

**OSMANLI'DAN CUMHURİYET'E MODERNLEŞME SÜRECİNİN YERELDE
DEMOKRATİKLEŞME VE KATILIMA BAKIŞI¹****Doç. Dr. Şafak KAYPAK²****Yrd. Doç. Dr. Soner AKIN³****Özet**

Bu çalışma, Osmanlıdan Cumhuriyet'e modernleşme sürecinin yerelde demokratikleşme ve katılıma bakışını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Batı Avrupa toplumlarında ortaya çıkan bu değişim süreci, 20. yüzyılın ikinci yarısından itibaren Batı dışı toplumlara da yayılmıştır. Osmanlı'da Tanzimat'tan itibaren karşılaşılan modernleşme çabalarının hedefinde, demokratikleşme ve halkın yönetime katılımını sağlamak değil; ülkeyi içinde bulunduğu sıkıntılı durumdan kurtarmak ve yeni bir gelecek oluşturmak yatmaktadır. Cumhuriyet ile birlikte, modernleşme hareketleri farklı bir boyut kazanmış; toplumun bütün yönleriyle dönüşüme uğraması olarak görülmüştür. Güçlü bir merkezi yönetim geleneği olan Türk toplumunda, gerek Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda gerekse Cumhuriyet döneminde yerel yönetimler bağımlı ve ikincil örgütlenmeler olma özelliklerini korumuşlardır. Bu bağlamda, yerelde demokratikleşme ve katılım olgusuna yukarıdan aşağıya bakılmış ve bu bakış günümüze kadar çok fazla değişmeden devam etmiştir.

Keywords: Modernleşme, Cumhuriyet, Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi, Demokratikleşme, Katılım.**FROM OTTOMAN TOWARDS REPUBLICAN: THE REVIEW OF MODERNIZATION
PERIOD ON DEMOCRATIZATION AND PARTICIPATION AT LOCAL SCOPE****Abstract**

This paper aims to examine and discuss the democratization and participation view of the Ottoman-Republican modernization process at local focus. This process of change in Western European societies has spread to non-Western societies since the second half of the 20th century. The aim of modernization efforts in the Ottoman Empire since the Tanzimat Period was not to achieve democratization and the participation of people in governance at reality. To rescue the country from its troubled situation and create a new future was aimed at the period. Along with the Republican period, modernization movements have gained a different dimension. It was seen as a turning-over of all aspects of the society after this. In Turkish society, which has a tradition of strong central government, local governments both in the Ottoman Empire and in the Republican era have become dependent and secondary organizations referring a problematic issue. In this context, the locality of democratization and participation has been looked down from above and this view has continued unchanged that gave us the point for discussion in this paper.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Modernization, Republic, Ottoman-Turkish Modernization, Democratization, Participation.**Özgün Araştırma / Original Article**

¹ Bu makale, 2. Uluslararası Bilimsel Araştırmalar Kongresi – İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri (IBAD-2017), 20-23 Nisan 2017 İstanbul Kongresinde bildiri olarak sunulmuştur.

² Sorumlu yazar/Corresponding author, Mustafa Kemal University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Public Administration, Turkey, skaypak@gmail.com

³ Mustafa Kemal University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Public Administration, Turkey, sakin77@hotmail.com.

INTRODUCTION

Modernity, as a process created by the greatest transformations of mankind, has brought its own intellectual / mental infrastructure and institutions in all areas. This process, firstly emerged in Western European societies, has spread to non-Western societies since the second half of the 20th century. The 'modernization' initiatives realized by the countries which want to go this way and to be modern have been following the path of western societies successively. Along with this path, and changed many things in the social structure, modernization became a social phenomenon. Modernization is today a process of change. Hence, modernization activities' are not considered only to be activities unique to the Republican period. The view that modernization in Turkey started in the pre-Republic period is generally accepted by all historians. The history of Turkish modernization also began with the efforts to keep up with the modern states in the last period of the Ottoman Empire. The basic goal of the modernization efforts since the Tanzimat (the political reforms made in the ottoman state in 1839) was coded to save the empire from the difficult situation it has been in. Modernization movements along with the Republican period were seen in a total turnover with the lower and upper structure of the society, though the motto and aims in political terms were not changed. This transformation not only involved political, managerial development, but also included economic, social, cultural change and had a broader and more radical dimension via applied reforms.

In the process of modernization, the socio-economic and politically two-dimensional structure of the Industrial Revolution in the West caused many important developments in terms of democratization and participation. One of the distinctive features of the evolution occurred for local governments and their place in the administrative system also in Turkey with its centralized dependence. The emergence of local governments in Turkish society, again, was not only the product of a socio-economic and political formation, seen in other nations. Unlike their examples in the West, local governments are not spontaneously structured in a guided manner as a result of administrative obligations, not a willingness to come from the bases in a historical sequence. It was not linear with an up and down, but an initiative and organizational from top to bottom. In accordance with the historical process, in the Ottoman Empire, the city administration was become similar to the medieval Europe in the nineteenth century, and generally the city administrations were seen by the sultan (*kadı, muslim judge*). In the Turkish societies where the central governments are very strong, as in the Ottoman Empire, local governments, even if they were so, were not seen as autonomous institutions in the Republican period. Since the continuity of industrialization and modernization, it is not evolved in the same or similar process as in Western societies. Indeed, democratization and participation can only be realized so far as the central government considers it appropriate.

In this context, in this paper, it is aimed to show how democratization and participation are perceived locally in the process of modernization of the Ottoman Empire and so on how local governments are influenced by this process. The study consists of three parts. In the first part, the reflection of the Ottoman period to the Republican administration on the different areas of the modernization process has been discussed. In the second chapter, the period of Ottoman modernization is examined. In the third chapter, the democratization and participation view of the newly established early Republican modernization is paid attention. The study ends with the results and the situation assessment to reach a profile.

1. MODERNIZATION OF THE REPUBLIC FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Following the political, economic and socio-cultural developments in the world, Turkish society has been experimented in a continuous modernization process since the Tanzimat (1839). In the Republican era this heritage has also taken over via different reforms. In this sense, the modernization in question is occurred as a reaction to politics. Instead of the word “modernization” in our country, the concepts of “westernization” and “modernization” which we produce in Turkish politics are mostly used (Sezer, 1998, Özkeçeci, 2004: 9). However, these concepts do not fully meet modernization’s meaning. Westernization, which means being like western in a way of life, resembling the concept on being “westerner” was juxtaposed to modernization. Modernization refers to the processes of being in the same stage or standard and about capturing the developmental level of the same age or time. Modernization, which expresses the stages of social progress and development on the basis of industrialization, is a broader concept than these concepts used with subordinate life and reflections from a superstructure. Modernization develops on four dimensions in politics on public management (Tekeli, 2002: 22). The province is exemplified for the economic dimension via representing an industrialized liberal social order. The second phase is the steps to reveal information, art and ethics approaches. The third dimension is the emergence of the self-guiding individual, who has been liberated from traditional community ties of past. The fourth dimension refers to the institutional formation that occurs as a result of the first three dimensions mentioned. This level briefly refers to being a nation-state and also enduring democratic processes (Tekeli, 2002: 23)

Since modernization is a movement originating in Western Europe, the countries in West have also determined the sub-superstructure of this concept. The countries outside them have tried to modernize their own cultures in path which have been handled before (Yaka, 2010). The Western world, along with the Renaissance, has also changed the Christian culture and morality, which has turned to free thought, new ways of life and views of life, juxtaposed steps by the Reform movements as well. The resulting situation has brought Europe to the Industrial Revolution and its technological accumulation which has been engineered and reengineered today. The welfare state, which constitutes the superstructure of modernization, was also established together with the Industrial Revolution. This superstructure could not have been created without the Renaissance and Reform, which constituted political and social infrastructure (Göküş, 2010). Whether in the Ottoman Empire, or in other countries that have attempted to modernize, this process is revealed in the same mentality as in Europe. For Turkish case, a big difference exists yet. There was no desire on this part of the society base that could live in movements such as the Renaissance and Reform in those countries that followed Europe. The beginning of the Ottoman society to recognize Europe corresponds to the beginning of the 18th century. Along the Tulip Age (18th century of Ottoman), only the life style of Western Europe has been dealt with, and the contents of modern countries have not been examined fairly. Westernization in society is gradually progressing to administrative area. Looking at the period of Selim the Third, we see that he began to penetrate the state in modern rules and reforms (Yaka, 2010; Kaypak, 2016: 176). However, contrary to what is believed, neither the Ottoman nor the republican regimes are 'top-down reformists at all'. Westernization did not begin with momentary decisions solely. Modernization in the Ottoman Empire, via III. Selim or II. Mahmut were not just forcing rules or reforms in order to catch the West. Looking at the institutions of former period, some modern applications which had already existed in some institutions in the Ottoman Empire were only taken into platforms to be renewed. Paying attention to the reforms of the last years of the Ottoman Empire, the revolutions made by the young republic with legislation seem to be a gathering platform from the top, but they have long been accepted and desired practices in the society (Ortaylı, quoted from Turan in 2008, 2015). In this respect, the reforms of 18th century was different from 19th century renewals in motivating forces, but the national subject to adapted had been similar to each other across centuries.

Ottoman modernization began in the army and was shaped by army until the middle of the 18th and 19th centuries. The fact that modernization starts in the army is a necessity. Unlike other state institutions, the military is the one with the most interaction with the West (Turan, 2015). In this interaction, the institutions in army was also the mediatory unit that felt the technological superiority of

the West and the backwardness of the Ottoman Empire (Turan, 2015). Modernization continued in the 19th century with Western imitation of state administration. European works have been translated into Turkish and Western literature, art and philosophy have begun to be learned. Through the military adaptation from the western lifestyle and the vision of life, reforms gradually began to take place in the Ottoman Empire. Mahmud the Second paid high efforts to modernize this century, most of his attempts were enacted without obstacles. These legal movements were followed by Tanzimat Fermanı (Decree). The relatively free atmosphere of thought brought by the Tanzimat prepared the birth of a new intellectual class called the Young Ottomans. In this period, a new sub era called Tanzimat modernization emerged, so the reforms were continued. Some reforms are evaluated as inadequate by Young Ottomans. Indeed, their faces turned to Europe. Young Ottomans actively influenced Ottoman social and political life until the end of the century. Following this, Jon Turks, the newly founded community continued this line. Committee of Union and Progress became active in later on. Until the early years of the republic, the Committee of Union and Progress continued to be effective in Turkish politics. The expression of this period was also shaped via literature. The western view of life was spreading from art to literature among the intelligentsia. Those milestones serves to this mentality has finally prepared the view of Atatürk (Turan, 2015).

The most important economic development in Europe is the formation of industrial society. European states have been enriched by economic and technological progress and the modern nation-states have begun their era. Europe has come to the central position at global level. The Ottoman Empire in agriculture has remained in the periphery for 17th and 18th centuries, and for the first time, a period of weakening against Europe has been emerged in Ottoman history. For example, given the capitulation of the French, this process was justified. In the end, the Ottoman markets became capitalized and the bourgeois class did not form a circular structure. In the Ottoman Empire, these troubles were noticed at first glance. Indeed, westernization did not occur. Reforms tried to bring the existing institutions' capability back to their original power for state administration. Over time, the perception of Westernization arose as a solution in this respect. Ottoman reformers thought that in order to continue the empire, it was necessary to make the society ready for whole capitalist arguments (Alibeyoğlu, 2012). This is needed to be added up on a modern nation-state understanding. Our modernization is firstly structured to be pragmatic. Priority is given to the preservation of the existence of the empire. For this, military, administrative, political innovations have been made ready for reforms, and over time these innovations have expanded in its scope and turned into an endeavor to change the mind via targeting the structure of the whole society. Political thoughts leading to Ottoman modernization started to be discussed during the 2nd Constitutional period. The main debate centered on 'Islamism-Anti-Islamism'. The Islamists, the 'traditional ones', are against all things in the West, and the term gâvur is reinvented for otherings. 'Modern Islamists' argued that the wisdom and technique of the West should be taken and the traditional values of Islam should be preserved (Alibeyoğlu, 2012). Those who carried the concept of 'westernism' were divided into the West and the only ones who wanted to take their technical infrastructure. The most attractive concept of westerners was in the axis positivism. Positivism became attractive to the intellectual-bureaucratic social engineering minds who want to maintain order and stability in society through reason and knowledge. As is known, positivism always aimed at bringing humanity religion instead of traditional religion. This understanding also constituted the basic pillar of modernization in our country (Alibeyoğlu, 2012).

2. DEMOCRATIZATION AND LOCAL PARTICIPATION IN THE OTTOMAN MODERNIZATION PROCESS

Until the 19th century, classical Ottoman rule, a local democratic and libertarian local government had never been thought of people participating in the administration. A request for this direction was not even expressed by the rulers (Ortaylı, 1985: 15). Since there was no municipal organization at the institutional level before Tanzimat period, the needs of the local people were mainly met with the common efforts of the residents of the town (Tümerkan, 1946: 6). Prior to Tanzimat, all large and small settlements outside of Istanbul were counted as provinces and managed within the

provincial organization of the central government. Almost every settlement unit is counted as “kaza” (a unit referred to towns) and linked to bigger states. The government directed by monarch, sultan, which is only able to provide general services by organizing the provinces to the communities, wasn’t interested in the local service needs and wan’t included the local government organizations in the system (Sencer, 1984a: 30). In the management model, some structural characteristics of the Islamic states was taken as well as the procedures from the workings sphere of the former Turkish states’ culture. The foundation structures was inherited by Seljuks. The position of governor, kadı and muhtesip etc. was also seen in former states. Administrative officers at local phase transferred from Islamic terminology, compared to the central stage.

The highest authority of the Ottoman city administration was “*kadı*” (Halaçoğlu, 1991: 109) in the period when an institutionalized and effective local government model for the understanding of local government was not even developed. In addition to their responsibilities in judicial and judicial matters, Kadı were carrying out security ordnance and municipal services of the towns and villages (Eryılmaz, 1997: 33). The *kadis* from the administrators assigned to each administration center are mostly accepted as an important indicator of the centrist administrative structure of the Ottoman Empire (Solakoğlu, 1994: 91-92). The selection and supervision of the *kadis* and their assistants appointed by central bodies, and they did not involve the participation of the public representatives in the context of a certain statute or rule (Şentop, 1996: 282). At local sphere, *kadı* was in charge of the foundation, the market, the chief auditor and other municipal and police services as well as the city's judicial authority (Tümerkan, 1946: 7; Ortaylı, 1974: 108). *Kadı* was also responsible for price determination in traditional markets. Fulfillment of law enforcement duties in economic affairs, taxation, collection, etc were also performed by *kadı*. They would help if the financial transactions were carried out and the people and artisans were leading in this sector (Ortaylı, 1996: 16). Although the economic work is mainly supervised by the *kadı* in consultation with the local staff, it is not regarded as a “local participation” of the urban services because the *kadis* fulfilled this function using their own initiative.

During this period, there are three agencies that are actively involved in meeting local services. These were foundations, guilds and neighborhoods (Halaçoğlu, 1991: 93). In this period, a unit that takes an active role in the fulfillment of local services was known as a foundation. Foundation was a unique structure in public services (Eryılmaz, 1997: 37). This means that a certain property belongs to a service or services for the benefit of the public was seen in an organizational form, being an actor. In the Ottoman Empire, before the Tanzimat, urban services are seen through the foundations as well as through state units. The foundation, which was an institution born as a result of donating the goods of wealthy people, especially from the sultans and their families, worked for the purpose of charity, culture, social welfare, clean-up work etc. of the cities in the fulfillment of various infrastructure and social public services of the local communities in the Ottoman Empire. They carried out many important functions (Sencer, 1984a: 31). In this period it was not possible to find an institutionalized attitude towards urban participation. However, due to the fact that almost all social welfare works and urban services were fulfilled, foundations are evaluated as a prototype of “municipality”, even not any democratic initiative existed (Karaman, 1994: 55). It can be stated here that the own initiatives of the foundations at the point of introducing local services accelerated the development of the settlements and contributed to the formation of local responsibility and “citizenship consciousness” (Karaman, 1994: 56). On the other hand, it has also been argued that, due to their functionalities in urban services, foundations prevented the development of “local consciousness” in combination with the weight and efficiency of central government in urban administration (Kılıçbay, 1994: 23). The city people who were engaged in the urban works and qualified as artisans were gathered under the roof of organizations called “*lonca*” (Halaçoğlu, 1991: 93). *Loncas* was primarily involved in the provision of various services to its members, as well as the protection of auditors and consumers (Göymen, 1997: 18). Yet, it was seen that artisans of the craftsmen, representatives of the craftsmen, city elders, spiritual leaders, did not gather in permanent committees to participate in the city administration (Ortaylı, 1996: 16).

The neighborhood or district type of administration, which is a physical unit, was not seen in the medieval European cities, was reflected from the Seljuk cities and the same system continued in the

Ottoman period (January, 1996: 82). The city administration was organized at the neighborhood level for Ottoman period. "Neighborhood" is defined as the place that was residence for a community of people who knew each other and who were responsible for each other's behavior and who were in a social solidarity (Özgenç, 1996: 408). Every neighborhood had its own fountain, mosque, bath, mosque, together with social, cultural and administrative recreation places (Karaman, 1992: 29). *Imams* ruling the neighborhood were appointed by the Sultan and were responsible for services at the first time using his cadre. Along with the formation of the *mukhtarianship* (headman of district) as a legal institution, the imams continued to be influential in the neighborhood administration, with the responsibility and authority, sometimes being restricted in time (Karaman, 1995: 228). The Ottoman neighborhood itself was a physical space where there was seen no difference in class and status (Karaman, 1996: 74). Non-Muslims also continued to live their own way of life and beliefs in different places across neighbourhoods (January, 1996: 82). The culture of the neighborhood that was formed in life provided the understanding of solving the problems together. In the neighborhoods, the practice of distributing the incomes of the donation funds called "*avarız akçası*" to the people in need living in the neighborhood has helped the individuals in economic terms and created a point to acquire a sense of responsibility and sharing, or adapting the habit of acting together (Kazıcı, 1996: 435). In addition to providing social solidarity and physical security, neighborhoods constituted the source of *homelandism* depending on their homogeneous structures, relative autonomy and sense of belonging (Göymen, 1997: 18)

In the historical process, initiatives for the formation and development of the local government units were made by the central government. In this context the local governments emerged as an extension of a service ring working to society from center (Eryılmaz, 1995: 186). Local government organization in the Western sense was realized after Tanzimat. The reason to carry out Tanzimat administration was to establish a municipal organization and regulate or improve the physical and administrative life of the cities, along with the help of the people. The municipal organization emerged not only as a request for participation of the citizens but also as a result of the central government's support and participation requests (Ortaylı, 1996: 454). The Tanzimat era, which started with the declaration of *Gülhane Hattı Hümayunu* in 1839, constituted the first step of the process to catch the west with political and administrative institutions (Eryılmaz, 1992a: 105). This decree by sultan was an important process in Turkish political and social life. After *Gülhane Hatt-i Hümayunu*, the possibility of political participation laid its basis via the level of consultation for local level, was begun to be developed. Decisions taken in the councils were transferred to a large extent. For the first time, those who ruled the state in the period of the Second Constitutional Monarchy and Second Constitutional Period had the opportunity to participate in political life, and then the elections took place and the movements of association started to take a shape. Thus, the individuals who started to get away from the understanding of the administrated subject (in terms of administration) began to approach the mentality on being a type of citizen in legal terms, who gave opinion to the participatory administration. People started to question the idea as being administrated, and so questioned the managerial phases of functioning (Buran, 1995: 212). Along with the "local assemblies" transferred to practice in 1840, individual privileges in the use of local sovereignty were sought to be abolished, and then the privileges transferred to the whole class was begun to be demanded (Güler 1992: 259). People of time assumed that they could substitute Ottomanism's consciousness instead of dissolving different cultural accumulations in the Ottoman Empire within administrative sense, find a way for legal and economic measures at the national level (Mardin, 1992: 12-13).

During the Tanzimat period, the administrative people in associations gained new dimensions on statuesque. Ottoman bureaucracy which started to be formed in modern terms from the time of Mahmut the Second, began to take political power together with the Tanzimat reforms. The Tanzimat was shaped as a product of an effort to bind the state to a new political and legal order in order to prevent the collapse of the Empire, which had gradually begun to dissolve, and to prevent its political interventions on the grounds of protecting the minority rights of the Western countries under its influence (Sencer 1984b: 51). That is say, the rulers and the ruled-people would be able to relate to each other without the help of the local people (Göküş, 2010: 233). The aim is structured to reach this aim; via political and administrative practices as well as the equalization of the masses of Muslims and non-Muslims, and

giving the opportunity for both parties to be represented at the local level and in parliaments established in Istanbul (1870). Local assemblies, together with non-institutionalized ones (Kalaycıoğlu and Sarıbay, 1986: 19), which were as unusual as the return of the local demands and complaints to the central authority were brought. After the announcement of the Tanzimat, the role of the state on society changed and the belief that social problems can be solved with legal regulations became dominant. The administration was transferred to the reform practices on bureaucrats (Eryılmaz, 1992a: 57).

Under the framework of the Tanzimat reforms, the understanding of local government centralized tendencies of central government officials (Ortaylı, 1996: 17). Ottoman municipal institutions were perceived as part of central governmental body with the reason that they were born at a time when authoritarian centralism developed. The provincial and district councils of the same period were influenced by the central government despite the existence some kind of local governing boards and equipped with only "consultation" function at the local level (Dursun, 1998: 15). In this period, the changes in the cities and institutionalization did not occur with the influence of certain social groups like the Westerners, and socio-economic developments due to the challenging conditions of the world conjuncture and political structure, having led to the formation of municipal organization at the institutional level in the Ottoman Empire (Ortaylı, 1979: 207). In this sense, a local government-city interaction and continuity were also mentioned in the post-Tanzimat period (Ökmen, 2002: 507), although it didn't have a tradition and historical continuity. Although the intellectuals and bureaucrats of the period wanted to establish and develop the municipal organization in the modern sense, there was a desire to have predominantly modern and regular cities in the background (Ortaylı, 1974: 4-5). In terms of the bureaucrats of the period, the priority was not given to sustain local democracy or to realize the political participation of large masses of people, but to ensure the safety of life and property and to protect the transportation ways via water (Tekeli ve Ortaylı, 1978: 18). Since all the institutions of Ottoman modernization were shaped for the empowerment of the central government, municipalities didn't emerge as powerful institutions in terms of their sources or authorities (Tekeli, 1992a: 131). Local government approaches that started to develop in intellectual meaning with the Tanzimat resulted in the establishment of city councils and prototype municipalities in 1855, seen in Istanbul and its affiliated districts (Tekeli, 1992a: 131). The basic aim of Şehremaneti, a prototype, was to bring the functions of the city's local quality services, being separated from the state affairs. It was primarily determined as the authority keeper at local level and functioned with the duties of a particular organ for the municipal registry services. (Ortaylı, 1974: 122; Sencer 1984b: 70).

The administrators of the Tanzimat saw local governments as a reflection of the central government (Keles, 1996: 95). Şehremini, being the head officer was brought by a procedure involving the choice of Bab-i Ali, a cabinet alike structure at center, and the approval of the Sultan. The city council, which is the decision body of Şehremaneti, was determined by the proposal of the government and approval of the Sultan (Tümerkan, 1946: 14). The procedure of centralized appointment and enforcement of decisions wasn't in line with the goals of "democratization" and "public participation" aimed at local government. Şehremaneti, which has been institutionalized in accordance with centralist understanding and tied to central management in financial terms, wasn't able to implement successful applications. Renewing the managers at the head of the institution under the saving of the center did not make these units functional as well (Ortaylı, 1974: 124). As a kind of application area, the sixth district's municipality organization was established in Beyoğlu-Galata district, where the elite community chose as crowded part of city at the same time. The administration organization was resembled to modern district of Paris, was structured with a semi-autonomous and privileged structure and was appointed by the appointment procedure again as if it was practicing city warfare with a conspicuous attitude that is far from the goal of local democratization (Ortaylı, 1996: 147). Establishment of the municipal organization in the western sense in the settlement areas outside Istanbul was realized with the a new regulation (Ortaylı, 1974: 170) dated in 1871 which constituted the legal basis of the provincial municipalities. However, even though the provisions of the regime wasn't transferred to practice everywhere and serious problems were experienced, this first application played an important role in the formation of the Turkish local government tradition with its positive and negative contributions (Ortaylı, 1996: 162).

The constitutional period started as a result of the political struggles in the Ottoman Empire and in 1876 (Kanun-i Esasi) the first constitution was put into effect. The 1876 constitution gave place to the regulations for municipal administrations. In the context of the 1876 Constitution, the masses targeted a new social equilibrium with open management. Those who prepare the constitution were much more interested in democracy and the constitution as a document that was to convey qualities that reflect the aspirations of the masses. Establishing parliament, and allowing the public items to participate in legislative activity to some extent, it was a great milestone. It prescribed that the sultan had some basic rights and restricted his government to a certain extent (Kili, 1986: 90-91). In this framework, Ottoman intellectuals regarded the constitution and Parliament as unifying elements (Hanioglu, 1998: 293). By virtue of article 112 of the 1876 Constitution, the municipal government was introduced as a management unit, and the development of a modern municipal organization was passed down (Karaman, 1995: 231). The "Provincial Municipal Law" dated 1877, which opened the way to the establishment of the municipal organization in the city and in the towns, was issued (Eryilmaz, 1992b: 213) following this. Electoral appointment criteria were determined as to be 25 years old, to have Ottoman subjects and civil rights, and so on. Conditions were also determined. The conditions of election required that Turkish speakers would be elected in addition to the requirements for becoming a voter. This last feature, which was considered as a condition of election, attracted attention as a provision restricting minorities in a multinational state (Ortayli, 1974: 191). In a period when the centralist structure was dominant, it was still perceived as a basis for the formation of municipal administrations as institutions providing so called democratic elections and political participation (Ortayli, 1996: 171). Along with a new law issued in 1912, municipal offices were removed and municipality branches were established instead. A council was established in place of the former centralized city councils, and despite the structural reforms, the 1912 regulation had a more decentralized character (Eryilmaz, 1997: 42).

In the Ottoman state, in the second half of the 19th century, legal and institutional arrangements, including the Constitution of 1876, failed to provide efficient and continuous delivery of local public services to citizens, nor did they function as the self-government of the local people. Municipal administrations remained 'patches' in the administrative and social structure of the Ottoman state as the Ottoman state did not allow autonomy and participation and delegated local public officials as a subcontractor to the center, indeed they continued to exist as an extension of central government until the first years of the Republic and could not become an autonomous and western institution (Keles, 1994: 8). It is necessary to look for local government initiatives in Turkey together with the Tanzimat and to see that the problems that are still experienced in current local governments (on autonomy, financial problems) were found in the Ottoman local government tradition (Ortayli, 1974: 4). Indeed, the weight of the central government in our country continued since the foundation of the Republic. The culture of administration, the culture of political elites were shaped in the warfare years, and then the argument of the unitary state led to the formation of local government under the custody of the central government (Falay, 1996: 20).

3. DEMOCRATIZATION AND LOCAL PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS OF REPUBLICAN MODERNIZATION

The republican government took over a municipal government mentality that had been weak since the Ottoman Empire, being legally and financially weak, functioning only with foundations and other pre-industrial institutions. The municipal system, which was taken over from the Ottoman Empire, was shaped within the framework of the reforms of the Tanzimat, mostly satisfied with the social and institutional restoration, and then these units were not upgraded and renewed. The administrative structure and principles of the Ottoman period were also adopted impartially by the new administration regime (Guler, 1992: 103). The process up until the year 1930, when the law on the municipalities (1580) was introduced following the proclamation of the Republic, was the preparation period for the establishment of the institutions in new administration, local government paradigm and especially municipality praxis. The founding leaders of the Republic and the Tanzimat, in effect, have been influenced by the traditions of the former ruling Union and Progress Party period, thus avoided

transferring authoritarian and centralist policies to the new administration regime. But they perceived local administrations not as political organs but rather as administrative units and preferred to keep authority, duty and institutional structures under the control of central government within the framework of fear of unity and cohesion across minorities to become dangerous (Eryılmaz, 1997: 19-20).

The 1921 Constitution, prepared during the War of Independence, gave place to contemporary norms in terms of local governments. The Constitution did not include the concept of “municipality” but included provisions that included the principle of “local administration”. In the 10th article of the Constitution, the governments of the country, the provinces were arranged via district based units, the counties were arranged to be cut down. The councils, which had legal personality and autonomy in the provinces in the local affairs, had actions to be determined by local people (Articles 11 to 12). The 1921 Constitution included a "local audit" case and was subject to the supervision of the general inspectors in their territory by the provision brought with article 23. The 1921 Constitution had a separate place among the Constitutions from 1876 to Republican period, along with the regulations that envisaged local autonomy and restricted central administration. However, there emerged a valid basis for the domestic political conjuncture at that time (Yayla, 1984: 128), although it was seen under a tutelage in which the constitutional authority, for example via inspectors' supervision, didn't want to go to autonomy at the local level. It was normal for a central government to have the authority to use the authority of supervision in order to deal with many problems which was brought by war in the socio-economic field. It can be said that the new formation, which was supposed to be brought to local governments, conformed to contemporary theoretical norms. In the context of local autonomy and democracy, these arrangements can be regarded as positive developments. Although the 1921 Constitution wasn't passed on to the practice of decentralization, it led to the shaping of the tradition of local government in the circumstances.

The 1924 Constitution was the first constitution of the Republican era. Contrary to 1921, the provisions on local governments were introduced. Along with the provision on the application for local taxation being collected by special provincial administrations and municipalities via the 85th article, the concept of municipality was used but it is wasn't explained. Because, in the context of the matter, the municipality was used as the concept upon the arrangements for the collection of taxes beyond an amendment directed to local administrations, the discussions were shallow. According to article 89, the country was divided into provincial units, via center with the name of province, districts and townships. The 1924 Constitution did not include the concepts of decentralization and the delegation of power via decentralization, leaving the concept of mentioned decentralization in 1921. Regulation on the public inspectorate wasn't included. It was stated that this transformation of living would be evaluated within the frame of political events and the weight for the adoption of contemporary norms and lifestyle for development (Yayla, 1984: 135).

After the proclamation of the Republic, the new administration encountered two important municipal issues. Firstly the western cities of the country where war is predominantly experienced began to be adapted to the conditions of the postwar period. The second problem emerged with the declaration of Ankara as the capital on October 13, 1923. In this residential area, administration had to be restructured in order to ensure that the general outlook and local services could be provided appropriately according to the requirements of the times. The new structural change aimed at the capital was also important in terms of ensuring the prestige of the Republic both inside and outside the country. The Republican administration encountered considerable difficulties in solving the problems of municipality. Some of the obstacles to municipalism encountered in the solution of urban problems were about some of the limitations of the municipality experience and the lack of resources transferred by the Ottoman state, and the rate of population increase was relatively low (Tekeli ve Ortaylı, 1978: 31). One of the most important structural regulations of the period was the establishment of the Ankara *Sehremaneti*, which has the same powers and duties as the Istanbul *Sehremaneti* (Tümerkan, 1946: 239). After Ankara became the capital city, the name of the Ankara Municipality was regulated as "Ankara Provincial Government" with the Law No. 417 dated in 1924. According to the legislation, Ankara City Hall was appointed by the Minister of Interior.

The use of municipality names belonging to the Ottoman local institutions in the new period as well as similar structural formations suggested that the centralist approaches were not transferred from the Ottoman Empire. This was an important feature in terms of the use of existing deposits. It was also important to remember that in addition to the change in the overall institutional approach to country management, the practitioners were individuals trained in the Ottoman period. According to the foundation law numbered 417, "Cemiyet-i Umumiye-i Municipality" was located in Ankara *Şehremaneti*, consisting of 24 members beside the headman as *Şehremin*. For the members in this formation, some former norms weren't applied, i.e. the real estate tax wasn't given to the members as it was practiced in Istanbul *Şehremaneti*. It can be emphasized herein for the reality of time that the majority of the bureaucracy cadres at that time in Ankara were not property owners in the recognition of the right to be elected in the municipal elections for men who didn't own real estate in Ankara (Tekeli, 1992a: 135). That is to say, a more democratic practice was reflected in the necessity of recognizing the equal participation of local people, which is an important dimension of local participation, at the local level. The appointment of *Şehremin* by the ministry through "appointment" constituted the local level of the centralist tendencies, inherited from the Ottoman Empire. This seems to confirm the view that the local policy process in Turkey was created by the state for first Republican years (Köker, 1995: 51).

The understanding of the municipal government developed by the Republican administration under the framework of the Ankara City dynamics was put into effect in 1930 by the Law on Municipalities No. 1580. It was stated that former centralized municipal administration model had been based on the fact that a traditionalist, conservative, small entrepreneurial stratum existed in cities, so it was supposed to stop with its activity on these institutions (Tekeli 1992: 10). Law 1580 was introduced in an environment created by the political, ideological and administrative circumstances of 1929-30. The one-party ideology and the understanding of the state were reflected in the law. Local governments were shaped under the influence of the center and became the provincial organs of central government. The existence of administrative, financial and legal autonomy of the municipalities born in such an environment wasn't the subject (Ökmen, 2002: 508). The idea of providing a national unity and having only a strong state can be seen in the managers or officers of time (Görmez, 1997: 100). In terms of fulfilling the modernization mission of the Republican administration in the understanding of 1930 period, the municipality or municipal administrations had to be strengthened to provide the services required by a modern society and the public administrations, being under the supervision of the central government for the provision of these services within the framework of the mission which was charged by the Republic (Prime Ministry Housing Development Administration, 1994: 87-88). Today, the constitutional concept of "guardianship supervision" is opened up to legal regulation (Karaman, 1995: 43). In Article 1 of the related Act, municipal administrations are defined as a legal personality that fulfilled the common and civil needs of local residents of the local residents. The Law on Municipalities and Buildings and Roads no. 2290 and the General Public Hygiene Law no. 1593 issued the municipalities in order to strengthen the municipality administrations and to provide support for the fulfillment of their duties assigned to them in the modernization projects, which have been given new duties and expanded for their areas of responsibility (Görmez, 1997: 101).

Equality principle was introduced to all municipalities by Law No. 1580. Ankara and Istanbul municipalities were excluded from this principle. In Ankara, the province is separated from the municipality. For the municipality of Istanbul, the case was merged with the province and the authority items to determine the mayor, and it was left to the Ministry of Interior (Ministry of Internal Affairs) (Article 94). In places where there is a provincial center outside of Ankara and Istanbul, the mayor's choice would be determined by the proposal of the Minister of Interior and the approval of the President of the Republic and approval of the governor of the other municipalities. It is necessary to perceive this practice as a reflection of the centralist understanding that began to take shape with the Tanzimat, regarding municipal administrations as an extension of central government. The municipalities, which did not have legal personality until this turnover, gained legal personality with the regulation of 1580. Despite the implementation of a two-rounded election system for parliamentary elections, it was adopted that a single-degree model for municipal elections would be applied. The 1580 numbered law based regulation opened a way that local elections could be regarded as an attempt to spread the electoral

dimension of democracy to the level of local democracy, in which municipal elections were open to the participation of one round elections' candidates and 18-year-old individuals. The expansion of electoral participation base at the local level was an important development (monopoly and mediation, 1978: 55), as it brought the voting rights for women. It wasn't recognized at the national level and elections are made at double standards. Recognition of the right to elect and be elected locally without discrimination between men and women is of particular importance in terms of ensuring individual equality via constituting a concrete example of the principle that the new administration was for many segments of society (Tekeli, 1992a: 135). It is necessary to see the openness principle in the municipal council activities by the same law, as an important application in terms of local democracy and local participation. While this model has not been fully transferred to practice, it can be seen as an important initiative in terms of ensuring local people/citizen control and participation (Çitçi, 1989: 66).

A bank was set up in order to fulfill basic infrastructure services. It was called "the Municipal Bank". They gave it five percent income. This rule was imposed by Article 131. Service areas that the local people had not been familiar with were defined. To the responsibilities of municipal administrations, modernization of the new administration and modern approach to contemporary norms were introduced. It is possible to meet these services with already limited resources. Defined structure for municipalities was obliged to transfer resources to this bank which will be formed within the scope of central government. It seemed to have increased the problem of resource creation of these municipal administrations. The pluralist regulation of local elections wasn't positive. There existed a lack of financial support for municipal administrations. This was the apparent negativity of the period. This period led to the inclusion of positive developments in terms of local participation and democratization. The development of local services and reaching contemporary norms were seen as the main problem. An institutional structure emerged that there needed to be a structure equipped with the financial resources required by today's conditions. Participation in a municipal administration that had gained administrative and financial autonomy made more sense. The production and distribution of both services seemed to be a priority in terms of local participation and democratic process health. However, it was not possible to deny these goals, which were tried to be achieved with the socio-economic conditions of the period. It was decisive in the institutionalization of the "statist understanding" approach that took shape in the first years of the Republic. There were negative problems in the country and new problems besides lack of resources. It was emphasized that the adapting modernity were to be dominated the administrators. It could also be argued that the economic orientation of the process of modernization through the understanding of statist understanding was desired to be completed (Keser, 1993: 64). The municipalities were organized differently in this period when the politics of statist understanding was applied. The resources were transferred to development initiatives and the local feudal forces were rendered ineffective (Güler, 1992: 165-167). The duties undertaken by the provincial private administration led them to be seen as primary representatives of the central government at the local level (Güler, 1992: 159). Law 1580 came up with some changes over time. And the perception of the municipalities as a natural extension of the central government has entered the text of the Constitution (Göymen, 1995: 1824).

After the Second World War, Turkey was influenced by the economic conditions of the war even if it did not join the war. In the affected Turkey, the extraordinary weight of initiatives towards urbanism was directed towards national economic development within the framework of Westernization. Therefore, it was important to distribute national and local resources throughout the country. Meanwhile, structural regulations including municipal administrations were completed. Despite this, local problems could not be resolved. After the Second World War, the rapid urbanization phenomenon emerged as a housing problem. It has also brought out the shanty town structures. Along with the Shanty Amnesty Law No. 5218 issued in 1948, the shanties made up to that time were legitimized (Tekeli, 1992b: 123) It also led to the construction of slums. After World War II, our country was entered into multi-party political life. Along with this, the necessity of municipal understanding and local democracy applications began to be discussed. Political parties in the political competition environment began to give place to the problems of local government. The first important step in democratizing the municipal administrations in this framework was taken with the Law No. 4878 dated 1946. The change in the

electoral procedures of the municipal councils became the subject of change. In the previous arrangement, the elections were completed within a week. Along with the law no. 4878, the election of the municipality was to be completed in one day. The autonomy and democratization of the municipalities began to be advocated through the Turkish Municipalities Association established in 1946. Multi-party political life came. Despite this, no significant changes were made in the direction of the democratization of municipal administrations. The financial possibilities of local governments, their position against the center continued to exist, and the authorities remained largely the same. The emphasis on strengthening local governments in the deployment of democracy took much place on the political agenda. Municipality mentality building became a movement. The reason for this was that the democracy in the country had to be sought deep enough. It was emphasized that there was no differentiation among the local government programs of different political parties (Tekeli, 1992a: 133).

Turkey has given its weight to the modernization of central government institutions in terms of administration (Eryılmaz, 1996: 91). A centralist political-administrative understanding and structuring was one of the basic qualities inherited from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic. It was a source of many problems, economic, political, administrative, social and cultural (Ökmen, 2002: 516). The state-oriented modernization was changing since the Tanzimat. Since the 1950s, society has begun to shift with the concept of modernization. Nevertheless, from those days onwards it couldn't be said that the problems in question were overcome. The problem of politicization of local governments could not be overcome. The pulse and normalization phases followed each other. Centralist elements in administrative functioning were not excluded. In terms of local governments, this situation was related to the fact that the administrators were elected to work but were not autonomous towards the center (Turan, 1986: 484). The central government wanted a local government system that was dependent on it. Democratization and participation became the most contemplated issues. Municipal assemblies were not allowed to work as local parliaments, for local governments to source through their own bodies, to put local taxation (Dursun, 1998: 102). These qualities of local governments couldn't be said to be fully won even in multiparty period or even today (Ökmen, 2002: 517).

CONCLUSION

Modernization is the product of the West, which passes from the agricultural society to the industrial society. It is a change process that the world has made. Modernization is not limited to industrialization alone. Besides economic changes, it also includes social, political and cultural changes such as urbanization, religious decline, rationalization of thoughts and actions, increasing democratization and decreasing social differences, individualism. Underdeveloped countries with the characteristics of an agrarian society want to come to this path that the West has opened up to develop and keep up with the times. In this context, Ottoman and Turkish modernization were not independent of each other. They are the continuation of each other. The idea that the modernization started in the Ottoman Empire and that Tanzimat Decree is an important stage of this process is widespread. Westernization began with the aim of saving the state in the Ottoman period. Accelerated with the Tanzimat, the changes to be made were seen as 'reforms'. The years of the Republic were different from those of the Tanzimat period. It was a period when the state turned its face completely to the West. Regulations made in all aspects of social life will enable the Turkish society to reach the level of contemporary civilization.

Modernization movements were necessary for the Republic, a new nation-state. These requirements included the dissolution of the traditional legal and political structure and the inclusion of new institutions and social tactics. The cities forming the spatial dimension of the municipalities, the basic unit of local governments, were seen as a sign of the modernization of Turkish society in public space. The Republic aimed to soften the tradition of strict centralized administration of the empire by democratizing the decision-making process by adding the local people of the municipal administrations to the governance. However, after Tanzimat the qualifications related to Ottoman-local government, democratization and participation also prevailed in the first years of the Republic. The single-party era

has developed on the basis of a political-administrative structure that has centralized qualities both in terms of legal arrangements and practices. There emerged a local government system. Along with the concern of maintaining the organs of the newly established state and the influence of the war conditions of the time, centralized understanding conveyed from the Ottoman Empire prevailed. And it was necessary not to deny that the practices were defended as mission in this period.

Modernization policies are carried out on different planes in order not to lag behind modern countries. Despite all the reform efforts in Turkey, the autonomy of local governments did not improve. This has not been an important way of having international standards. This can be explained by a social structure that is not based on the continuity of industrialization-urbanization-democratization. Socio-economic development and democracy will facilitate, if there is participation in the principle being the base of adoption. Local governments can't be considered apart from local people in the context of local services and local democracy. On the one hand, administrative custody, on the other hand, continued to depend on the central government in financial terms. It also prevented the development of local governments as autonomous institutions. In this direction, it is not enough alone to increase the competence of local governments. Democratization of local governments and the need for further increase of civic participation has hardly begun to be accepted.

REFERENCES

- ALİBEYOĞLU, Serdar (2012), "Türk Modernleşmesi", 23.12.2012, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/radikalarti>, (9.05.2015).
- BAŞBAKANLIK TOPLU KONUT İDARESİ (1994), *Türkiye'de Yerel Yönetim Sisteminin Geliştirilmesi*, IULA-EMME Yayını, 2. Baskı, İstanbul, s.87-89.
- BURAN, Hasan (1995), "Yönetim -Yurttaş İlişkileri ve Katılımlı Yönetim", *Kamu Yönetimi Disiplini Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, TODAİE Yayını, Ankara Cilt 1. s.209-224.
- ÇİTÇİ, Oya (1989), *Yerel Yönetimlerde Temsil (Belediye Örneği)*, TODAİE Yayını, Ankara.
- DURDUN, Davut (1998), "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Yerel Yönetim Anlayışı", *İslam Geleneğinden Günümüze Türkiye'de Yönetim Geleneği*, (Ed. Davut Dursun- Hamza Al), İlke Yayınları, İstanbul, s.93-104
- ERYILMAZ, Bilal (1992a), *Osmanlı Devletinde Millet Sistemi*, Ağaç Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- ERYILMAZ, Bilal (1992b), *Tanzimat ve Yönetimde Modernleşme*, İşaret Yayınları, İstanbul.
- ERYILMAZ, Bilal (1995), *Kamu Yönetimi*, Akademi Kitabevi, 2. Baskı, İzmir.
- ERYILMAZ, Bilal (1996), "Küreselleşen Dünyada Kent, İnsan ve Yönetim", *İzlenim*, Haziran, s. 33-34.
- ERYILMAZ, Bilal (1997), *Yerel Yönetimlerin Yeniden Yapılandırılması*, Birleşik Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- FALAY Nihat- Ersin Kalaycıoğlu -Umut Özkırımlı (1996), *Belediyelerin Mali Yönetimi; İktisadi ve Siyasi Bir Çözümleme*, TESEV Yayını, İstanbul.
- GÖKÜŞ, Mehmet (2010), "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndan Modern Türkiye'ye Yöneten-Yönetilen İlişkilerinin Gelişimi", *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Cilt 15, Sayı 3, s. 227-249.
- GÖRMEZ, Kemal (1997), *Yerel Demokrasi ve Türkiye*, Vadi Yayını, Ankara,
- GÖYMEN, Korel (1995), "Türkiye'de Yerel Yönetim", *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, İletişim Yayınları, Cilt 10, İstanbul, s.1798-1824.
- GÖYMEN, Korel (1997), *Türkiye'de Kent Yönetimi*, Boyut Kitapları, İstanbul.
- GÜLER, Birgül Ayman (1992), *Yerel Yönetimler Liberal Açıklamalara Eleştirel Yaklaşım*, TODAİE Yayını Ankara.
- HALAÇOĞLU, Yusuf (1991), *XIV- XVII Yüzyılda Osmanlıda Devlet Teşkilatı ve Sosyal Yapı*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayını, Ankara.
- HANİOĞLU, Şükrü (1998), "Siyasal Temsil Olayının Osmanlı İmparatorluğundaki Yeri", *Türk Siyasal Hayatının Gelişimi, Türkiye'de Politik Değişim ve Modernleşme*, (Ed. Ersin Kalaycıoğlu- Ali Yaşar Sarıbay), Dora Yayınları, Bursa, s. 363-364.

- KALAYCIOĞLU, Ersin -A. Yaşar Sarıbay (1986), “Tanzimat: Modernleşme Arayışı ve Siyasal Değişme”, *Türk Siyasal Hayatının Gelişimi*, (Ed. Ersin Kalaycıoğlu-A.Yaşar Sarıbay), Beta Yayınları, İstanbul, s.9-29.
- KARAMAN, Zerrin Toprak (1992), *Yerel Yönetimler*, Anadolu Yayın, İzmir.
- KARAMAN, Zerrin Toprak (1994), “Kamu Hizmetlerinde Verimliliğin Sağlanmasında Alternatif Kurum Olarak Vakıflar”, *Türk İdare Dergisi*, Yıl 66, Sayı 403, s.54-60.
- KARAMAN, Zerrin Toprak (1995), *Kent Yönetimi ve Politikası*, Anadolu Matbaacılık, İzmir.
- KARAMAN, Zerrin Toprak (1996), *Yerel Yönetimler*, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Yayını, 3. Baskı, İzmir.
- KAYPAK, Şafak (2016), “Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Modernleşmesinin Kadına Bakışı”, *Türk Dünyasında Kadın Algısı*, Cilt I, s.173-188. (Ed. Şayan Ulusan -Kayhan Shurunu), Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Yayını, İsparta
- KAZICI, Ziya (1996), “Osmanlılarda Mahalle İmamaları ve Yerel Yönetim İlişkileri”, *İslam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehir ve Yerel Yönetimler* (Ed. Vecdi Akyüz - Seyfettin Ünlü), İlke Yayınları, İstanbul, s.430-438.
- KELEŞ, Ruşen, (1992), *Yerel Yönetimler ve Siyaset*, Cem Yayınevi, İstanbul
- KELEŞ, Ruşen (1994), “Yerinden Yönetim Sorunumuz”, *Türkiye Günlüğü*, Sayı 26, Ocak-Şubat. s.26–31.
- KELEŞ, Ruşen (1996), *Kentleşme Politikası*, 3. Baskı İmge Yayınevi Ankara.
- KESER, İhsan (1993), *Türkiye’de Siyaset ve Devletçilik*, Gündoğan Yayınları, Ankara.
- KILIÇBAY, Mehmet Ali (1994), “Vatandaşlık Okulu Olarak Yerel Yönetim” *Türkiye Günlüğü*, Sayı 26, Ocak-Şubat, s.19-24.
- KİLİ, Suna (1986), “1876 Anayasası’nın Çağdaşlaşma Sorunları Açısından Değerlendirilmesi”, *Türk Siyasal Hayatının Gelişimi*, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul, s. 89-103.
- KÖKER, Levent (1995), “Local Politics and Democracy in Turkey: An Appraisal”, *American Academy of Politics and Social Sciences*, Iss 540, July s. 51-62.
- MARDİN, Şerif (1992), Türk Modernleşmesi, Makaleler 4, (Der. Mümtazer Türköne-Tuncay Önder), İletişim Yayınları, 2.Baskı, İstanbul.
- OCAK, Ahmet Yaşar (1996), “XIII- XVI. Yüzyıllarda Anadolu Şehirlerinde Dini-Sosyal Hayat”, *Kente Birlikte Yaşamak Üstüne*, (Ed. Ferzan B. Yıldırım) WALD Yayınları İstanbul, s.73-100.
- ORTAYLI, İlber (1974), Tanzimat’tan Sonra Mahalli İdareler, TODAİE Yayını, Ankara.
- ORTAYLI, İlber (1976), “Osmanlı Kadı’sının Taşra Yönetimindeki Rolü Üzerine”, *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, Cilt 9, Sayı 1, Mart s. 95-107.
- ORTAYLI, İlber (1979), *Türk İdare Tarihi*, TODAİE Yayını, Ankara.
- ORTAYLI, İlber (1985), *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyete Yerel Yönetim Geleneği*, Hil Yayınları, İstanbul
- ORTAYLI, İlber (1996), “Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyete Yerel Yönetimler”, *İslam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehir ve Yerel Yönetimler*, (Ed. Vecdi Akyüz- Seyfettin Ünlü), İlke Yayınları, İstanbul Cilt 1. s. 445-466.
- ORTAYLI, İlber (2008), “Tarih Dersleri-Modernleşme”, NTV 30 Nisan 2008.
- ÖKMEN, Mustafa (2002), “Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye’de Kent ve Kentleşme”, *Türkler*, (Ed. Salim Koca- Kemal Çiçek- Hasan Celal Güzel), Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Cilt:17, Ankara, s.505-518.
- ÖZKEÇECİ, Şule B. (2004), “Modernleşme Olgusunun Toplumsal Olarak İçselleştirilmesi (Kayseri Örneği)”, *SDÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, İsparta,
- ÖZGENÇ, Özer (1996), “Osmanlı Şehrinde Esnaf Örgütlerinin Fizik yapıya Etkileri”, *İslam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehir ve Yerel Yönetimler*, (Ed. Vecdi Akyüz - Seyfettin Ünlü), İlke Yayınları, İstanbul. s.407-417.
- SENCER, Muzaffer (1984a), “Tanzimat’a Kadar Osmanlı Yönetim Sistemi”, *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, Cilt 17, Sayı 2, Haziran, s.21-44.
- SENCER, Muzaffer (1984b), “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Tanzimat Sonrası Siyasal ve Yönetimsel Gelişmeler”, *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, Cilt 17, Sayı 3, s.46-74.

- SEZER, Baykan (1998), “Doğu-Batı Ayrımı”, *Doğu-Batı Dergisi*, Sayı 2, Şubat, Mart, Nisan, s. 34-36.
- SOLAKOĞLU, Gönül Budak (1994), “Osmanlı Devlet Örgütünün Weberian Açısından İncelenmesi”, *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, Cilt 27, Sayı 3, s.83-100.
- ŞENTOP, Mustafa (1996), “Osmanlı Yerel Yönetiminde Kadılık”, *İslam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehir ve Yerel Yönetimler*, (Ed. Vecdi Akyüz -Seyfettin Ünlü), İlke Yayınları, İstanbul, s. 283-284.
- TEKELİ, İlhan (1983), “Yerel Yönetimlerde Demokrasi ve Türkiye’de Belediyelerin Gelişimi”, *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, Cilt16, Sayı 2, s.3-22.
- TEKELİ, İlhan (1992a), “Cumhuriyetin 60 yıllık Belediyecilik Deneyimi Üzerine”, *Belediyecilik Yazıları*, IULA-EMME, İstanbul, s. 130-136.
- TEKELİ, İlhan (1992b), “Günümüzde Belediyelerin Konut Girişimleri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”, *Belediyecilik Yazıları*, IULA-EMME Yayını, İstanbul. s. 122-125.
- TEKELİ, İlhan (2002), “Türkiye’de Siyasal Düşüncenin Gelişimi Konusunda Bir Üst Anlatı”, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*, İletişim Yayını, İstanbul, s. 22-24.
- TEKELİ, İlhan - Ortaylı, İlber (1978), *Türkiye’de Belediyeciliğin Evrimi*, Türk İdareciler Derneği, Ankara.
- TURAN, İlter (1986), “Türkiye’de Siyasal Kültürün Oluşumu”, *Türk Siyasal Hayatının Gelişimi*. (Ed. Ersin Kalaycıoğlu -Ali Yaşar Sarıbay), Beta Yayıncılık, İstanbul, s.461- 489.
- TURAN, Kenan (2015), “Türk Modernleşmesinin Kritiği”, 27 Temmuz 2015/, <http://www.reelbulten.com//> (20.10.2015).
- TÜMERKAN, Sıddık (1946), *Türkiye’de Belediyeler, Tarihi Gelişim ve Bugünkü Durum*, İçişleri Bakanlığı Yayını, İstanbul.
- YAKA, Aydın (2010), “Türk Modernleşmesi ile İlgili Sosyolojik Bir Değerlendirme”, *Toplumsal Dinamik*, [http://www.aydinyaka.com/\(13.05.2015\)](http://www.aydinyaka.com/(13.05.2015)).
- YAYLA, Yıldızhan (1984), *Anayasalarımızda Yönetim İlkeleri Tevsi-i Mezuniyet ve Tefrik-i Vezâif*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilimler Fakültesi Yayını, 2. Baskı, İstanbul.