgovernm00bent/page/n10>
- Heper, M. (1990). "The State, Political Party and Society in post-1983 Turkey." *Government and Opposition* 25(3): 321-333. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/44482520?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, University of Oklahoma Press.
- Kaiser, A. (1997). "Types of Democracy: From Classical to New Institutionalism." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 9(4): 419-444.
- Kalaycioglu, E. (2005). *Turkish Dynamics: Bridge Across Troubled Lands*, Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Karaömerlioğlu, M. (2009). *Ersin Kalaycioglu. Turkish Dynamics: Bridge Across Troubled Lands*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Koçak, E. and N. Uzay (2018). Democracy, Economic Freedoms and Economic Growth: An Investigation on the Role of Institutions. *Sosyoekonomi Journal*, Sosyoekonomi Society, issue 26(36). Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/a/sos/sosjrn/180205.html>
- Lewis, William, A. (1965). *Politics in West Africa*, London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Lijphart, A. (2012). *Patterns of Democracy*, Yale University Press.
- Lord, C. (2013). "The Persistence of Turkey's Majoritarian System of Government." *Government and Opposition* 47(02): 228-255. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2011.01360.x>
- Onis, Z. (2001). *Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation* by Ergün Özbudun.
- Özbudun, E. (2000). *Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation*, Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Parlar Dal, E. (2015). "Democracy, Identity, and Foreign Policy in Turkey: Hegemony Through Transformation." *Turkish Studies* 16(1): 141-143.
- Schmitter, P. C. (1993). "Democracy's Third Wave." *The Review of Politics* 55(2): 348-351.
- Sunshine, J. H. (1972). *Economic Causes and Consequences of Democracy: A Study in Historical Statistics of the European and European-populated English-speaking Countries*, Columbia University.
- Tachau, F. (2001). ERGUN ÖZBUDUN, *Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation* (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 2000). Pp. 181. \$49.95 cloth.
- Truman, D. B. (1971). *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley.
- Turan, I. (1984). *The Evolution of Political Culture in Turkey. Modern Turkey: Continuity and Change*. A. Evin. Wiesbaden, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften: 84-112.
- Young, R. (1994). How Do Peaceful Secessions Happen? *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 27(4), 773-792. doi:10.1017/S0008423900022022.
Retrieved from <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/canadian-journal-of-political-science-revue-canadienne-de-science-politique/article/how-do-peaceful-secessions-happen/999D59EA5ED0801379472A22197F7D4E>