

# BUILDING CONSENSUS: ELDERLY RIGHTS AS A REGIONAL NORM IN THE TURKIC WORLD

Turkic World already possesses the elements required to treat elderly rights not as a marginal welfare topic, but as a core dimension of regional cooperation. Common ground among social ministries, foreign ministries, OTS institutions, youth groups, and elder organisations reveal a shared intuition that older persons should not be left to the contingencies of family solidarity or ad hoc welfare measures alone, but ought to enjoy a minimum set of guarantees compatible with both civilizational ethics and contemporary standards of dignity. When read through the lens of *Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal* tradition, this intuition crystallises into a coherent set of principles on dignity, reciprocity, participation, protection, and intergenerational responsibility that can serve as the normative backbone of a regional elderly rights agenda.

## Dr. Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun

---

*Analyst, Center for Eurasian Studies (AVİM)*

## Berna Sarıca

---

*MA Candidate, Social Sciences University of Ankara*

### **Introduction: From scattered debates to a shared agenda**

Over the last decade, discussions about ageing in the Turkic World have multiplied across policy circles, academic forums, and civil-society initiatives. Demographic analyses document a rapid increase in the share of older persons in member states of the Organization of Turkic States (OTS), raising questions about the sustainability of pension systems, health services, and care arrangements. At the same time, earlier work rooted in Constructive Eurasianism has underlined that the region is not starting from a normative vacuum:

longstanding cultural resources such as *Ata Kültürü* (Ancestor/Forefather Culture) and the *Aksakal* (“White Beard”/Elder) tradition, together with the symbolic and consultative institutions of the OTS, already frame expectations about how elders should be treated and what kind of solidarity binds generations together. Yet despite this growing attention, debates on elderly rights remain fragmented—oscillating between domestic welfare reforms, cultural invocations of respect for elders, and sporadic references to international human-rights standards, without a clearly articulated regional baseline.<sup>1</sup>



Previous publications in this research programme have addressed different parts of the puzzle. Public-facing commentaries and blog posts have sought to place Eurasia's demographic turning point on the agenda of policymakers and wider audiences, arguing that Turkic states cannot afford to treat ageing as a secondary issue. A first preprint has mapped institutional landscapes and policy options, highlighting both promising initiatives and serious gaps in the protection of older persons, including lessons from the COVID-19 pandemic. The Istanbul Forum paper has explored future scenarios and the potential of OTS institutions, especially the Council of Elders and youth platforms, as an "intergenerational architecture" linking ancestral ethics with contemporary governance. Forthcoming work is set to examine elderly rights through the lenses of norm diffusion and international law, positioning Turkic Eurasia as a possible source of legal and policy innovation.<sup>2</sup>

What is still missing, however, is a **shared regional point of departure**; a coherent account of what relevant actors in the Turkic World already agree on, which principles

rooted in *Ata Kültürü* can be translated into a common normative framework, and what kind of institutional package could command broad but realistic support in the near term. Without such a baseline, efforts to develop legal instruments, data-driven evaluations, or global norm-entrepreneurship strategies risk either outpacing political realities or reproducing existing fragmentation.

This article addresses that gap. It aims to consolidate a **consensus baseline** on elderly-rights in the Turkic World by, first, identifying minimal common ground across governments, OTS bodies, youth and elder organisations; second, reconstructing the civilizational principles that can underpin a regional elderly-rights norm; third, sketching a first-generation package of soft-law and institutional instruments; and, finally, outlining a practical consensus-building process suited to the capacities and constraints of OTS members. In doing so, the article is intentionally positioned as a bridge between diagnostic work, most notably the OSF index preprint and related empirical studies, and the more theory-intensive analyses of norm entrepreneurship and international law that forthcoming SSRN, CESRAN

**Foreign ministries and regional-cooperation units, for their part, are attentive to the international image of the Turkic World and to opportunities for Constructive Eurasianism; they are drawn to initiatives that project a distinctive but cooperative social model without generating rigid treaty obligations.**

indexes, and indexed-journal pieces will develop. Its central claim is that, by moving from scattered debates to a shared agenda, the Turkic World can begin to treat elderly rights as a regional norm in the making rather than as a series of isolated national experiments.<sup>3</sup>

### **1. Minimal Common Ground: What Actors Already Agree On**

Over the past several years, a growing body of work has depicted the Turkic World as standing at a demographic and institutional crossroads. Commentaries, preprints, and forum papers have documented how member states of the Organization of Turkic States (OTS) are entering a period of rapid population ageing that will test the resilience of social-security systems and the legitimacy of existing welfare regimes. At the same time, these studies underline that the region possesses of distinctive cultural resources, above all *Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal* legacy, as well as emerging OTS platforms that could be mobilized in response.<sup>4</sup> Rather than rehearsing this diagnosis in full, this section asks a different question: given this background, what minimal common ground already exists among key actors that could support the emergence of a regional elderly-rights norm?

When we read earlier AVİM and OSF work side by side, at least five convergence points stand out. First, there is a growing recognition across the region that ageing is no longer a narrow social-policy or family issue, but a strategic concern for economic sustainability, social cohesion, and political legitimacy. Demographic projections and recent policy debates are increasingly framed in terms of long-term risks to labour markets, public finances, and intergenerational trust, even though the language of “rights” is not yet fully articulated.<sup>5</sup>

Second, there is a widely shared cultural respect for elders, expressed in everyday practices and in public rhetoric through concepts such as *Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal* figure. While the intensity and social expression of these norms vary, no major actor openly contests the idea that older persons deserve special consideration and honour.<sup>6</sup>

Third, despite significant institutional differences, states already accept basic welfare obligations toward older persons. Pension schemes, subsidised health services, and varying forms of long-term care exist in all member countries, and recent reforms have generally expanded rather than curtailed these arrangements. Fourth, there is a diffuse but increasing concern over ageism (discrimination against the elderly), the fear that older persons may be reduced to economic “burdens” or epidemiological “risk groups,” especially in the wake of COVID-19 debates in other regions. Even when ageist language does not dominate domestic discourse, policymakers and experts in Turkic Eurasia are acutely aware of the reputational and moral costs of such framings. Finally, there is evident interest in OTS platforms as venues where social questions, including ageing, can be discussed alongside trade, connectivity, and security. The consolidation of the Council of Elders, the expansion of youth forums, and the inclusion of social topics in summit agendas all point in this direction.<sup>7</sup>

These convergence points become clearer when we distinguish the main actor groups involved in the debate. Social ministries and welfare agencies tend to foreground the fiscal sustainability of pensions, healthcare, and care services; yet their internal documents and public statements also emphasise the need to maintain social legitimacy and prevent poverty in old age. Foreign ministries and regional-cooperation units, for their part, are attentive to the international image of the Turkic World and to opportunities for Constructive Eurasianism; they are drawn to initiatives that project a distinctive but cooperative social model without generating rigid treaty obligations. Within the OTS architecture, bodies such as the Council of Elders and the Secretariat seek agendas that can connect symbolic civilizational references with concrete cooperation, thereby demonstrating the practical relevance of Turkic solidarity.

Alongside these institutional actors, youth groups and early-career scholars increasingly engage with ageing

as a way of thinking about their own futures. Forum discussions and postgraduate research projects show that younger cohorts view intergenerational solidarity both as a cultural inheritance and as a policy field in which they wish to have a voice. Finally, elder councils and civil-society organisations, ranging from retirees' associations to social non-governmental organizations (NGOs), frame their demands in terms of dignity, participation, and protection from neglect or abuse, often invoking traditional respect for elders in support of more predictable services and safeguards.

When these positions are cross-matched, a pattern of overlapping interests emerges. Social ministries seek reforms that are fiscally viable but also publicly defensible; foreign ministries and OTS bodies are interested in visible, low-cost initiatives that enhance the region's normative profile; youth and elders wish to avoid both economic precarity and symbolic marginalisation in later life. None of these actors necessarily begins from a fully articulated rights-based vocabulary. Yet taken together, their concerns point toward a shared intuition; that older persons in the Turkic World should be able to rely on a minimum set of guarantees compatible with civilizational ethics and contemporary standards of dignity.<sup>8</sup>

This minimal common ground does not, by itself, determine the exact shape of a regional elderly-rights regime. It does, however, provide a sufficiently broad and solid basis for developing a consensus-oriented package of norms and institutions, which the remainder of this article seeks to outline. In the next section, we therefore move from mapping convergences to reconstructing the civilizational principles that can translate *Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal* tradition into shared, region-wide standards for the treatment of older persons.

## 2. From *Ata Kültürü* to Shared Normative Principles

The minimal common ground outlined above is not simply the product of short-term policy calculations. It reflects, more fundamentally, the civilizational grammar through which ageing, authority, and responsibility have long been understood in Turkic societies. *Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal* tradition do not only supply symbolic references for political speeches; they structure expectations about how generations ought to relate to one another and about the place of older persons within the moral community. If a regional consensus on elderly

rights is to be more than a technocratic adjustment of welfare schemes, it must therefore take these civilizational resources seriously as a starting point.<sup>9</sup>

Earlier analyses have shown how *Ata*, far from being a purely biological category, denotes the person who raises, guides, and transmits collective memory, thereby embodying a living link between past, present, and future. Old age, in this horizon, is not primarily associated with decline but with the accumulation of experience and moral capital. The *Aksakal*, literally the “white-bearded elder,” condenses this status: he is expected to mediate conflicts, advise rulers, and safeguard communal norms. Taken together, *Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal* figure place elders at the centre of social life rather than at its margins, suggesting that a community in which older persons are humiliated or abandoned has, in some sense, betrayed its own self-understanding.

Everyday practices continue to echo this ethic. In many families, elders are addressed with honorifics, seated in the most respected places at gatherings, and consulted on important decisions. Caring for parents is described as a repayment of a longstanding debt, not as an optional act of generosity. Local leaders invoke *Ata Kültürü* when mobilising support for vulnerable older neighbours in times of crisis, and political actors regularly appeal to the wisdom of elders when speaking about unity and continuity. Even where urbanisation, migration, and changing family structures have weakened these patterns, they remain powerful reference points in public discourse. Crucially, they frame respect for elders as a **duty grounded in reciprocity**, not merely as a matter of individual preference.

From this civilizational grammar, a limited but robust set of **normative principles** can be distilled that is capable of underpinning regional consensus. The first is **dignity**: the idea that the worth of older persons does not depend

***Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal* tradition do not only supply symbolic references for political speeches; they structure expectations about how generations ought to relate to one another and about the place of older persons within the moral community.**

on their current economic productivity, health status, or household role. In the language of *Ata Kültürü*, the elder's life is valuable because it concentrates memory and experience; in legal-policy terms, this translates into commitments to prevent degrading treatment, ensure adequate living conditions, and avoid policies that implicitly treat older persons as disposable.

A second principle is **reciprocity**. Intergenerational obligations are understood not as one-directional flows of assistance from young to old, but as part of a long arc of mutual giving and receiving. Policy language grounded in this principle would move beyond charity-based schemes and emphasise entitlements earned through prior contributions, whether economic, social, or caregiving.

**Participation** is the third principle. The *Aksakal* is not a passive beneficiary of protection but an active interlocutor in communal life; similarly, a regional elderly-rights norm should affirm that older persons have the right to participate in family, community, and public decision-making, including in discussions of policies that affect them.

The fourth principle is **protection against neglect and abuse**. Traditional expectations that families and communities must not “leave elders alone” can be reformulated in contemporary terms as a negative duty on both public authorities and private actors to prevent abandonment, exploitation, and violence in old age. This does not require uniform criminal codes or social-service models across the region. It does, however, imply that certain forms of treatment are incompatible with Turkic civilizational ethics and should be recognised as such in regional instruments.

Finally, a fifth principle can be captured under the heading of **intergenerational responsibility**. Here, *Ata Kültürü* speaks not only to what younger generations

owe their elders, but also to how each cohort envisions its own future ageing. In policy language, this supports measures that foster solidarity between age groups, avoid zero-sum framings of “young versus old,” and integrate ageing concerns into long-term development strategies.

Translating these principles into **legal and policy vocabulary** does not mean turning cultural references into rigid legal codes. Instead, it involves articulating them in a form that can be endorsed in summit declarations, charters, and national strategies, while leaving detailed doctrinal testing and institutional design to more specialised work. An Elderly Rights Charter, for example, could cluster them into a small number of articles, on dignity and non-discrimination, on participation and social inclusion, on care and protection, each accompanied by explanatory language that explicitly links modern concepts to *Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal* legacy. National policies and OTS initiatives would then be guided by a shared vocabulary that is recognisably Turkic in its ethical roots yet compatible with contemporary rights discourse.

By reconstructing *Ata Kültürü* in this way, Section 2 seeks to provide the **normative backbone** for the consensus package that later sections will propose. The principles of dignity, reciprocity, participation, protection, and intergenerational responsibility do not resolve all policy controversies, but they do narrow the range of legitimate disagreement and offer a common reference point for states, OTS bodies, youth groups, and elder organisations. On this basis, the next part of the article turns to the more practical question of how these principles can be assembled into a realistic regional “consensus package” of instruments and mechanisms suitable for the Turkic World in the coming decade.

### 3. Blueprinting a Regional Elderly-Rights Consensus Package

If the previous sections have identified *why* a regional elderly-rights norm is both necessary and culturally legitimate, they have not yet answered the question of *what* such a norm might look like in institutional terms. Minimal common ground among key actors and the principles derived from *Ata Kültürü* together suggest a direction of travel, but they do not, on their own, specify concrete mechanisms or instruments. Drawing on the policy pathways outlined in earlier OSF work and on the

**Crucially, the Charter's language would explicitly link these commitments to *Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal* tradition, thereby signalling that they arise from within Turkic civilizational ethics rather than being imported wholesale from external models.**



scenarios developed for the Istanbul Forum, this section sketches a first-generation “consensus package” that could realistically be adopted within the OTS framework over the coming decade. The package consists of three interlocking components: an Elderly Rights Charter, a Regional Observatory on Ageing, and a set of soft coordination tools.

The **Elderly Rights Charter** would form the normative core of this architecture. Its purpose would not be to replicate a detailed convention or to harmonise national legislation line by line, but to articulate, in concise form, the shared principles that OTS members recognise as binding on their political conscience. Building on the analysis in Section 2, the Charter could be organised around two or three clusters of rights and responsibilities. A first cluster, centred on **dignity and non-discrimination**, would affirm that older persons have the right to live free from degrading treatment, ageist stereotyping, and unjust exclusion from services and opportunities. A second cluster, focused on **participation and social inclusion**, would state that older persons have the right to take part in family, community, and public life, including in decision-making on policies that affect them. A third cluster, framed in terms of **care, protection, and intergenerational responsibility**, would affirm obligations to prevent neglect and abuse, to secure minimum income and access to essential health and care services, and to foster solidarity between age groups.

Crucially, the Charter’s language would explicitly link these commitments to *Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal tradition*, thereby signalling that they arise from within Turkic civilizational ethics rather than being imported wholesale from external models. Preambular paragraphs could recall the role of elders in transmitting memory and safeguarding communal norms, while operative provisions would translate that ethic into contemporary rights language. At the same time, the Charter would be cast as a **softlaw-instrument**, adopted at the summit level, referenced in national strategies, but not directly justiciable in domestic courts, so as to accommodate the concerns of governments wary of premature legalisation. This combination of clear principles and flexible legal form is central to the package’s political feasibility.

Whereas the Charter would articulate *what ought to be guaranteed*, a **Regional Observatory on Ageing** would help answer the question of *where member states stand* in relation to these aspirations. Earlier OSF work has already proposed the idea of a light monitoring and knowledge-sharing mechanism; the contribution of this article is to specify a basic design that fits the consensus logic. The Observatory would not function as a supranational authority or a heavy reporting bureaucracy. Instead, it would operate as a small, technically focused structure tasked with three functions. First, it would **collect and collate data** that national statistical offices already produce on demographics, income security,

health coverage, and care arrangements for older persons. Second, it would **facilitate the exchange of methodologies and promising practices**, for example by convening technical workshops and publishing brief comparative notes. Third, it would prepare **periodic overview reports** that map regional trends against the broad principles of the Elderly Rights Charter, without ranking states or issuing sanctions.<sup>10</sup>

In institutional terms, the Observatory could be anchored in the OTS Secretariat or in a partner research network, with a governing board that includes representatives from social ministries, national statistics institutions, and, over time, advisory input from elder councils and youth platforms. Budgetary needs would remain modest, especially if existing data streams are used and digital tools are leveraged for cooperation. The key innovation would lie less in new bureaucracy than in **creating a regular, structured space** in which ageing is discussed on the basis of shared evidence, thereby reinforcing the sense that elderly rights are a regional, not merely national, concern.

The third pillar of the consensus package consists of **soft coordination tools** that link the Charter's norms and the Observatory's knowledge to concrete policy evolution. Here, earlier scenarios and pathways suggest several low-cost but symbolically powerful options. One is the introduction of an **informal peer-review mechanism**; at regular intervals, social policy ministers from OTS states could present recent reforms and challenges related to ageing, with feedback from peers, Observatory experts, and representatives of elders and youth. These sessions would not produce binding recommendations, but they would generate gentle political pressure to show progress and to learn from neighbours.

A second tool would be the encouragement of **voluntary national action plans on ageing and elderly rights**, explicitly referencing the Elderly Rights Charter. Each state would define its own priorities, such as expanding community-based care, improving pension adequacy, or combating ageism in the labour market, while situating these initiatives within the shared regional vocabulary. OTS could support these efforts by offering templates, convening technical roundtables, or facilitating links with international partners. A third tool would involve consolidating an **OTS social-policy track** in which ageing features as a recurring agenda item alongside other welfare issues. Over time, this track could evolve

into a standing working group or ministerial format that ensures continuity and follow-up between summits.

Combining these three components into a single package raises inevitable **trade-offs**, which this article makes explicit. A more detailed and legally binding Charter might offer stronger guarantees on paper but could fragment consensus and delay adoption; a very minimal text, by contrast, might attract wide endorsement but lack normative bite. Similarly, an Observatory with extensive powers and indicators could produce rich data at the cost of political resistance and administrative burden, whereas an overly light structure might fail to change practice. The approach advocated here seeks a **middle ground**; principles that are sufficiently specific to guide expectations, monitoring functions that are robust enough to sustain learning, and coordination tools that create incentives without provoking sovereignty concerns.

It is important to underline that this proposed consensus package does **not** exhaust the agenda of elderly rights in the Turkic World. Detailed doctrinal analysis of how Charter principles interact with domestic constitutions and international law, the design of justiciable remedies, and comprehensive quantitative assessments of socio-economic impacts are deliberately left to subsequent work, including the planned SSRN preprint and future TR Dizin and ESCI/Scopus indexed articles. Nor does the package presume uniformity across diverse welfare regimes; rather, it offers a shared framework within which differentiated paths of reform can unfold.<sup>11</sup>

What it does provide, however, is a **coherent starting point** around which governments, OTS institutions, youth groups, and elder organisations can align in the short to medium term. By bringing together the cultural principles of *Ata Kültürü*, the institutional opportunities of OTS governance, and the empirical insights of prior AVİM and OSF work, this first-generation package translates consensus in values into an actionable, region-wide agenda. The next section therefore turns from design to politics, examining which actors would need to move, in what sequence, for such a package to be negotiated, adopted, and implemented in practice.<sup>12</sup>

#### **4. Consensus-Building Process: Who Needs to Move, and How?**

The architecture outlined above sketches what a first-generation regional elderly-rights package could look

like. Yet institutional blueprints do not implement themselves. Whether an Elderly Rights Charter, a Regional Observatory, and soft coordination tools remain on paper or crystallise into practice will depend on the willingness and capacity of specific actors to invest political capital, time, and expertise in the project. In other words, the question is not only *what* kind of consensus is desirable, but also *who* must move, and *through which pathways*, for that consensus to emerge.

The starting point is the constellation of actors already identified in earlier sections: social ministries and welfare agencies; foreign ministries and regional-cooperation units; OTS institutions such as the Council of Elders and the Secretariat; youth groups and early-career scholars; and elder councils and civil-society organisations. Each of these brings distinct resources and constraints. Social ministries command technical knowledge of pension, health, and care systems but are often risk-averse and fiscally constrained. Foreign ministries and OTS structures are better placed to shape narratives and convene regional forums, yet they lack detailed policy expertise. Youth and academic networks contribute energy and ideas, while elder organisations embody lived experience and moral authority. A viable consensus-building strategy must therefore work with *coalitions* that combine these strengths, rather than relying on any single actor.

A first, pragmatic step would be for a small group of **lead social ministries and the OTS Secretariat** to frame ageing and elderly rights as a standing item on the organisation's social-policy agenda. Building on the diagnostic work already undertaken in AVİM and OSF projects, these ministries could request an initial technical meeting under OTS auspices, perhaps in the format of a social-policy working group or an ad hoc task force, to review existing national strategies and identify areas of convergence and concern. At this stage, the emphasis would be on information-sharing and trust-building rather than on formal commitments. The outcome could be a short internal note recognising the demographic challenge, acknowledging the civilizational principles at stake, and inviting further exploration of regional responses.<sup>13</sup>

In parallel, **the Council of Elders and youth platforms** can play a crucial role in framing the political narrative around the proposed Charter and Observatory. As bodies that embody the intergenerational logic of *Ata Kültürü*

**Foreign ministries and OTS structures are better placed to shape narratives and convene regional forums, yet they lack detailed policy expertise.**

in institutional form, they are well placed to articulate why codifying respect for elders in soft-law instruments is both a natural extension of tradition and a necessary adaptation to contemporary conditions. Joint sessions bringing together elders and young leaders, building on formats already tested in the Istanbul Forum context, could produce non-binding “statements of intent” or recommendations that call on governments to explore the consensus package. Such documents would not carry legal force, but they could help to normalise the idea that elderly rights are a legitimate topic for OTS deliberation and not merely a domestic welfare issue.

Once this **dual track**, technical discussion among ministries and narrative framing by elders and youth, is underway, the next step would involve **sequencing negotiations** over the different components of the package. Given their symbolic importance and relative legal flexibility, discussions on the Elderly Rights Charter could begin first. A small drafting group, including representatives from social and foreign ministries, OTS legal advisers, and selected experts, could prepare an initial text structured around the principles identified in Section 2. This draft would then be circulated for comment among member states, elder councils, and civil-society organisations, with revisions aimed at maximising acceptability while preserving substantive meaning. Only once a broad informal consensus is visible would the text be placed on the agenda of a leaders' summit for formal adoption as a non-binding instrument.

Negotiations on the **Regional Observatory on Ageing** and associated coordination tools could follow a slightly different path. Here, the key challenge is not symbolic endorsement but concerns over cost, administrative burden, and potential ranking or naming-and-shaming. To address these sensitivities, pilot initiatives could be launched with a smaller group of willing states, perhaps under the label of an “OTS Ageing Data and Practices Network.” This network would initially focus on exchanging methodologies and producing low-stakes comparative notes, demonstrating the practical value of



cooperation without imposing heavy reporting duties. If these pilots prove useful and politically uncontroversial, they could subsequently be upgraded into a formal Observatory with a clearly defined, light-touch mandate, as described in the previous section.

Throughout this process, **civil-society actors and the epistemic community** surrounding AVİM, OSF, and partner institutions have an important supporting function. By generating research, hosting workshops, and producing accessible policy briefs, they can help keep ageing on the public agenda and provide the evidence base that ministries and OTS officials require. They are also well placed to build bridges to **global processes**, such as the United Nations Open-Ended Working Group on Ageing, by translating regional experiences into contributions to international debates. In doing so, they can subtly signal that the Turkic World is positioning itself not only as a norm-taker but as a potential norm-shaper, without pre-empting the more elaborate norm-entrepreneurship analysis reserved for forthcoming SSRN and CESRAN work.<sup>14</sup>

Sequencing and coalitionbuilding in this way does not guarantee success, but it **reduces the barriers** that often derail ambitious regional initiatives. Beginning with informal technical discussions and narrative framing, moving toward soft-law adoption of a Charter, piloting cooperative data practices before institutionalising an Observatory, and gradually embedding ageing in an OTS social-policy track all allow member states to test

and adjust the consensus package without incurring high political or sovereignty costs. At each stage, the emphasis remains on aligning actors around the shared intuition, articulated in earlier sections, that treating older persons with dignity, reciprocity, participation, and protection is both a civilizational duty and a strategic investment in the Turkic World's future.

In this sense, the consensus-building process proposed here is deliberately **incremental and directional**. It does not assume that all elements of a regional elderly-rights regime can be agreed at once, nor does it underestimate domestic constraints and competing priorities. Instead, it suggests a pathway through which existing minimal common ground, deeply rooted cultural principles, and a realistic institutional package can be woven together into a living regional norm over time. The concluding section of the article will reflect on what such a trajectory would mean for broader debates on constructive Eurasianism and on the Turkic World's potential contribution to global discussions on the rights of older persons.

### **Conclusion: From Regional Consensus to Norm Entrepreneurship**

This article has argued that the Turkic World already possesses the elements required to treat elderly rights not as a marginal welfare topic, but as a core dimension of regional cooperation. Minimal common ground among social ministries, foreign ministries, OTS institutions,

youth groups, and elder organisations reveals a shared intuition that older persons should not be left to the contingencies of family solidarity or ad hoc welfare measures alone, but ought to enjoy a minimum set of guarantees compatible with both civilizational ethics and contemporary standards of dignity. When read through the lens of *Ata Kültürü* and the *Aksakal* tradition, this intuition crystallises into a coherent set of principles on dignity, reciprocity, participation, protection, and intergenerational responsibility, that can serve as the normative backbone of a regional elderly-rights agenda.<sup>15</sup>

Building on these foundations, the article has proposed a first-generation **consensus package** consisting of an Elderly Rights Charter, a Regional Observatory on Ageing, and soft coordination tools such as peer review, voluntary national plans, and an OTS social-policy track. These instruments are deliberately framed in soft-law and light-institutional terms, balancing the need for meaningful commitments with member states' concerns about sovereignty, costs, and administrative burdens. The package is therefore not a fully-fledged regional rights regime, but a realistic and politically feasible starting

point around which diverse actors can align in the short to medium term.

Finally, the article has outlined an **incremental consensus-building pathway** in which technical cooperation among social ministries, narrative leadership by the Council of Elders and youth platforms, pilot data networks, and sustained engagement by think tanks and civil society gradually weave the package into OTS practice. If pursued, such a trajectory would not only strengthen intergenerational solidarity and social protection within Turkic Eurasia; it would also position the region as a credible contributor to global debates on the rights of older persons and on the design of culturally grounded social-rights norms. In this sense, the regional consensus mapped here is best understood as a **launchpad** for the more explicit norm-entrepreneurship analyses that forthcoming SSRN and CESRAN studies will develop, and as an intermediate step toward the data-rich, doctrinally detailed work planned for TR Dizin-indexed and international journals.

## Endnotes

- 1 Berna Sarica, and Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun. 2025. "From Council of Elders to Regional Standards: How OTS Traditions Can Guide Elderly Rights Reform." AVİM Blog, November 21. Center for Eurasian Studies (AVİM). <https://avim.org.tr/Blog/FROM-COUNCIL-OF-ELDERS-TO-REGIONAL-STANDARDS-HOW-OTS-TRADITIONS-CAN-GUIDE-ELDERLY-RIGHTS-REFORM>
- 2 Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun. "Sweden's Coronavirus Fight Strategy And Bitter Memories Of Past Eugenic Practices," AVİM Analysis, no. 2020/15 (May 4, 2020), Center for Eurasian Studies (AVİM), <https://www.avim.org.tr/en/Analiz/SWEDEN-S-CORONAVIRUS-FIGHT-STRATEGY-AND-BITTER-MEMORIES-OF-PAST-EUGENIC-PRACTICES-1>
- 3 Berna Sarica, and Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun. 2026. "Institutionalizing Elderly Rights: Regional Needs And Policy Pathways In Turkic Eurasia." OSF Preprints (SocArXiv). DOI: 10.31235/osf.io/6z3qj\_v1. [https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/6z3qj\\_v1](https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/6z3qj_v1)
- 4 Rahimov, Rahim. "Values and heritage in the construction of the Organization of Turkic States: a Turkic archipelago in the making." Global Discourse (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1332/20437897y2025d000000064>.
- 5 Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun, Eurasian Demography's Turning Point: Why Turkic States Must Lead on Elderly Rights, AVİM Commentary No. 2025/52 (November 21, 2025), <https://avim.org.tr/en/Yorum/Eurasian-Demography-s-Turning-Point-Why-Turkic-States-Must-Lead-on-Elderly-Rights>.
- 6 Berna Sarica, and Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun. 2026. "Institutionalizing Elderly Rights: Regional Needs And Policy Pathways In Turkic Eurasia."
- 7 Ismail, Mohamed, and S. Hussein. "An Evidence Review of Ageing, Long-Term Care Provision and Funding Mechanisms in Turkey: Using Existing Evidence to Estimate Long-Term Care Cost." Sustainability (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116306>.
- 8 Halim, Amran Abdul, N. Anas, Amiruddin Mohd Sobali, Abdulloh Salaeh, Syed Najihuddin Syed Hassan, and Mohd Izzuddin Agiman@Azman. "Community and Legal Right on Elderly Care." International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences (2024). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbs/v14-i5/21151>.
- 9 Khommyyev, Toily B., and Annagul Sh. Abdyrakhmanova. "Traditions associated with honouring the elders in the Turkmen rural community." Historical Ethnology (2024). <https://doi.org/10.22378/he.2024-9-2.201-213>.
- 10 Berna Sarica, and Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun. 2026. "Institutionalizing Elderly Rights: Regional Needs And Policy Pathways In Turkic Eurasia."
- 11 Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun and Berna Sarica, "Norm Entrepreneurship in Eurasia: Legal Invention and Elderly Rights in the Turkic States" (unpublished working paper, planned SSRN preprint, n.d.)
- 12 Berna Sarica, and Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun. 2026. "Institutionalizing Elderly Rights: Regional Needs And Policy Pathways In Turkic Eurasia."
- 13 Berna Sarica, and Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun. 2026. "Institutionalizing Elderly Rights: Regional Needs And Policy Pathways In Turkic Eurasia."
- 14 Berna Sarica, and Teoman Ertuğrul Tulun. 2026. "Institutionalizing Elderly Rights: Regional Needs And Policy Pathways In Turkic Eurasia."
- 15 Türk Devletleri Teşkilatı, Türk Dünyası 2040 Vizyonu (İstanbul: Türk Devletleri Teşkilatı Sekreteryası, 2021)