



ST. CLEMENTS UNIVERSITY

ST CLEMENTS INSTITUTE

Professorial Diplomate Program

The History of Political Science and it's Current Situation

Erdal Firat

2018

A Brief Summary

Political science is based on very old. Indeed, it can be said that the Ancient Greeks were the creators of political science: the State of Eflatun, the example of Aristotle's Policy. It was later seen that the Romans were interested in political science: Cicero's *De República* (on State) is proof of this. Throughout much of the Middle Ages, political science left the first order to God. The Florentian Machiavelli revived this science: the ruler (*Il pirincipe*, 1513).

In France over the centuries, many writers have come up with various ideas and opinions on power and institutions: XVI. Jean Bodin in the 16th century (*Les Six Livres de la République* [Six Books of the Republic, 1576]); XVIII. Montesquieu (*L'Esprit des lois*, 1748) and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (*Du Contrat social*, 1762); XIX. Tocqueville (*L'Anden Régime et la Révolution* [The Old Regime and Revolution, 1856]); etc. These thinkers came out as readings of the works, explanations of the inner mind, fed by personal memories, from the inside. In other words, the literary character of political science dominated. In contrast, In the 19th century, it was seen that economics, social science, public law made a breakthrough on the scientific level. As a result of this competition, a modern political consciousness was born: this modernization of the mainland, undoubtedly, It was at the end of the XIX. century.

In Europe, André Siegfried was seen as the founder of the new politics of the *Tableau des forces politiques delà France de l'Ouest* (1914), but the science in question was only in Europe, but after the Second World War, I could find the floor. This was evidenced by the establishment of *institut d'études politiques de Paris* (Paris Institute of Political Studies) in France, in place of the *École libre des sciences politiques* (Political Science Free School). However, new developments have also led to the emergence of new debates.

Subject Of Political Science

According to American school, political science is the power of government. William Robson of the U.S. claimed that power should recognize the nature, foundations, functioning, goals and influences of society in society.

The existence of totalitarian regimes was one of the major factors that led to the concept of power between the two world wars. Indeed, such regimes were built on unprecedented oppressive means that modern techniques made possible, and there were profound differences in the way the institutions actually functioned in the foreseen form in written texts.

The first reaction to the definition we have spoken of came from European jurists, and political science was defined by Soltau as "the examination of the aims of the state, of the state, of the institutions, of the relations of the state with the persons and of the other states, and of what they think about these problems, their writings and what they say at the same time" .

Thus, the understanding of two political science came out. The first understanding is blurred and difficult to limit, and the second is an understanding that is restrictive to some researchers and does not cover all political problems. On top of this, at the initiative of U.N.E.S.C.O, a series of topics covered by political science was organized:

1. Political theory: a) Political theory; b) History of thought.

2. Political institutions: a) Constitution; b) the central government; c) regional and local government; d) public administration; e) the economic and social functions of the government; f) comparative political institutions.

3. Parties, communities, public opinion: a) Political parties, b) communities and associations, c) citizen participation in the administration and administration; d) public opinion.

4. International relations: a) International politics; b) politics and international organization; c) international law.

In another approach, the four headings in the U.N.E.S.C.O's delegation can be grouped into three major themes: political thought; political institutions; political life.

Table2. Classification of Political Systems

Rule of the One	Rule of the Minority	Rule of the Majority
Tyranny	Oligarchy	Democracy
Despotism	Aristocracy	
Monarchy	Tymmarchy	
Dictatorship		

(Türköne, 2010: 151)

Political Science and the Other Social Sciences

The point of political science is that it requires observing relations with other branches of science.

1. **POLITICAL SCIENCE AND LAW.** Public law and political science are very close to each other. But, while acting from the law and the texts, political science tries to act from the events and to recognize and analyze them. Political science has found a useful effect on the law by developing "legal reality". In addition, political science tries to identify systems and to identify "types" that provide the existence of balanced societies.
2. **POLITICAL SCIENCE AND HISTORY.** Political science, part of history, can be seen as a political study of the contemporary era. History brings political science to the understanding of time, continuity, even change, historical causation. Political science pushes the consciousness of one of the dimensions of history, social reality, the concept of regimes, the concept of evolution, and the fact that the other schemes are connected to "politics".
3. **POLITICAL SCIENCE AND ECONOMICS.** Political science provides information on the functioning of political institutions in economy, the ability of management, the ideologies of social segments and the habits of thought, the possibility of political change and all the data that are effective in economic life. On the other hand, the economist also informs about the level of political science employment and its stability, price and wage movements, price fluctuations and items affecting political life. The close relationship between the two scientists enables us to examine the relationship between economic structures and political regimes.

4. **POLITICAL SCIENCE AND SOCIOLOGY.** If industry societies are accepted as public regimes, the contribution of sociologists may be important when examining how public opinion is defined and the general cause on which political action is based. Sociology, therefore, helps political science to place political life in its own environment, that is, in the social environment. In short, the study of the evolution of political consciousness, documents, institutions, and thoughts is history; political sociology in the direction of examination of communities; social psychology when examining limited clusters; it also functions as political psychology when it tilts to people.

Antique Greek Era

The better the history of comparative political science is understood, the more likely it is to contribute to the future of this science. Therefore, it is important to know where comparative political science begins and from which path (Lane, 2011: 14-16). It is not a new process to make a political system classification using comparative method in researches in political science field (Pickel, 2010: 31; Landman, 2005: 5). The comparative approach of politics has a long tradition in political science. The first comparisons of different political systems made in the field of politics in one place are in BC. It was made in Ancient Greece in the year 500 (Brunner, 1979: 22, Violin, 2006: 3; Rose, 1991: 446). In other words, the historical background of comparative political science as a scientific field can be brought back to Ancient Greece (Lane, 2011: 14-16). However, even though the first comparisons in the field of political science have emerged in ancient Greece, non-political issues are being compared in the Bible and the Torah, the holy books of the post-Ancient Greek period (Bare, 1999, James, 2011: 5). As a matter of fact, political comparisons in the Ancient Greek period continued with non-political comparisons in later periods. The first comparators in the Ancient Greek era are political theorists. Important works written in this period are the basis of political science today (Munck, 2007: 33-34). What kind of management is the "best" in terms of the moral outlook that the ancient Greek political theoreticians are exploring? They search by searching for answers. For this reason, the works written in the Ancient Greek period are seen as normative in an intense way (Beyme, 2007: 29-30, Çağla, 2010: 127, Kopstein / Lichbach, 2005: 1). In other words, they must be looking for good governance of ancient Greek thinkers, and they should be referring to features that should be in good governance. According to Cem Eroğul (1981), the earliest work on the comparison of political

systems in the history of political thought is "History" of Herodotus (485-425 BC). Seven Persian nobles make a comparison by killing the illegitimate-Smerdis, who is seated with a trick on the Persian throne, and then discussing them in order to determine the form of government (Tunçay, 1969: 2). Otanes, who is one of the seven nobles, supports Darius, who proposes democracy, another Megabiz, oligarchy, and monarchy in the rest (Duden, 2011). Herodotus' "History" for the first time his political systems; (Tunçay, 1969: 1), the classical forms of governance are classified according to the sovereignty of a person (monarchy), a minority (oligarchy) or the whole being (democracy). This shows that political system classifications have been made quite long ago in the field of comparative politics. Herodotus preceded comparative political science before the famous ancient Greek philosophers (Plato, Aristotle), which in turn became one of the important thinkers of political science.

Table3. The classification of Political Systems by Herodotus

Seven Persian Nobles	Regimes According to the Number in Rule
Otanes	Democracy
Megabiz	Oligarchy
Darius and others	Monarchy

(Çıgın/Yardımcı, 2007: 10 ve Tunçay, 1969: 1-3)

When the ancient Greek sources are examined, a classification based on the number of people ruling the country, as seen in Table 3 of Herodotus' History, is the first classification of the political system ever made. In her book Herodot History, it expresses the thoughts of the Persian nations about the forms of government through an imaginary fiction (Çıgın / Yardımcı, 2007: 10). Otanes, who advocated democracy, became the first talker of the classifications in the work. Otane seemed more appropriate to touch the bad sides of the monarchy before talking about the good aspects of democracy. According to Otanes, the monarchy is not in the form of good governance because it can not be part of a sound moral system without the responsibility and supervision. It argues that even the best people can worsen in such a management approach. Monark's typical evils are envy and kink, which is the main reason for all kinds of evil. Monark speaks to those who do evil, but envies the most worthy of their nation. Violating old traditions, raping women and killing people without trial are other characteristics of monarchs (Herodotus, 2006: 254; Tunçay, 1969: 2-3). After

describing his negative views on the monarchy, Otanes referred to democracy, the political system he defeated. Otanes is the most beautiful of democratic names in the sense of the people's administration. The people who have the power in the administration avoid the monarch's actions (Herodotos, 2006: 254; Tunçay, 1969: 3). Here Otane is not referring to democracy (democratia) as the counterpart of the people's administration, but to the word of isonomy (Agaogulları, 2009: 109). Herodotos should be appointed by the lot in the people's government. 2) The administration is responsible for its actions against the public meetings. 3) The public meetings have an exclusive legislative power, all questions are open to debate. With these characteristics Herodotus democracy defines the middle and lower classes as a state in which they participate in political decision-making and governance (Duden, 2011). After mentioning the characteristics of monarchy and democracy in Otanes, he argued that the monarch should be left and the people should go to power. According to him, the state is already the people (Herodotos, 2006: 254; Tunçay, 1969: 3). In the History of Herodotos, following the removal of the other Persian noble Megabiz monarch, Otánás opposed the emre of the people whom the political power called the legitimate, with the positive view. According to him, masses of people are clumsy clumsy, and in such a structure, irresponsibility and violence are very common. It therefore supports oligarchic tendencies by describing the disregard for the enjoyment of a king and its equality with the legs as unbearable. Political power should be given to them by choosing the best of a certain number of countries, thus advocating the best governance of the best people (Herodotos, 2006: 254-255; Tunçay, 1969: 3). The third speaker, Daryus, agrees with what Megabiz has to say about the people and does not accept oligarchic views. According to Daryus, the monarchy is better than the other two forms of government as long as monarch is the best man for administration. 1) Monarch's supremacy over the public is over all sorts of complaints. 2) The monarchy has more to do with the measures taken against the enemies and the treacherous than the other forms of government. good secrets. 3) Because Monarch is the sole power, it can not be replaced by conflict and confusion as in other governments. 4) Democracy turns into monarchy after a certain period of time when people start to choose whom they admire. In this case, it shows that the monarch is the best management style. After these conversations, the other four who did not take the word were decided in the monarchy, supporting Daryus (Duden, 2011). But at the end of the discussion Heredot prefers monarchy to Persians in accordance with historical truth. Herodot 's discourse in history finds a pro - democratic political system closer to himself (Yalçınkaya, 2011: 50, Çıgın / Yardımcı, 2007: 10). In the field of comparative politics, another important name in ancient Greece is Plato (427-347

BC). Plato thinks that none of the existing political systems exist on earth. He argues that the first political system of human history is "patriarchy", a form of social organization in which all man, mind, and spirit are dominant in all social, political, economic and cultural decisions. However, later with socialization, the patriarchate disappears from the stage of history (Türköne, 2010: 152). Plato refers to the classification of the political system outside patriarchy in three different works (State, State Man and Law) as seen in Table 4. Each work has different classifications (Eroğul, 1981: 87-98). In Plato's "State" his political systems in Ancient Greece are summarized in four titles: timocracy, oligarchy, democracy and tyranny. Timocracy is a form of government that is military in its nature. Oligarchy is a government in which the poor do not participate in the power of the wealthy, and democracy is the administration in which the poor are dominant and all the citizens have equal rights and luck in joining the government. The tyrant is defined as the tyrannical rule of a single man (Eroğul, 1981: 87-98).

Table.4 Classification of Political Systems by Platon

Works	Classification of Political Systems by Platon					
State	Tymmochracy	Oligarchy	Democracy	Tyranny		
Man of the State	Aristocracy	Oligarchy	Monarchy	Tyranny	Rightful Democracy	Arbitrary Democracy
Law	Dynasty	Absolute Otocracy	Absolute Democracy			

(Eroğul, 1981: 87-98)

In Plato's "State" he defends the destruction of the ideal state when reason is lost. Military guards are not listening to the word of the current administration, but they are dreaming of a management that will have their say. Thus, the ideal state of the state leaves the Timocracy, the military regime. The virtue which prevails in the military regime is honorable and after a certain time this honor turns into a cyborg. After a certain period of military rule, money and material wealth are beginning to emerge, and thus Timocracy leaves its place, the oligarchy of the rich. Within a period of oligarchic rule, there are two conflicting groups, the richest in number and the poor in number. When the economic gap between the two groups grows over time, the poor want to have the rights they possess by coveting the rich. Democracy, which is

a regime of poverty, comes to the fore in the wake of a revolution that will erupt. The individual who lives in a democratic political system advocating an ideal of equality, reaching the extremism, has the greatest degree of extrapolation, thinking that it has the right to everything. The same excess is also the case in the political system, and an impermanence and imbalance situation arises. But despite this extreme, Plato's worst management in the political system classification is still not democracy. It is the tyranny that democracy produces because of the turmoil and irregularities in the way governance is at the pinnacle of political corruption. The tyranny is a form of governance that is the result of one of the demagogues who say that the people will be protected from all evil, with sweet language and conviction of the people. The power seized with sweet language is then tried to be strengthened by applying violence (Çıggin / Yardımcı, 2007: 31-32; Türköne, 2010: 152-153). The administrators in the country are only trying to satisfy their own personal interests. This kind of management sacrifices the rough desire and virtue to evil. Tyranny is the worst form of government that Plato can imagine (Tannenbaum / Schultz, 2011: 77). Plato does not speak clearly about the existence of another political system after the tyranny. But a competent philosopher argues that by educating the tyranny he can make the political system an ideal state (Çıggin / Yardımcı, 2007: 31-32; Türköne, 2010: 152- 153). Plato makes a second political system classification in his work "The Man of the State" in the sense that the number of people in administration as Herodotus did and that the administration has a good or bad political system. These are the aristocracy, the oligarchy, the constitutional monarchy, the tyranny, the legal democracy, and the arbitrary democracy, most of which are unlawful. lawless management) (Eroğul, 1981: 87-98).

Table6. Political Systems Classification in the Man of State by Platon

Number of people in charge	Political systems ruled by good law	Political systems ruled by bad law or no law at all
Only one person	Institutional Monarchy	Tyranny
Minority	Aristocracy	Oligarchy
Majority	Rightful Democracy	Arbitrary Democracy

(Çıggin,Yardımcı, 2007: 34)

According to Plato, the legitimate political system in the hands of the only one in political systems is the best within the existing systems of administration. As Table 6 shows, Plato's political systems are ranked from 1 to 6, from the best to the worst (Çiğın / Yardımcı, 2007: 34). In Plato's "The Laws", he mentions that there are two main sources of management style, and that the other forms of management come from these two sources. One of the two sources of this form of administration is the monarchy, and the other is democracy. Plato argues that the monarchical system was in Persians and the democratic system was in the Athenians. It also mentions that if the monarchy or democracy is overestimated from the way of administration, the measure can not be met (Platon, 2007: 144). Hence, according to him, these forms of government are not considered to be a good political system. In Plato's "Yasalar", his administrative forms generally undergo a dual separation, namely Dinasti (patriarchal tribal organization) and Absolute autocracy (administration where the freedoms are not recognized), and absolute democracy (the administration of which everyone recognizes unlimited freedom) : 87-98). At this distinction he made, although he speaks of absolute democracy, he is a renowned thinker who does not hate democracy. Democracy is, in his view, not a fair form of government in reality, since it is based on "apparently" equality. Because, according to him, democracy is a regime in which everybody can aspire to every job regardless of the people in society. Whether the person knows politics or not, it does not matter whether or not he has the ability. Kura can work in every job that he desires, regardless of his skill. For such reasons, according to Plato there is no good state present in the world. If a good state is sought, it must be sought in the past or in the future. Such a state can only be sought out of history. According to Plato, those who will bring down this good state to the earth will be philosophers (Yalçınkaya, 2011: 112-114). From this point of view, Plato's ideal state is the state of the "best", ie, philosophers. According to him, "Leaders do not pass philosophers, or if they do not do philosophy, the suffering of mankind will not end" (Gökberk, 2008: 67). Aristotle (384-322 BC) is another western political thinker who compares political systems in the Ancient Greek era. He investigated 158 constitutions of his time and formed the empirical foundations of his "Politics" (Lauth und Wagner, 2010: 17). In this work Aristotle tried to reveal the political organizations in ancient Greek sites with observations and classify political regimes. Aristotle can be regarded as the founder of contemporary comparative political science and the founder of contemporary political science because he obtained some conclusions by examining the political systems of the time on a comparative basis (Dursun, 2012: 39). In this context, the first modern comparison can be said to arise from the comparison of Aristotle's state forms (Pickel, 2010: 31). In short, in his book

"Politics", Aristotle examines Greek governmental states in a comparative way, according to the forms of political administration, by making good governance or normal governance and bad governance classification (Kesselman, Krieger, Joseph: 2010: 10; Sidgwick, 1892: 141). Aristotle's classification in "Politics" is based both on qualitative criteria (how are they governed, more for benefits or common good?), And quantitative, that is, for the number of those who have power (who and how many people govern?) And for whom power is used for the benefit of others. Aristotle makes a six-fold distinction by examining three "good" and three "bad" governments, as shown in Table 7 (Cagla, 2010: 127; Lauth und Wagner, 2010: 17; Landman, 2005)

Table7. Political System Classification by Aristotle

Number of people in charge	The quality of the Rulers	
	Good	Bad
Only one person	Monarchy	Tyranny
Minority	Aristocracy	Oligarchy
Majority	Politeia	Democracy, Oklokracy

According to Aristotle, these categories are followed by "monarchy" and then "aristocracy" and "politeia", respectively. Among all classifications, the order of abuse is composed of Monarchy, Aristocracy, Politeia, Democracy, Oligarchy and Tyranny (Eroğul, 1981: 101). There are different classifications of Aristotle in Table 7 according to the way in which the sovereignty of the administrative form is found in a person, a few persons or a very person. It is the form of governance that is correct according to Aristotle, which is the form of management that a few, many or many people have created by taking care of the public good. But if only one, a few or many people are interested in the benefit of a certain sector rather than the public interest, then this is a deviation from the right type of government. Aristotle calls the administration of a person who aims the public interest to be the Kingdom, and the deviation from this is the Tyranny. Aristocracy is the rule of a few who aim for public good, and the deviation is Oligarchy. For the benefit of the whole society, the name of the administration which is carried out in the majority of the citizens is polityia. Aristoteles refers to democracy as a deviation from political administration or the constitutional rule of

majority. There is no public interest in deviations from the correct forms of governance. Tyranny is for the benefit of the sole ruler, oligarchy for the benefit of wealthy people, and democracy for the benefit of the non-wealthy. None of these forms of management can provide any collective benefit (Aristoteles, 2010: 92-93). Aristotle's "Politics" also makes a distinction from the modalities of governance in terms of which is the worst and which is the second worst. Aristotle calls the kingdom of administration the best. The deviations from the first and the flawlessly on the BD are also the worst form of management. Thus, according to Aristotle, tyranny is the worst form of government. Oligarchy is the second worst. Democracy is the least bad form of government as a deviation from the right form of government. Moreover, Aristotle argues that it is not right to say that one of the forms of bad governance is better than the other, but that it can only be said that it is worse. In addition, Aristotle reminds Machiavelli that Aristotle gives advice to the rulers about even how to protect his rulers, and how to slow down the system's collapse (Aristotle, 2010: 124-125; Tannenbaum / Schultz, 2011: 94-96). In short, deviations from the best governance according to Aristotle lead to the worst form of governance, and deviations from less good governance lead to less bad governance. This distinction of Aristotle's different forms of state has long provided a guiding framework (Lauth und Wagner, 2010: 18). Aristotle's classification of the political system is a very broad classification of moral, institutional and economic dimensions. Aristotle is a thinker who deserves the title of being the founder of contemporary political science in many respects (Çağla, 2010: 128). At this point, Aristotle's most important contribution to political science is the ability to use observation and empirical research in political investigations without ignoring the ethical elements (Kalaycıoğlu, 1984: 12). The comparative empirical research of Aristotle based on these observations directly influences the development of comparative political science (Ishiyama, 2012: 8). The most important feature that distinguishes Aristotle from Plato is that Plato's idealism is to enter a scientific path by acquiring a critical, imaginative trait in Aristotle. While Aristotle classifies the political systems, he demonstrates an "objective" approach that is not completely independent of moral judgments. People are not as they should be, but as they are. However, he still prefers the political systems he prefers. It argues that state power must establish a balance between the rich and the poor. Thus, he speaks of a management mentality that is as active as the day-to-day advocate of the middle class (Bouthoul, 1997: 35). Approaches to the comparative analysis of political events after the Ancient Greek period are also found in Roman historiography (Lauth und Wagner, 2010: 18). However, with the establishment of the Roman Empire, the "police" took its place in cosmopolis (world state). As a result, despite the

decrease in the number of political units, their size grew to that extent. The growth of the dimensions of the political units made it difficult for them to get to know it well and did not allow for a meaningful comparison. Nevertheless, comparative politics continued to exist for a short while in the Roman period (Eroğul, 1981: 82). Because of the western medieval period in later periods, the religious themes were more important, and comparative politics of consciousness disappeared in Europe for about a thousand years (Brunner, 1979: 23-24). The development of comparative political science can only be revived with the New Age. Along with the Renaissance and the Reform, the scientific state of thought has been liberated from the strict limits of Christianity, and a nation state has emerged which is a new unit that will allow comparison with the emergence of a nation state understanding that can challenge the world state understanding (Eroğul, 1981: 82).

Social Structure of Antique Greece

Unlike today's modern world, the political organizations of the Ancient Greeks were based on the police (city / site-state) order, not the nation-state. Aside from war alliances, they did not have the concept of a state that contained more than one cop. Every policeman was politically independent and self-directed. At the same time, the cops have an autonomous structure. Although the cops had to rely on a certain amount of imports, these imports were too small to compare with those of today's world. Every police had a piece of land to meet their basic needs. These lands consisted of an area comprising the police headquarters and the surrounding villagers. The public worked all day long in these agricultural lands surrounding the police center and returned to the police on security grounds (Sealey, 1976: 19). These lands, which the people have worked on in order to make a living for their people, have been divided among themselves. Real estate was the source of polish citizenship. But the essence of the citizens' lives is not the activities they show on these instruments, but the roles they play in political, judicial, military, and religious areas (Foster, 1971: 28). As Mayo expressed to the Athens police, the main idea is that the best life for a citizen can be experienced by joining the life of the police. Pericles, who led in Athens' most brilliant period, said that "citizens who are not actively engaged in public activities are not only unnecessary but also pose a threat to the police". In this sense, the life of the citizen was valued only by serving the city and participating in its administration (Mayo, 1964: 37). They were slaves, working on the soil of the citizens. In ancient Greece, slavery was regarded as a natural institution because it provided the time and opportunity to participate in political and social activities for the

citizens. Likewise, if a person had to work enough to win his life and participate in political activities to support his family, he would not have been worthy to pursue a free life (Foster, 1971: 28). On the other hand, there are also suggestions that these ideas of slavery in ancient Greece are exaggerated. According to this, the idea that citizens are a non-working class and democracy can not be without slavery is wrong. It is not the belief that citizens spend all their free time in the Agora (the market place) and discuss public affairs. Most of the citizens had to work to make a living. After this obligation was fulfilled, the rest of the citizens would have given themselves up to police affairs (Mayo, 1964: 35). Citizens who could not make a living without having to work were either farmers or craftsmen. Carpentry, sculpture, construction mastery, pottery were the most important professions. In all these professions, there was a continuity and a tradition based on the transfer from the father to the son. The workshops were not very large, but the work was carried out with an average of five or six people. Women do not take part in these jobs, they just take care of housework. They are free and lack political rights (Millard, 1987: 30). The ancient Greek religion took an important place in social life. Religion's social prosperity stems from the positive role that police citizens with a homogeneous dynasty play in their collective rituals and festivals. In ancient Greece, religion served to consolidate the solidarity of its own citizens, as well as to the development of indirectly interpersonal relations, with different ties from different police forming a religious unity around a certain temple. Indeed, in entering such a tribe, tribal leaders were instructing that other member tribes would not fight the police and would not harm water resources (Sealey, 1974: 34-5). In the words of Störig (1993: 184), the Greeks believed in many gods and hundreds of myths about them, as far as we learned from Homer's blind but heart-open account. The Greeks thought of their gods as being anthropomorphic, distressed, rejoicing, loving, fighting each other, adulterers. Their differences from human beings were immortal. The most important gods of ancient Greece lived in Olympos, Greece's highest mountain. That's why they call them Olimpians. At the head of this family of gods is Zeus, the god of heaven, depicted in epics as "the father of the gods and of men" (Mansel, 1984: 134-36). His wife, Hera, is a moon goddess and does the protection of women; marriage and childbirth. Aphrodite, god of love and beauty; Ares, god of war; Athena, goddess of intelligence and guardian of cities at the same time; Apollo is the sun god. Themis and Dike are goddesses of "justice" (Millard, 1987: 34-34). Themis is the goddess of aristocratic justice. It is regarded as the guardian of established aristocratic values and institutions (nomos). Themis, based on divine authority, represents much "righteousness" from justice. Dike represents more "justice". Equality before the law refers to democratic

values such as being fit for general acceptance of the society. With the development of police life, Themis lost importance and Dike became important (Şenel, 1968: 19-20). After these general explanations of the political-cultural structure of the police order in ancient Greece, we can now reinforce our knowledge of the ancient Greek civilization by specially addressing the two most important police officers, Sparta and Athens.

Examples of Sparta and Athens

Sparta is a polystyrene (Mansel, 1984: 113), located in the south of Argolis, surrounded by the Taygetos and Parnon mountains, built by the Dors in Lakonia, which is essentially of the Evrotas Valley. BC The Dora, who came from the Thracian direction in about 1200-1000 and destroyed the Mykene civilization of the Akhas, were ironic, tribal, and unequal tribes using iron weapons (Şenel, 1970: 173). After they destroyed the Mycenaean civilization in the Mora region they occupied, the Dorians became socially stratified after passing through the settled life. This new social level is striking three separate classes. These are: a group of approximately 25,000 family members (Spartans), who share the names of the lands they have captured and who live in the city of Sparta because of their "Spartan" status, a group of villages in the mountainous regions of Lakonia and their villages and towns, (Mansel, 1984: 1), which was called "Helot", which was independent of the state, but completely military and political, and which had been subject to the Spartans and had to give them sixty percent of the periokos and spartans'. In this triple layer, Spartans and Periocos were free-cutting, while Helots were semi-serpent attached to the soil. Only within the free sections were the Spartans able to hold in the hands of political power. The involvement of perioces in governance was only a limited participation as a local autonomy. When we look at this triple stratification of Sparta's social structure as well as its political structure, we see a triple structure. These are the two-headed kingdom (diarchy), Gerusia (House of Elders) and Apella (People's Assembly). At the beginning of the Sparta state there was a king from the Agiadlar dynasty. However, a second king from the family of Evripontids later joined the power of the first king, whose historical reasons were not known precisely. The powers of these two kings were the same. In the battle of Sparta's early times, these kings, who were Commander-in-chief, priest and judge in peace, moved up to the position of a simple state officer with the

protection of their nobility in the coming period (Mansel, 1984: 115). As a result of this development, a class of aristocrats emerged in the Spartan society, which became enriched after the conquests in Peloponnes. In the wake of the struggle for power between this new-born class and the kings, the kings accepted the power of the aristocrats and accepted the foundation of an aristocratic Senate called Gerusia, consisting of 30 members, including themselves (Shenel, 1970: 175-76). Lastly, we see Apella (People's Assembly), which consists of equestrian and pedestrian Sparta men and holds the real sovereignty, which is understood to be the product of the struggle of the people against these two institutions in the historical development process. Apella chose state inspectors with the name of Gerusia and "Eforus", making decisions on important issues such as peace and alliance, and making laws. In the process of issuing these laws, the efor- ence drafts draft laws, these drafts are discussed in Gerusia and finally submitted to Apella's approval (Mansel, 1984: 115-16). Let me briefly mention the social life of Sparta, which summarizes social stratification and political institutionalization in relation to it. In Sparta there was a commitment to an intense police force. The reason for the existence of the people was to ensure the continuity of the police (Rostovtzeff, 1963: 77-81). If a child is born weak or flawed, he was left to die in a remote corner, thinking that the police would not be a useful citizen in the future (Williams, 1993: 66-67). Healthy boys would be given to communities led by young Spartans, who were called "herds" when they were 7 years old. During this time, the children were mountain-topped, exercised, satiated with their simple meals. By this way of life, the Spartans believed that their children grew up as fierce warriors. Every child who passed this brutal education would be entitled to join the army when they reached the age of 20. The soldiers in the army could be home-bark owners, but they seldom went to their homes. Instead, they used to live with their soldiers in the winter and eat simple meals they used to live in a dreary life. In Sparta, the main aim is to survive and ensure the continuity of the police, so any incentives are avoided; art, philosophy and music. Trade and wealth were thought to create separation and laziness within society, and these things were humiliated (Mansel, 1984: 116-17). For this reason, it is suggested that the legendary Spartan legislator Lykurgus, in order to remove trade and its degenerating effects, has replaced the worthless iron bars instead of the valuable gold coins (Şenel, 1968: 178). The basic necessities of the Spartans, who were stumped by the Spartan commerce in this frame, the warrior and the ruler at the same time, were in the nature of an agrarian society where agricultural production was made by the semi-serfs called helot. Sparta BC was victorious in the fifth century, victorious from the Peloponnesian wars against the Attic-Delos naval union, the head of Athens. Sparta has lost a lot of blood during these wars

that have been ongoing for about 25 years. The Spartans, who were already in limited numbers, were broken in these wars, and the gold and silver obtained from the commanders were collected in the hands of certain people. BC In 371, the battle of Lektra, which he captured with Thebai, was lost and Spartan's collapse process accelerated. BC Spartans, who entered the Macedonian government precisely after 192 BC, In 146, when he entered the Roman domination, political life ended.

Athens, which was dominated by Akha-Ion elements, had a more democratic, egalitarian structure than Sparta. Athens, located on the Aegean Sea coast of the peninsula of Greece, has become quite natural in commercial life thanks to its coasts being a natural harbor and the fertility of its land (Şenel, 1970: 205). Especially the production of wine and olive oil has had an important place in this trade. In addition, the rich silver mines of the Lareum also had a significant share in the richness of Athens (Millard, 1987: 18). In Athens, social stratification was made up of the aristocrats called eupatridea, the people class called thet, strangers called metoikos, and the "slave" class. In these classes, eupatridea, thet and metocyclos were composed of free humans. However, only those belonging to the eupatridea and thet classes in these classes have citizenship status and have political rights. It was not a legal nationality for the Metoikos. Metocycles like slaves have no place in the political life of the city; but the lack of liberty and political rights did not mean that there were other social distinctions that worked against it (Sabine, 1969: 3). We have already mentioned that in ancient Greece, slavery was regarded as a natural institution. There were two main types of this institution: the slavery of agricultural services and the slavery of household services. Industrial slavery had also joined them in the following period. The slaves whom the master allowed to work in other affairs could have accumulated wealth, married, and even bought their freedoms, even with the money they had accumulated, after giving a portion of his money to his master (Shenel, 1970: 269). One issue that needs to be addressed in relation to social stratification is the place of women in Ancient Greece. Both in the Spartan society and in the Athenian society described earlier, women did not have the right to participate in the political decision-making process together with being free. The woman was stuck between the walls of the house from her childhood. Unlike Athens, unlike Athens, in Sparta society, despite the fact that the girls were educated with the boys in the same way, with the marriage, they were closed to the home as the Athenian homosexuals (Russell, 1984: 206-07; Williams, 1993: 67). When we look at the political-institutional structure of Athens, where we can summarize the social structure in this way, we see that there are three separate administrative areas selected

from among the first aristocratic class. These are also the King-Chaplain, the Polemarkhos (the Chief Commander) who governs the military forces of the police, and the Arkons (Rostovtzeff, 1963: 83), the representative of the civilian authority. There were also aristocratic assemblies named "Areopag" because of the gathering at the top of Ares in Athens alongside these three administrative sites. According to Mansel, this parliament is a form of advisory board for experienced and noble people, and perhaps government officials, political, religious and legal issues (Mansel, 1984: 183). However, the right of sovereignty belongs to Eklesia (the People's Assembly), which is a member of all Athenian male citizens who have reached the age of 20 (Sabine, 1969: 4). This parliament elected civil servants, enacted laws, and made decisions on important issues such as war, peace and alliance (Mansel, 1984: 183). Our trial of an Athenian citizen's point of view is not as precise as our trial of a Spartan citizen's point of view against the police. As a matter of fact, the idea that Williams (1993: 67), Spartans lived for their police officers literally in the name of the police, and first of all the interests of the police, is generally accepted among writers who have contributed works on Ancient Greece. On the other hand, there is not a consensus among writers about the citizen-police relationship in Athens, but there are basically two different views. According to the first of these opinions, in Athens there is also a citizen-police relationship with the police. Citizens gain meaning in life when they have committed themselves to public affairs. In this context, there is a general belief in Athens that in the same way as Sparta, the interests of the police among citizens are in front of their individual interests (Mayo, 1964: 37). On the other hand, according to the second opinion on this issue, an Athenian citizen, unlike a Spartan citizen, would not have uploaded a number of transcendental values that would require him to give himself up. Instead, the idea that the Athenian citizens existed for the happiness and prosperity of the police person. In this framework, in the eyes of an Athenian citizen, the police are a society in which the natural ability of the individual can be developed in the best possible way, in which a regular life can be sustained, the right to participate equally in public affairs without discrimination on the basis of wealth, (Sabine, 1969: 12). BC Fifth Century Athens is the century that both peaked and passed on. BC The Peloponnes Wars, which started in 431 between the Attic-Delos Sea Union headed by Athens and the Peloponnes Union led by Sparta, In 404, it ended with the defeat of the Attic-Delos Union. Athens, defeated in this battle to Sparta, had to pay a lump sum war reparations. In Athens, which was demolished from the financial side, there was a great revolution in the administrative direction and democratic regime was demolished and "Thirty Thousands of Tyrants" was established. Despite the fact that this administration was demolished one year later and democracy was

reestablished, Athens did not go back to its old days. BC Since the war against Macedonia in 348 has been lost, Athens has entered into Macedonia sovereignty since that date. As Macedonia became a Roman province in 148 BC, the city became relatively independent. In 86 BC he was able to survive until the Roman invasion (Şenel, 1968: 283-84).

The Science of Political Science

The classic question asked in classical political science books is whether politics is science or art (Dillon et al., 1958: 2). This question is a kind of knowledge that politics can learn on the one hand; on the other hand, is a pre-emption that is acquired or inherently acquired skill. Therefore, the question was asked about the political activity of Ancient Greece by taking a basic and even model. In this respect, the "examination" of politics in the capitalist-modern period differs on the concrete plane from its effectiveness. Indeed, the question does not emphasize the nature of politics as a matter of examination, beyond the extent of being learned-taught or acquired-acquired. It does not cover the examination of a fact or object but only reflects the content of the learning-teaching activity. 1 In contrast, in ancient Greece, politics in capitalist-modern societies, in sophisticated form, scientific analysis does not differentiate on the abstract-qualitative level when it is accepted that political science predicts a certain politics or that it is structured on a certain political ground. We will discuss this in the final chapter below. However, it should be noted here that in the provincial literature, even in everyday life, the emergence of political science or the collapse of the society is taken up to Ancient Greece. However, when we base our disaggregation on political science and political theory in Western literature, it is accepted that political science has emerged as an academic discipline in the United States and spread in Europe after the Second World War (Berndtson, 2009: 1). The main element of this acceptance is that politics is beginning to be remembered together with science, and that the association of politics with science has meant that it is positioned as an examined object. In the context of the discussion we are trying to make shortly above, politics is related to the nature of the object being examined rather than science

(knowledge) as a learning-teaching activity. This dimension also constitutes one of the characteristics of politics, capitalist-modern turnover. As a matter of fact, political science plays an active role in object separation with the subject, which is the core of power (Holloway, 2003: 61). The positioning of politics as the examined object is a consequence of the structuring of science politics in the social reality in terms of the reproduction of the subject-object divide. In the structure of capitalist-modern society, the formal separation between the economic field and the political sphere is reproduced by the knowledge produced by the social sciences and specifically by the science of politics. In general, the position of science and social sciences in the capitalist-modern society is characterized as producing information within the context of the formal separation mentioned. The subject-object separation is also based on the continuity of this formal character. Politics The process of "science" being "US-centered" is the transformation of politics into a form of object being examined as a form of politics. This is the limitation and structuring of politics as politics within the limits of the political sphere. This configuration is internally related to the positioning of politics as the object being examined. In short, in capitalist-modern society, the structuring of politics in the form of politics and the positioning of the science of politics by science are not totally disjointed processes. In this context, "science" of political science means that it is based on a certain science politics, as a discipline of science which does not study data-politics. The positioning of politics as an object to be studied has been shaped by the historicity of being an independent / academic discipline and obtaining the legitimacy of science. It is also claimed in the literature that political science is US knowledge, as the discipline's independent and scientific qualities are US patented (Berndtson, 2009: 1,2) .2 However, as can be seen in the following lines, the development of discipline in Europe it is not different. In other words, the process of being "independent" and science of discipline is based on similar developmental structures. In fact, it is stated in the literature that the Wissenschaft tradition in German universities in the 19th century was imported into the US as political science (Goodin and Klingemann, 1996: 9). Moreover, German-Jewish immigrants have contributed to the development of political science (Ball, 2007: 16); Scientists who emigrate from Europe are also acknowledged to be influential in the process of being a science of political science, using new scientific methods (Johnson and Reynolds, 2005: 41). Thus, in the formation of political science, the two traditions of the US and the European counterparts do not form in general, but it is possible to achieve such a result when the departure or opposition of political theory and political science comes about. But all of this is not enough to remove the fact that political science has become widespread with the US-

centered and developed. In general, the study of political science as the "science" of the development process or its history divided into five stages also reveals historically the characterization of the object as the examined object. According to this, Apriori and the deductive dimension are predominant, with the history, the law and the philosophy, the period after 1850; the second half of the 19th century, where comparative studies dominate; the post-1920 period in which psychology and sociology were established; (Dryzek and Leonard, 1988: 1252, 1253; Almond, 1996: 50), in which the measurement and observation dominated and the use of mathematical methods began in the post-World War II period, also called behavioral "revolution." As a sixth period, it is necessary to add the post-1990 period in which interpretative approaches dominate. Based on the totality of these periods, we will try to discuss politics as the examined object below.

Scientific thinking in the mainstream paradigm is to perceive all social phenomena as totally the forms / forms of social relations. Social relations are solidifying within forms. Since these forms are accepted as verbal, they contribute to the immutability of the capitalist society. Scientific thinking is the concept of their form (Holloway, 2003: 130). The positioning of politics as an object to be examined is also the positioning of the political in the form of politics and within the framework of a certain science politics. Thus, this process has historically evolved and developed in different forms of formalism. In this sense, the science of political science is based on a science politics that is centered on the empiricist-positivist epistemology.⁵ This science politics is the explication and rationalization of social forms. The process of positioning politics as an examined object has evolved into different forms within the scope of certain historical necessities. In this context, between 1800-1870 and the behavioral period characterized as "revolution" in the literature, the qualitative differentiation is not so great, with significant differences in form. Because, the formal dimension of social institutions and formations as object of examination corresponds to a certain political content, even politics. In the behaviorist approach, the most important reason for the rejection of political philosophy and the bereaved approach is the claim that it has a value-driven nature. Yet, legal and behavioral formalisms differ formally on the basis of value-fact division. It will also be explained that this formal differentiation corresponds to a certain historical necessity. The process has two dimensions. The first is the formal differentiation of politics as an examined object, from legal-formalism to behavioral-formalism; second, pushing political theory out of the "science" label in the sense that this differentiation is reconstructed on the basis of fact-value separation. After the 1800s, the state and its legal and institutional

dimensions in the USA and Europe seem to be handled in the context of history, law and philosophy. This period is also referred to as the period when some of the authors are dominated by traditional political science, and its main characteristic is defined as concentrating on legal-legalist and institutional formal issues 6 (Johnson and Reynolds, 2005: 40,41). Legislative-formalism is basically the examination of state and state institutions with their legal qualities. Indeed, the state is a solidified or fetishized form of social relations (Holloway, 2003: 130). However, a distinctive feature of this period is that the distinction between political science and political theory has not changed the history and philosophy of politics by philosophy, especially because of the very clear line (e) (Ball, 2007: 2,10) It is also the philosophy that it is nested. The examination of classical political texts has been seen to be related to both philosophy and history. It should also be noted that in the formation of the discipline's work, the literature is shaped in part by a legal framework and in connection with the law, with the emergence of national states, together with the importance of sovereignty, rights and duties, (Haas, 1970: 10). There are three basic dimensions. These are academic training topics, publications and organizing by association. These processes have developed in a similar way in the United States and Europe, although they occur in different histories. As a matter of fact, at the beginning of the 1800s, in the US colleges, politics was taken up in the scope of ethics philosophy; In South Carolina College, in 1825 the Political Economy became an independent educational subject.⁷ From the beginning of the 1800s onwards it appears that politics is not directly positioned as the object being studied. What is important from the point of view of locating, starting from the 1870s, has been the formation of object identification and object identification methods. This has not only been a peculiar development of politics "science", but after 1870, structural transformation in US universities has also affected political science. With this structural transformation that expresses the emergence of large research universities, discipline has become "independent" (Berndtson, 2009: 7,8).⁸ The University of Chicago is important in that it is the starting point of the first empirical studies in political science (Almond, 1996: 66; Parsons, 1968: 13). The other leg of the period in which politics is positioned as an object to be examined in the USA is the magazines. One of the first political science publications in the United States, John Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science, was published in 1882. Later, in 1906, the American Political Science Review (APSR) began to be published (Berndtson, 2009: 5, 6).⁹ The last leg of positioning is association. In this context, the American Political Science Association (APSA) was established in 1903 (Almond, 1996: 72).¹⁰ Politics occupies a different place, especially in its position in Europe as an object of study. In the literature, politics education in Europe is

taken up to the 14th century, based on Vienna and Prague Universities and 15th century Leipzig and Erfurt Universities. In the 17th and 18th centuries, the Politikwissenschaft chair at the German Universities came forward with a content aimed at increasing the prosperity of the political community, aside from comments on this tradition or root search effort or the evaluation of political and political science together. In this context, Staat Swissenschaftliche Fakultoten was founded in 1814 in Munich, in 1817 in Tübingen and in 1822 in Würzburg Universities. Institutional change began in the 19th century, just as it was in the United States.

11 Humboldtism, one of the educational ideologies in Europe, has developed in Germany and includes the coexistence of research and teaching. In other words, the research case was included in the process. In the 20th century, political science institutes were established; Especially in Europe, Ecole Libre has been the pioneer of the "independent" examination of politics or as an object to be studied, in 1871. Although politics in the United States is developed in the field of social science and in Europe, it is seen in the field of law that there is no difference between them. It has been studied in Europe with politics, law, history and philosophy as it has been these years in the USA (Berndtson, 2009: 7,13-15). The main element in which politics is positioned as the object under examination is the prominence of research in both the US and Europe. This means that the state and its institutions, which are objects of legal-formalism, are examined empirically, not in terms of legal-institutional viewpoint. Thus, while politics continues to be defined by its institutional / formal content, the object is embodied through empirical research. It can be argued that until the emergence of the behaviorist movement, a process in which politics is embodied and positioned as an object to be examined has been developed. In this process, the institutionalization of education and publications is also a factor in the realization of the object. The behaviorist movement, also referred to as "revolution", is the completion phase of the process of positioning 13 politics as the examined object. In this process, the breakdown of political science from political theory has become definite and the nature of discipline has begun to be discussed. Some authors even considered the emergence of the behavioral "revolution" in the 1950s as the collapse of political theory (Ball, 2007: 10). Another characteristic of the behaviorist movement is that the US hegemony has now been fully established on political science.¹⁴ This phenomenon has become historical, both in terms of post-war conditions and research opportunities. Many factors have been influential in this process. Indeed, as one of the reasons for the sudden break-up of behavioralism from traditional political science, there is a desire to utilize scarce research funds in the postwar period in the United States. In this context, it is stated that behaviorists are not directly opposed to political establishment, and that competition of

natural sciences and social sciences for fund raises this result (Ball, 2007: 19). In this context, in the development and institutionalization of the process, the research funds established in the USA and the research funds supported by the US-based capital have been effective. Indeed, in 1961 in the United States, the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR); In 1970, with the support of the Ford Foundation, the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) 15 was established (Almond, 1996: 70, 78). It is also argued that the dynamics of professionalism in the US science are influential in the United States's support for social science research on war (Johnson and Reynolds, 2005: 41) in the race to gain superiority over the Soviet during the cold war period (Ball, 2007: 17). In addition, along with the Marshall Plan, American scientists have assimilated European science, using American empirical and qualitative research methods, playing a missionary role in the renewal of European science. In the process, American foundations also played an active role, but the process did not develop on the basis of a unilateral dependency relationship, and since the national cultures of Europe underwent major damage under the Nazi regimes, old universities were restructured and rebuilt in the 1960s (Almond, 1996: 78). The most fundamental characteristic of the behaviorist movement as the final stage in the positioning of politics as an object to be examined is the realization of a definite separation from political theory, as mentioned before. Indeed, in the related literature, the dimension that comes to the fore in all writings and discussions about the behaviorist current is the question of the science of political science. 16 Yet, while this discussion does not have a specific conclusion in itself, the most important conclusion is that the political theory It is inserted. Thus, political science has become a US-centered, "independent" study area. This process has developed within the scope of the discussions centered on the scientific nature of political science. As mentioned earlier, the question of the science of political science emerged in the United States in the 1950s (Heywood, 2004: 10). According to natural scientists, politics is not science because the variables used in political science are not appropriate to measure, they are all subjective and political scientists can not experiment, they can never make precise estimates (Bealey, et al., 1999: 12). Another reason why political science is not science is the fact that the subjects are worthy-normative and that the relationship between political phenomena changes somewhere and from time to time (Godwin and Wahlke, 1997: 5). It is argued that political science is more philosophical than natural science because it is historically a theory of political science (Dryzek and Leonard: 1988: 1251, 1257). As a result, it is mentioned that a problem of measurement arises when human actions in political science can not be predicted or can not be described according to general law. (Johnson and Reynolds,

2005: 27, 38) .17 From this point of view, in order for politics to become a science, the phenomenon and value must be separated from each other, empirical explanatory method should be developed; Legitimacy should not be sought in history, based on the fact that the physics is not the date, and it should not be necessary to examine Locke or Platon in this context (Ball, 2007: 6,7). Within these criteria, behavioralism has been introduced as a key development in the founding of modern political science (Stoker and Marsh, 2002: 4). This ground is the exclusion of political theory from "science". As a result, in the related literature; traditional political theory is not compatible with positivist¹⁸ criteria (Ball, 2007: 7); (Marsh and Furlong, 2002: 23), and as a result of the debate about the lack of scientificness of political theory, the theorist argues that the theoreticist movement is an open reaction to political construction because political theory is related to value- person. The theorists examine the history of political thought. So it belongs to the history section. Because of their examination of practical political philosophy, they belong to philosophy (Ball, 2007: 1). Since all these discussions, on the one hand, are weighted on the one hand and the axis of fact-value separation is taken, and the phenomenon defined by the amprisist-positivist tradition is an ideological form of the construction of capitalist modern social reality with a worthwhile statement, politics. Hence, these discussions are instrumental in embodying the process of positioning politics as an examined object. In contrast, in the related literature, it is claimed that politics is science or not, depending on the meaning attached to the definition of science (Goodin and Klingemann, 1996: 9). According to some authors, the science of political science is a science when science is regarded as regular information based on systematic examination, because politics is the production of systematic knowledge about politics (Stoker and Marsh, 2002: 11). In this context, by emphasizing that political science should help people to understand their social preferences and anticipate their future preferences, and thus to change the political preferences of the empirical science produced by political science (Godwin and Wahlke, 1997: 4, 5) it is suggested that the functional position in the construction process may or may not be the case, and that it is in the dimension of the desire that this location can and will produce information for its application as a result and conclusion. According to some authors, political scientists tend to think that the general theorem of everything should be (Shapiro, 2002: 609), in other words political science is in search of universally applicable general theory, scientist-scientist (Adcock and Beevir, 2005:). In particular, the US claims to be objective science, independent of political science, historical context and national culture (Adcock and Beevir, 2005: 11). As a result, political theory has become a subfield of political science in US political science. According to some

authors, an analytical examination of political theory, ideas and doctrines (Heywood, 2004: 10) suggests that some of the dimensions of social life are the study of how society lived together in the society as it constitutes state-individual relations (McKinnon, 2008: 2). Because of these qualities, it is often said that political theory has a normative content (McKinnon, 2008: 4). Some authors refer to political philosophy as political theory, and it is accepted that the examination of political life is an attempt to formulate the first doctrines of common human movements, a subfield of philosophy (Ethridge and Handelman, 2004: 21) and of political philosophy and Lipman, 1965: 6). According to some authors, political philosophers should examine the philosophical nature of politics (MacKenzie, 2009: 3). The pushing of political theory into the realm of value has contributed to the politicalization of capitalist society in the form of politics and its concretization. Thus, traditional-normative-political theory and system theory have shifted; the state concept was not suitable for scientific use and replaced the concept with the concept of the political system (Ball, 2007: 10). In this context, the behavioral approach focuses on examining phenomena rather than 21 values. Because values are subjective and can not be proved scientifically (Magstadat, 2006: 11, 12). Thus, in the study of politics, what is scientific is to know the truth, to discover the facts and to establish cause-effect relations (Lipson, 1981: 26). In this context, political theorists are described as normative political scientists (Shapiro, 2002: 597) and empirical political science is defined as method-driven and theoretical research as problem-oriented - problem-driven (Shapiro, 2002: 597- 599). Thus, politics is positioned as the object being examined, with the contribution of the behaviorist movement. Along with the behaviorist approach, the law-historian approach is broken; interest groups, elections, public opinion, communication issues (Almond, 1996: 78); ensuring that political institutions and constitutions are removed from the formal-legal examination (Stoker and Marsh, 2002: 4); (Sanders, 2002: 53), in behavioral research, focusing on voters' views, not on the past but on the past as politics of politics (Sanders, 2002: 53), focusing on voters' social profiles, partisan identities, ideological positions, political preferences and economic perceptions Ball, 2007: 4), and even that the behavioral "revolution" has a meaning beyond aiming at improving the efficiency of the state (Haas, 1970: 14). However, being based entirely on empirical research, it does not liberate political science as a formalist in the way of behaviorism. Because, without any change in the nature of the political and within the borders of the political arena, the data have begun to be searched for in political "behaviors" on the basis of a political definition. Behavior is of value as a defined form of movement. The value is the political content of the political behavior. Therefore, behaviorism deals with the behavior of these

political contents, so it is formalist. As we have already pointed out, the behaviorist movement has been regarded as the result of a quest for a scientific legitimization as part of the debate over the scientific legitimacy of political science.

However, the initial aim and conclusion of these discussions is that the scientific legitimacy of a political science based on political establishment is invalidated by the dominance of the value-oriented dimension of political theory and that this problem will be solved by the exclusion of political theory. Moreover, it has been justified that studies based on estimating election results using various political and economic macro variables have created an industry in political science rather than a generalization (Shapiro, 2002: 610). However, in today's behavioral approaches, it is accepted that an objective explanation of phenomena and phenomena can be made by establishing a link between definitions and abstract explanations of empirically testable hypotheses (Sanders, 2002: 46, 47). Therefore, new behaviorists do not reject that theoretical analysis should be the starting point for empirical research. The theory plays an inevitable role in post-behavioral empirical analysis because different theoretical viewpoints produce different observations (Sanders, 2002: 62, 63). In this context, it is claimed that political positivism must be overcome in the political examination between the normative and empirical distinctions because political values can not be distinguished from the understanding of the political reality in the periphery (Bellamy, 1993: 13). Being new does not make any sense beyond form change, as new-behaviorism does not qualitatively differ from new position, pre-acceptance or assumption in old position. Because the fact-value disparity has an assumption of contradiction in itself. In neo-behaviorism, this contrast is sought to be based on the assumption that the sides of the opposition are either displaced or balanced, rather than being overcome or re-established on the basis of a new whole. In political science, the second revolution after behaviorism is regarded as rational choice theory (Goodin and Klingemann, 1996: 24, 25). Rational choice theory is based on collective action and generalizations. Behaviorism has many similar assumptions. The most important of these is that they regard normative values and political theory as normative (Ward, 2002: 68). The rational choice theory fed from economic theory is criticized as being an over-simplifier (Ethridge and Handelman, 2004: 23). However, the most important characteristic of this theory in terms of its position is the increase of disciplined professionalism with this theory along with behaviorism (Marsh and Savigny, 2004: 156). Hence, the rational choice theory has a qualification that strengthens the positioning of politics as an object to be examined and reinforces concretization empirically.

Methods and Techniques

The contemporary development of political science is intrinsic to the development of objective research methods and political scientists have to use the techniques and methods that have emerged in the United States between 1930 and 1950. For example, the famous public opinion surveys, in other words, the social segment in which the voters of a political party are in a society, the age, the sexes, etc., are largely ignorant of the fact that, in a choice two rounds or two consecutive elections, how to determine the way the slide is displayed. A modern political party has to apply more and more to the information provided by political science.

We must emphasize here that it is necessary to distinguish techniques from methods.

1. Mathematics comes at the beginning of scientific methods. Mathematical methods are useful in the electoral sociology, in public inquiries, in the same election propaganda from different parts of the same city, or in comparing the results obtained with different topics.

In general, much of the observation is from a real experiment. However, this observation is much more complicated than the observations made by other human sciences. The "clinical method" transmitted from the field of medicine allows the possibility of a "diagnosis" of a community in crisis or growing. Classic methods are, in principle, much less compact. Functional method tries to interpret events as function; it is applied to investigate the continuity of constitutional habits in different regimes. The comparative method is particularly used in the study of regimes and institutions. The historical method deals with the evolution, the history of institutions; This is the first source of political thought.

2. In the case of techniques, the simplest method is to investigate the frequency of an expression, to count lines that divide a topic into a newspaper or all the newspapers. However, this content analysis carries bigger goals; greater aims also require more powerful means for the ideological changes of an country to be measured from the newspapers.

Live techniques confront people who are being investigated by those who conduct the survey. There are many types of interview techniques. In the simplest interviews, the person interviewed is kept within certain limits. The most complicated conversation is from a psychoanalytic type of conversation (the person who is talking to him is freed from telling

himself during each and every desired period). This technique "drilling procedure" has gained importance in public investigations.

Political science has also shown the most striking achievements in this field. One of the major innovations is that the sampling method has been put into practice. After a few misunderstandings, "drilling methods" have been matured at various times using the panel technique (replicate technique), ie the same example throughout the entire duration of the event.

In the field of testing, the number of purely political tests is not very high. The measurement of behaviors was used primarily by psychologists and sociologists, since citizens' "motivation" played a major role in political events. The simplest measure of behavior is to measure the degree of "sympathy" or "antipathy" of a community towards another community, nationalism, racism prejudices, etc. determines; highly sophisticated mathematical methods are used to determine the levels of value of community behaviors and to determine their numerical expressions. Modern techniques are effectively applied when examining the relationships between individual relations or limited communities. On the other hand, when it comes to large-scale political movements, they are inadequate; the examination of such movements requires that the investigator's own abilities (sensitivity to objectivity, understanding of interpretation, etc.) be revealed in addition to the techniques in question. As an example, the resolution of a political party can be done almost mechanically at the local level, but not at the national level. Modern political science can not give up the techniques first introduced in the U.S., but it is nothing without personal thought that is based on the past political science.

Thus, in spite of its long history, political science is a young science in its modern form; description and explanation are far from consuming all of your power. He wants to explain now, or even play a role in explaining the past; like economics, foreseeing to be found. Naturally, there is no statistical information in political science, which simply extends the "curves" to provide a clearer view of the future; but political science can give an idea of the future of societies, which now makes better sense.

References

ADAM, H. (2007). Bausteine der Politik: eine einführung. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

AĞAOĞULLARI, M.A. (2009). Kent devletinden İmparatorluğa. 6. Baskı, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

AKÇALI, N. (1994). Çağdaş siyasi rejimler. Ege Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Yayınları, İzmir.

ANDERSEN, U., WICHARD, W. (2003). Politisches system. [Web Address]:

[http://www.bpb.de/nachschlagen/lexika/handwoerterbuch-politischssystem/40364/politische s-system?p=all,](http://www.bpb.de/nachschlagen/lexika/handwoerterbuch-politischssystem/40364/politische-s-system?p=all)

- ARISTOTELES (2010). Politika (Çev. Ersin Uysal). İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- BARE, I.O. (1999). introduction: the study of comparative politics. [Web Address]:
<http://home.millsaps.edu/omobai/LEC-A130.HTM>,
- BEYME, K.V. (2007). Historische entwicklung der vergleichenden politikwissenschaft, Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft, 1 (1), 28-42. ss.
- BHUSHAN, V. (2006). Comparative politics. India: Atlantic.
- BOUTHOU, G. (1997). Politika sanatı (Çev. S. Eyüpoğlu, V. Günyol), İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.
- BRUNNER, G. (1979). Vergleichende regierungslehre. Band1, Paderborn: UTB Verlag.
- ÇAĞLA, C. (2010). Yeni başlayanlar İçin siyaset bilimi. İstanbul: Omnia Yayıncılık.
- ÇIVGIN, İ., YARDIMCI, R. (2007). Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- DUDEN (2011). Herodot. [Web Address]: <http://www.schuelerlexikon.de/SID/9042abb3ca59312442874dea50f6fc9d/lexika/geschichte/index.htm>
- DURUN, D. (2012). Siyaset Bilimi, 6. bs., İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
- EROĞUL, C. (1981). Siyasal düzenlerin sınıflandırılmasına ilişkin birkaç tarihsel örnek ve tartışma, Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Komisyonu (ed.). Prof. Dr. Ahmet Şükrü Esmer'e Armağan, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- FABER, A. (2011). Einführung in die politikwissenschaft: begriffe, theorien, methoden [Web Adress]:
<http://www.kuwi.europa-uni.de/de/lehrstuhl/vs/politik2/lehre/lehrarchiv/SS11/EinfuehrungPowi/EinfPowi06062011.pdf>
- GÖKBERG, M. (2008), Felsefe tarihi. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- GÜRBÜZ, Y. (1987). Karşılaştırmalı siyasal sistemler. 2. Basım, İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
- HERODOTUS (2006). Tarih (Çev. H.A YÜCEL). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

- HEYWOOD, A. (2011). Siyaset (Çev. B.B. ÖZİPEK). Ankara: Adres Yayınları.
- ISHIYAMA, J. T. (2012). Principles of political science series. Comparative Politics Principles of Democracy and Democratization, USA: Wiley- Blackwell.
- JAMES, S. C.M. (2011). Introduction to comparative politics. Malappuram/Kerala/India: School of Distance Education.
- KALAYCIOĞLU, E. (1984). Çağdaş siyasal bilim: teori, olgu ve süreçler, Beta Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- KALAYCIOĞLU, E. (2011). Karşılaştırmalı siyaset. E. KALAYCIOĞLU, D. KAĞNICIOĞLU (ed.), Karşılaştırmalı siyasal sistemler, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- KEMAN, H. (2006). Comparing political systems: Towards positive theory development, Amsterdam: Working Papers Political Science.
- KESSELMAN, M., KRIEGER, J., JOSEPH, W. A. (2009). introducing comparative politics. M. KESSELMAN, J. KRİEGER, W. A. JOSEPH (ed.), introduction to comparative politics brief edition, Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company.
- KESSELMAN, M., KRIEGER, J., JOSEPH, W. A. (2010), Introducing comparative politics. M. KESSELMAN, J. KRİEGER, W. A. JOSEPH (ed.), introduction to comparative politics: political challenges and changing, Canada: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- KOPSTEIN, J., LICHBACH, M. (2005). Comparative politics: interests, identities, and institutions in a changing global order. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- LANDMAN, T. (2005). Issues and methods in comparative politics: an introduction. London, New York: Routledge.
- LANE, R. (2011). Karşılaştırmalı siyaset sanatı (Çev. Z.A. KILINÇ). İstanbul: Küre

Yayınları.

LAUTH, H.J., CHRISTOPH W. (2010). Gegenstand, grundlegende kategorien und forschungsfragen der vergleichenden regierungslehre. H.J. LAUTH (Hrsg.), Vergleichende Regierungslehre: Eine Einführung. 3. Auflage, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

MCCORMICK, J. (2010). Comparative politics in transition. Canada: Wadsworth.

MUNK, G. L. (2007). The past and present of comparative politics. G.L. MUNCK, R. SNYDER (ed.), Passion, Craft and Method in Comparative Politics. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

NOHLEN, D. (2002). Vergleichende Regierungslehre. D. NOHLEN, R.O. SCHULZE, Lexikon der Politikwissenschaft, München: C.H. Beck Verlag, 1031-1033. ss.

ÖZTEKİN, A. (2010). Siyaset bilimine giriş. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.

PICKEL, S. (2010). Methoden der Regierungssystemanalyse und des Regierungssystemvergleichs. H.K. SCHRENK (Hrsg.), Analyse demokratischer Regierungssysteme. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

PILZ, F. und HEIKE O. (2008). Das politische System Deutschlands: systemintegrierende einföhrung in das regierungs-, wirtschafts- und sozialsystem, München, Wien: Oldenburg Verlag.

PLATON (2007). Yasalar, İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi.

PRITTWITZ, V.V. (2007). Vergleichende Politikanalyse, Stuttgart: Lucius-Lucius Verlagsgesellschaft.

ROSE, R. (1991). Comparing forms of comparative analysis. in Political Studies, 39, ss. 446-462.

SIDGWICK, H. (1892). Aristotle's classification of forms of government. in The Classical

- Review, Cambridge University Press, 6 (4), 141-144, ss.
- STAMMEN, T. (1976), Vergleichende Regierungslehre. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft Verlag.
- STYKOW, P. (2007). Vergleich politischer Systeme, Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink GmbH&CO. Verlag.
- TANNENBAUM, D., SCHULTZ, D. (2011). Siyasi Düşünce Tarihi: filozoflar ve fikirleri (Çev. F. Demirci). Ankara: Adres Yayınları.
- TUNÇAY, M. (1969). Büyük siyaset felsefecilerinden önce. M. TUNÇAY (ed.), Batı'da Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi-1: Eski ve Orta Çağlar Seçilmiş Yazılar. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları.
- TURAN, İ. (1986), Siyasal sistem ve siyasal davranış, İstanbul: Der Yayınları.
- TÜRKÖNE, M. (2010). Siyaset. İstanbul: Opus Yayınları.
- YALÇINKAYA, A. (2011). Yunan uygarlığı içinde polis ve siyaset. M.A. AĞAOĞULLARI (ed.), Sokrates'ten Jakobenlere Batı'da Siyasal Düşünceler. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- ZABCI, F. (2011). Aristoteles: yüce bir amaç olarak siyaset. M.A. AĞAOĞULLARI (ed.), Sokrates'ten Jakobenlere Batı'da Siyasal Düşünceler, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Forster, M. (1971). Masters of Political Thought. London: G. Harrop & Co. Ltd.
- Mansel, A.M. (1984). Ege ve Yunan Tarihi. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Mayo, H.B. (1964). Demokratik Teoriye Giriş. Ankara: Türk Siyasi İlimler Derneği Yayınları.
- Millard, A. (1987). Welcome to Ancient Greece. London: Penguin Books.
- Rostovtzeff, M. (1963). Greece. New York: Galaxy Book.
- Russell, B. 1984). Batı Felsefesi Tarihi cilt I. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Sabine, G. (1969). Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi I. Ankara: Türk Siyasi İlimler Derneği

Yayınları.

Sealey, R. (1976). A History of Greek City States. California: University of California.

Störig, T.A. (1967). A History of Political Thought. Routledge & Keagan Paul Ltd.

Şenel, A. (1968). Eski Yunan'da Siyasal Düşünüş. Ankara: SBF Yayınları.

Şenel, A. (1970). Eski Yunan'da Eşitlik ve Eşitsizlik Üstüne. Ankara: SBF

Yayınları.

Williams, F. (1993). Ege Medeniyetleri Tarihi. İstanbul: Düşünen Adam Yayınları