

The Rethinking of the July 15 Coup Attempt on Bureaucratic Communitarianism in Turkey

Salih Zeki Haklı*

Abstract

It is supposed that many bureaucratic institutions including army will be regulated by the government after 15th July coup attempt in Turkey. Since bureaucracy which constantly tries to dominate political power has been the most important and superior institution in Turkey for two centuries the regulations should be done regarding not only the Fethullah Gülenist Terror Organisation (FETÖ) but also over the entire bureaucratic tutelage system. For this reason, that power of bureaucracy should be reduced as soon as possible is vitally important. It is obvious that Turkish bureaucracy has been organised like a secular community since Tanzimat period. This community has consisted of a modernisation project which is designed to be embraced by Turkish people, a perception which depends on the superiority of bureaucracy against political power and finally on suspicion towards all individual choices of ordinary people. It is argued in this article that Turkish bureaucracy which has been aimed to transform the whole political realm and the society in Turkey has used a communitarian mind-set in order to accomplish its purposes.

Keywords

Turkish Bureaucracy, FETÖ, communitarianism, common good, perfectionism

* Assist. Prof. Dr., Police Academy Directorate, Institute of Security Science – Ankara/Turkey
szhakli@gmail.com

Introduction

How Turkey should eliminate the conditions in its society that allow for the occurrence of coup attempts is the most important issue to be resolved after the July 15 coup attempt. It is assumed that the first regulations will concern the military bureaucracy, since the coup was attempted by the Turkish army. Furthermore, it is very crucial that the military and civil bureaucracy should be reorganized to prevent any similar attempts or other interventions against political power, and to promote healthy, open, and social relationships among the Turkish people. By studying the last two centuries of Turkish history, it becomes clear that the most powerful institution that has influenced and transformed society is the bureaucracy; this includes the army.

The main aims of the July 15 coup attempt were to destroy civil society, which has been expanding for fourteen years, and to design a different political and social order in Turkey. Although the coup attempt on the night of July 15 was initiated by military forces, a huge civil bureaucratic force stood behind it. The generals who attempted to overthrow the government and the civilians who supported them imagined a new political system based on bureaucratic authoritarianism. This partnership consisted of members of the Fethullah Gülenist Terror Organisation (FETÖ), who had been placed in the upper ranks of the bureaucracy, including the military, judiciary, security, and educational systems. These officers have obtained important positions in their institutions through clandestine efforts and agreements. Thus, they have gained vital power both in the military and the civil bureaucracy.

Despite that the July 15 coup attempt was realized by members of FETÖ, and the reorganization of state institutions was primarily intended to diminish their power, other military coup d'états in 1960, 1971, 1980, and 1997 prove that Turkey has a greater problem concerning the mind-set of its bureaucracy. Thus, Turkey should not only take measures to diminish the FETÖ threat, but should also consider removing the entire bureaucratic tutelage system. An institutional and mind-set transformation need to be carried out in the Turkish bureaucracy to enable elected and responsible politicians to pursue their freely-chosen policies, and for civil society to be able to thrive in Turkey. In this article, the communal mindset of the

Turkish bureaucracy is analyzed in light of its attempts to direct politics and society with compulsive decision-making over the last two centuries.

Bureaucratic Communitarianism in Turkey

The bureaucracy has been one of the most important institutions of the Ottoman Empire since it was established in 1299. The state achieved centralization within the first few centuries of its existence and strengthened the authority of the Ottoman Sultan by means of absolute fidelity to his rule. Thus, the bureaucracy ensured the central authority of the Sultan over the Muslim lordships in Anatolia during the classical ages (İnalçık 2008:84). The most talented bureaucrats who were educated in the Enderun School, which was established for training Ottoman bureaucrats, worked in the Ottoman Palace. Other graduates of the school were assigned to different regions as higher bureaucrats or officers.

The bureaucrats who served in the palace or provinces of the country were married women who were educated in the Harem and were faithful to the Sultan (Göçek 1999: 64). They had a proper marriage coherent with their new lives and to ensure the loyalty of the new family. The bureaucrats went on to serve under the control of the Ottoman palace for a long time. The bureaucrats, whose number and influence increased continuously, began to dominate the governance of the state around the 17th century (İnalçık 2008: 91).

After the Ottoman state had begun to be defeated by European states on the battlefield and began facing enormous problems in the field of administration, it considered initiating a significant reformation movement beginning in the final years of the 17th century. Although the first reform projects advised the reconstruction of the old institutions of the state, new plans included the modernization of military forces and administrative structures of the state at the beginning of the 18th century (Ortaylı 2003: 42). Modernization projects that aimed to save the state were first implemented in the education system. Even though conventional schools were not abolished, new Western style schools where the military students were educated were established within a short time. The students who held Western and secular values decided to exalt the notion of the state rather than the personality of the Sultan. Thus, the fidelity of the bureaucrats toward the Sultan decreased largely and they believed that the state could be

saved only by the people who had received a Western-style education like them and supported the progressive reforms occurring in Europe at the time (Göçek 1999: 105).

It is thus clear that the Turkish bureaucracy was organized on the basis of communitarian thought in order to establish a secular state and society. It has taken the sole responsibility of saving and modernizing the state since the Tanzimat period (1839-1876). Therefore, it preferred to preserve its main principles within the framework of a communal understanding to achieve this goal. When the Turkish bureaucracy constructed a model of state and society that fit its own perspective, it found a legitimate way to ignore the sociology, needs, and prospects of the Turkish people.

The bureaucracy constituted its mind-set and institutionalization on three main communitarian principles. First, the Turkish bureaucracy intended that its modernization project would represent the *common good* since the Tanzimat period. Through the common good concept, it found an opportunity to justify its policies and decisions. In addition, it presumed that all citizens accepted the common good without question.

Second, the communitarian bureaucracy believed that the Turkish Republic inherited a strong state tradition but also a weak social structure from the Ottoman Empire. This opinion, which became prejudiced over time, gave birth to a different, dangerous idea that people were not mentally or morally adequate to participate in government or have control over the fate of society. This belief in the inadequacies of society led the bureaucracy to believe that alteration and transformation had to be realized without the consent of people. However, this belief also created discomfort within the bureaucracy toward democracy and the national will of the Turkish people during the first several years of the republic.

The third communitarian thought is that the new state had to embrace *perfectionism* in order to establish a system based on the common good and to improve the lives of the people, who were unable to meet the requirements of modern life. The bureaucracy strove to constitute the political and moral infrastructure of the new state and society to improve the lives of the Turkish people by emphasizing a strong state tradition. At this point, these three features of the Turkish bureaucracy will be analyzed further.

The Common Good Concept of the Turkish Bureaucracy

One of the main communitarian principles is that all people have to act in accordance with the common good that is accepted by the community. Acting for such a common good concept presumes that all people living in the same community embrace the same values. The advantages of this concept are that it brings different people together like a family and that they become members of a moral system into which their differences and various individual choices are transformed for the greater good (Etzioni 2000: 15). It is more important to preserve the common culture than individual choices, since the common good concept can only work in a specific type of cultural environment where everyone participates (Taylor 1990: 201).

If the history of the last two centuries of bureaucracy in Turkey is examined, it will become clear that the bureaucracy transformed its political philosophy to the common good concept. This concept, which depends on Westernization, secularization, and a refusal of the Islamic tradition, indicates which values should be accepted by the people and which moral system should be regarded as the legitimate one. For this reason, to proclaim any alternative or dissenting opinions in the public sphere was prevented by state force. In this way, the Turkish bureaucracy guaranteed that the cultural environment of its common good concept was formed within a short time without any resistance.

The first stage of the organization of the new Turkish bureaucracy on the basis the common good concept and becoming an independent political power can be recognized in the nineteenth century. The new bureaucracy, by creating new schools based on Western values to educate bureaucrats, took control of the whole political system by deactivating the Ottoman Sultan in order to modernize the empire when they gained political power. Having undertaken sole responsibility for the transformation of the state, the bureaucracy started to make the policy instead of carrying out it anymore. These developments paved the way for the autonomy of the bureaucracy in the Ottoman Empire (Heper 2010: 31). Even though the Ottoman bureaucracy occupied a powerful position before the nineteenth century, it became the most powerful institution that controlled and altered every political and social decision thenceforth.

The new bureaucracy independently undertook a great duty, which can be summarized as *saving the state* via Western values instead of traditional ones. When it determined its policy in the capital, it never took into consideration whether the people had any expectations or needs regarding the reforms. Actually, habits and lifestyles that had prevailed for centuries could be changed abruptly. Values that had been embraced consciously by ordinary people were turned upside down as a result of the common good type of bureaucratic administration. Since there was no power to balance the new bureaucracy in the Ottoman Empire during the modernization period, ethnic minorities appealed to European countries to defend themselves (Mardin 2003:119). When the new common good concept was imposed on all religious and ethnic groups, the defenseless Muslim society faced significant challenges in the face of the changing social system.

The political power of the bureaucracy lasted until Sultan Abdül Hamid's reign (1876-1909). It has been said that the Sultan strove to control of his all opponents including the bureaucracy during his reign. Thus, a great power struggle occurred between Sultan Abdül Hamid and the bureaucracy before announcing the Second Constitutional Era of the Ottoman Empire (Ahmad 2009: 48). Having Sultan Abdül Hamid dethroned by a military coup in 1909, the Union and Progress Party, which was set up by the abovementioned bureaucracy, gained political power. Thus, the bureaucracy, which had lost its power during Abdül Hamid's reign, recovered its powers of transformation and alteration in the new era. While the bureaucracy was controlling all mechanisms of the state during these years, the secular political norms of the future Turkish Republic were beginning to take hold in political decisions (Heper 1974: 86).

The Turkish Republic, which was founded on bureaucratic heritage of Ottoman Empire in 1923, proceeded to implement its modernization project rapidly and harshly. The new republic's determination toward its goals of modernization caused the bureaucracy to apply its common good concept more systematically, and its communal structure became more powerful than in previous eras. By this means, the project of saving and strengthening the state while modernizing society was continued in accordance with bureaucratic values and mind-sets (Mardin 2006: 62). The bureaucracy controlled not only the political and social systems but also

the economy of the country in those years. Since businessmen did not hold equal power to the bureaucracy, all of their commercial activities needed bureaucratic approval. Businessmen understood that control of natural and human resources was only possible if they obeyed the rules of the economic bureaucratic institutions (Kalkan 2016: 3).

Even though rapid revolutions and new policies were carried out in the first years of the new state by the Republican People's Party (RPP), transformation was not realized through political instruments alone. Unlike other parties, the RPP preferred to consolidate its power by means of the bureaucracy instead of depending on broad social groups during these years. If the Turkish novels that narrate one-party terms in Turkey are studied, it can be seen how the bureaucracy embraced the alteration eagerly and also made an effort to spread the principles of the new regime to the entire country. Young military officers, qaymaqams (provincial governors), teachers, and doctors, who described themselves as the only persons capable of enlightening the people and preserving them from old-fashioned religious rules, became the representatives of the new lifestyle (Timur 2001: 79). The literary characters depicted by important Turkish authors such as Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Reşat Nuri Güntekin, and Şükûfe Nihal narrated stories of the new bureaucratic group that supported the regime and the main principles of the common good concept, which were quickly spread across the entire nation.

Since the founders of the RPP were military officers and the party gained the support of the bureaucracy, the power of the bureaucracy was expanding daily. Thus, the bureaucracy became the establishment that controlled and constantly directed the RPP, just like the Ottoman bureaucracy had exercised its governing authority in the name of the Sultan (Heper 1974: 115). For instance, it is stated in the *Ordinance of Party Inspectors*, approved by the RPP between 1929 and 1931, that party inspectors had to be respectful when they inspected officers. It is important that such a sensibility about officers be emphasized rather than the inspection itself. Since these officers embodied the power of the new state in Anatolia and their statuses were higher than politicians, it is clear why the authorization of inspectors was restricted against officers (Koçak 2007: 679).

It was nearly impossible that the RPP had not sufficiently overseen bureaucratic power as a result of firmly stressing the importance of the bureaucracy for the regime. Therefore, the RPP could not have preserved itself against the state bureaucracy for long (Yılmaz 2007: 683). However, the bureaucracy absorbed the party after the Party Declaration of 1936, which made all executives of the central and provincial bureaucracies into senior managers of the party. The declaration is regarded as the final step in the merging of the party and the bureaucracy (Koçak 2003: 119). Bureaucratic institutions such as the military, judiciary, and foreign affairs had the authority to make political decisions instead of the government after the party officially became part of the bureaucracy.

The bureaucracy began attributing the legitimacy of its common good concept and tutelage over political power and society through the reputation of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Turkish Republic. Thusly, it ensured the validity of its policies and its superiority over society. In this context, Max Weber's theory on the *Three Types of Legitimate Rule* is rather descriptive in understanding this choice of the Turkish bureaucracy. Weber said that the legitimacy of authority occurs as a result of obeying it and that the legitimacy is always formed by one of the three different types of rule. According to Weber, authority depends on either legal procedures, tradition, or the charismatic personality of a leader (Weber 2005: 40).

The bureaucratic conception of the new Turkish Republic could not rely on legal procedures or tradition since it strove to transform the state and society by itself and rejected all traditional rules originating from the past. The Turkish bureaucracy, as stated above, thus had to supply its own legitimacy, which consisted of the common good concept and the ideology of Kemalism or Atatürkism. It caused the bureaucracy to generate the cult of Atatürk, the leader of the Independence War and the founder of the republic, in order to continue its tutelage of the Turkish political and social systems.

One could refer to the Turkish novels written during the early years of the republic to clearly see how the cult of Atatürk's charismatic authority was successfully generated by the bureaucracy. The sanctity of Atatürk can be observed in the novels of important authors such as Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Safiye Erol, Şükufe Nihal, and Etem İzzet (Haklı 2008: 188). Even though the cult was generated to protect the authority and

reputation of Atatürk, it became a source element of the legitimacy of the Turkish bureaucracy built on Kemalism. In fact, this legitimacy of the military and civil bureaucracies, which were serving as guards of the regime, was made possible by Kemalism and the cult of Atatürk that was produced and reinforced by the bureaucracy themselves. The common good concept fed by this cult caused the bureaucracy to become an instrument to create policies, rather than an instrument to obey them (Heper 2010: 31).

This mind-set and the institutionalization of the bureaucracy forced society to accept the common good concept and immediately accept what was approved by the bureaucracy as good and right (Güngör 2003: 47). The core of the common good concept includes the idea that all politicians, regardless of their policies and differences, have to follow the same ideological rules and all people, regardless of their beliefs and worldviews, have to embrace a single lifestyle. This fundamental difference between the bureaucratic concept and the civil society concept created the dual political realms of state policy and government policy.

This clash was mostly observed in the multi-party period of Turkey. When the Democratic Party (DP) was set up by Adnan Menderes and Celal Bayar in 1946, their biggest challenge was that they had to compete with the bureaucracy, which continually hindered the activities of the DP (Heper 2010: 137). One of the most important examples of the power of the bureaucracy is that the DP believed that fair elections were not possible and that a party could never gain political power unless it compromised with the bureaucracy. The DP realized that they had to make some promises to the bureaucracy to win the election of 1950 and to obtain political power. One such promise was to emphasize the difference between the bureaucracy and the RPP by ceasing all criticism of the bureaucracy. The DP blamed the RPP for all of the country's problems rather than the bureaucracy; this ensured that the bureaucracy preferred to act impartially for a while (Ahmad 2009: 132).

The influence of the bureaucracy gradually diminished during the first years of the DP government and a power vacuum was created in the sphere of civil politics. The new government appointed itself as the decision-maker and the balance of power began to shift against the bureaucracy (Heper 1974: 122). The DP was only interested in the Turkish people and strengthening the new

business class in Anatolia. It naturally pursued policies in accordance with the will of the people. One of the biggest complaints of the bureaucracy in those years was that the political power was in touch with ordinary people and businesses rather than the bureaucracy (Heper 1974: 138).

The bureaucracy complained that the government cared more about the political, economic, and social requests of the people rather than the common good concept of the bureaucracy. While the bureaucracy strove to narrow the scope of the government's political power, the DP procured its legitimacy through its voters. Since the DP took the will of the people and businesses into consideration, the bureaucracy described its policies as the deterioration of moral and state order. This clearly explains why the accusations, which included the degeneration of governance and the exalting of material goods, were repeated after the 1960 coup against the DP (Karpat 2014: 145).

In this manner, it is possible to interpret the multi-party period of Turkey as a history of struggle between political parties and the bureaucracy. Having transformed to a multiparty system, the struggle between the two different legal institutions intensified daily in Turkey. When elected politicians tried to make new policies that were different from the bureaucracy's common good concept, and to expand the democratic field through their support, the bureaucracy, especially the army, judiciary, universities, and foreign affairs, resisted in proportion to their power. When resistance was not sufficient to hinder the actions of the political parties, the Turkish army stepped in to seize control of the state, preserve its superior position, and sustain the common good concept of the bureaucracy.

Perfectionism and Modernization

Perfectionism is another principle that was embraced by the communitarian mind-set of the Turkish bureaucracy. Perfectionism aims to improve human beings, or help them to reach their potential, and includes all related efforts within this purpose. At the same time, perfectionism assists the emergence of a common good in any society by intending that all human beings attain this ultimate goodness (Tüysüz 2009: 20). From this point of view, one of the main features of the perfectionist state is that it has to pursue the common good concept depending on the lifestyle of the dominant

community in the society. However, this state adopts communitarian policies that all people have to embrace them. A perfectionist state ignores all concepts that are contrary to the superior, accepted one and, moreover, creates a public classification and hierarchy of different lifestyles (Kymlicka 2006: 310). The other feature of a perfectionist state is the belief that human beings are insufficient creatures in terms of mentality and morality. According to communitarians, human beings cannot make good choices unless they embrace the dominant virtues, values, and lifestyle of their own community. This principle, in short, states that human beings are incapable of determining their own values because of their inherent mental and moral flaws (Blanchot 1997: 14).

When the development of these main principles of the perfectionist state are analyzed, it is clear that their source is in the last century of the Ottoman Empire rather than in the beginning years of the Empire. The rule of the sultans between the fourteenth and nineteenth centuries is described as the classical age of Turkey. The sultans allowed citizens who were members of different religions and nations in his land to live and practice their beliefs freely during the classical period. Even though the sultan had a superior position over all religious and ethnic groups, he tolerated religious differences and legally protected them (İnalçık 1996: 268). However, after the new bureaucracy gained the sultan's power informally during the modern age, it began exercising control over the social order using its newfound power. As long as state intervention into society increased, the perfectionist state could be realized.

Having established the Turkish Republic in Ankara, the founders had a sharper and more rapid idea of Westernization and transformation in their minds. New administrators believed that not only science and technology, but also Western institutions and values should be adopted by Turkey as soon as possible (Turhan 1967: 62). Since they had achieved a modern state and society like other European countries, they also wanted to reform the Turkish people by encouraging the adoption of a Western lifestyle. The dominant policies of the new state applied Western reforms and espoused the education and enlightenment of the people toward Western values (Öz 1996: 113). In this context, it is thought that the common good concept and the common purposes of the bureaucracy were superior to the traditional

and individual values of people by accepting that representatives of state and the bureaucracy were intellectually and educationally advanced.

The Turkish bureaucracy ensured the establishment of the perfectionist state by absorbing all social groups between 1923 and 1950 by means of its common good concept and elitist position. Perfectionist policies ended in the years of the DP and open society became wider than past term in Turkey. The bureaucracy punished this preference of the DP by strengthening and expanding its institutions after the 1960 military coup. High distrust in elected governments appeared and the bureaucracy sought to inject perfectionism again into the Constitution of 1961. That the parliament became a bicameral institution with both elected and appointed members is one of the first examples of this policy. Through newly established bureaucratic institutions such as the Constitutional Court, the National Security Council, and the State Planning Organization, the latter of which was responsible for determining economic strategy, the bureaucracy was able to strengthen its superior position after the DP came to power. Furthermore, the military bureaucracy had a great opportunity to intervene in the political system due to the successful coup and the new constitution.

The bureaucracy was also reorganized in this axis of perfectionism, since it had never seen the people as mentally or morally mature individuals capable of responsible decision-making for themselves and the future of the country. According to the bureaucracy, it was not possible to allow people to make political, economic, and social decisions until they reached a specific intellectual level. The Turkish bureaucracy held that ordinary people could attain this intellectual level if they received a Western-style education and embraced the modern reforms. Thus, the bureaucracy believed that democracy was too dangerous for Turkey, unless its people could reach the desired level of intellect and modern values. This judgment, based on the insufficiency of people for freedom of choice and especially democracy, is one of the most important elements of perfectionism (Heper 2010: 139).

Although the bureaucracy has always held a negative opinion regarding the capabilities of Turkish society, the Turkish people have expressed their demands and expectations bravely whenever they found the opportunity to do so. Since the bureaucracy had never considered the will of the people as important or legitimate, a conflict finally arose between the bureaucracy and the Turkish people, because of the bureaucracy's doubts regarding the demands and expectations of the people, and the people's desire to carry

out their choices in free and fair elections (Mardin 2006: 66). Therefore, the bureaucracy tried to control democratically elected political parties in order to control people whom the bureaucracy was doubtful about. The perfectionism of the state has been protected particularly by the judicial system that brought about the tutelage of political parties. Many political parties were banned by the Constitutional Court after 1960 in Turkey because of their different ideologies and politics. Whenever these judicial interventions were not sufficient, attempts to preserve the bureaucratic system based on perfectionism were made through military coups. Thus, it can be stated that all military coups and interventions in Turkey should be evaluated as the inability of the bureaucracy to hinder the free political choices of the people. The coups and interventions in 1960, 1971, 1980, 1997, and 2016 intended to remove parties from political power, in addition to being examples of restoring the perfectionist state that was thought to be corrupted by the people. The coup attempt of 2016 was the only unsuccessful one.

Despite all artificial interventions, a high proportion of Turkish people have preferred to support the parties who have challenged bureaucratic tutelage, beginning with the Progressive Republican Party, which was the first opposition party in the Turkish Republic since the Justice and Development Party (JDP), in power since 2002. Thus, it is often not recognized that the Turkish people have a high democratic consciousness in contrast to the opposite claim made by the bureaucracy for two centuries. Above all, Turkish people achieved the preservation of their democratic system by resisting the military, who operated with jets, helicopters, and tanks on the night of July 15. Therefore, it is not surprising that the parties struggling against bureaucratic tutelage rely on the power of the people. The DP and the JDP have depended on the *national will*, as they have always trusted in the power of the people.

Conclusion

When the Turkish Republic emerged out of the ashes of the Ottoman sultanate, and secular norms were supported instead of the traditional and religious values, only the Turkish bureaucracy protected its power and institutions. Thus, while all other sectors of the country were fighting against each other in this transition period, the bureaucracy was the sole institution that was not wounded, and thus was able to solidify its power in policy-making.

The bureaucracy established the tradition of communitarian thought and institutions during the modernization period in Turkey. This caused the bureaucracy to undervalue the expectations, choices, and differences of Turkish society. Turkey has struggled through three problems for decades since the bureaucracy emerged out of the elitism that is described in this article. First, there has been a struggle in Turkey between the traditional values that have been embraced by people for centuries and the modern values that were transferred from Europe two centuries ago. The bureaucracy tried to solve this problem by imposing its common good concept on society. This imposition did not diminish the tensions between Turkish society and the state; on the contrary, they became worse. Second, since the bureaucracy demanded Turkish society to adopt its common good concept, the minority exerted dominance over the majority. Since illegal organizations like FETÖ are never able to garner the support of the majority, they try to impose their concepts using the powers of alteration and transformation of the bureaucracy. Third, since bureaucratic institutionalization was formed along the lines of communitarian thought in Turkey, it is possible for dangerous common good concepts, such as those of FETÖ, to arise in this environment.

Even though efforts to control the bureaucracy started with the DP during the first years of the multiparty period in civil politics, these efforts have reached their greatest heights since 2002 through a mind-set transformation in Turkey. Maybe it is the first time in the history of the Turkish Republic that political alteration and transformation have been realized by politicians whom the Turkish people supported voluntarily. This transformation has fulfilled the expectations of the people while diminishing the power of the bureaucracy. In this context, it is known that President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has complained about the resistance of the bureaucracy since he became Prime Minister. The JDP had too many obstacles to implementing its government policy for years in many bureaucratic institutions such as the courts, military, education, and foreign affairs. Prime Minister Erdoğan stated that the bureaucracy encumbered his efforts for the democratization and development of Turkey. The words of Erdoğan, who is the present representative of civil politics, echo the words of Celal Bayar, even seventy years later: “My biggest rival is the bureaucratic oligarchy.”

References

- Ahmad, Feroz (2009). *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yay.
- Blanchot, Maurice (1997). *İtiraf Edilemeyen Cemaat*. Çev. I. Erdüden. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yay.
- Etzioni, Amitai (2000). *The Third Way to Good Society*. London: Demos Panton House.
- Göçek, Fatma Müge (1999). *Burjuvazinin Yükselişi İmparatorluğun Çöküşü*. Ankara: Ayrıntı Yay.
- Güngör, Erol (2003). *Kültür Değişmesi ve Milliyetçilik*. Ankara: Ötüken Yay.
- Haklı, Salih Zeki (2008). "Türk Romanında Tek Parti Dönemi". *Liberal Düşünce Dergisi* 51-52: 181-196.
- Heper, Metin (1974). *Bürokratik Yönetim Geleneği*. Ankara: ODTÜ İdari İlimler Fakültesi Yay.
- _____ (2010). *Türkiye'de Devlet Geleneği*. Çev. Nalan Solyarıık. Ankara: Doğu Batı Yay.
- İnalcık, Halil (1996). "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İslam". Çev. Mustafa Özel. *Osmanlı Ansiklopedisi*. Ed. Mustafa Armağan. İstanbul: İz Yay. 262-270.
- _____ (2008). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Klasik Çağ (1300-1600)*. Çev. Ruşen Sezer. İstanbul: YKY.
- Kalkan, Buğra (2016). "The Role of the Economic Rents in the Political Transformation of Turkey After the 1980s". *Eurasian Journal of Social Sciences* 4(3): 1-13.
- Karpat, Kemal (2014). *Türk Siyasi Tarihi*. Çev. Ceren Elitez. İstanbul: Timaş Yay.
- Koçak, Cemil (2003). "CHP-Devlet Kaynaşması (1936)". *Toplumsal Tarih* 118: 74-79.
- _____ (2007). "Tek Parti Döneminde CHP Parti Müfettişliği'ne İlişkin Ek Bilgi(ler)". *Mete Tunçaya'ya Armağan*. Der. M. Ö. Alkan, T. Bora ve M. Koraltürk. İstanbul: İletişim Yay. 675-681.

- Kymlicka, Will (2006). *Çağdaş Siyaset Felsefesine Giriş*. Çev. Ebru Kılıç. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yay.
- Mardin, Şerif (2003). *Din ve İdeoloji*. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- _____ (2006). “Türk Siyasetini Açıklayabilecek Bir Anahtar: Merkez-Çevre İlişkileri”. *Türkiye’de Toplum ve Siyaset*. Der. M. Türköne ve T. Önder. İstanbul: İletişim Yay. 35-76.
- Ortaylı, İlber (2003). *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Öz, Esat (1996). *Otoriterizm ve Siyaset*. Ankara: Yetkin Yay.
- Taylor, Charles (1990). *Philosophy and Human Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Timur, Taner (2001). *Türk Devrimi ve Sonrası*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Turhan, Mümtaz (1967). *Garplılaşmanın Neresindeyiz?* İstanbul: Yağmur Yay.
- Tüysüz, Zekeriya (2009). *Siyaset Teorisinde Mükemmeliyetçilik*. Ankara: Liberte Yay.
- Weber, Max (2005). *Bürokrasi ve Otorite*. Çev. Bahadır Akın. Ankara: Adres Yay.
- Yılmaz, Murat (2007). “Recep Peker, CHF ve Bürokrasi: Kazım Dirik Örnek Olayı Üzerinden ‘Parti-Devlet’ Uygulaması ve ‘Faşist Proje’”. *Mete Tunçaya’ Armağan*. Der. M.Ö. Alkan vd. İstanbul: İletişim Yay. 683-705.

15 Temmuz Darbe Girişimini Türkiye'deki Bürokratik Cemaatçilik Üzerinden Yeniden Düşünmek

Salih Zeki Haklı*

Öz

15 Temmuz 2016 tarihindeki darbe girişiminin engellenmesinden sonra Türkiye'de ordu başta olmak üzere birçok bürokratik kurumun yeniden yapılandırılması beklenmektedir. Türkiye'nin son iki yüzyıldır en etkili kurumunun sivil siyaset üzerinde vesayetçi bir hâkimiyet kurmaya çalışan bürokrasi olduğu dikkate alındığında, yeniden yapılanmanın sadece FETÖ değil bu vesayeti düzenini üreten zihniyet üzerinden gerçekleştirilmesi gerektiği anlaşılmaktadır. Bu sebeple, öncelikli olarak vesayete dayalı bürokratik sistemin Türkiye'deki gücünün anlaşılması önem taşımaktadır. Bürokrasinin siyasî iktidar üzerinde hâkimiyet kurmaya başladığı Tanzimat döneminden bugüne bakıldığında Türk bürokrasisinin kendi içinde tıpkı cemaatçi zihniyet eksenin örgütlendiği görülmektedir. Bu cemaatçi zihniyet ise bürokrasinin modernleşme projesinin toplum tarafından benimsenmesinden, devletin bürokratik anlayış ekseninde örgütlenmesinden ve toplumun tercihlerine yönelik bürokrasinin şüpheli yaklaşımından oluşmaktadır. Bu sebeple Türkiye'de bilhassa çok partili dönemin cemaatçi bir anlayışa sahip bu bürokratik zihniyet ile toplumsal desteğe dayanan sivil siyasetin çatışmaların sıkça yaşandığı gözlemlenmektedir. Türkiye'nin vesayet düzenini tam manasıyla ortadan kaldırmak içinse bu bürokratik zihniyetin hâkimiyetine son vermesi gerekmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Bürokrasi, FETÖ, cemaatçilik, ortak iyi, mükemmeliyetçilik

* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Polis Akademisi Başkanlığı, Güvenlik Bilimleri Enstitüsü –Ankara/Türkiye
szhakli@gmail.com

Переосмысление переворота 15 июля как бюрократической коммунитаризм в Турции

Салих Зэки Хаклы*

Аннотация

После попытки переворота в 15 июля 2016 года, в Турции ожидается, перестройка многих бюрократических институтов, начиная с армии. Поскольку бюрократия, которая была самым важным и высшим органом в Турции, пытается постоянно доминировать над политической властью в течение двух столетий, реструктуризация должно быть не только по отношению к ФЕТО, но и по всей бюрократической системе. По этой причине, важное значение имеет определение силы бюрократической системы в Турции. Глядя на тот период, когда бюрократия стала доминировать в политической власти, наблюдается мысли коммунитаристский организации. А эти концепции коммунитаристский организации состоит из принятия обществом проекта бюрократической модернизации, из сомнительного подхода бюрократии к предпочтением общества. Поэтому, часто встречаются конфликты между бюрократической и гражданской политики. Для того, чтобы устранить эту систему надо положить конец господству бюрократического менталитета.

Ключевые слова

Бюрократия, Фето, Коммунитаризм, общее благо, Перфекционизм

* и.о. доц. док., Полицейская Академия, Институт Наука Безопасности- Анкара/Турция
szhakli@gmail.com