

NATIONALISM IN TÜRKİYE'S 1961 AND 1982 CONSTITUTIONS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

*1961 ve 1982 Anayasalarında Milliyetçilik:
Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analiz*
Ali Çiçek*

Abstract

This study provides a comparative analysis of nationalism as expressed in Türkiye's 1961 and 1982 constitutions. Shaped in different historical and political contexts, these two constitutions reflect the changing nature of Turkish nationalism. Influenced by civilian nationalism, the 1961 Constitution emphasises legal equality and democratic governance and promotes an inclusive concept of national identity. In contrast, the 1982 Constitution represents a more state-centred approach to nationalism, shaped by concerns over national security and territorial integrity following the 1980 military coup. This study analyses key articles in both constitutions, the balance between civic and ethnic nationalism, and the role of secularism and citizenship in shaping national identity. The analysis also highlights different approaches to ethnic diversity and minority rights. In addition, the article explores the influence of military and political authority in shaping nationalism in both periods. Through this comparative framework, the study demonstrates how the concept of nationalism in these two constitutions shaped Türkiye's political landscape and had lasting consequences for contemporary Turkish nationalism. The findings contribute to a better understanding of the complex relationship between nationalism, constitutional law and political authority in Türkiye.

Keywords: Nationalism, Turkish constitutions, civic nationalism, ethnic nationalism, military influence.

Makale Geliş Tarihi: 29.09.2024, Makale Kabul Tarihi: 17.11.2024

Araştırma Makalesi/Künye: ÇİÇEK, Ali, "Nationalism in Türkiye's 1961 and 1982 Constitutions: A Comparative Analysis", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Dergisi (TÜRKAD)*, C. 1, S.2, Aralık 2024, s.79-107.

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Yıldızeli Meslek Yüksekokulu Pazarlama ve Reklamcılık Bölümü, E-posta: alicek@cumhuriyet.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0001-9875-2400.

Özet

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'nin 1961 ve 1982 anayasalarında ifadesini bulan milliyetçiliğin karşılaştırmalı bir analizini sunmaktadır. Farklı tarihsel ve siyasi bağlamlarda şekillenen bu iki anayasa, Türk milliyetçiliğinin değişen doğasını yansıtmaktadır. Sivil milliyetçilikten etkilenen 1961 Anayasası, hukuki eşitlik ve demokratik yönetimi vurgulamakta ve kapsayıcı bir milli kimlik kavramını teşvik etmektedir. Buna karşılık 1982 Anayasası, 1980 askeri darbesinin ardından ulusal güvenlik ve toprak bütünlüğüne ilişkin kaygılarla şekillenen, milliyetçiliğe daha devlet merkezli bir yaklaşımı temsil etmektedir. Bu çalışma her iki anayasadaki kilit maddeleri, sivil ve etnik milliyetçilik arasındaki dengeyi ve ulusal kimliğin şekillenmesinde laiklik ve vatandaşlığın rolünü incelemektedir. Çalışma aynı zamanda etnik çeşitlilik ve azınlık haklarına yönelik farklı yaklaşımların da altını çizmektedir. Bunlara ek olarak, makale her iki dönemde de milliyetçiliğin şekillenmesinde askeri ve siyasi otoritenin etkisini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu karşılaştırmalı çerçeve aracılığıyla çalışma, bu iki anayasadaki milliyetçilik kavramının Türkiye'nin siyasi manzarasını nasıl şekillendirdiğini ve günümüz Türk milliyetçiliği için kalıcı sonuçlar doğurduğunu göstermektedir. Bulgular, Türkiye'de milliyetçilik, anayasa hukuku ve siyasi otorite arasındaki karmaşık ilişkinin daha iyi anlaşılmasına katkıda bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Milliyetçilik, Türk anayasaları, sivil milliyetçilik, etnik milliyetçilik, askeri etki.

Introduction

Nationalism, which is a fundamental principle in the organisation and administrative activities of modern states, plays an important role in shaping constitutional frameworks, especially in societies that have undergone deep transformations in their political and social structures.¹ As the supreme legal documents of a country, constitutions generally guarantee the values, ideologies and principles that define the state's relationship with its citizens and, more broadly, its national identity.² In the Turkish context, nationalism has been one of the fundamental principles of the nation-building process, especially since the foundation of the Republic in 1923. As a guiding ideology, nationalism not only

¹ Ali Çiçek, "Milliyetçilik Kuramları", içinde *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği* (Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi, 2024), s. 5.

² İbrahim Ö. Kaboğlu, *Anayasa Hukuku Dersleri*, 6. Baskı (İstanbul: Legal Kitabevi, 2010), s. 65.

underlines the unity and sovereignty of the state, but also defines the parameters of citizenship, loyalty and national culture.³ Türkiye's constitutions, particularly the 1961 and 1982 constitutions, provide a unique lens through which the evolution of Turkish nationalism can be observed and understood.

The 1961 and 1982 constitutions were both drafted during periods of significant political turmoil in Türkiye, and each reflects the specific socio-political needs and aspirations of their respective eras. While both constitutions aim to consolidate the national identity of the Turkish state, their approaches to nationalism reveal significant differences in emphasis and interpretation. The 1961 Constitution emerged in the aftermath of the 1960 military coup, at a time when the Republic of Türkiye sought to reaffirm its democratic identity while preserving the integrity of the state.⁴ In this context, nationalism is largely civic in character, emphasising the unity of the Turkish people, secularism and the protection of democratic institutions. The 1961 Constitution is a progressive constitution for its time, seeking to strike a balance between individual freedoms and the state's duty to protect national unity, but always placing the nation-state at the center of its legal and ideological framework.⁵ In contrast, the 1982 Constitution, drafted following the 1980 military coup, was a response to a period of intense political instability and violent social conflict. The drafters of this constitution sought to create a more centralized and controlled framework in which nationalism was more explicitly state-centered and security-oriented. Whereas the 1961 Constitution prioritised democratic pluralism within a united nation, the 1982 Constitution emphasised the indivisibility of the state and national unity above all else. In the 1982 Constitution, nationalism took on a more defensive stance, reflecting concerns about internal divisions and external threats and positioning the state as the ultimate protector of the nation's integrity.

³ Tunca Özgişi, “Milliyetçilik ve Vatandaşlık Olgusunun Türk Anayasalarına Yansıması”, *Türkoloji Kültürü Dergisi* 2, sy 4 (2009), s. 98.

⁴ Yılmaz Aliefendioğlu, “T.C. Anayasalarında Devlet Anlayışı”, *Amme İdaresi Dergisi* 26, sy 2 (1993), s. 14.

⁵ Abdulvahap Akıncı, “Türkiye'nin Darbe Geleneği: 1960 ve 1971 Müdahaleleri”, *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi* 9, sy 1 (02 Kasım 2014), s. 62.

The Turkish nation, as conceptualised in both constitutions, is not merely a community of individuals living within the territorial boundaries of the state. Rather, it is a political and cultural entity bound together by common history, language and values, all of which are based on the concept of Turkishness. This concept of Turkish identity is deeply intertwined with the principles of secularism and republicanism, which have historically been seen as the core components of Turkish nationalism. While both the 1961 and 1982 constitutions reflect this understanding, there are differences in the ways in which they promote and protect it. Emphasising democratic governance, the 1961 Constitution sought to foster a sense of national unity through the participation of all citizens in the political process. On the other hand, responding to an environment of division and strife, the 1982 Constitution adopted a more prescriptive approach and used nationalism as a tool to ensure social cohesion and political stability.

In both constitutions, the concept of nationalism serves as a bridge between state authority and the collective identity of the people. However, while nationalism is universally present as a guiding principle, the way in which it is expressed and implemented differs significantly. The 1961 Constitution's expression of nationalism is more inclusive and aims to create a coherent national identity through democratic participation and the guarantee of fundamental rights. This approach reflects the broader post-World War II international consensus in which the protection of human rights and democratic freedoms is seen as an integral part of national power. In this context, nationalism is not only about protecting the state, but also about empowering citizens as the embodiment of the will of the nation. In contrast, the nationalism of the 1982 Constitution, while still based on the principles of unity and territorial integrity, has taken on a more authoritarian character. In response to the perceived failures of the democratic experiment of the 1970s, the drafters of the 1982 Constitution placed greater emphasis on the role of the state as the protector of national identity. This shift towards a more state-centred nationalism was not a rejection of the idea of Turkish unity, but rather a re-emphasis on the state's right to define and protect this unity in the face of internal and external threats.

The aim of this study is to examine the nuances of nationalism as expressed in Türkiye's 1961 and 1982 constitutions, focusing on how each document reflects the socio-political context of its time. By examining the key provisions on nationalism in both constitutions, the study will analyse the ways in which nationalism is used as a tool for state-building. It will also consider the broader implications of these constitutional frameworks for understanding the role of nationalism in modern Turkish political thought. The study will argue that while both constitutions are based on a nationalist ideology, they represent different visions of how nationalism should be expressed and implemented within the Turkish state. The scope of the study is limited to the constitutional texts themselves, as well as the political and historical conditions surrounding their drafting. In other words, the study will not attempt to provide a comprehensive history of Turkish nationalism, but rather will focus on how nationalism is embedded in the legal and institutional structures of the Turkish state. In doing so, it aims to contribute to the academic understanding of how constitutions serve as a vehicle for the expression of nationalist ideologies, especially in states with a strong tradition of state-centred nationalism such as Türkiye. In conclusion, the notion of nationalism in Türkiye's 1961 and 1982 constitutions offers a rich field of study for understanding the evolving relationship between the state and its citizens. Both constitutions reflect the enduring importance of national unity in the Turkish political imagination, but they do so by being shaped by the particular challenges and aspirations of their respective periods. By comparing the nationalist discourses in these two constitutions, the study will attempt to shed light on the dynamic and often controversial nature of nationalism in Turkish constitutional history and its continuing relevance in contemporary Turkish politics.

1. Nationalism in the 1961 Constitution

The 1961 Constitution of Türkiye stands as an important document in the political and legal history of the Republic, embodying a renewed approach to governance and statehood following the turbulent events that led to the establishment of the Republic. Nationalism, which has been one of the fundamental elements of the ideological framework of the Turkish state since its foundation, also occupies an important place in this constitution. However, the version of nationalism expressed in the 1961

Constitution reflects the changing political and social dynamics of Türkiye in the early 1960s, in particular the desire to balance the nationalist imperatives of the state with the emerging demands for democracy, pluralism and social justice. This chapter will examine how nationalism was conceived, structured and balanced in the 1961 Constitution, highlighting the socio-political conditions that led to its drafting, the key constitutional articles that embody nationalism, and the important roles of secularism, citizenship and national identity, as well as the careful balance it sought to maintain between civic and ethnic nationalism.

The 1961 Constitution was in many ways a direct response to the authoritarian tendencies that had emerged under the Democratic Party (DP) government in the late 1950s.⁶ The increasing suppression of political opposition, the erosion of civil liberties and the concentration of power under Prime Minister Adnan Menderes led to widespread dissatisfaction, especially among the military and intellectual elite.⁷ Initially a response to this crisis, the military coup of 27 May 1960 was also a manifestation of the traditional role of the military as the guardian of the Republic and the Kemalist nationalist ideals on which it was founded.⁸ The coup d'état, which was legitimised in the name of protecting national unity and democracy, eventually led to the drafting of the 1961 Constitution, which aimed to institutionalise a more pluralistic and democratic form of government while preserving the principles of Turkish nationalism.

During the drafting process of the 1961 Constitution, nationalism was at the centre of intense debates. In this process, those who defended the concept of 'national state' emphasised that nationalism was an ambiguous and multi-meaningful concept. For example, the National Socialist regime in Germany and the Fascist regimes in Italy also defined themselves as nationalist. For this reason, serious differences of opinion have emerged on the content of nationalism. As a result of the discussions,

⁶ Tanel Demirel, *Türkiye'nin Uzun On Yılı Demokrat Parti İktidarı ve 27 Mayıs Darbesi* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2021), s. 250.

⁷ Feroz Ahmad, *Demokrasi Sürecinde Türkiye (1645-1980)* (İstanbul: Hil Yayınları, 1994), s. 86-90.

⁸ Orhan Aldıkaçtı, *Anayasa Hukukumuzun Gelişmesi ve 1961 Anayasası* (İstanbul: Bahar Matbaası, 1964), s. 19; Mustafa Erdoğan, *Anayasa Hukuku*, 8. Baskı (Ankara: Orion Kitabevi, 2014), s. 160.

a compromise was adopted and it was decided to include the concept of 'national state' in Article 2 of the 1961 Constitution. In addition, it was deemed appropriate to include a comprehensive and detailed definition of Turkish nationalism in the Preamble of the Constitution. In this way, it has been tried to prevent the principle of nationalism from being interpreted and misunderstood in different ways.⁹

On the other hand, in drafting the 1961 Constitution, the Constituent Assembly was tasked with addressing the political fragmentation and instability of the previous decade, while reaffirming the nationalist principles that had been at the centre of the Turkish Republic since its foundation¹⁰. In the Turkish context, nationalism has always been intertwined with Kemalist reforms, particularly the emphasis on secularism, modernity and the creation of a homogenous national identity. However, the 1961 Constitution introduced a more nuanced version of nationalism that aimed to bring together a wider range of political voices while ensuring that the integrity and sovereignty of the state was not compromised.¹¹

This new constitutional framework reflected the ongoing evolution of Turkish nationalism, blending civic and ethnic elements to create a more inclusive national identity that could accommodate Türkiye's growing social and political diversity.

Key articles of the 1961 Constitution express this renewed vision of nationalism. Article 1 declared that Türkiye was a 'Republic', a term that was more than a political classification but an affirmation of the values of national unity, sovereignty and independence that had been central to the Turkish nationalist movement since the War of Independence. This was further strengthened by Article 2, which defines the state as 'a national, democratic, secular and social state of law'. These principles, especially the emphasis on secularism and democracy, were seen as

⁹ Ergun Özbudun, *Türk Anayasa Hukuku* (Ankara: Yetkin Yayınları, 1998), 52; Hasan Tunç ve Faruk Bilir, "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Anayasalarımızda Milliyetçilik Anlayışı ve Atatürk Milliyetçiliği", *Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 2, sy 2 (01 Haziran 1998), s. 3.

¹⁰ Erdoğan, *Anayasa Hukuku*, s. 159-69.

¹¹ Bülent Tanör, *İki Anayasa 1961-1982*, 3. Baskı (İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım, 1994), s. 16-17.

fundamental to preserving the integrity of the Turkish nation and ensuring that the state remained the ultimate guardian of national identity. The inclusion of the word ‘national’ in this article emphasised the indivisibility of the Turkish nation, reaffirming that the state and the nation were inextricably linked in the constitutional order. The 1961 Constitution also introduced provisions emphasising the importance of civic participation and social justice as components of Turkish nationalism. For example, Article 3 states that sovereignty belongs unconditionally to the nation, a clear reflection of civic nationalism in which the Turkish people, regardless of their ethnic or cultural origins, are seen as the true owners of political power. This principle is further elaborated in Article 4, which establishes the supremacy of the constitution and the rule of law, ensuring that all citizens are equal before the law and that the nationalist agenda of the state is pursued within the limits of democratic governance. Emphasising the role of the people in the governance of the state, the 1961 Constitution adopted a version of nationalism defined not only by ethnicity or cultural homogeneity, but by a shared commitment to the ideals of the Republic.

Although civic nationalism was the central theme of the 1961 Constitution, ethnic nationalism was not completely absent. The Constitution continued to favour the concept of ‘Turkishness’ as the defining feature of national identity. Article 5, which set out the duties of the state, included the protection of the independence and integrity of the Turkish state as well as the indivisibility of the Turkish nation with its territory and nation. This article reinforced the idea that the Turkish nation was a singular entity bound together by a common language, culture and history. However, unlike earlier formulations of Turkish nationalism, the 1961 Constitution did not impose a strict cultural or linguistic uniformity; instead, it allowed for the possibility of a more inclusive nationalism in which ethnic minorities could participate in the civic life of the nation while adhering to the broader nationalist framework. The balance between civic and ethnic nationalism was carefully calibrated in the 1961 Constitution both to preserve national unity and to promote individual freedoms. The drafters recognised the need to preserve the integrity of the Turkish state while meeting growing demands for political pluralism and social justice. This balancing act is evident in the constitution's emphasis

on secularism, which serves as a unifying principle transcending ethnic and religious differences. Maintaining a strict separation between religion and state, the 1961 Constitution aimed to create a national identity based on shared civic values rather than religious or ethnic affiliations. Therefore, secularism was presented not only as a political principle but also as a key component of the nationalist ideology enshrined in the constitution.

Citizenship, as defined in the 1961 Constitution, was another critical aspect of nationalism during this period. Article 6 states that all citizens of Türkiye, regardless of their ethnic or religious origin, are equal before the law and have all the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. This provision reflects the constitution's commitment to civic nationalism, in which the bonds of national identity are based on legal and political equality rather than ethnic homogeneity¹². Emphasising the importance of citizenship as a unifying element, the 1961 Constitution sought to develop a sense of national belonging that transcended ethnic divisions and to reinforce the idea of a unified Turkish nation. Therefore, national identity as expressed in the 1961 Constitution was a complex and multifaceted concept. On the one hand, it was based on the ethnic and cultural heritage of the Turkish people, as reflected in the emphasis on Turkishness and the preservation of national unity. On the other hand, it was also defined by civic principles such as democracy, secularism and social justice, which allowed for a more inclusive and pluralistic understanding of national identity. This duality is perhaps the most distinctive feature of nationalism in the 1961 Constitution and reflects the changing social and political realities of Türkiye in the early 1960s.

The role of the state in promoting and protecting national identity is also one of the main themes of the 1961 Constitution. The Constitution vested the state with significant powers to protect national unity and pursue the interests of the nation. For example, Article 7 vests executive power in the President and the Council of Ministers, who are charged with protecting the integrity of the state and the welfare of the nation. This

¹² Fatma Nalbant, "Türkiye'de vatandaşlık anlayışının gelişimi", *III. Türkiye Lisansüstü Çalışmaları Kongresi*, 2014, s. 89, https://www.academia.edu/download/40738817/Turkiyede_Vatandaslik_Anlayisinin_Gelisimi.pdf.

concentration of executive power, though tempered by democratic principles enshrined in the constitution, reflected the continuing importance of a strong state in the nationalist ideology of the time. The state was seen as the ultimate guarantor of national identity and unity and its authority was legitimised by its role as the protector of the nation. Moreover, the emphasis on social justice in the 1961 Constitution reflects a broader conception of nationalism that encompasses not only the preservation of national unity but also the promotion of the welfare of the Turkish people. Article 8, which summarises the economic and social duties of the state, emphasised that the state must ensure the social and economic welfare of its citizens. This provision reflects a nationalist ideology concerned not only with the protection of the state but also with the welfare of the nation as a whole. By promoting social justice and economic development, the 1961 Constitution aimed to create a more cohesive and prosperous nation, united not only by a common national identity but also by a commitment to the common good.

In conclusion, the 1961 Constitution represents a critical moment in the evolution of Turkish nationalism. While it retained many core elements of the Kemalist nationalist project, notably the emphasis on secularism and the preservation of national unity, it also introduced new elements reflecting the changing political and social dynamics of Türkiye in the early 1960s. The Constitution's blend of civic and ethnic nationalism, its emphasis on secularism and citizenship, and its commitment to social justice and democratic governance reflect a more inclusive and pluralistic vision of Turkish nationalism. At the same time, by reaffirming the central role of the state in the development and protection of national identity, the 1961 Constitution ensured that nationalism would remain a key element of Turkish political life for decades to come.

2. Nationalism in the 1982 Constitution

The 1982 Constitution is the product of a turbulent and transformative period in Turkish political history. The Constitution emerged in the aftermath of the 1980 military coup, itself a reaction to the period of intense political fragmentation, social unrest and violent conflict

that gripped the country in the 1970s.¹³ This context is essential for understanding the ideological and legal framework of the 1982 Constitution, particularly its emphasis on nationalism. Nationalism as conceived in this constitution is deeply intertwined with concerns for national unity, security and state stability. It reflects a shift away from the more pluralistic and democratic tendencies¹⁴ that characterised the 1961 Constitution towards a more centralised and state-centred form of nationalism that prioritises protecting the sovereignty, integrity and security of the nation. This section will examine the historical context that led to the drafting of the 1982 Constitution, analyse its main provisions emphasising nationalism, and discuss the role of national security and unity as the pillars of the nationalist framework in the document.

The political and social conditions leading to the 1982 Constitution were marked by serious instability. In the late 1970s, Türkiye was engulfed in political violence, with clashes between left and right groups, labour strikes and increasing polarisation within society. The failure of successive civilian governments to overcome these challenges led to a growing sense of crisis among both the political elite and the military.¹⁵ By 1980, the Turkish Armed Forces, traditionally seen as the guardian of the fundamental principles of the Republic, including nationalism, stepped in to restore order. The military's intervention was legitimised on the grounds of protecting national unity and preventing the collapse of the state, grounds steeped in nationalist rhetoric. During this period, the military saw itself as the guardian of the Kemalist vision of the nation, which emphasised a strong, centralised state, secularism and the indivisibility of the Turkish nation. The coup leaders believed that the existing political framework had failed to protect these fundamental pillars of the state and that a new constitutional framework was needed to re-emphasise the primacy of national unity and security. As a matter of fact, the preamble

¹³ Erik Jan Zürcher, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*, çev. Yasemin Gönen, 7. Baskı (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2020), s. 407-9.

¹⁴ Davut Dursun, *Türkiye'nin Siyasal Hayatı* (İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım, 2018), s. 143.

¹⁵ Halis Çetin, *Türk Siyasal Hayatı - V Vesayet Gölgesinde Siyaset 1960-1980* (Ankara: Orion Kitabevi Akademik Kitaplar, 2016).

of the 1982 Constitution contains frequent references to this emphasis. Paragraph 2 of the Preamble of the Constitution reads as follows¹⁶:

“No thought or consideration shall be protected against Turkish national interests, the principle of the indivisibility of Turkish existence with its State and country, the historical and spiritual values of Turkishness, Atatürk's nationalism, principles and reforms and civilisation, and as required by the principle of secularism, sacred religious feelings shall not be mixed with state affairs and politics;

That every Turkish citizen has the inherent right and authority to lead an honourable life within the national culture, civilisation and legal order and to develop his material and spiritual existence in this direction by enjoying the fundamental rights and freedoms in this Constitution in accordance with the requirements of equality and social justice;

That collectively Turkish citizens are partners in national pride and honour, national joys and sorrows, rights and duties towards the national entity, blessings and burdens, and in all manifestations of national life; that they have the right to demand a peaceful life with absolute respect for each other's rights and freedoms, with sincere feelings of mutual love and brotherhood, and with the desire and belief in ‘peace at home, peace in the world’...”

Referring to the above statements, Gözler¹⁷ states that the nationalism adopted in the 1982 Constitution corresponds to the Renanian conception of the nation, even though it is defined as Atatürk's nationalism. Renan's conception of nationalism is based on the idea that the nation is a spiritual consciousness or spirit. This spiritual consciousness or spirit is based on having a common past, living together in the present and having a unity of ideals in the future¹⁸. In other words, in Atatürk's nationalism, Renanian nationalism or the nationalism

¹⁶ Tarhan Erdem, *Anayasalar ve Belgeler 1876-2012* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2012), s. 293.

¹⁷ Kemal Gözler, *Türk Anayasa Hukuku Dersleri*, 23. Baskı (Bursa: Ekin Yayınları, 2019), s. 59.

¹⁸ Gözler, 58; Özbudun, *Türk Anayasa Hukuku*, 59; Ernest Renan, *What Is a Nation? And Other Political Writings* (Columbia University Press, 2018).

perspective of the 1982 Constitution, the nation is not expressed in terms of biological identity, and a race-based perspective is not included. The 1982 Constitution's nationalist emphasis in the preamble refers to national unity in this sense. The erosion of national unity can be interpreted as a breach of security. However, the nation and its representatives were excluded in the constitution-making process, thus the 1982 Constitution was a constitution ordered by the junta acting on behalf of the state, not the nation. Therefore, even though the constitution is based on the principles of Renan nationalism, in essence, it assimilated a state-oriented nationalism, not Turkish nationalism. On the other hand, Erdoğan¹⁹ states that the preamble of the Constitution referred to above was written with a 'nationalist-corporatist' philosophy. According to him, this philosophy is incompatible with liberal-pluralism and although it does not base the nation on the same ethnicity, it functions to homogenise the nation under the name of national unity and solidarity. Erdoğan has negatively characterised the 1982 Constitution's view of the nation as a homogeneous entity, even though the 1982 Constitution sees the nation as a whole and expresses it within this unity in legal terms. However, the perspectives of nationalism in the Turkish constitutions are based on the idea that each member of the Turkish nation is an equal citizen and therefore each member of the nation is homogenous in terms of rights.

The drafting of the 1982 Constitution was undertaken by a Constituent Assembly, which operated under the supervision of the military leadership. This assembly was tasked with creating a new legal framework that would address the perceived failures of the previous system, in particular the political fragmentation and social divisions that had contributed to the instability of the 1970s²⁰. Nationalism, as a guiding principle, was at the centre of this endeavour. The Constitution was designed to create a stronger and more centralised state apparatus capable of maintaining order and ensuring the continuity of the nation. This shift in focus is evident in the way nationalism is expressed throughout the document, with an emphasis on the protection of the state, the preservation of national unity and the importance of national security. Key provisions

¹⁹ Erdoğan, *Anayasa Hukuku*, s. 176.

²⁰ Şenol Durgun, *Turkish Political Life* (Ankara: A Kitap, 2014), s. 98.

in the 1982 Constitution reflect this high importance attached to nationalism. Article 2 of the Constitution defines the Republic of Türkiye as a ‘democratic, secular and social state of law’, but also emphasises that it is a state ‘committed to Atatürk's nationalism’. This direct reference to Atatürk's nationalist principles underlines the centrality of Kemalist nationalism in the new constitutional framework. Atatürk's nationalism, based on the idea of a united, sovereign and secular Turkish nation, serves as the ideological foundation on which the 1982 Constitution is built. This article sets out the state's obligation to protect and promote national identity and frames nationalism as a fundamental element of state legitimacy.

In addition to Article 2, other provisions of the 1982 Constitution clearly emphasise the importance of national unity and territorial integrity. Article 3 declares that the Turkish state is indivisible with its territory and nation and stipulates that Turkish is the official language of the state. This article reflects the nationalist imperative to maintain a homogenous national identity around Turkish language and culture. At the same time, it emphasises the role of the state as the ultimate guardian of national unity and does not discuss ethnic or linguistic differences within the nation. Instead, it focusses on seeing the nation as a whole and glorifying this unity through similarities rather than differences. The emphasis on territorial integrity in this article is particularly important as it reflects concerns about separatist movements and internal divisions that could threaten the unity of the state. By enshrining these principles in the constitution, the drafters sought to create a legal framework that would prevent the fragmentation of the nation and maintain the dominance of Turkish identity. The 1982 Constitution's focus on nationalism is also reflected in its provisions on citizenship and political participation. Article 66 broadly defines Turkish citizenship by stating that ‘Everyone who is bound to the Turkish state by the bond of citizenship is a Turk’. This definition reflects the constitution's commitment to a unitary conception of national identity in which citizenship is equated with Turkishness. It reinforces the idea that all citizens, regardless of their ethnic or cultural

background, are part of a single and united Turkish nation²¹. This formulation reflects a constitutional nationalism that is state-centred but does not include ethnic elements, which forms the basis of the 1982 Constitution.

One of the most significant changes in the 1982 Constitution compared to its 1961 predecessor is the shift towards a more centralised and state-centred form of nationalism. This shift is largely a response to the political fragmentation and instability of the previous decade, which military and political elites believed had weakened the state and undermined national unity.²² The constitution grants significant powers to the executive, particularly the presidency, to ensure that the state has the capacity to maintain order and protect national interests. The president is given broad powers in matters of national security and the constitution establishes a National Security Council to advise the government on matters related to the protection of national unity and the defence of the state. This institutional framework reflects a nationalist vision in which the state is seen as the primary protector of the nation and the protection of national security is considered paramount. National security is one of the main themes of the 1982 Constitution and is closely linked to the concept of nationalism. The Constitution reflects a deep concern about internal and external threats to the state and establishes mechanisms to enable the state to respond effectively to these threats. Article 5 outlines the fundamental duties of the State, including the preservation of national independence and territorial integrity, the protection of the Republic and the provision of national security. These duties are framed within a nationalist discourse emphasising the indivisibility of the nation and the importance of maintaining a strong, united state. The inclusion of national security as a constitutional duty reflects the belief that the state should have the authority to protect the nation from any force that could harm its unity or sovereignty.

The 1982 Constitution also contains provisions limiting certain political freedoms in the name of national security and unity. While the

²¹ E. Semih Yalçın, “Türk Anayasa Metinlerinde Vatandaşlık Meselesi”, *Düşünce Dünyasında Türkiz* 1, sy 6 (25 Kasım 2022), s. 301.

²² Kemal H. Karpat, *Türk Siyasi Tarihi Siyasal Sistemin Evrimi* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2020), s. 278.

Constitution guarantees fundamental rights and freedoms, it also allows for the restriction of these rights in cases where national security, public order or the integrity of the state is at stake. This reflects a logic that places the protection of the state and the nation above individual freedoms. The drafters of the constitution believed that the instability and violence of the 1970s was caused by excessive political freedom and inadequate state control, and sought to remedy this by giving the state greater powers to regulate political activity. This shift towards a more controlled and orderly political environment is consistent with the broader nationalist framework of the 1982 Constitution, which emphasises the central role of the state in ensuring national unity and security. The emphasis on national security is also reflected in the 1982 Constitution's treatment of political parties and associations. Article 68 authorises the establishment of political parties but places strict limits on their activities. Political parties are prohibited from engaging in activities that violate the principles of the indivisibility of the state and the nation or threaten national security. This reflects the nationalist imperative to ensure that political activities do not undermine the unity of the state or the integrity of the nation. The Constitution further reinforces the role of the state as protector of national unity by establishing mechanisms for the dissolution of political parties that violate these principles²³. Through these restrictions on political parties, the 1982 Constitution aims to prevent the fragmentation of the political system and the emergence of movements that might challenge the nationalist foundations of the state.

The role of the military in the 1982 Constitution is another important aspect of the state-centred nationalism that characterises this constitution. The military is explicitly mandated to protect the unity and integrity of the nation and is given considerable autonomy in matters of national security. The National Security Council, composed of high-ranking military officials, plays an important role in advising the government on security matters and ensuring that the state remains vigilant in the face of internal and external threats. The prominence of the military in the constitutional framework reflects the belief that the armed forces are

²³ Hüseyin Özcan ve Murat Yanık, *Siyasi Partiler Hukuku*, 2. Baskı (İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 2011), s. 145.

the ultimate guarantor of national unity and security, which stems from the historical role of the military in the establishment and preservation of the Turkish Republic. This militarised form of nationalism, which emphasises the importance of a strong and vigilant state, can be interpreted as a defining feature of the 1982 Constitution.

In sum, nationalism in the 1982 Constitution represents a significant shift towards a more centralised and state-centred form of nationalism that prioritises the protection of national unity, security and the integrity of the state. The Constitution was drafted in response to a period of intense political instability and violence and its provisions reflect a deep concern to maintain order and protect the nation from internal and external threats. Key articles in the Constitution emphasise the indivisibility of the state and the nation, the central role of Turkishness in defining national identity and the importance of national security as a constitutional duty. This version of nationalism, while rooted in the Kemalist tradition, represents a more authoritarian and security-oriented approach in which the state is seen as the primary protector of the nation and individual freedoms are subordinated to the needs of national unity. In this sense, the 1982 Constitution can be understood as an attempt to reassert the primacy of the state in the nationalist project and to ensure the continued dominance of a unified Turkish national identity. On the other hand, the lack of a participatory approach in the drafting process of the 1982 Constitution and the closure of political parties and associations preventing them from contributing to this constitution reveal that although this constitution includes nationalist provisions, it was drafted with an understanding detached from the nation. This constitution, which emphasised Atatürk's nationalism or Turkish nationalism, did not derive its strength from the Turkish nation under the conditions of the coup d'état, and thus, instead of a Turkish nation-oriented nationalism, it revealed a state-oriented understanding of nationalism.

3. Comparative Analysis of Nationalism in Both Constitutions

Türkiye's 1961 and 1982 Constitutions present two different manifestations of nationalism, reflecting the different political, social and historical contexts in which they were created. Nationalism, as a driving force, serves as a central theme in both constitutions; however, its expression, emphasis and underlying philosophy exhibit significant

evolution over time. A comparative analysis of nationalism in these two constitutions reveals not only the transformation in Türkiye's approach to national identity and unity, but also the increasing role of state control, military influence and national security concerns in shaping the constitutional framework.

The first important difference between the two constitutions is the way national identity and unity are expressed. The 1961 Constitution, drafted in the aftermath of the 1960 military coup, claimed a period of political and social détente²⁴. The expression of national identity was based on a civic model of nationalism in which citizenship and national belonging were based on legal and political inclusiveness rather than ethnic or cultural homogeneity. The focus was on creating a more democratic, pluralistic society in which national unity was promoted through civic participation and legal equality. The Constitution emphasised the importance of fundamental rights and freedoms, aiming to strike a balance between state authority and individual freedoms.²⁵ This vision of nationalism, rooted in civic values, was designed to promote a sense of belonging among all citizens, regardless of ethnic or religious origin. In contrast, the 1982 Constitution, following the 1980 military coup, represents a shift towards a more state-centred and security-oriented form of nationalism. The political instability and violence of the 1970s, combined with the perceived failures of the 1961 constitutional order, led to a re-emphasis on the role of the state as the ultimate guardian of national unity and security. The 1982 Constitution reflects a more centralised and authoritarian approach to nationalism, focusing on the preservation of territorial integrity, the protection of national security and the promotion of a homogenous national identity. The concept of national unity in this constitution is closely linked to the preservation of the Turkish state and leaves little room for ethnic, cultural or religious diversity. The shift from a civic model of nationalism to a more exclusionary model of nationalism marks one of the main differences between the two constitutional frameworks.

²⁴ Bilal Tunç ve Bilal Akarçay, "12 Mart Muhtırası Sonrası 1961 Anayasası'nda Yapılan Değişiklikler Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi* 11, sy 3 (2022), s. 1550.

²⁵ Ersan Şen, "Yeni Anayasaya Doğru", *Ankara Barosu Dergisi*, sy 1 (2013), s. 359.

The evolution of nationalism from a civic model in 1961 to a stronger model of state control in 1982 is evident in the respective constitutions' treatment of national identity. The 1961 Constitution, while based on the principles of Kemalism, allowed for a more flexible interpretation of nationalism. It emphasised the role of citizenship and legal equality as the basis of national identity, thus promoting a more inclusive vision of the Turkish nation. The preamble of the 1961 Constitution reflected this civic spirit, stating that the Turkish nation was based on 'love of homeland' and 'the principles of democracy, secularism and the rule of law'. This conception of nationalism, although based on the founding ideology of the Republic of Türkiye, was more adaptable to a multi-ethnic and diverse society. On the other hand, the 1982 Constitution adopted a more rigid and state-centred approach to nationalism. The emphasis on national security, territorial integrity and the indivisibility of the state reflects concern about internal and external threats to the unity of the nation. The drafters of the 1982 Constitution, which was shaped by the instability of the 1970s, considered strong state control necessary for the protection of the Turkish nation. In this constitution, national identity is closely linked to the concept of 'Turkishness' and Article 66 defines every citizen as a Turk, regardless of ethnic or cultural differences. This definition reveals a truly civilian understanding of nationality. In this respect, both constitutions were drafted with a civilian understanding of nationalism, but the 1982 Constitution has a more security-based nationalist tone than the 1961 Constitution.²⁶

The treatment of ethnic diversity and minority rights emphasizes that the two constitutions do not have substantively different approaches to nationalism, but differ only in secondary respects. This is because both constitutions were drafted in an effort to define the Turkish nation from a holistic perspective rather than ethnic diversity and minority rights. The 1961 Constitution, while not explicitly recognising ethnic minorities, provided greater legal protection for individual rights and freedoms, which can be interpreted as providing a degree of protection for cultural

²⁶ Taha Parla, *Türkiye'de Anayasalar*, 3. Baskı (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), s. 35.

diversity.²⁷ Its commitment to the rule of law, human rights and democratic governance has created a space for ethnic and religious minorities to defend their identities, albeit indirectly. However, the constitution did not explicitly address the rights of minority groups and the concept of ‘Turkishness’ remained a central element of national identity. However, the 1982 Constitution did not include a provision on ethnic and religious minorities. The fact that both constitutions do not mention ethnic and religious minorities is due to the fact that they consider all citizens within the country as equal to each other and insist on preventing any group from having privileges. This seems to be in line with both the founding philosophy of the Republic of Turkey and the basic principles of Turkish nationalism. Article 3 of the 1982 Constitution asserts the indivisibility of the Turkish state and territory and states that Turkish is the official language of the state. This article draws attention to the fact that the 1982 Constitution unites all ethnic or religious differences within the country under the umbrella of Turkishness, but that “Turkishness” here does not include an ethnic or racial expression. Therefore, the 1982 Constitution does not have a positive perspective on the rights of ethnic and religious minorities that are fed by differences instead of the nation. The Constitution also prohibits the establishment of political parties based on ethnic or religious differences, further entrenching state control over expressions of diversity. This reflects a nationalist vision that prioritises the unity and homogeneity of the nation over the recognition of ethnic pluralism.

The role of secularism in both constitutions reflects different approaches to nationalism. The 1961 Constitution adopted secularism as one of the fundamental principles of the state, but did so in a more liberal context, a context in which secularism was seen as a way of protecting individual freedoms and promoting equality between citizens of different religious backgrounds. Secularism in the 1961 Constitution was linked to a broader project of civic nationalism in which the state was expected to remain neutral in matters of religion and allowed for greater religious diversity within the framework of national unity. In contrast, the 1982

²⁷ Bülent Tanör ve Necmi Yüzbaşıoğlu, *1982 Anayasasına Göre Türk Anayasa Hukuku* (İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım, 2023), s. 30.

Constitution strengthened secularism in a more authoritarian manner, linking it to the protection of national security and state integrity. The military coup in 1980 was partly legitimised on the grounds that political Islam and religious extremism threatened the secular nature of the state and thus the unity of the nation. The 1982 Constitution thus framed secularism as an instrument to protect national integrity rather than as a means to promote individual freedoms.²⁸ This approach to secularism, combined with the emphasis on a homogenous national identity, reflects the more state-centred and security-oriented nationalism of the 1982 Constitution.

In both constitutions, the influence of the military on nationalism cannot be ignored. In the 1961 Constitution, the military played an important role in restoring order after the 1960 coup, but the constitution itself took a more moderate approach to the military's intervention in politics. While the military retained its status as the protector of the Republic, the 1961 Constitution placed greater emphasis on civilian-democratic governance and the protection of individual rights.²⁹ The National Security Council established under this constitution was an advisory body with limited influence on political decision-making processes. In contrast, the 1982 Constitution greatly expanded the role of the military in shaping national policy. The National Security Council was granted significant powers and its decisions were made binding, elevating the military to a position of direct influence over the civilian government. This change reflects the more authoritarian and security-oriented nationalism of the 1982 Constitution, in which the military is seen as the ultimate defender of national unity and security.³⁰ The constitution also grants the military broad powers to intervene in political affairs, especially when national security is deemed to be at risk. This militarisation of

²⁸ Arslan, "Adil Yargılanma Güvencesi Olarak Silahların Eşitliği İlkesi", 2022, https://anayasa.gov.tr/tr/baskan/eski-baskanlarin-konusmaları/zuhtu-arslan/konusmalar/adil-yargılanma-guvencesi-olarak-silahların-esitligi-ilkesi/#_ftn9.

²⁹ Sinem Birol, "1961 Anayasası'nda İfade Özgürlüğü", *İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi* | *Istanbul University Faculty of Communication Journal*, sy 43 (2012), s. 43.

³⁰ Ayşegül Kars Kaynar, "Making of military tutelage in Turkey: the National Security Council in the 1961 and 1982 Constitutions", *Turkish Studies* 19, sy 3 (27 Mayıs 2018), s. 471, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2017.1387055>.

nationalism is a defining feature of the 1982 constitutional order and underlines the extent to which national security concerns shaped the drafting of the document.

A comparative analysis of nationalism in the 1961 and 1982 Constitutions reveals a clear evolution from a more civic, liberal model of nationalism towards a more centralised, state-driven approach. The 1961 Constitution, while still based on the principles of Kemalism, allowed for greater political pluralism, legal equality and individual freedoms. It reflected a more inclusive vision of national identity in which citizenship was based on legal and political participation rather than ethnic or cultural homogeneity. In contrast, the 1982 Constitution represents a more restrictive and authoritarian form of nationalism in which national unity is closely tied to the power of the state and the expression of ethnic or cultural diversity is subordinated to security and territorial integrity concerns.

Table 1 Comparative Table of Nationalism in the 1961 and 1982 Constitutions

	1961 Constitution	1982 Constitution
National Identity	Civic nationalism based on legal equality and citizenship	State-centred nationalism with a focus on Turkishness and homogeneity
Ethnic Diversity	Implicitly allows diversity through individual rights	Strict restrictions on ethnic and cultural expression
Secularism	Promotes individual freedoms and religious diversity	Linked to national security and state integrity
The Role of the Army	Army as protector, but limited role in civilian government	The military is given broad powers to influence national policy
National Security	Emphasised but balanced with democratic governance	At the centre of the constitutional framework, prioritising unity and security

This comparative table highlights the main differences between the two constitutions in terms of how nationalism is expressed and practised, and reflects the broader change in Turkish political and legal culture over time. Overall, the 1961 and 1982 Constitutions present two contrasting visions of nationalism, shaped by their respective historical and political contexts. While the 1961 Constitution presents a more civic and inclusive model of nationalism, the 1982 Constitution adopts a more authoritarian and state-centred approach. This evolution reflects broader trends in Turkish political history where concerns for national security, political stability and territorial integrity have increasingly come to define the nation's understanding of nationalism and national identity. Nevertheless, both constitutions underline the central role that nationalism has played and continues to play in shaping the Turkish state and legal order.

Conclusion

A comparative analysis of nationalism as expressed in Türkiye's 1961 and 1982 constitutions underlines the changing nature of Turkish nationalism and its fundamental role in shaping the country's legal and political structures. Drafted in different historical periods, both constitutions reflect the changing priorities and challenges faced by the Turkish state. The 1961 Constitution, which emerged after the 1960 military coup, was influenced by a vision of civic nationalism that sought to balance state authority with individual rights while promoting democratic governance and legal equality. On the other hand, the 1982 Constitution, drafted after the 1980 military intervention, represented a more centralised, state-centred model of nationalism that prioritised national security, territorial integrity and the preservation of a homogenous national identity. One of the most important findings from this analysis is the sharp contrast in the two constitutions' approach to the concept of national identity. The 1961 Constitution promoted a more inclusive and civic model of nationalism in which citizenship and legal equality formed the basis of national belonging. This reflected a desire to create a pluralistic society that allowed for greater diversity within the framework of a unified Turkish state. In contrast, the 1982 Constitution adopted a more homogeneous and general approach and strengthened the concept of 'Turkishness' as the central element of national identity. This change reflected growing concerns about internal and external threats to

the unity of the nation, and the state assumed a more prominent role as the guardian of national security and territorial integrity.

The evolution of nationalism from the 1961 Constitution to the 1982 Constitution also shows the increasing centralisation of state power. While the 1961 Constitution sought to limit the influence of the military and promote democratic governance, the 1982 Constitution significantly expanded the role of the military in political decision-making. The creation of a more powerful National Security Council by the 1982 Constitution demonstrated the extent to which national security and internal stability concerns dominated nationalist discourse. This militarisation of nationalism marks a departure from the more liberal and civilian ideals of the 1961 Constitution and reflects the political realities of a turbulent period in Türkiye's history. Another important finding is the different approaches to ethnic diversity and minority rights in the two constitutions, which are not primary but secondary. The 1961 Constitution, while not explicitly recognising ethnic minorities, provided a framework that allowed for a degree of cultural and religious diversity, albeit within the constraints of a single national identity. Emphasising legal equality and individual rights, the 1961 Constitution offered a more flexible interpretation of nationalism. The 1982 Constitution introduced a stricter perspective on the expression of ethnic and cultural differences and emphasized the identity of Turkishness. The prohibition of political parties or associations based on ethnic or religious grounds exemplifies the stricter and more security-oriented approach to nationalism in the 1982 Constitution.

The comparative analysis also reveals the enduring role of secularism in Turkish nationalism, albeit in different forms in each constitution. The 1961 Constitution, in line with the principles of Kemalism, favoured secularism as a means of promoting individual freedoms and protecting the state from religious interference. Reflecting a more liberal and inclusive interpretation of secularism, it allowed a degree of religious diversity within the framework of national unity. However, the 1982 Constitution reflected concerns about the rise of political Islam and religious extremism by linking secularism more directly to national security and the integrity of the state. This shift in the understanding of secularism underlines a broader shift towards a more authoritarian and

state-centred nationalism in the 1982 Constitution. The influence of the military in shaping nationalism is another critical theme in this analysis. Both the 1961 and 1982 constitutions were the product of military interventions, but the role of the military changed significantly between the two periods. While the 1961 Constitution aimed to restore civilian rule and limit the direct influence of the military, the 1982 Constitution reinforced the military's role as the ultimate protector of the Turkish state.

In reflecting on how the concept of nationalism in these two constitutions has shaped Türkiye's political and social landscape, it is clear that both documents have had profound and lasting effects. The 1961 Constitution, with its emphasis on civic participation, legal equality and democratic governance, laid the groundwork for a more pluralistic society, while retaining the basic tenets of Kemalist nationalism. By providing a framework for balancing state authority and individual rights, it allowed for the development of a more open and inclusive political culture. However, political instability in the 1970s exposed the limits of this constitutional order and ultimately led to the intervention of the military in 1980 and the drafting of a new constitution. The 1982 Constitution, by contrast, marked a decisive turn towards a more centralised and authoritarian model of nationalism. Its focus on national security, territorial integrity and the preservation of a homogenous national identity reflected the state's response to threats of political extremism, ethnic separatism and foreign intervention. Although this approach to nationalism was criticised for its exclusionary and authoritarian tendencies, it was also praised for restoring stability and order at a time of significant political and social turmoil. The 1982 Constitution continues to shape Türkiye's political landscape, with particular emphasis on national unity and the central role of the state in protecting the nation against internal and external threats.

For contemporary Turkish nationalism, the legacy of both the 1961 and 1982 constitutions is highly significant. The tensions between civic and ethnic nationalism, as well as the balance between state authority and individual freedoms, continue to influence debates on national identity, minority rights and the role of the military in Turkish politics. The 1982 Constitution in particular has been the subject of sustained criticism and calls for reform, with many arguing that its authoritarian tendencies are

incompatible with modern democratic norms. Nevertheless, its emphasis on national security and state control remains a strong factor in shaping contemporary Turkish nationalism. In conclusion, the 1961 and 1982 constitutions represent two distinct but interconnected phases in the evolution of Turkish nationalism. While the 1961 Constitution reflects a more liberal, civilian vision of nationalism, the 1982 Constitution represents a more centralist, state-centred approach. Both constitutions are products of their historical contexts, shaped by the political and social challenges of their respective eras. The comparative analysis of these two constitutional frameworks reveals the complex and changing nature of nationalism in Türkiye and emphasises the enduring importance of national unity, security and state sovereignty in shaping the country's legal and political order. As Türkiye continues to meet the challenges of the 21st century, the legacy of these two constitutions will undoubtedly continue to influence the country's understanding of itself and its place in the world.

Finansal Destek ve Teşekkür / Grant Support and Acknowledgement	Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir. / The author declared that this study has received no financial support.
Çıkar Çatışması / Conflict of Interest	Yazar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir. / The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

References

AHMAD, Feroz, *Demokrasi Sürecinde Türkiye (1645-1980)*. İstanbul: Hil Yayınları, 1994.

AKINCI, Abdulvahap, “Türkiye’nin Darbe Geleneği: 1960 ve 1971 Müdahaleleri”. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi* 9, sy 1 (2014): 55-72.

ALDIKAÇTI, Orhan, *Anayasa Hukukumuzun Gelişmesi ve 1961 Anayasası*. İstanbul: Bahar Matbaası, 1964.

ALİEFENDİOĞLU, Yılmaz, “T.C. Anayasalarında Devlet Anlayışı”. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi* 26, sy 2 (1993): 3-17.

ARSLAN, Zühtü, “Adil Yargılanma Güvencesi Olarak Silahların Eşitliği İlkesi”, 2022. https://anayasa.gov.tr/tr/baskan/eski-baskanlarin-konusmalari/zuhtu-arslan/konusmalar/adil-yargilanma-guvenesi-olarak-silahlarin-esitligi-ilkesi/#_ftn9.

BİROL, Sinem, “1961 Anayasası’nda İfade Özgürlüğü”. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi| Istanbul University Faculty of Communication Journal*, sy 43 (2012): 39-54.

ÇETİN, Halis, *Türk Siyasal Hayatı - V Vesayet Gölgesinde Siyaset 1960-1980*. Ankara: Orion Kitabevi Akademik Kitaplar, 2016.

ÇİÇEK, Ali, “Milliyetçilik Kuramları”. *İçinde İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği*, 1-27. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi, 2024.

DEMİREL, Tanel, *Türkiye'nin Uzun On Yılı Demokrat Parti İktidarı ve 27 Mayıs Darbesi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2021.

DURGUN, Şenol, *Turkish Political Life*. Ankara: A Kitap, 2014.

DURŞUN, Davut, *Türkiye'nin Siyasal Hayatı*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım, 2018.

ERDEM, Tarhan, *Anayasalar ve Belgeler 1876-2012*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2012.

ERDOĞAN, Mustafa, *Anayasa Hukuku*. 8. Baskı. Ankara: Orion Kitabevi, 2014.

GÖZLER, Kemal, *Türk Anayasa Hukuku Dersleri*. 23. Baskı. Bursa: Ekin Yayınları, 2019.

KABOĞLU, İbrahim Ö, *Anayasa Hukuku Dersleri*. 6. Baskı. İstanbul: Legal Kitabevi, 2010.

KARPAT, Kemal H, *Türk Siyasi Tarihi Siyasal Sistemin Evrimi*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2020.

KARS KAYNAR, Ayşegül, “Making of military tutelage in Turkey: the National Security Council in the 1961 and 1982 Constitutions”. *Turkish Studies* 19, sy 3 (27 Mayıs 2018): 451-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2017.1387055>.

NALBANT, Fatma, “Türkiye’de vatandaşlık anlayışının gelişimi”. *III. Türkiye Lisansüstü Çalışmaları Kongresi*, 2014. https://www.academia.edu/download/40738817/Turkiyede_Vatandaslik_Anlayisinin_Gelisimi.pdf.

ÖZBUDUN, Ergun, *Türk Anayasa Hukuku*. Ankara: Yetkin Yayınları, 1998.

ÖZCAN, Hüseyin, ve Murat Yanık, *Siyasi Partiler Hukuku*. 2. Baskı. İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 2011.

ÖZGİŞİ, Tunca, “Milliyetçilik ve Vatandaşlık Olgusunun Türk Anayasalarına Yansımaları”. *Türkoloji Kültürü Dergisi* 2, sy 4 (2009): 83-103.

PARLA, Taha, *Türkiye’de Anayasalar*. 3. Baskı. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

RENAN, Ernest, *What Is a Nation? And Other Political Writings*. Columbia University Press, 2018.

ŞEN, Ersan, “Yeni Anayasaya Doğru”. *Ankara Barosu Dergisi*, sy 1 (2013): 357-69.

TANÖR, Bülent, *İki Anayasa 1961-1982*. 3. Baskı. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım, 1994.

TANÖR, Bülent, ve Necmi Yüzbaşıoğlu, *1982 Anayasasına Göre Türk Anayasa Hukuku*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım, 2023.

TUNÇ, Bilal, ve Bilal Akarçay, “12 Mart Muhtırası Sonrası 1961 Anayasası’nda Yapılan Değişiklikler Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi* 11, sy 3 (2022): 1540-71.

TUNÇ, Hasan, ve Faruk Bilir, “Cumhuriyet Dönemi Anayasalarımızda Milliyetçilik Anlayışı ve Atatürk Milliyetçiliği”. *Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 2, sy 2 (01 Haziran 1998): 1-7.

YALÇIN, E. Semih, “Türk Anayasa Metinlerinde Vatandaşlık Meselesi”. *Düşünce Dünyasında Türkiz* 1, sy 6 (25 Kasım 2022): 293-304.

ZÜRCHER, Erik Jan, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*. Çeviren Yasemin Gönen. 7. Baskı. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2020.