

The Changing Meaning of Sovereignty in the Process of Globalization: Sovereign State *versus* Sovereign Public & People¹

Dr. Fatih DUMAN

Hitit University
Department of Politics
Turkey

Dr. İsmail SEYREK

Hitit University
Department of Economics
Turkey

Abstract

The concept of the sovereignty has constituted the basic characteristic of our modern state since Jean Bodin. The basic form of the modern nation state which is exposed to the process of globalization constitutes currently one of the most important discussions. Globalization, which is a product or result of historical or social processes, has been bringing about to the transformation of the classical version of nation state. In this framework new concepts like the post sovereign state/period or shared sovereignty have come up for replacing the understanding of the sovereign state. First of all, this work introduces the interactions of modern state and the process of globalization with respect to the concept of sovereignty. Then secondly, the relationship between globalization and the transformation of classical sovereignty is handled. Lastly the study presents Turkey's political and economic evolution in relation to current globalization process. As a conclusion the paper argues that in order to be stay as a state current nation states have to contribute the lived process by taking part in the globalization process and at the same time to look forward to keeping their existence. The same thing is also valid for Turkey. The geostrategic position of Turkey eliminates the probably of being out of globalization process.

Key words: globalization, sovereignty, nation-state, Turkey, post/shared sovereignty

I- Introduction

The concept of the sovereignty has been known to constitute the basic characteristic of the modern state since Jean Bodin. The theory of modern sovereignty, which has arisen during the formations of the capitalism and the nation state, has made up the subject of a serious debate with the process of globalization. The worldwide changes lived both in the level of technology and the technology related economic relations have brought along the debates in relation to the political and juristic positions of the nation state. These changes in different contexts, which point a kind of crisis, and responses shown to them, have been affecting not only Europe and Unites States, but also all countries in various forms. In the framework of this paper the results of the globally scaled changes are analyzed in Turkey, which has just started to get more and more effective in the world politics. Global changes, which have especially become effective just after the period of the Cold War, have great significance in giving meaning to the political and economic developments lived in Turkey in the 1990 and 2000s.

The form of the modern nation state which takes in the process of globalization constitutes one of the important discussions. The nation state which makes its legitimacy with the concept of classical sovereignty has started to struggle in keeping that legitimacy in the dynamics which the process of globalization has created. With this respect the international system which is consisted of sovereign states which is accepted to begin with the 1648 Westphalia Agreement. A new global order, in which both supra and sub units are also participating, has been coming out. It is necessary not to evaluate this process which is a kind of a new order of peace/freedom form or an imperialism which destroys nation states. The relationship between the process of globalization and nation state is a multilateral and contingent relation depending on mutual interactions. With this respect for the nation states the globalization is both an external power which forces them to change and also an internal relation which they give shape with their own will (as in the European Union).

¹ This paper was presented at the Third Global International Studies Conference organized by World International Studies Committee, 17-20 August in Porto 2011.

In broadly speaking globalization, which is a product or result of historical or social processes, has been bringing about the transformation of the classical version of nation state. In this framework new concepts like the *post sovereign state/period* or *shared sovereignty* have come up for replacing the understanding of sovereign state. During the globalization process states have been sharing some of classical authorities of sovereignty with supra and sub nation units. The new concept so called governance has taken the nation state from being the single determining factor in its own boundaries. In short in the process of globalization the concept of sovereignty has been redefined, and new boundaries have been brought to the sovereignty of the state. It is no more possible to distinguish in a cut and dried way an internal matter of a country from its external one. The work has concentrated on the transformation that the theory of sovereignty which provides the legitimacy of modern nation state has been exposed during the globalization, and the reflections of that on the state in Turkey. With this respect modern state and the concept of classical sovereignty is analyzed in the first main section; in the second main section the transformation of the sovereign nation state during the globalization has been handled. In the last main section the developments in Turkey are concerned in relation to the globalization.

II- Modern State (Nation-State) and the Concept of Sovereignty

‘State’ as an institution is the dominant subject of the politics in the modern era. As a form of organization modern nation state has increased its power and coverage area since its formation, and has touched all areas of human activities in one way or another. For this reason, in spite of all different evaluations it is not possible any more to imagine politics as an independent activity from the state or outside of it. Modern state is either the basic subject of the politics or it is a groundwork field on which political struggles take place. In brief, although political struggle is carried out with different aims like restricting, protecting, capturing, transforming or destroying the state, it takes the modern state on its focal point. With *Max Weber’s* (1991: 78) words, “...at the present time... The state is considered the sole source of the ‘right’ to use violence. Hence, ‘politics’ for us means striving to share power or striving to influence the distribution of power, either among states or among groups within a state.” With this respect modern political ideologies constituted in the last three hundred years in the Western World have been decomposed from one another in relation to the points of views about the state. Nevertheless political ideologies claims different arguments about the matters like the nature of state, its functions and operations, and interests represented by it, they have settled up on seeing it as an *‘institutionalized political power’*.

However, the modern nation state has got important differences from the earlier political formations. The structure of the state and the way of perception by us has not been the same in every periods of the history. When it is looked from the history of human point of view, the formation of governor and governed division has let the more and more institutionalization of political function and the dichotomy of state and society in general meaning (Claessen & Skalnik, 1993). However, it has been seen that individuals or institutions who perform the political function in the historical process or in other words political structures have taken different shapes from each other. The basic characteristic of the state which distinguishes it from other political organizations is its ownership of sovereignty. Because when this characteristic does not exist, it would not possible to distinguish the state from other institutions. In this respect, the tales of the modern state and the concept of sovereignty come intersect in the Western World.

When it is look at historical and empirical plain, modern state has come about with the changes of feudal social and political order. In other words, the sovereign modern state has been established on the rejection of the feudal political structure. The main characteristic of the middle age in which feudal order was dominant is the nonexistence of a central political power. The style of feudal production which does not support a national market also reflects a political fragmentation. There was a church or papacy which had important authorities both in spiritual and worldly areas in the political tableau in the feudal period. Furthermore, feudal seigneurs (land owners), city administration which gained special feature, the Holly Roman German Empire which is claimed to be the successor of the West Roman Empire and weak kings who carried the name of king but did not have significant power are the other political actors of the tableau. There was a fragile and fragmented political structure among these powers who struggled with each other. There was not *a central and sovereign state* in this system in which there were individualism rather than institutionalism, and the political royalty was toward individuals not towards state or country. In brief the political society or worldly power of the middle age was dependent on an external transcendental power and its worldly representative (the Church); in the case of using its power, it was often limited with the authority of empire.

With this respect it is possible to talk about quite numerous factors and processes which have led to the changes in this political structure: Broadly speaking transformation of social and economic orders from feudalism into capitalism, the beginning of changes in the production structure, the improvement of the trade, the changing meaning of the wealth ownership, the increases in urbanization, the formation and strengthening of new political and economic classes, the increasing of monetization in the economic structure, changes in the war technologies, important changes lived in the intellectual world, etc. In short feudal economic and social order has become inadequate in meeting the requirements of the lived changes. The result of this is the formation of political power since the 16th century, i.e. the formation of modern state which was gathered in one hand and centralized. The historical examples of the formation of the central power structure which organizes a national market are the formation of central states which were created by the concentration of power around the kings in England and France (King-State). Shortly the modern state as having the monopoly of using legitimate power/authority in limited boundaries has come about with realization of a kind of power *unity/solidarity* (Moers, 1991).

During the centralization process of political power some important functions which used to be carried out by seigneurs or church men have been started to be made directly by the state any more. The state has started directly to collect taxes, provide security and ensure justice. While feudal institutions carried out these function earlier on have been dismissed or lost their places, the state has come out with a new central bureaucratic organization (Poggi, 1978; Pierson, 1996). The state has had the right to demand tax from every individual in its territory, to judge every one, to load certain responsibilities to them independently from external powers like empire or church. The most important part of the process of 'the centralization of state power' is consisted of the centralization of coercive/oppressive power. Accordingly, the state had had the monopoly of using the means of force on the land on which it has practice the power; it attempted to apply this through continuous and central armies.

If we define shortly the modern state means a central political structure (*centrality*) that does not share its power (*sovereignty*) with an external or internal power within a certain boundaries of a country (*territoriality*)². The boundaries of country which states the authority field of the moderns state which exercises its sovereignty as a monopoly like especially uses of legitimate force, tax collection, exercise of jurisdiction and the authority of punishment. In this process in view of the increasing power of central army and bureaucracy, the authority of the old intermediate institutions and mechanism has been exponentially decreased. In the subsequent periods with the integration of people/nation' identity and those that constituted the legitimacy sources of the state, the '*nationality*' has also constituted one of the main characteristic of the modern state with the other three factors. So the structure of the modern state has been evolved from king-state into nation-state and has taken the shape of the modern nation state with its meaning in our time.

When it is look from the view of intellectual/theoretical level the concept of sovereignty is a theoretical tool which provides the legitimacy to the state in order to continue its central political power as a monopoly. The main source of legitimacy of the modern state which accumulates the core the power/principle (*auctoritas*) and the conduct/application (*potestas*) of it in just one central has been the theory of sovereignty. During this period new theories have been developed that they defends the sovereignty of the state against the external focus of power at a rational basis (Erözden, 1997: 48-50). While some of these have been realized as a total breakdown from the past, some others have been realized in the manner of reinterpreting the concepts of the past which will be in the mode of explaining or justifying the newly formed conditions (Schmitt, 2002: 41). During this process the institutional structure of the state has been increasingly free of individuality, and has been abstracted. The state, which has been equalized with the abstract and immortal public body as distinct from king's body in the first period, has been identified with the abstract people or nation (nation state).

The fundamentals of the concept of the sovereignty exist in Niccolo Machiavelli who is an intellectual of the Renaissance. It can be said that there is a search for a kind of institutionalized political power, i.e. the state, in his work named 'Prince'.

² With Max Weber's (1991: 78) explanation: "Today the relation between the state and violence is an especially intimate one. In the past, the most varied institutions — beginning with the sib — have known the use of physical force as quite normal. Today, however, we have to say that a state is a human community that (successfully) claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory. Note that 'territory' is one of the characteristics of the state".

With this respect Machiavelli first time mentioned about the state (*stato*) in the meaning that the state is an institution which cares about self interest in the relations with other states as superior and institutionalized power in its land, and introduced about an unnamed '*modern nation state*' or understanding of sovereignty. The theorem of sovereignty by Jean Bodin (1576) who had introduced absolute, enduring, indivisible and nontransferable sovereignty as an essence of the state was followed in one way or another by the later intellectuals (Suarez, Hobbes, Rousseau, Sieyès etc.). Even though it has been edited differently by every intellectual, the modern state, which is regarded anyway as an *institutionalized sovereign power*, has happened to be an inseparable part of the political thought.

Spanish intellectual Suarez added the approval/consent of governed people to the theorem by associating the concept of the sovereignty with the *construction of social contract*. However, Hobbes who reintroduced these two concepts (sovereignty and social contract) in a systematical way with an integrated perspective has made up the hypothesis of 'modern state' (Akal, 1990: 61-123). The sovereign state is defined as an '*abstract and artificial*' political integration/body in the hypothesis of Hobbes (2004) who has put the wills of rational individuals to the foundation of the state. The theorists of people/nation sovereignty, however, such as Rousseau (1994) and Sieyès (2005), has introduced people/nation as sovereign political subject into political thought, in other words they have changed the subject of the sovereignty, but have not touched the basic characteristics of sovereignty theorem. Through this way with the contributions of intellectuals who would like to provide a democratic justification to the state the basic framework of the concept of the modern state which has reached to our days has been drawn.

At the theoretical level although it is specially defined distinctly from despotism or arbitrary power, there is not guaranteed that such a power or *Leviathan* with Hobbes' word behaves consistently to this restriction in the practice. For this reason, the theories of sovereign state have also tried to introduce the mechanisms of limiting this power. Briefly, the state, in spite of its sovereignty and glory, is not an arbitrary power, and it is required not to work like that in the real life. However, the matter of how it is made in real life and practice constitutes a serious debate. It is not possible to say that the sovereign state always exhibits a fair government in the framework of common interest and goodness as in the design of sovereign state at the theoretical level (Barry, 2004: 70-74). When it is look at the adventure of the last three centuries, it is hard to say that the state has undergone a good exam about this issue.

III- Globalization and the Transformation of Sovereignty

Nevertheless while the sovereign state has increased its power in the historical process, developments which have increased the power of governed have also been lived. The nation state has continued to be the single political unit which has been affecting the destiny of humanity in the 20th century. However, realized changes have brought new boundaries to the authority of the nation state and have transformed the concept of *the national sovereignty* which constitutes the foundations of legitimacy. Wars lived, crisis, clashes, massacres and massive deaths which have been brought by these made that the limitation and control of the state power or that of the activities and decisions of those who use this power have become an important necessity. Nevertheless it has been controversial how it works in practice, factors like constitutionalist action, the concept of universal human right, the principle of the rule of law, the principle of democracy, the separation of powers etc could be counted among the applications for this purpose.

Especially development in the period just after the Second World War, and increasingly activation of the term so called '*international community*' led to the relaxation of the classical characteristics of the state mentioned above, and to changes of them, or to disputability of them. Having started to defend human rights through international agreement, and the democratization of the state, which only possible through the signing and application of those agreements, have relaxed the concept of the *absolute sovereignty*. This process which opened the sovereign political units to the international control also started to change the concept of the state. The state which puts their signs to international agreements became open to the control mechanism of this which brought along in spite of their will. Before the Second World War the most serious human right violations which the states carried out against their citizens, constituted the reasons lying at the foundations of these developments. With the support of the developing technological means the increased power of the sovereign state made it possible to destroy easily the individual rights and freedom. For this reason, now days the power of the state has been restricted through various instruments including international intervention. Although the efficiency of this tool is controversial, the basic development in our days is in this direction.

In this framework it is possible to find a direct process between the transformation of the concept of the classical sovereignty which is regarded as the *complementary characteristic of the modern state* since the establishment of the state system constructed with the *Westphalia* agreement, and the term the so called globalization which has economic, social, cultural, modern and political sides. Although it is defined with different ways, the globalization has been understood as process in the contexts like the concentration of over boundary relations, increased international financial transitions, the abolishment of the state based limitations for the creation of a globally open economy and the widening of numerous areas at the global level (Scholte, 2000). With developments lived especially just after the Cold World War the nation state has lost the possibility of providing the legitimacy depending on the concept of the classical sovereignty and of being successful. Pressures created by external and internal factors on the sovereignty of the nation state have brought up concepts such as the *post-sovereign state*. The nation state is still an important actor, but it has given up the sovereignty which meant earlier on to be the highest, comprehensive, unlimited and unshared authority. The state of the new period constitutes a part of the new structure in which much wider and multilateral platforms take place compared to the old one (Scholte, 2000: 157).

Globalization which constitutes the foundation of this transformation or change implies that we have been living increasingly in a single world, and mutual interactions and dependencies of individuals or nations have increased. Accordingly, social, political, economic and cultural developments in any region of the world have the characteristic of affecting individuals and groups in other regions of the world. The basic phenomena which increased the speed and scope of this dependency and interaction have been the developments in knowledge and information technologies (Krasner, 1999: 34-35). This development which made it possible to shorten time and zoom places has speeded up and deepened the process of globalization. The role of the multinational firms which have been affecting global production processes and international division of labor in economic area has been increasing more and more. Economic activities have become a struggle which has gone beyond the role of the nation state. Characteristics like the massive volume of global financial funds, the integration of global financial markets through electronic developments, the unprecedented varieties and scope of goods and services of the world trade have faced us as a complementary of this process (Giddens, 2008: 83-85). Held and McGrew (1999: 16), who defines globalization in a broader meaning as the transformation of social relations and operations in terms of territorial organization, analyzes the issue from the stand point of *detrterritorialization* concept. Accordingly, limitations which the classical nation state had brought in various areas have been losing their legalities, and a kind of detrterritorialization process has been lived.

As a result of these developments a global economy, in which it is becoming increasingly difficult or perhaps impossible for a country to regulate its international capital flows, has come into existence. The capacity of managing economic live and providing general welfare of states have been restricted and the national economic strategies have become unrealizable in global context. The increased strength and effects of multinational firms, the increased importance of the United Nations, European Union, NATO and World Trade Organization and supra-national institutions have shown that increasingly more decisions have been taken outside of the classical theoretical structure of the nation state (Heywood, 2007: 143-144). People, groups and societies have been interested in more and more global issues and process compared to past. Binding of the international law and the existence of the international community's responsibility in taking action to defend human rights are the assumptions which have been accepted increasingly much more.

Another important part of this process is also the appearance of new social activities and the policies of identity. Resources outside of the nation state have increasingly come forward in identity constructions. '*New social movements*' which represent themselves both *supra and sub* nation scales have given way to that many regional and global identities have appeared to be against national identities. In another words, a strong representation of regional cultural identities in different regions of the world, or the beginning of increase in identification of supra nation identities (like European) have shown that the binding of the traditional nations state has been in an important transformation. In this process which has resulted in a new *global consciousness* the classical concept of sovereignty has also been undergone a change, and a new concept of sovereignty, in which the levels of both supra and sub nations are also effective, has come out (Held and McGrew, 2000: 18). To some people while these developments, which have carried out the expressions like the *post sovereignty* period or *shared sovereignty* to the agenda, means the deterioration of the state, some others thought that it is a kind of adaptation of the state and the classical concept sovereignty to the newly formed situation.

The classical sovereignty of the nation state has been transformed in extent that the power is used by sharing in a framework in which the levels of regional, local and global take place (Held and McGrew, 2000: 11). As a result of lived changes, it has been started to get over duality of state-civil society defined in the line of nation state, and new and different publicities have been formed. In this framework the area of civil society has also exceeded the national boundaries and has gained an international dimension. Nowadays institutions out of governments/states, which are named as NGO (*Non Governmental Organizations*) and consists of an important sections of the civil social organizations, have been performed a function of pressure in the international plan on nation states. Citizens of the nation state have become a part of the international public through NGOs. The NGOs, which have been organized in the areas like human rights, conservation of peace, disarmament, woman rights, environmental issues, health problems, non-racialism, etc, have been in the position of effective pressure mechanism not only on the Western State as an important representatives of international civil community, but they have been also very effective on other states. In short, the NGOs have increased the transformation process of the sovereignty because they have undertaken some part of the government functions and they have also appeared as new actors beside states in the international level.

Nowadays, nongovernmental organizations, which are able to affect the policies of nation states, have increased their activities. More and more nation states have been increasingly accepting the authorities of supra nation courts in solving the issues among themselves. Nation states have accepted to transfer some authorities of classical sovereignty to supra national supervision boards which do not contain their representatives. Moreover, since the beginning of the 20th century new concepts stated with the term of *governance* have been coming up. Accordingly, the central state, rather than taking its decisions as a single subject in the national boundaries, will take them as consulting with the subjects of the civil society or will take their demands and expectations on board. This situation has been originated from the pressures toward *self administration* which implies the propensity of transferring the responsibilities of national and central organs to local ones. Nowadays in the European Union a kind of 'multi level' model of governance, which has included sub national organs, states and supra national organs, and has been difficult to reconcile with the traditional concept of sovereignty /state, has arisen up (Heywood, 2007: 145). Broadly speaking the process of globalization has made that certain arguments in three main areas and the applications based on this have been inevitable for the modern state.

Firstly, the spreading of the concept of the universal human right has brought some limitations to the sovereignty of nation state in the area of law. Secondly, the idea of free market has come forward in the economic field, and the intervention of the nation state has been restricted in this area. The fall down of the Soviet type communism with the dissolution of the Soviet Union resulted in disappearance of the economic systems based on a central planning. Communist regimes which went into the melting pot have tried to embrace the basic theoretical structures of the liberal economic and political systems. And lastly, the idea of liberal democracy has expanded quickly. The process of democratization has become an important part of the agenda in most countries of the world; the democratic management has been regarded as the universal standard of civilization and has become a normative necessity. Nevertheless, it is clear that these developments has changed the classical concepts of sovereignty significantly, the debate on what the position of the nation state is, and will be has been still going on. Assertors, who claim that the idea of globalization has been overstated, have rejected the thought that the globalization has radically devitalized nation states, and a world system, where they are less effective, has been created; and that the dominant motivation has been continuing to be still the national interest; and nation states have been reserving the positions that they are main actors.

However, according to people, who are in direct contradiction, a global age has been started. And that age depends on global capitalism, global governance and global civil community. In the new global order in which market powers are stronger than national governments the nation states have become the position of not regulating their own economies; and they have deteriorated both in terms of effectiveness and importance. In short the end of the modern nation states has been coming. But, people, who take a middle position compared to the first two groups, in spite of increase in the global multilateral dependency have mentioned that nation states have been continuing to keep a remarkable power at their hands. In the process of globalization, which is not a one way process and contradictive in itself, contains opposite trends, the modern state has not lost its sovereignty and has not disappeared; the state has been restructured as an answer to the new type of economic and social organizational forms like supra national firms, social actions and international organizations, which do not depend on the basis of territory.

With this respect, we have been living in a different order in which the nation states have been reformed according to the changes created by globalization, but not in world which is centered with the modern state in classical meaning (Giddens, 2008: 93-96; Keyman, 2008).

VI- Globalization and Turkey's Political and Economic Evolution

Broadly speaking changing dynamics and processes which are parts of globalization have been related with the changes which Turkey has lived in the last 30 years. Especially in the 2000s the process of reform has got the opportunity to be realized with the effects of external dynamics which has been created increasingly globalizing world as well as the effects of internal dynamics. It has been even started to debate that if the distinctions between external and internal dynamics is true. Because of changed lived at the global level the objective conditions of keeping internal structure isolated from the outside, and of maintaining a closed economic and political system have been disappeared. For this reason, the effects of changes in the internal dynamics of Turkey and the reflections of those on political and economic order have been directly related with the external dynamics engendered by globalization.

Before all else, the historical development of the state in Turkey and its social and economic foundations have sustained some differences compared to the classical modern state appeared in the Western Europe. The State of the Republic of Turkey has been a historical successor of the Ottoman State which had been organized as an empire. Evolution of feudal fragmentation into a form of nation state in the Western Europe and the process of increasing power gained by the modern state have been intercepted with the process of the disintegration of the central government structure for the Ottoman Empire. As we have mentioned in the main second section while the nation state in the West has been come out to the stage of history, the Ottoman State has entered into process of disintegration and different states have originated from its body. In the last century Ottomans carried out various reforms of modernization in order to keep the state in a form of empire which was consisted of people who are from different religion, languages and ethnic roots, but these have not become successful and the empire has been dissolved.

Nevertheless the newly established state, the Republic of Turkey, is a successor of the Ottoman Empire, has been in an effort to be organized in the form of a nation state. However, the structure of the state at hand in Turkey has been containing differences from the state which has been a product of economic and social developments lived in the Western Europe. First when it is look at the economic and political order, the transformation of class structure and the suppressive behavior of bourgeoisie over the other classes have lied at the foundation of the nation state in the West. As a result of changed productions structure the growing bourgeois class has reflected its hegemony at the economic level to the political level, and the form of the modern nation state has been shaped on this background. In short the economic and social foundations of the state are directly related with the hegemony of bourgeoisie. However, when we look at the development in Turkey there are not socio-economic foundations like the transformation of economic structure and growing bourgeoisie the new nation state has got. There is not a strong bourgeoisie in Turkey; the economic and social structure of the society which has survived long time wars has lost remarkable power.

Therefore, in Turkey, the bureaucratic class, who has been composited of army officers and civilians who have wanted to set up the modern state, has formed an *authoritarian and statist* political structure under these conditions. This statist economic system, which has got the aim of making up a local bourgeoisie with the hands of the state, has also reflected an authority based on the exercise of a *single party* at the political level and the official ideology defined by the party. In short, policies, which have been applied by the *soldier-civil bureaucrats* who have taken over the power, have been realized two parallel processes which are the transition from empire to the nation state, and the establishment of capitalism.³ The period of the single party, which has been authoritarian, and even some time has demonstrated totalitarian practices, lost its applicability in the period after the Second World War. By taking the democracies of the Western Europe as example Turkish state has moved into multiparty life and has opened the way to the organization of different thoughts in political area. However, this democratization process was interrupted in 1960, 1971 and 1982 through military interventions. The determination and hegemony of the soldier/army on politics has constituted an important element of the political order in Turkey.

³ See Timur (1994), Boratav(1982) Tunçay(2010) for the details of economic and political process.

With this respect, the statism is not only a principle which secures development in economic field, but will also provides the control and supervision of the state in political and economic areas, and by this way, it has been defended as a principle which provides the legitimacy of the authoritarian administration (Beriş, 2009). In this clash between the society and the state the legitimacy of the political system has not been from bottom to top, but it was tried to establish from the top by soldier and civil bureaucrats who were dominant to the state. This *authoritarian and statist* structure has been tried to be protected in the legal system through the constitutions made after various coup d'états.

In this model where the project of the radical modernism has been exercised with the hands of statist elites economic, politic, juristic and cultural areas have been tried to be regulated in the direction of the official view made up. Ideas or actions, other than this, have been regarded dangerous for the state, and for this reason they have become the subject of the penal codes. The anti-democratic structure of the 1982, which empowers the state versus individuals, refers to the responsibilities of individuals rather than their freedom, and restricts the field of politics, constitutes the clearest indicator of this understanding. Results of this authoritarian understanding, which widens the state authority to numerous parts of the community, and desires to transform the society in the direction of the accepted official view, have been the suppressions of the civil community and forms of democratic organizations. This situation has avoided the formation of a democratic and participating understanding/culture in the social field; and has led to the violations of rights and freedom which have serious results for individuals and groups with respect to the modern democratic traditions. Dynamics of the globalization process have a great effect on starting this anti-democratic structure to change.

As we have touched in the second main section the results which globalization has given rise to in relation to the sovereignty of nation state have been effective in starting the statist and authoritarian structure to change in Turkey because it does not seem to be possible to run an economic and political system such as in Turkey in the new global order. In this context, although it has been often materialized in quarrels, the state in Turkey has been exposed to transformations which are consisted with the necessities of the new global order. Nevertheless there are actors who support and object that, it does not seem possible to deny the transformation/change lived (Bülbul, 2006). The results which globalization has created for the nation state, has similarly brought in changes in Turkey. Turkey has started to become an important actor of her region and she is very important in terms of geo-politics and geo-strategy. It is possible to handle the changes in Turkey in three categories like juristic, economic and political. These three areas have been related somehow with the relations between European Union and Turkey. Turkey, which demands to be member of European Union, has been trying to meet the requirements of the membership in spite of slow process sometime. In fact this process have been taking place in extent that Turkey is to accept the European *acquis communautaire* in her political, economic and juristic orders, and to make necessary changes consistent with them. In short in a limited sense the relationship with European Union and the needs of the new global order has been forcing to change the order and the state in Turkey within this context.

In field of law Turkey has been experiencing a transformation from her own juristic concept into universal one which depends on the perception of human rights. In this framework the position and authorities of the state have been undergoing transformation, and some state authorities have been shared with supra national courts. With this respect the right of individual application to European Court of Human Rights has been accepted; and capital punishment has been removed; individual rights and freedom have been strengthened; the priority of international agreement signed in human rights area over national acts has been accepted, and the freedom of organization has been increased. In short with her own will Turkish state has accepted to transfer some authorities based on the right of sovereign to international organizations, and has been applying this. In fact, all of these constitute the basic needs of the Copenhagen criteria which are necessary to become member to the European Union.

In economic field Turkey has been in the way of actualizing legal arrangements and structural reforms for the establishment of a strong market economy and continuation of it. Turkey lived a radical structural change in the period after 1980 in order to be integrated to the world economy and dynamics of economic globalization. The protectionist and import substitutive structure has left the place to a new structure which depends on free market and export incentives, and in which trade exchange rate, rates of interest and capital account have become free. During this process the state has been drawn back from economic life and the productions of numerous goods and services have been transferred to private sector through privatization carried out. The state has taken a neutral position among local and foreign market actors, and has handled economic matters in their own working logic on the principles of productivity and efficiency.

Economic and fiscal conditions of the Copenhagen criteria have made it necessary for the state to accept and apply international standards about this issue. In the *political field* steps which democracy requires have been taken in broad sense. Legal arrangements have been taking place in the recognition of basic rights and freedom, the establishment of rule of law, the protection of minority rights, the improvement of woman, the expansion of political field which are necessary for establishing a liberal democracy in the Western term. In this process constitutional amendments in various periods and now the current discussions to make a democratic and pluralist constitution have aimed that the state and the institution of politics work accordingly to universal democratic assumptions in Turkey. Although it is not possible to say how far this aim is realized, we can say that the process in turkey is working in that direction.

V-Conclusion

The dynamics which the process of globalization has created has forced the legal, economic and political structures of Turkey toward changing. However, it is necessary to state that it is controversial how these changes are relevant in practice or if these change the order in Turkey at structural level. It is not realistic to expect that the political culture does not change suddenly countries like Turkey. Nevertheless, in spite of all deficiencies and different practices the changes lived have started to change the concept of the state in Turkey, even though it is slow. With this respect we can talk about accountability of all institutions of state and persons who use the government authority; the expansion of the concept of instrumentalist state depending on that state is from the society rather than the concept of holy state; individual claiming for rights and freedom against the state; the critics of official arguments and starting to compare them with the developed countries of the world by the new rich social sections out of the state; and increases in the number and efficiency of civil social organization; and beginning of setting up relationships with supra nation organizations by individuals.

All these lived things have been realized as conditions that the state has been adapting itself to new conditions in Turkey. However, positive and negative aspects of these changes have been continued to be seriously discussed. Different reactions have been shown to results of the globalization in Turkey from different ideological preferences. Globalization does not contain only the process of democratization, the universal rule of law or the expansion of free market. At the same time these also include the increasing ethnic clashes and human right violations, wars against terrorism and the occupations of countries; global fiscal crisis and failures, global warming and environmental problems. However, all these problems could be solved in a global basis. The current state of the world contains new global threats. The only way of solving these global problems for state is to constitute new co-operations or organizations at local and regional levels. In short it seems inevitable that in order to be stay as states current nation states have to contribute the lived process by taking part in the globalization process and at the same time to look forward to keeping their existence. The same thing is also valid for Turkey. The geostrategic position of Turkey eliminates the probably of being out of globalization process.

REFERENCES

- AKAL, Cemal Bali (1990), **Sivil Toplumun Tanrısı**, İstanbul: Afa Yayınları.
- BARRY, Norman P. (2004), **Modern Siyaset Teorisi**, çev: Mustafa Erdoğan and Yusuf Şahin, Ankara: Liberte Yayınları.
- BERİŞ, Hamit Emrah (2009), **Tek Parti Döneminde Devletçilik: Türkiye’de Otoritarizmin Siyasal ve Ekonomik Kökenleri**, Ankara: Liberte Yayınları.
- BODIN, Jean (1955), **Six Books of the Commonwealth**, çev. ve düz.: M. J. Tooley, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- BORATAV, Korkut (1982), **Türkiye’de Devletçilik**, Ankara: Savaş Yayınları.
- BÜLBÜL, Kudret (2006), “Ulus-Devlet, Ulusallığın Dönüşümü ve Türkiye (Nation-State, Transformation of Nationality and Turkey)”, **İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi**, No: 35, pp. 23-47.
- CLAESSEN, Henri J. M. and SKALNIC, Peter (1993), **Erken Devlet (Kuramlar-Veriler-Yorumlar)**, çev: Alaeddin Şenel, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- ERÖZDEN, Ozan (1997), **Ulus Devlet**, Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.
- GIDDENS, Anthony (2008), **Sosyoloji**, yayıma haz: Cemal Güzel, İstanbul: Kırmızı Yayınları.

- HELD D. ve MCGREW A. (1999), **Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture**, Cambridge: Polity Press.
-(2000), “The Great Globalization Debate: An Introduction”, **The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate**, ed: Held D. and McGrew A., Cambridge: Polity Press.
- HEYWOOD, Andrew (2007), **Siyaset**, çev: Bekir Berat Özipek vd., ed: Buğra Kalkan, Ankara: Adres Yayınları.
- HOBBS, Thomas (2004), **Leviathan**, çev: Semih Lim, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- KEYMAN, E. Fuat (2008), “Küreselleşen Dünya, Türkiye ve Demokratikleşme”, **Demokrasi Platformu Dergisi**, Yıl: 4, Sayı: 15, pp. 1-17.
- KRASNER, Stephen D. (1999), “Globalization and Sovereignty”, ed: David A. Smith, Dorothy J. Solinger and Steven C. Topik, **States and Sovereignty in the Global Economy**, New York: Routledge, pp. 34-52.
- MACHIAVELLI, Niccolo (1985), **Hükümdar (Il Principe)**, çev: Selahattin Bağdatlı, İkinci Baskı, İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınları.
- MOOERS, Colin (1991), **The Making of Bourgeois Europe -Absolutism, Revolution and the Rise of Capitalism in England, France and Germany-**, London & New York: Verso.
- PIERSON, Christopher (1996), **The Modern State**, London & New York: Routledge.
- POGGI, Gianfranco (1978), **The Development of the Modern State -A Sociological Introduction-**, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- ROUSSEAU, Jean Jacques (1994), **Toplum Sözleşmesi**, çev: Vedat Günyol, İstanbul: Adam Yayınları, 6. Baskı.
- SCHMITT, Carl (2002), **Siyasi İlahiyat -Egemenlik Kuramı Üzerine Dört Bölüm-**, çev: Emre Zeybekoğlu, Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.
- SCHOLTE, Jan A. (2000), **Globalization: A Critical Introduction**, New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- SİEYÈS, Emmanuel-Joseph (2005), “Üçüncü Sınıf” Nedir?, çev: İsmet Birkan, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- TİMUR, Taner (1994), **Türk Devrimi ve Sonrası**, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- TUNÇAY, Mete (2010), **Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde Tek-Parti Yönetimi’nin Kurulması (1923-1931)**, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 5. Baskı.
- WEBER, Max (1991), “Politics as a Vocation”, ed: H. H. Gerth & C. Wright Mills, **From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology**, London: Routledge, pp. 77-128.