

The Root Cause of Turkish Political Instability

Elizabeth Moore

Senior Thesis, Renaissance School

March 8th, 2017

Early in the morning of July 16th, 2016, the streets of the Turkish cities of Ankara and Istanbul filled with the sounds of planes and chanting, with what was meant to be a coup. Crowds of thousands of civilian and parts of the military filled the streets protesting the Turkish government. The president, speaking from the airport, urged the people to resist this coup. The next morning, the coup instigators were detained and the streets filled with people chanting in support of the government (Dewit). People were chanting, “police uzanan eller kırılınsın,” (“may the hands seeking to harm the police be broken!”) and after the victory of the government supporters, “Türkiye sizinle gurur duyuyor!” (“Turkey is proud of you!”) and chants of takbir such as, “Allahu Akbar,” meaning “God is great”(Koru). After this night of violence and upheaval, thousands of coup supporters were imprisoned and Erdogan declared Turkey to be in a state of emergency for the next three months.

The attempted coup of July 16, 2016 was triggered by long- standing religious tensions within the Turkish government. Friction between Islam and Secularism, as embodied in the policies of Mustafa Kemal, later called Ataturk, are at the root of most of the modern conflicts within Turkey. These tensions can be traced back to the disintegration of the Ottoman empire and the birth of the Modern Turkish republic in the years after World War I. An examination of the recently failed coup will demonstrate a trend toward increased religious sentiment within Turkey from the time of the rise of Ataturk’s Turkish republic.

In order to understand the causes of the coup, it is necessary to examine the foundation of the Turkish society, which began as the Ottoman Empire. This Empire was formed from the crumbling Byzantine Empire by nomadic fighters who were part of the lineage of Osman I, but fighting on behalf of the Seljuk Empire. The primary reason these Turkish raiders, or *ghāzī* s,

were trying to take over the Byzantine Empire was that they wanted to promote and spread Islam, or Çetinsaya, as it is called in Turkish. These nomadic warriors secured the Anatolian peninsula, and a Turkish-Seljuk government planted its roots in Konya, the southern part of Anatolia. The ultimate goal was for the Seljuk empire to expand and spread Islam, and they used these Turkish raiders to accomplish these ends and to settle in this area. In order to make the Turks conform to and respect the government's laws and social structure, there was a strong government presence that built Islamic-based infrastructure, such as the Sunni-based schools. The government chose its officials based on their religious prominence, so many people were converted to Islam, and the fact that everyone shared the same religion and code of ethics provided much self-governance within this new empire.

With services, such as education, the use of religion in government institutions, as well as the instillation of the idea of ethics and following a code, much like chivalry, the nomadic Turks were settled and began to form a sedentary society (Lapidus). The first Sultan, Osman I, came to power in 1299 and ruled the principality later known as the Ottoman Empire. Once the empire was established, it became the major Islamic territory and attracted people to the idea of expanding and fighting against the Byzantine Empire and other "infidel" states in order to spread Islam (Shaw and Yaak). This was the fighters' divine purpose, but it also aided in the growth and expansion of the Ottoman empire. From the beginning, the Ottoman Empire never would have succeeded or grown without Islam.

The Ottoman empire continued to grow until the late 1600's, dominating the trade routes and establishing itself as a major power in European affairs due to its influence and location. Within the country, the society functioned in a millet system. Millets usually refer to non-

Islamic communities. The underlying idea of this social system was keeping the different religions separate in their own semi-autonomous spheres (Carey). The people within these communities were called “dhimmi,” meaning people under the protection of the state, and lived on the lands but followed their own form of government and religion (“Dhimmi”). Islam was the dominant religion and the underlying belief of the government, so Islam was not one of these separate millets; Islam was the overseeing and ruling power. As the Ottoman empire expanded, taking over lands and people with their own culture and religion, the Sultanate did not try to dominate and convert these people. The reason for this was the idea of religious tolerance set forth in the *Quran* as a major pillar of faith. Besides religious reasons, the Sultanate saved money and time because, when people were allowed to follow their own religion, they essentially governed themselves, and the Sultan did not have to justify or assert his power as the Sultan. This social system lasted until the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, showing how effective and lasting the millet system was. As stated by Fatih Ozturk in his abstract analyzing the millet system, “People were seen in the eyes of State not on the basis of ethnicity or language, but religion. Religion, language, community, ethnicity, and family made up the socio-cultural fabric of the millet.” (Ozturk). The Ottoman empire’s rule was much more effective because conquered people were able to retain their cultural identity, often rooted in religion, without feeling oppressed (Faroqhi).

After 1600, the Ottoman Empire began its slow descent from its position as the dominant European trading and political power. The end of Ottoman expansion was the beginning of the empire’s decline due to the fact that the empire gained its population, funds, and resources from expanding to new lands. During the Empire’s decline and due to the wars of conquest and

expansion, the militia was built up. People between the ages of 18 and 25 were recruited to be on the front lines fighting, while the reserve army stayed behind and acted as police. As other countries grew, such as France and England, the Ottoman empire shrunk, which is why the Ottoman Empire was called, in words of Tsar Nicholas I of Russia, “the sick man of Europe”(Bellaigue). In an attempt to slow the empire’s decline, the Sultan Pasha consolidated the army into three parts: guards, reserves and active duty. This restructuring of the military was an attempt to centralize and strengthen the Ottoman Empire military. Sultans in the 1800s had been using western ideas of secularism and technological advancements in attempt to stop the decline of the empire, but if anything this push for westernization created disunity within the country. When Sultan Abdülhamid II came to the sultanate in 1876, instead of encouraging westernization, he used religion as a way to unite people. Using religion as a way to unite people and discouraging westernization was inflammatory because of the previous attempts began to integrate the concept of Westernization into this traditional and religious-based society. These inspired people such as the organization CUP (Committee of Union Progress) in 1902 and the Ottoman Freedom Society, led by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, in 1906, to form in support of western ideals(Hanioglu). The Committee of Union Progress and the Ottoman Freedom Society were fighting for secularization of the country and eventually worked together towards these goals. The CUP provided the structure and the networking The Ottoman Freedom Society needed, and these groups became very linked in members and goals. This was circa 1909, right at the beginning of World War One. when the first coup in Turkey occurred.

One of the driving factors for this revolution in 1909 was the meeting of Russia and Britain in Reval. This meeting was about deciding what to do strategically with certain territories

such as Macedonia, of which parts had been acquired in the previous century. The powers at this meeting were deciding how to run Macedonia and they decided to instate a governor, which began to push into the Ottoman Empire's boundaries with this semi-autonomous state. This created uneasiness within the empire because this territory, technically part of the empire but now run by foreign powers, was trying to expand into the empire. Disorganization within the governmental system led to inconsistent paychecks for the militia and high inflation rates, making the sultanate increasingly weak (El-Khawas). At this point, the sultan had no powers and was essentially a figurehead. With all of these internal and external factors, on July 15, the CUP forced the sultan to reinstate a parliamentary system with elections. In the next election, the CUP candidate won control. Unfortunately, the CUP party encountered similar problems of lack of government structure and unity within the country, straining to balance their own agenda with what the population demanded. In order to once again unify the country, the government reinstated Islamic Law and used violence during the elections before World War I in order to remain in power. With all of this political turmoil and uncertainty, the Ottoman Empire was not in a strong or stable position going into World War I. This theoretical CUP parliamentary system turned into a dictatorship ruled by the Three Pashas. During World War I, Turkey was divided into three sections and each section was ruled by a Pasha. The Three Pashas were the head of government at the beginning of World War I, but it was decided that it would be a good strategy to divide the country into these semi- autonomous sections.

After World War I, the Ottoman Empire was dissolved by the allies and the CUP government and the Empire was overthrown and declared as a republic. Ottoman conquests in Northern Africa, north towards Russia and into Macedonia were taken back, leaving the Turkish

republic only on Anorak(Macfie). The government, established before the war, used religion in order to maintain order and unity within the country until 1919 when the oligarchy was thrown out and the Sultan, with Ally influence, was put into place. The military commander noticed how the once autonomous and independent Turks were now at the point where they did not have control of their own country. In order to rally nationalistic sentiment, Ataturk had to define and get people to believe in what it meant to be a Turk. Ataturk used this transition time and his influence over the situation to establish his own ideal of the Turkish identity, which had been previously based on Islam. The Turkish War for Independence(1923) was the beginning of the birth of New Turkey, led by Ataturk. it overthrew the allied imposed government and put Ataturk in power(Atatürk). The Turkish revolution overthrew the original allied controlled Turkey and began a new phase in history altogether.

Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, as a former military officer and politically active citizen, believed that religion had been the cause of divisions and weakness within the Turkish population. (Mustafa). As he saw it, in order for Turkey to reestablish itself as a world power post World War I and have a stable foundation for growth, religion was not the answer(Atatürk). Ataturk attributed Turkey's failure and lack of advancements and power within the world to the effects of the religiously based systems of government. Instead of uniting the people under religion, as the millet system did, he sought to take religion out of the equation and westernize Turkey(Itzkowitz). One of the problems that had been encountered in the past when similar attempts were made by the Sultanate was the Turkish identity. Since the formation of the Ottoman Empire, religion had been a key factor in how the people connected under Islam. Religion tied the people together in practice, beliefs, and daily life. Kemalism is the belief in

secularist policies that restrict religious influence in government and people and in the use of westernization in order to advance society as a whole. Kemalism, named after Atatürk (Mustafa Kemal), encompasses Atatürk's policies and was intended to originally address and state political ideals. The issue Atatürk faced was how to secularize the society and have Kemalism succeed long-term. The idea was to unify people based on nationalism rather than religion (Baran). In order to achieve this, he took away as much religious influence as possible. Unlike the previous attempts at westernization, Atatürk's rule, the "New Turkish" government, took a more authoritarian approach to the issue of religion. This approach helped the government to unify and convert the masses to secularism without opposition by enabling the secular belief system to impact people in their daily lives (Baran).

Atatürk observed the strengths the allies had in the war and attempted to strengthen Turkey based on these observations. Theoretically, under Atatürk, all religion was taken away in government and the population's daily lives through restrictive policies. His new constitution included removing Islam as the state religion, changing the Arabic alphabet to the Latin characters, making it illegal to wear hijab and other religiously affiliated clothing or symbols, and closing mosques (Atatürk). As restrictive as the laws concerning beliefs were, social liberties in terms of education were highly encouraged in an attempt to get Turkey at the front of technological developments and intellectual discoveries. Turkish females experienced more rights and relative equality, such as freedom to vote and right to work, decades before women of other countries. Laws allowing gender equality and encouraging education characterized some social policies during Atatürk's rule. This social progressivism was meant to move the country's overall intellectual understanding ahead in an attempt to compete with more advanced countries

such as the United states, Britain, and France. The theory of Kemalism would potentially allow for social advancements, internal improvements, and technological advancements (Tachau).

This is the point in history where the Ataturk molded an entirely new country. The Turkish military becomes significant under Kemalist ideology during this time period because of the significance placed on the military. The military gained the role of “guardians of secularism” and there was a certain prestige associated with it. The military adopted this image of guardians of secularism and continue to carry that message. The reason the military was such a strong and ardent believer in Ataturk was because the Kemalist ideals originally gave the military their power. In a paradoxical way, this religionless secularism became a religion of its own.

Ataturk died in 1938 and was officially given the name Ataturk (Father of Turkey) after his death. Ataturk was able to unite a country and people under his ideals and leadership. His strong image and the respect for the ideals and policies enforced during his rule has remained with the country for almost a century(Itzkowitz). Although the impact of Kemalism has remained, after Ataturk died, the subsequent leaders were not as effective at uniting people under these same ideals.

Ataturk's Republican People's Party remained in power in the single party government until 1945 when Inonu, the leader that took over the RPP after Ataturk, got elected. Inonu allowed for opposing political parties to form in reaction to WWII. Turkey observed the unstable and failed communist and fascist governments in order to learn how to avoid Turkey becoming one of those governments. One common issue was the single-party government system that eventually evolved to communist or fascist. In attempt to preserve Turkey's relative 20- year stability, Inonu allowed other parties to form. One of the first opposing parties that formed in

opposition to the Republican People's Party was the Democratic People's Party(DPP) The basis for the DPP platform was privatization of business, increased representation of citizens, and more egalitarian policies concerning who could run the government and what beliefs these people could have (Tachau). The election of 1950 was won by the DPP candidate Celal Bayar. Bayar was a former Ataturk supporter and minister of finance and parliament member in the RPP government. He broke from the RPP and ran as the DPP's candidate. One indicator that showed that sentiment for Ataturk's Turkey was slowly shifting toward more conservative ideals selection of the Democratic People's Party candidate, Celal Bayar(McCally).

During his presidency, Bayers implemented economic policy restricting state interference in the economy and promoted private business(Celâl). While common people became more influential in government, the former powerful members of the military and upper class got less say in government actions which made Kemalist feel they had these power and influence to act as guardians of secularism(Ahmad). By restricting the government's power financially, this was taken as a direct restriction and suppression of Kemalism. During Bayer's first term, common people were allowed to have a voice and participate in government. This is why in the next election Bayar won by an overwhelming majority, because he appealed to the masses. People liked being heard and having influence in government(Tachau). Popular sentiment was promoting decreased religious restrictions and whether Bayer privately believed in Secularism or Islam, policies passed by the government reflected support for less religious restriction because this is what the public wanted. Due to the influence and representation common people were given, he was extremely popular and got elected for a second term. During this second term, he became less popular because he wanted to raise taxes. This was a highly unpopular decision that

did not pass because of the influence that the people had in the government(McCally). This caused the Turkish government to run deficits and encounter other financial problems allowing the government to become weakened and enabling the military to overthrow this government, due to less popular support.

This Democratic government was almost completely opposite to Ataturk's vision of Turkey. The country was ruled by the people and the leader could do little to stop their will so there was much disagreement and disunity within the country and government. With Ataturk's presidency, the people had less influence and Ataturk was similar to a monarch in the sense the people followed policies and laws that Ataturk made because they believed in him. With a weakened government power, people started pushing for less pressure against religion. This increased social religious tolerance was directly opposed to Ataturk's beliefs and policies. These more liberal policies caused the military to instigate a coup in 1960. The army instigated this coup to overthrow the Democratic People's Party and Bayar's government under the idea that Islamists had taken over the government due to the increased religious toleration. The military claimed Ataturk's constitution was being broken but needed to be revised in order to get the government and people to completely conform with Kemalist values(Ä- zbudun). The military executed Bayar and his Prime Minister Menderes and wrote a second constitution. The new constitution called for strong military influence in government, and put the state under military rule for 5 years in order to maintain this new constitution. This new constitution dissolved the Democratic People's Party and made it impossible for right wing ideals, such as religious tolerance, to stand in government. This left Turkey as a state highly influenced and controlled by the government and military(Harris). The rewriting of the constitution and the coup was pushed

over the edge and justified due to religion. The Turkish people who were running the government clearly did not want complete secularism and wanted a religious presence back in their lives. Ataturk had been that Kemalist presence that became like a religion in people's lives. Ataturk was the leader that the country looked up to and could follow because of their trust and belief in him. Without Ataturk, the citizens did not have that unifying leader uniting the people under Turkish nationalism as they once were. Before Ataturk, religion had united the Turkish people and was a huge part of the social fabric of this society. After Ataturk, that stability and deep set religious identity was forcibly taken away and replaced with Kemalism. When Ataturk died, Turkey had a difficult time maintaining all of those new Kemalist ideals that one man had brought to Turkey so they naturally gravitated back toward Islam. People were searching for that religious presence in other places other than the government so, the military, the protectors of secularism and strict disciples of Kemalist ideals, pushed back against this popular sentiment of increased religion. They reinforced Kemalism and wrote a constitution outlawing the right wing ideals of less government. This was done in support of Kemalism because without Kemalism the military would have less power and influence(Kissane). In 1965 the military allowed the people to run the government again under the military's establish constitution and the people elected justice party leader and military general Cemal Gursel(Harris).

In the 70's, there was increasing discontent and armed fighting between the left and right wing political parties within Turkey. The 1970s were a violent and factionalized time for Turks because of the tensions between people with different beliefs and political philosophies(Harris). There were numerous coalition governments formed at this time in order to try to reunite and piece back together a once united country. The political parties fighting, the military, and the lack

of government action allowed the conflicts to escalate to the point of a coup(Ciller). In 1980 the military planned and initiated the 1980 coup when martial law was placed. It was a forcible and violent peace that was created using fear. The military stepped into the role of policing their own citizens and enforcing a strict justice for any infractions. This severe backlash shows just how chaotic the 70's riots were.

The initial 1970's rebellions and disorder were caused by conflicting beliefs and ideas about how involved religion should be in government and what beliefs would be reflected in this government(Harris). Turkey was under the firm control and watch of the military who tried to control the messages that people were getting through literature by burning and controlling books, rewriting the constitution so the military was granted more power, and they trying to create a nation with homogeneous views and ideals in attempt to prevent future issues(Ciller). This was a coup that left fear of the army and the government in Turkish citizens. This fear helped the army and government control people so there was much self censorship and not vocalizing different opinions(Harris). This was the first time the military fully exercised its power within its own nation. It was an attempt from the military to gain control of the people by imposing a certain set of beliefs upon the people and forcing the people to follow their rules by using hard power(Tiller). The legacy of required conformity to Kemalist ideals and justification of actions the military took when there was dissent characterized the military power for years to come. Nationalistic sentiment was a central theme in Ataturk's constitution, and this recent coup established and enforced those same ideas and prevented any contrary opinions or laws that conflicted with the constitution (Kissane). In 1982, the parliament had to vote whether the

constitution should be passed knowing that if they voted against the new constitution, the army would blacklist them.

Present-day Turkey continues to use this constitution put in place by the military. The constitution includes a unicameral legislature, military command over civilian matters and an autonomous military. There are free elections but there is always the Kemalist eye looking over appointments, laws, and elections in order to make sure this constitution is not “violated” (Finkel). In many ways, this government requires any opposing parties to slowly work their way up the political chain without being too volatile concerning issues such as religion. This requires a strong charismatic and diplomatic figure such as Ataturk in order for any other political parties to gain power.

The current President, Erdogan, began his political career as the Prime Minister and worked his way up to the presidency which is where he remains. The peculiar thing about this is Erdogan is Muslim and is a strong advocate for religion. This is in direct opposition to Kemalist and military ideals that are so strictly enforced in Turkey. To gain this position in government, Erdogan had to work his way up the chain of command using his charisma and diplomacy in order to work with Kemalist supporters. While working his way through the chain of command, he did not make a huge uproar in government that would have threatened the military. When Erdogan was elected, he slowly started changing the people in prominent military positions from strong Kemalists to people who supported his own cause (Zurcher). By altering the makeup of who was in the military, he secured at least half of the support of the military leaders. In the recent coup that occurred in July 2016, what was surprising was the military, the force of solidarity and

secularism, was split in their support of the coup. These strategic appointments is part of the reason the coup failed, because of the lack of unity in the military.

This July 2016's coup concerned the politics of increased religious sentiment within the government and Kemalist, like other groups that had instigated earlier coups, believed the government was no longer based around Ataturk's ideals. The night of the coup, Kemalists tried to assassinate Erdogan and reinstate a president with Kemalist, or "Turkish" values. With Erdogan's new policies he has slightly been shifting the conversation from a purely secularist one to a more liberal one of religious tolerance and people have been in support of this because of the extreme anti-religious values the military has enforced since the 60's(Ciller). He uses religion and his charisma as tools to attract and rally people in support of him. Instead of uniting people under secular nationalism as Ataturk did, Erdogan is uniting people under an Islamic nationalism and allowing more and more religious influence to pervade present day Turkish society.

Like the past coups in the 60's and 80's, this coup was about beliefs about how Turkey should be governed. The difference between this recent coup and the previous ones is that this coup failed due to a divided military, which had been the real enforcer and guardians of Kemalism. With lack of support and a minority of people supporting the coup, the attempt to reinstate Kemalism in the government by taking over, failed. Erdogan strategically placed people with his ideals into higher positions in order to ensure he could have some protection and stay in power. Now that parts of the military are less and less secular, this will lead to potentially redefining the military-civilian relations in Turkey. That is significant because if the military is now fighting for Erdogan's and Islamic values does Turkey become a theocracy or a caliphate? The question is, where does the significance of religion in government stop and how does this

affect the Turkish citizens? Looking at the past coups and having the benefit of looking at the political trends over the past hundred years, every coup has been about religion or lack of it. For the purposes of this paper and extreme beliefs rooted in Ataturk's philosophy, Kemalism is considered a religion just as much as atheism. Religion is defined by Merriam Webster's dictionary as, "a cause, principle, or system of beliefs held to with ardor and faith," which is exactly how Ataturk supporters have approached following his ideals.

By observing and recognizing past failures, Erdogan can identify key points that can be used to his advantage (Atatürk). Erdogan was able to maintain the current government and continue toward merging religion and nationalism within Turkey because of this ability. He has done something not many other Presidents have been able to do, stop the military power. Erdogan has been the only president to assert this dominance and control over the Turkish military, showing his power and influence as a president. Ataturk created a military power with intense connections to his values and every president or government that threatened those values has gotten overthrown, except for Erdogan. In each coup, the issue has been religion or lack of it. Since Ataturk's extreme secularization, people do not have religion as a core belief system to tie identity to, so naturally they gravitate back toward the orbit of a religion that they have known, but have been pushed back from that orbit every single time by the military. With Erdogan in power and having leaders and influential people surrounding him in support of his goals and ideals, not much can stop him unless there is a major push back with someone as influential as Ataturk at the head of its movement.

This shift in culture and politics within Turkey has been noted by people such as Resat Kasaba, the University of Washington's Director for the Jackson School of International Studies.

Mr. Kasabe grew up in Southern Turkey along the Syrian border and researches and writes books about Turkish history. In order to get this first-hand perspective of how Turkey has shifted demographically, culturally and politically I interviewed Resat Kasabe in order to learn his perspective as an academic and someone who has lived through and observed major political evolutions within Turkey. In an email interview he stated, "Turkey has become a lot more conservative in recent years. There is much more public display of religion and use of religion in politics." and later explains, "The politics in Turkey is very polarized. Major parties are very antagonistic toward each other, which makes everyday politics very difficult and destructive."

The group responsible for instigating this recent coup was motivated to overthrow Erdogan's government due to the government's movements toward increased religious tolerance policies and Erdogan's social push toward religion(Ahmad). Erdogan has not denounced Ataturk, and he has acknowledged basic events and what Ataturk did for Turkey, but he put Ataturk's legacy in the past, for instance s by renaming parks that were named after Ataturk and some of his prominent supporters (Tanner). Erdogan emphasizes the importance of looking to the future rather than the past. That is partially how he was able to take down some statues of Ataturk and rename parks dedicated to him. Renaming parks does not seem like a huge political statement, but in many ways it will subtly alter how people think of Ataturk. Previously, Ataturk was a household name in the mind of many Turks, but by slowly taking away traces of remembrance of Ataturk, this pushes the concept of Ataturk and his philosophies as a thing of the past. To the ardent Ataturk supporters, this was unconstitutional and deemphasized Ataturk as a figurehead for Kemalism. Kemalists were losing in terms of dominance in ideals and politics as more people began following Erdogan. Under Erdogan, people are allowed to show their faith through

worship, clothing, and lifestyle where, in previous Kemalist Turkey, they were unable to. These somewhat cultural changes were projection of people slowly taking advantage of the opportunity to be a part of a religion they had not had access to for more than 80 years.

With every coup, a new constitution was put in place to continue to restrict the freedoms in varying beliefs and the more restrictions there are, the more people gravitate in the opposite direction, as with Bayar, introducing more religious tolerance twenty years after Ataturk's death, with the military fighting for control and instating martial law for two years in Turkey in order to make people conform to Kemalism. These are not coincidences, and each time a new constitution is written there is a change in the system of government which creates constant instability if a country has to rewrite its constitution every thirty years. Each constitution contained a strong religious influence intended to keep Kemalism in place. Even though Kemalism is "secular" people follow and believe in its ideals like a religion and actions in coups reflect this. Turkey has been struggling between two religions of Kemalism and Islam for almost 100 years and religion is tearing the country apart.

The periods with the most stability were when there was a strong, autocratic leader uniting a vast majority of people under their ideals, such as Ataturk and Erdogan. After the death of the leaders, their ideas and beliefs slowly disintegrate until a majority of people decide they do not want to follow these rules based upon older beliefs and they instigate a coup. Religion and politics go hand in hand in Turkey but clearly this partnership between these two things is not having the desired effects. Looking forward, Erdogan will mostly likely be successful if he maintains a solid strategy in keeping people who believe in his cause around him and maintaining the faith the public has put in him. After his death, Turkey may operate in the same

manner he structured it in but ultimately there will just be a rise in opposing opinions and another coup will happen. The issue with running a government under beliefs is, it is unstable because beliefs change so the people want the government to completely change its structure and laws to represent the current majority beliefs and values that whichever dominant religion is in the majority. If Turkey ever wants to gain some semblance of stability, there has to be a somewhat neutral constitution that sets the structure for the government and how to run it. It is imperative that this neutral constitution is something that is stable and does not get altered or influenced drastically. Beliefs are good; it can connect people and help to give them hope, but I do not believe the government or military should be involved in enforcing a beliefs system through laws and regulations.

Bibliography

- Ahmad, Feroz. *The Making Of Modern Turkey*. London: Routledge, 1993. *eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Web. 18 Nov. 2016.
- Ágoston, Gábor. "HABSBURGS AND OTTOMANS: Defense, Military Change and Shifts in Power." *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1998, pp. 126–141. www.jstor.org/stable/43385414.
- "Atatürk." *Study Mustafa Kemal Atatrk*. The Atatürk Society of Canada, 2016. Web. 13 Dec. 2016. <<http://theataturksocietyofcanada.ca/mka/ataturk/>>.
- Å- zbudun, Ergun, and GenÅşkaya, Å- mer F., eds. *Democratization and the Politics of Constitution-making in Turkey*. New York, US: Central European University Press (CEU Press), 2009. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 1 January 2017.
- Baran, Zeyno. Hoover inst press Publication : Torn Country : Turkey between Secularism and Islamism (1). Stanford, US: Hoover Press, 2010. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 2 January 2017.
- Bellaigue, Christopher De. "'The Sick Man of Europe'." *The New York Review of Books*. NYREV, Inc, 5 July 2001. Web. 28 Nov. 2016. <<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2001/07/05/the-sick-man-of-europe/>>.
- Campo, Juan Eduardo. "Dhimmi." *Encyclopedia of Islam*. N.p.: Info Based, n.d. 194-95. Print.
- Carey, Andrea. "Millet System of the Ottoman Empire." *Millet System of the Ottoman Empire*. University of Washington, 3 Sept. 2008. Web. 12 Nov. 2016. <<http://courses.washington.edu/disisme/Our%20Encyclopaedia/84135754-B01E-4A3A-BBA4-8BD129E3C331.html>>.
- "Celâl Bayar." *Britannica Academic*, Encyclopædia Britannica, 19 Sep. 2016. academic.eb.com.proxy.library.vcu.edu/levels/collegiate/article/13860. Accessed 1 Jan. 2017.
- "Christianity and the Ottoman Empire." In *Atlas of the World's Religions, Second Edition*. Ed. Ninian Smart, Frederick Denny. *Oxford Islamic Studies Online*. 09-Nov-2016. <<http://www.oxfordislamicstudies.com/article/opr/t253/e2>>.
- Cilliler, Yavuz. "POPULAR DETERMINANT ON CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS IN TURKEY." *Arab Studies Quarterly* 38.2 (2016): 500-20. *ProQuest*. Web. 4 Jan. 2017.
- "Definition of Religion." *Merriam-Webster*. Merriam-Webster, n.d. Web. 04 Jan. 2017. <<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/religion>>.
- DeWitt, Dave. "Raleigh Volunteer Offers First-Hand View Of Attempted Turkish Coup." *WUNC*. N.p., 17 July 2016. Web. 04 Nov. 2016. <<http://wunc.org/post/raleigh-volunteer-offers-first-hand-view-attempted-turkish-coup#stream/0>>.
- "Dhimmi." *New World Encyclopedia*, . 16 Aug 2013, 15:21 UTC. 13 Nov 2016, 02:14 <<http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/p/index.php?title=Dhimmi&oldid=972690>>.
- El-Khawas, M. A. "Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks, 1902-1908 (review)." *Mediterranean Quarterly*, vol. 13 no. 1, 2002, pp. 113-117. *Project MUSE*,

- Faroqhi, Suraiya. *Ottoman Empire And The World Around It, The*. London: I.B.Tauris, 2004. *eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Web. 17 Nov. 2016.
- Finkel, Andrew. *What Everyone Needs to Know : Turkey*. Oxford, GB: Oxford University Press, 2012. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 1 January 2017.
- Hall, Richard, ed. *War in the Balkans: An Encyclopedic History from the Fall of the Ottoman Empire to the Breakup of Yugoslavia* : Santa Barbara, US: ABC-CLIO, 2014. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 17 November 2016.
- Hanioglu, M. Şükrü. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2008. Print.
- Harris, George S. "Military Coups And Turkish Democracy, 1960–1980." *Turkish Studies* 12.2 (2011): 203-213. *Political Science Complete*. Web. 4 Jan. 2017.
- Itzkowitz, Norman. "Kemal Atatürk." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., 2 Nov. 2006. Web. 02 Jan. 2017.
<<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Kemal-Ataturk>>.
- Kasaba, Resat, "Director of WSU Perspective on the Current Political State of Turkey." E-mail interview. 10 Nov. 2106.
- Kinross, Patrick Balfour. "Part VII: The Last of the Sultans." *The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire*. New York: Morrow, 1977. N. pag. Print.
- Kissane, B. (2014) 'Atatürk and After: Three Perspectives on Political Change in Turkey', *The Review of Politics*, 76(2), pp. 293–307. doi: 10.1017/S0034670514000096.
- KORU, SELIM. "Turkey's Last Coup: What I Saw in Ankara." *War on the Rocks*. War on the Rocks, 16 July 2016. Web. 04 Nov. 2016.
<<http://warontherocks.com/2016/07/turkeys-last-coup-what-i-saw-in-ankara/>>.
- Macfie, Alexander Lyon. *Turning Points : The End of the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1923*. Florence, GB: Routledge, 1998. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 20 November 2016.
- McCally, Sarah P. "Party Government in Turkey." *The Journal of Politics*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1956, pp. 297–323. www.jstor.org/stable/2126986.

- "Mustafa Kemal Pasha (Ataturk)." *Turkey in the First World War*. Altay Atlı, 26 June 2006. Web. 02 Jan. 2017. <<http://www.turkeyswar.com/whoswho/who-mustafakemal.html>>.
- "Ottoman Empire". *Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2016. Web. 08 Nov. 2016
- "Ottoman Greece." *Ottoman Greece - New World Encyclopedia*. N.p., 6 Mar. 2016. Web. 17 Nov. 2016. <http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Ottoman_Greece>. <<https://www.britannica.com/place/Ottoman-Empire>>.
- Shaw, Stanford J. and Gökhan Çetinsaya. "Ottoman Empire." In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Islamic World. Oxford Islamic Studies Online*. Nov 8, 2016. <<http://www.oxfordislamicstudies.com/article/opr/t236/e0611>>.
- Shushter, Mike. "The Middle East and the West: Rise of the Ottomans." *NPR*. NPR, 18 Aug. 2004. Web. 17 Nov. 2016. <<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=3857633>>.
- Tachau, Frank, and Mary-Jo D. Good. "The Anatomy of Political and Social Change: Turkish Parties, Parliaments, and Elections." *Comparative Politics*, vol. 5, no. 4, 1973, pp. 551–573. www.jstor.org/stable/421396.
- Tanner, Lou. "Mudhouse Meetings." Personal interview. 12 Sept. 2016.
- The Reval Meeting. (1908, Jun 18). *The Independent ...Devoted to the Consideration of Politics, Social and Economic Tendencies, History, Literature, and the Arts (1848-1921)*, 64, 1371. Retrieved from <http://proxy.library.vcu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.proxy.library.vcu.edu/docview/90606577?accountid=14780>
- Zürcher, Erik J.. *Library of Modern Middle East Studies : Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building, The : From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey (1)*. London, US: I.B.Tauris, 2010. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 17 November 2016.
- Zurcher, Erik Jan. *Turkey : A Modern History (1)*. London, US: I.B.Tauris, 2004. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 18 November 2016.
- 3-minute History of the Turkish War for Independence*. Dir. Jabzy. *Jabzey*. Youtube, 8 Jan. 2015. Web. 6 Jan. 2017. <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CH42eJZhBDk>>.