



International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)

ISSN 2307-4531
(Print & Online)

<http://gssrr.org/index.php?journal=JournalOfBasicAndApplied>



Neutralized Politics by Bureaucratic Power in Turkey from 1923 to 2002

PhD. Erdal Gişi*

İzmir, Turkey

E-mail: erdlgisi@gmail.com

Abstract

Although the Republic of Turkey is recognized as a country figured in opposition to the heritage of and in contrast with the Ottoman Empire, it is obvious that this viewpoint does not fully comply with realities. In this regard, it is possible to claim that the attempt of a bureaucratic group to control the whole social and political area, which also revealed itself for centuries in the Ottoman Period and became more evident in its last periods, has passed to the Republic. Center-periphery relationship established by both the bureaucracy and the public with the spirit of Kuva-yi Milliye (meaning either National Forces or Nationalist Forces in Ottoman Turkish) has evolved into a bureaucratic management structure upon the foundation of the Republic. This structure, which was attempted to be justified for institutionalizing and guaranteeing the new state in the early years of the Republic, did not change in the following years; moreover, it turned into an uphill struggle of bureaucratic structure not to lose the positions that it obtained. Although the powerful governments supported by the public upon the initiation of the multi-party system, the bureaucratic structure, having positioned itself as the owner of the state, struggled to take hold of the power every time by antidemocratic means and usually achieved to do it. In this regard, the coups of May 27, September 12 and February 28 may be considered as the attempts of the bureaucratic structure to take hold of the state again. Today it seems that the bureaucratic structure that regards itself as the owner of the state has lost some of its positions; however, it may be suggested that the struggle between the masses willing to have more democracy and this deep structure will go on for a long time. In this study, the struggle of bureaucratic structure to acquire areas and protect the acquired ones in spite of public and democracy and neutralization of politics in this struggle as from the foundation of the Republic until 2002 are discussed.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: erdlgisi@gmail.com.

Keywords: Turkey; bureaucratic power; neutralization of politics

1. Introduction

The fight for independence, where the whole Anatolia with its public, governors, intellectuals acted with the spirit of Kuva-yi Milliye, resulted in victory and foundation of the Republic of Turkey. Including the abolition of the sultanate and caliphate, all religion-based institutions were discharged both during the war of independence and in the early years of the Republic and the new state positioned itself as a modern state based on the sovereignty of public. In this period, the source of justification for the political power was the nation, not Islam. *This situation was revealed itself with the words "Sovereignty rests unconditionally with the nation".*

It is difficult to claim that the theory suggesting that the Republic is based on the sovereignty of public is also realized in practice. It did not take long to notice that the sovereignty was taken from the hands of the sultan and delivered to a bureaucratic structure. As stated by Söğütü, the Republic elites adopted democracy as a part of unconditional modernization project and binded its practice to the elimination of thought patterns of the public raising their awareness. Initiation of multi-party system in 1946 in Turkey mostly for external reasons and formation of politics according to the social demands aroused a trouble for bureaucratic elites, who thought that the public was not at a position to be the subject of politics yet [1].

Until a new government took charge by democratic ways in consequence of the free election held in 1950, the bureaucratic structure considered itself as the owner of the state and refused to share the government with any party. Until that date, politics and all kinds of administrative organizations were an area of activity which was special to bureaucratic elites and closed to public. Even after the initiation of multi-party system and democratic government, this democratic structure did not gave up politics in Turkey and let it be shaped according to the social demands within the natural course.

There has been no essential development that led to a return from democratic political system in Turkish politics. However, these political organizations and principles could not obtain a context fitting to the exported Western sense. Through the constitutions issued after military interventions, the power was shared among bureaucrat elites and political elites and bureaucratic mechanisms were established to control political elites [1]. It is obvious that the new management and political structure does not align with the idea of taking part in management, which was promised to public during the foundation of the state, and the target of managing elites to construct a modern social state.

Efficiency of politics considerably decreased because of the below-specified institutions, which were established upon the coup of May 27 to serve for the bureaucratic structure not with their names, but with their functions. The coup of September 12, which was of course utilized as a good means to adjust the society in other aspects, constricted the area of politics with aspect of blessing bureaucratic structure and state. Following the coup, struggle of politics and the bureaucratic structure had one of its most difficult periods with Özal. This period, in which Özal acquired many positions from the bureaucratic structure, ended with the death of Özal and a new period, in which the bureaucratic power would get both the lost positions and new areas. In this process that

reached to the peak following the coup of February 28, the bureaucratic power structure acquired a large area against politics and the politics started to stand still. This continued to be the most apparent view of Turkish political life in the early 2000s.

The main purpose of this study is to explain the reason behind the fact that the management could not turn into a public-based civil willpower and a bureaucratic-elitist class dominated the state and constricted the area of politics in spite of all contrary statements as from the proclamation of the Republic.

1.1 Bureaucracy and bureaucratic power

Just like many other concepts in the area of social science, it seems that it is really difficult to make suggest a widely acceptable definition for bureaucracy. It is possible to divide the available definitions into two categories with the viewpoints that generally affirm or negate this concept. Weber, who undoubtedly have a great contribution to the explanation of this concept, is one of those affirming the concept. Weber defines bureaucracy as “the process of arranging widespread social acts and movements in accordance with rational and objective guidelines [2]”. According to Weber, bureaucracy may be evaluated as a means for valuing the social benefit above personal benefits and properly managing the state mechanism.

Bureaucracy generally expresses a system of laws and rules. These rules eliminate all problems in public administration, provides objectivity and equality and constitutes a rational and perfect social organization thanks to these qualities. In this context, the opinion that “bureaucracy subsists with an advanced division of labor, central authority, clearly identified policies and rules and a detailed filing system [3].” is in line with the approach of Weber and emphasizes that bureaucracy is the most rationalist way to solve problems and provide social equality.

Negative approaches to bureaucracy are generally claimed to criticize unclear explanations about authorizations and responsibilities, strict and impersonal rules, delinquent officers, slowness in performance, attempts to put the responsibility on others' shoulders, contradicting processes and instructions, unnecessarily repeated works, individuals' attempt to increase their power, disposition of too much authority to wrong persons and waste of resources [2]. One may immediately realize that this approach to bureaucracy is totally contrary to Weber's approach to bureaucracy. In this approach, bureaucracy stops being a productive mechanism enabling steady operation of the state system that protects social benefits and turns into a disruptive and clunky structure and a mechanism that values personal benefits above social benefits in contradistinction to Weber and those who have similar opinions. Waste of resource and time are the other characteristics of this approach to bureaucracy.

Bureaucracy reveals itself as an indispensable mechanism in modern states. Expressing a hierarchical superior-subordinate relationship, bureaucracy turns into an instrument by which the abstract structure called state is concretely visualized by citizens. Bureaucracy and bureaucrats ensure that state stops being abstract and turns into a visible, touchable and communicable structure. Bureaucracy making its presence felt in every area of life may be considered as a means used by the mechanism called the state, the main duty of which is to provide services for the society, in providing such services.

Existence of state in bureaucracy unavoidable creates a relationship between the politicians, who are responsible for processing this mechanism, and the bureaucracy. This relationship is usually realized by making bureaucracy governed by politics. In other words, the politics and bureaucracy of the legislative authority, it is required to create a relationship between politics and bureaucracy, in which the former has a legislative and decisive power and the latter is a means of implementing the decisions. However, it is rarely seen that this relationship between the political mechanism and bureaucracy is established as intended. Bureaucracy has turned into a structure that has crossed the line of fulfilling the duties imposed by the political power and developed reflexes like entering into the area of politics and taking a part in enforcement.

Bureaucracy has fallen away from the meaning blessed by Weber a long time ago and is now considered as a pirate structure trying to take part in the political management and it is expected to leave the political areas it has acquired and go into its own shell.

2. Necessity and ways of ensuring national unity

2.1. *Necessity of Ensuring National Unity*

2.1.1. *Construction of a New Nation and Revolutions*

Taking May 19, 1919 as a beginning in our political history is deemed wrong in terms of the philosophy of history; however, it is possible to consider this limitation as an acceptable obligation about the late history in order to clearly understand the beginning and development of a newly founded state on a geography with a history of empire. The movement having started in Samsun and Erzurum and Sivas congresses have not been examined enough in our political life. This period, which is also called as the Third Constitutionalist Period, was a coup staged in order to protect the legislation of the sultan and caliph against Istanbul government and paid excessive attention to the principles of constitutionalism [4]. Even though the cadre of the fight for independence had different purposes in mind, it is well known that the majority of people and public who took part in this fight, did not aim to leave out the sultan and caliph and found a new state until the last years of the war of independence.

The deputies, who constituted the Assembly on April 23, 1920 when the Republic was proclaimed, took their whole strength from the fact that they were exiled, took refuge in Ankara or their all powers were destroyed by the occupying forces and they were the representatives of congresses in Anatolia and local forces. Furthermore, each member of the assembly in Istanbul was considered as a natural member of the assembly in Ankara[4]. This arises the the opinion that majority of the leading group in the War of Independence did not aim to found a new state and leave out the authority of sultan and caliph.

It is accepted that the first assembly was a movement organized within the Ottoman Empire in order to protect sultanate and caliphate; however, aim of the the cadre group leaded my Mustafa Kemal was not the same. Atatürk and his inner circle started to declare this new aim in a short time. There was now a new state and government, alphabet and bureaucracy of this new state would be totally different. It should be admitted that the public and the land they lived on was inherited from the Ottoman Empire and the arising government and

political understanding belonged to a new state. The new state totally broke with the past and started to construct a new nation.

If we do not take the practices until 1938 as the attempts of founding a new state, we will not have anything but dictatorship of a single party. However, in this period, the law of revolution was in force and the constituent power endeavored to make the reforms accepted as requirement for the new state. Therefore, it would not be right to evaluate the government of that period only on the basis of the criteria of democracy. The Republic did not begin as a one-party system, but the democratic structure of the Assembly, which represented the spirit of Kuvayi Milliye, progressed into a one-party dictatorship in time[5].

TBMM (Grand National Assembly of Turkey) officially declared that the Ottoman Empire was ended by the Decree No. 308 in November 1, 1922. The Decree was applied to an earlier date and end date of the Ottoman Empire was declared to be March 16, 1920. Istanbul assembly resigned and terminated all its activities upon the execution of this Decree. By this resignation, it was officially recorded that Ankara government was unquestionably the only ruler of the country. 5 cabinet councils were established until 1926 and 4 Republic governments were formed after the proclamation of the Republic. It would, however, be wrong to individually discuss and compare the practices of Republic governments in this period, because the country was governed by Atatürk and İsmet İnönü under a single-party rule.

After the sultanate was abolished and caliphate was taken under the control of TBMM (abolished), the reforms believed to be required for the new Nation to be founded were initiated. Change of headgear and dresses, closure of religious convents and dervish lodges and adoption of international time and calendar system were accepted in 1925. In 1926, the Civil Code, Penal Law, Code of Obligations and Citizenship Act were enacted. In 1928, Secularism was accepted and the expression “Religion of the State is Islam” in 1924 Constitution was changed. Again on this date, the religious oath in the oath texts of the President and Deputies was abolished and the secular approach started to spread to every area of live. Reforms gained speed especially after 1926. In this regard, the years between 1926 and 1938 may be taken as a period when reforms were adopted and developed.

2.1.2. *Ways of Ensuring National Unity*

It is seen that there was no stability in the governments formed as from the proclamation of Republic to 1950. Moreover, there was a state that gave orders to the public in a strong tone and resolutely advanced towards those who resisted to the reforms.

There is a contradiction between the instability in governments and decisive attitude adopted in making the reforms. It is possible to state that the persistence of bureaucratic stability and decisive attitude of the state was hold by a one-man and one-party rule. In this sense, a detailed analysis should be carried out especially on this period of our history of Republic in the discussions made on the basis of the main idea that politically coming into power does not mean gaining power in the state government.

2.1.3. Independence Tribunals

Independence Tribunals is a questionable taboo of this period. This structure is a court of revolution that revived every time opponent voices about the reforms aroused and spread fear. Atatürk said the following on this issue: “The Assembly fulfilled the natural requirements of revolution by enacting the Law on Treason on April 29, 1920 and Laws on Independence Tribunals in the following months [6]”. The new Republic used Independence Tribunals for all kinds of opponent attitudes, particularly the revolts. The fact that Lütfi Fikret, President of Istanbul Bar Association, was arrested and got a prison sentence of five years for his open letter about the abolition of the caliphate, which was published in the press, proves that Independence Tribunals were not only exploited against rebellions, but also against the internal opposing parties within the public [5].

2.1.4. Abolition of Party Opposition

The Veteran was disposed to select those who show highest loyalty in words and writing, stating that he did not want opponents[7]. The Progressive Republic Party (Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası), the first official opposing party, was founded by those who were against this disposition under the leadership of Kazım Karabekir Pasha (November 17, 1924). One of the most important points in this party was that many people with military background from the leading group in the War of Independence, except Atatürk and İnönü, were members to this Party. Even though the party was seemingly civil, it was utilized as a kind of center in the struggle for power between the soldiers having taken part in the foundation of the Republic. “*Mustafa Kemal Pasha specified the situation as “Conspiracy of Pashas” in Nutuk (a speech of Atatürk) that he read three years later and this indicates that the problem was all about the army [5]*”.

The Progressive Republic Party had its first political achievement three days after its foundation. Government of İsmet Pasha requested the proclamation of marital law and fell as it could not get the vote of confidence. Later on, government of Ali Fethi (Okyar), which was the first government formed by a Prime Minister other than İsmet Pasha, was formed. Sheikh Said rebellion having started in the period of this government led to really significant political developments. First of all, the article “*Making religion an instrument of politics is treason*” was added to the Law on Treason. The most important influence of the rebellion might be that the government of Ali Fethi (Okyar), who was known to be more modest than İsmet Pasha, was overthrown because of not getting the vote of confidence (03.03.1925). The first practice of the new government formed by İsmet Pasha was to issue the Law on the Maintenance of Order. East Independence Tribunals, which were reestablished for eastern provinces and was not even required to get the approval of the Assembly for sentences of death, took office. Ankara Independence Tribunals also took office; however, they were required to get the approval of the Assembly for sentences of death. The practice of closing religious convents and dervish lodges was initiated by the east tribunals specifically for the region and it would be put into practice in the whole country in the forthcoming periods.

In the atmosphere, which was a consequence of the issue of Law on the Maintenance of Order, the government closed the Progressive Republic Party (03.06.1925). In addition to adoption of the principles of Republic, liberalism and democracy, respect for religions beliefs was also included in the charter of the party. This was

quite normal for a period when 1924 constitution stated that the official religion of the state was Islam. However, many members of the Progressive Republic Party were judged by the Independence Tribunal with the claim that they formed the basis of Sheikh Said rebellion. After the Progressive Republic Party, the first real opposing party of our political history, was closed on the grounds of the Law on the Maintenance of Order, Turkey would not have a real opposing party until the Democratic Party was founded. Some suggest that the Law on the Maintenance of Order is the first political coup of our history of Republic [8].

2.1.5. *Silencing the Unorganized Opposition*

Upon the warning that a conspiracy was prepared against Atatürk in İzmir, the claims were researched in June 1926. The research went back to the old members of the Progressive Republic Party, which had been closed in a short time, and politicians including deputies with ongoing immunity were arrested.

Thus, the revenge was taken on the conspiracy of pashas and “*The overwhelming claw of the Republic Tribunals now liberated the Republic from the hands of assassins*” Among those who were arrested, Kazım Karabekir Pasha was the one who attracted the greatest attention together with the deputies with ongoing immunity[6]. As İsmet Pasha opposed to this arrest, Karabekir Pasha was released; however “the case went so far that this time it was decided that Prime Minister should be arrested because of preventing the arrest of Karabekir Pasha” [5]. This tense atmosphere, which is an important example to understand the Independence Tribunals, was calmed down by the intervention of Atatürk. The decision about İsmet Pasha was revoked, but Karabekir Pasha would be arrested. Some of the defendants, including previous ministers and deputies, were sentenced to death. Rauf Orbay, President of the fourth Cabinet Council, was abroad when the decision was taken and would be able to return after a ten-year exile. The sentence to death imposed on the powerful leader of the opposition, Kazım Karabekir Pasha, was revoked upon the request of Atatürk. Kazım Karabekir did not go into politics during Atatürk’s lifetime.

The party opposition was eliminated by closing the Progressive Republic Party. On the grounds of İzmir Assassination, politics who lost their official organization and still had the potential of opposing were silenced. This situation may be construed as the discharge of a group, who took charge in the Committee of Union and Progress before the Republic and began to oppose Atatürk and İsmet İnönü in the political environment of that time.

2.1.6. *Discourse of Single-Party State and Reinforcement of Bureaucratic Power*

Platform and decisions of the Republican People’s Party (CHP) naturally turned into the platform and decisions of the state, as there was no opposition. CHP took six principles symbolized with six arrows into the party doctrine in 1931. In the same year, community centers were established to function as the grassroots organization of the party. 478 community centers and 4322 community rooms were opened between the years 1932 and 1950. In 1933, the six-arrow emblem designed by İsmail Hakkı Tonguç was used by the party. In 1934, the first five-year plan was put into force and the capital required for this plan was covered by the Soviet Union.

In terms of the history of Republic, the most attention-grabbing development in this period was experienced in the big congress of CHP in 1935. This congress, in which the word “Kemalism” was taken into the doctrine of the party, clearly indicated CHP turned into an organization embedded into the state. It was declared by a circular that the Minister of Internal Affairs would also take on CHP’s Office of General Secretary and Governors would appointed as CHP’s Provincial Chairman with an additional duty. After these developments, six arrows constituting CHP’s emblem were be taken into the Constitution in February 13, 1937. Under the light of these developments, it is possible to suggest that the discourse of “Single-Party State” is the product of a systematic approach.

2.1.7. *Bureaucratic Stability in the Single-Party Period*

5 governments (Cabinet Council) were formed as from the opening of the Assembly until the proclamation of the Republic and 9 governments were formed in fifteen years from the proclamation of the Republic to the death of Atatürk. İsmet İnönü was the Prime Minister in 7 of these governments. It is remarkable that governments frequently changed in a country under the power of a single man (Atatürk) and a single party (CHP).

The fact that governments were formed and subverted at such short intervals by the same person in an atmosphere, where the President never changed and such a change was not even discussed, should be considered as a political instability. In spite of the political instability, there was a remarkable stability in bureaucracy. 6 governments were formed in twelve years between 1926 and 1938, but Hasan Kemaleddin Gedeleş, the Undersecretary of the Prime Ministry, hold his duty for these twelve years. Moreover, Fevzi Çakmak Pasha held the office of General Staff, which has been an effective position in every period of our political life, for twenty three years uninterruptedly between the years 1921 and 1944. Muhittin Üstündağ was the Governor of Istanbul ten years between 1928 and 1938 and Nevzat Tandoğan was the Governor of Ankara for uninterruptedly seventeen years between 1929 and 1946 and these are two other remarkable examples of bureaucratic stability. These examples prove that there was a really stable structure in bureaucracy in spite of the instability in politics in early years of the Republic.

This situation continued between the years 1938-1950, when İsmet İnönü was the President. While nine governments were formed in these twelve years, the Undersecretary of the Prime Minister changed only three times (Mehmet Vehbi Demirel, Cemal Yeşil, İsmail Hakkı Ülkmen). Office of undersecretariat has a symbolic meaning as it is the peak of bureaucracy. Considering the fact that Lütfi Kırdar, the Governor of Istanbul, held office uninterruptedly from 1938 to 1949 and Nevzat Tandoğan, the Governor of Ankara, held office starting from the period of Atatürk to the period of İnönü, it is possible to claim that bureaucratic stability continued in this period. Governors had a critical role in Turkey’s political life in the mentioned period, as they also the Mayors and CHP’s Provincial Chairman until 1946 in their provinces.

Bureaucratic stability has a high significance in the success of Atatürk’s reforms. Positions in this period had a great impact on bureaucracy’s gaining effectiveness on governments. Considering the fact that reforms cannot be applied without bureaucratic support, it may be suggested that the biggest moves (reforms) of the republic are concluded in bureaucracy, rather than politics.

3. Democratic politics and government

3.1. *The Necessity of Deploying Sovereignty*

3.1.1. *National Chief*

İsmet İnönü was always in the forefront as from the foundation of the Republic. Except from the government of Fethi Okyar formed under the influence of the Progressive Republic Party and the 9th Government formed by Celal Bayar, İsmet İnönü was the unchanging Prime Minister of the period of Atatürk and İnönü served as the Prime Minister in 7 of these 9 governments formed in this period (1923-1938).

The unchanging Prime Minister quitted the Prime Ministry due to a conflict with Atatürk one year before Atatürk passed away. İnönü preferred to lapse into silence, just like the previous opponent; but he would stop being the second man and return to politics as the first and single man after the sudden death of Atatürk. This early death of Atatürk had a significant influence on İnönü's return to politics [5]. İnönü became the President. Celal Bayar, who was the Prime Minister for one year, did not make any change in the cadre that might be against İnönü and this had an important role in İnönü's rapid return to politics, as distinct from other politicians opposing to Atatürk. Bayar, the last prime minister of the period of Atatürk, would be assigned to form the first government of the period of İnönü.

Election of İnönü as the President in a short time was a favorable situation for eliminating any potential gap of authority. However, the powerful opponents within the party were passivated either by being excluded from the assembly or sent abroad for duties like embassy. Şükrü Kaya, Hasan Rıza Soyak, Fuat Balca and Kılıç Ali, who were among the strongest names that may oppose to İnönü in the government of Refik Saydam formed in consequence of the general elections in 1939, were left out of the assembly.

İsmet İnönü was the unchanging party leader of CHP and Refik Saydam was the unchanging general secretary. Celal Bayar became the permanent general vice president. İnönü was given the title of "national chief" in CHP's congress in Aralık, getting inspiration from the powerful single-party governments in the World (Leaders of single-party dictator countries, which were deemed successful and popular in that period, have an influence on the grant of this title)

3.1.2. *The Need for Opposition*

After becoming the President, İnönü tried to come to terms with powerful politicians left out of politics by the system for various reasons, even though his doubts did not end. Kazım Karabekir, Fethi Okyar, Ali Fuat Cebesoy and Refet Bele returned to active politics; but the single-party government continued as the current election system did not change in the period from 1938 to 1950.

Although the powerful opponents were excluded from politics, İnönü intended to constitute a controlled opposition as understood from the example of the Free Republican Party. The opposing movements against the institutionalized power of CHP had no chance; but opposition became an inevitable requirement for Turkey

having started to integrate into the World, especially Europe. An independent group, which composed of 21 persons from the party and led by İnönü, was established as the first controlled opposing movement. However, this group did not have voting rights and therefore did not make any impact on politics. In 1943, Celal Bayar put out his first opposition and submitted a motion regarding the Wealth Tax to the assembly. The Prime Minister Şükrü Saraçoğlu proposed in person CHP Parliamentary Group Deputy Chairmanship to Bayar, who got a great reaction through the mediation of İnönü; but the answer was not positive. A voting of confidence was carried out against Şükrü Saraçoğlu in 1944. There were 251 affirmative and 57 negative votes and this was a really high number, which had not been experienced until that date. The explicit opposition having begun within the party became more clear during the budget discussions in May 1945 and Celal Bayar, Refik Koraltan, Fuat Köprülü, Emin Sazak, Recep Peker and Adnan Menderes gave negative votes. İnönü made a speech encouraging the foundation of a new party in November 1945 and, one month after that, agreed with Bayar about the foundation of a new party. Foundation of a new party is highly significant in such a critical period, but express consent of İnönü was obtained about the founders of this party.

CHP group was convinced and the new Democratic Party (DP) came into action on January 7, 1946. However, discussions of “collusion” aroused in DP due to the closeness of Bayar, Koraltan and Fuat Köprülü to CHP. There is a sharp distinction about the opposition method to be adopted between those who defend moderate opposition (Bayar, Koraltan, Köprülü) and those who defend strong opposition. These discussions were based on the claim that DP was not a real opposition, but a so-called opposition formed by İnönü. It is impossible to agree with this claim when the founders and the environment of foundation are taken into account and express that DP is different from CHP. Style of opposition of Bayar and the moderate opponents is like the continuation of CHP. However, this situation may be clarified as the conflict between the tendencies of experienced politicians like Bayar to carry on their old habits and exciting demands of the younger politicians.

Abolition of the titles of National Chief and Permanent Party Leader gives important clues about the change in CHP and single-party rule. However, the President and CHP Party Leader being the same person was not abandoned despite all insistence of the opposition.

CHP held the power until 1950. DP did not make much impact on politics, as the election system (open voting secret counting) had not been changed until this period. In fact, it is not possible to consider the period until this time as a period of multi-party system. Votes of people, who used their votes openly in company with soldiers, were counted behind secret doors. It is impossible to mention a real democracy in such an atmosphere. After the election system was changed, DP came into power following the elections held in May, 1950. Therefore, it may be suggested that the real multi-party period started in 1950, not in 1946.

3.1.3. The World Balances Having Changed During and After the Second World War

It is important that the period of İsmet İnönü coincided with critical years of the Second World War. While our relationship with the Soviet Union came to a halt, our relationship with the United States of America (USA) developed after we signed the Charter of the United Nations in June 26, 1945. İnönü tried to remain impartial about International Affairs. Our foreign policy was based on the aim of establishing a balanced dialog between

Russia and the West and never taking a clear side and there was a new power on the World stage, USA. England, which had led the Western countries until that period, withdrew from the stage and gave its place to USA.

Having already westernized culturally, Turkey turned its face to the West in the political sense after entering into the United Nations. It is obvious that the attempts to modernize people, including five-year development plans and Village Institutes, were practices initiated with an inspiration from communist regimes. However, Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan were prepared by USA to fight against communism and Turkey was one of the countries to utilize them. Turkey was armed against the threat of communism with an Truman Doctrine aid of 100 million dollars and this process was carried on through Marshall Plan with an aid of 228 million dollars. By the influence of these aids, liberal and capitalist policies reflected on Turkey. Therefore, it was expected some practices from the past to change. For instance, it is obvious that this atmosphere had an impact on change in the election system in 1950. Village Institutes were closed with the same approach. Together with Alparslan Türkeş, who became one of the important actors of Turkish political life in the subsequent years, 16 military officers were sent to ABD for Special Warfare Course in 1948 and this had a considerable impact on the new course of the relationship between Turkey and USA.

Turkey became a member to international organizations like UN, IMF, NATO and World Bank after the Second World War and accordingly the political and economic relationships with the West entered into a dynamic period. Following the visit of Missouri battleship to Istanbul in 1946, Turkey-America convergence was infused into Turkish public in a spectacular manner. After a certain period of time, Turkish specialists trained in American institutions and universities took over the public administration of the Republic of Turkey as the passionate defenders and practitioners of the parallel suggestions. [9] After the Second World War, there was an obvious change both in the World and in Turkey. USA was now the new actor in the world and communism was one of its biggest enemies. Turkey would now function as an important guard in USA's struggle of being the superior power in the world.

It was expected that Turkey would totally turn its face to the West in the process having started with Truman and Marshall aids. Our side became clear when we sent our soldiers to Korea and entered into NATO and the new face of Turkey was Menderes as from that point.

4. Democratic politics and government

4.1. *Period of Democratic Party*

The period between the years 1950 and 1960 is a highly interesting period in terms of politics. Having come into power through elections in May 1950, Democratic Party (DP) would form the government for five times and hold power for ten years under the chairmanship of Adnan Menderes. This ten-year period was stable for DP, but it is not much different from the governments of the Single-Party period when the duty term of governments was averagely two years. The biggest difference of this period from the previous years was that there was a real opposing party (CHP) against the ruling party and there was an effective figure of National

Chef, whose influence subsisted even though he was not the President anymore. In the presence of politicians like İnönü who went through many difficulties starting before the proclamation of the Republic, Menderes tried to rule by concentrating only on the economic policies.

It was not easy for Menderes and the Democratic Party to govern Turkey. The reason is that the country was not governed only by the politicians until that date and the biggest advantage of CHP lays behind sharing the power between politicians bureaucrats. It is obvious that the ten-year period of Democratic Party was a period of confusion for both the public and leaders in a country which was ruled by a single party for twenty seven years. Although it seemed that the state government, which controlled by a party without regard to any alternative until this period, passed in other hands, the only thing that passed in other hands was the political power.

As Menderes got closer to the public, he received a great support from them. The reason behind this support was that the public got richer and religious values were respected, as understood from the example of the adhan. It was one of the first practices of the Democratic Party to revoke the condition of reciting the adhan in Turkish, which was one of the most reacted practices of the single-party period, and permit reciting in Arabic. DP thus aroused the perception in public that the government had changed. People, who were really poor until that period, got rich for reasons that could not be attributed only to the Democratic Party and by the influence of the new World conjuncture developed after 1946. No change was made on the issues constituting the essence of Atatürk's reforms, except from some practices, which could not be considered as main reforms, like letting the adhan to be recited in Arabic and closing Village Institutes.

It is possible that the discussions of collusion which aroused during the foundation of DP and differences in the political approaches continued after DP came into power. Celal Bayar, the President, had a history of Union and Progress which started before the Republic. Besides, Bayar is also important for the fact that Atatürk and İsmet İnönü preferred him consecutively for the position of Presidency. Right after DP came into power, Celal Bayar elected as the President and remained on duty for ten years. Considering the political culture that Bayar came from, it is doubtful whether he approved the political attitudes of the Prime Minister Menderes. Only three politicians were executed by Yassıada Courts and this shows that coup perpetrator especially preferred these names. The difference in political approaches may be the reason behind this preference.

Although Menderes held the power, the situation having aroused with the coup of 1960 proved that he was not actually competent. The political power could not take part in the bureaucratic power, maybe it did not even notice the bureaucratic power. The coup was carried out by junior military officers. We also see that they obtained a considerable civil support in this process. During the preparation of the new Constitution and judgments, sections from academicians to bureaucrats supported to coup with a prejudice that could not be explained with fear.

4.2. *The Coup of May 27, 1960*

The opposition formed around the Progressive Republican Party was totally eliminated upon İzmir assassination and the Free Republican Party terminated itself upon Menemen incident, which show that the opposition

movements in the early periods of our history of Republic could not be carried on for some reason. At this point, it would be right to consider the concept of power as the Bureaucratic Power, that aroused in the Single-Party period, not as the political power. We may get better results if we analyze the main reason behind the comments and criticisms against the government of Democratic Party in terms of the risk about the handover of the customary elite Bureaucratic Power.

Independence Tribunals established whenever necessary in the single-party period were substituted with Yassıada courts upon the coup of May 27. In Yassıada courts, not only the opposing politicians but also some politicians within the Democratic Party stood by the coup perpetrators. Politicians like Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Nail Kubalı, Turhan Feyzioğlu, Refik Tulga, Fahri Özdilek, Ekrem Alican (the Minister of Finance), Ethem Menderes (the Minister of Defense) testified against Menderes with a strong language in Yassıada. It is accepted that some of these persons acted with fear, but not all of them. Reminding the discussions of “*collusion*” expressed during the foundation of DP and two groups, which were formed around Celal Bayar and Adnan Menderes within the party, adopting a different opposition; the executions (Menderes, Zorlu, Polatkan) are based on the same logic with the execution of only certain members of the Progressive Republican Party in the investigation of İzmir assassination.

In the example of the Progressive Republican Party, the opponents were silenced. However, in the example of DP, three persons who thought they would gain political power by disregarding the “bureaucratic power” formed in the Single-Party period were cleared away. In the end of ten years of DP government, the bureaucratic power proved that they were really powerful against Menderes. Menderes, who though he was powerful with the interest of the public, could not be “powerful” in reality. When the increase in economic indicators and support of the public and this dramatic end with execution are compared, it is understood that voting rates would not be enough for coming into power in Turkey. As the public, who could not state their wills and were rendered incapable of getting organized, could not sow the necessary reaction when the government of Menderes was subverted, the coup perpetrators had no trouble.

5. Contemporary politics and government

5.1. *Prevention of Contemporary Politics And Government*

5.1.1. *Statist-Elitist Approach*

The struggle between the bureaucratic power, which aroused in the single-party period and institutionalized in the subsequent periods, and political powers may be construed as the continuation of a process having started with the distinction between the statist-elitist approach within the Committee of Union and Progress and the traditionalist-liberal side including the Prince Sabahattin[10]. The struggle between the parties, which tried to rule over the center and thus the bureaucracy, started in the last periods of the Ottoman Empire, became deeper day by day and passed down to the Republic.

Bureaucratic institutionalism and accordingly the bureaucratic power won the the competition of dominating the center and thus the elitist structure increasingly dominated the state. Reforms were realized determinedly despite

the fact that 18 governments changed in 27 years between 1923-1950 and the only factor behind this achievement may be the bureaucratic stability and bureaucratic power. In the forthcoming years, the government of Menderes and the period of Democratic Party played a more effective role on the development of institutionalization desired by the bureaucrat management and on the politics. The coup of May 27 seemed to be against the government of Menderes at the first stage. However, the soldiers having staged the coup attempted to transfer the government of the Republic of Turkey to the military-civil bureaucracy, not to the political parties or the Assembly, through radical institutional changes.

5.1.2. *Sovereignty Transferred to Institutions*

The coup of 1960 is a milestone. The military junta started by firstly eliminating the opposing military members. “Pursuant to the law no. 42, 235 generals and admirals and nearly 5000 military officers were removed from the armed forces. By retiring the officers, called Retired Officers of the Revolution (EMINSU), it was aimed both to reorganize and renew the army and justify the authority of the National Unity Committee on the armed forces.” [11] Considering the fact that the total number of generals in Turkish Armed Forces in 2012, it is obvious that a deep transformation was carried out in the army under the conditions of 1960. When the age of retired generals is taken into account, this transformation may be also construed as the elimination of the last group of military officers who saw the War of Independence.

The most significant action of the coup of 1960 and the Military Junta was maybe the institutional changes made in order to ensure the long-lasting influence of the coup. The bureaucratic power, which took its roots in the period of Republic, entered into a radical process of institutionalization together with this coup and “the new political mechanisms brought significant changes to the understanding of sovereignty[11]”. The national sovereignty is in the hands of the assembly in the Constitution of 1924, while the sovereignty is shared among the assembly and other institutions in the Constitution of 1961. The Constitution of 1924 defines TBMM as the only and real representative of the nation and an institution to use sovereignty on behalf of the nation. However, in the Constitution of 1961, TBMM is not the only body to represent national sovereignty and the authority is shared with other institutions.

“The coup of May 27, 1960 also stopped the natural course of multi-party politics and led to the normalization of coups and military regimes as a means of hegemony, instead of democratic mechanisms (early elections or repetition of elections etc.) aiming to regenerate the system during crises[11]”. In place of CHP’s bureaucracy, which was sufficient alone until that period, a government model authorities of which were shared with institutions out of the Assembly was developed. Governments took office through elections, but control mechanisms were applied to governments and the assembly. Thus, the assembly and governments became controllable bureaucratically.

5.1.3. *Institutional Structure Strengthening the Bureaucratic Power*

Politics is about power[12]. As a matter of course, governments represent powers. However, Voltaire clearly summarizes the relationship between the power and people saying “There has never been a perfect government, because men have passions and if they did not have passions, there would be no need for government [12]”.

The history starting from the coup of 1960, is not the history of governments, but the history of coups and coup perpetrators. Political parties, which tried to subsist until this period, gave their places to bureaucratic institutions and the approach of bureaucratic management. Therefore, the subsequent period should be analyzed on the basis of military bureaucracy instead of parties and governments.

By virtue of the institutions established in consequence of the coup, effectiveness of politics was reduced or maybe eliminated. Turkey turned into a grave of parties due to the Constitutional Court. Impositions were made on governments by means of the resolutions of National Security Council and they were prevented from gaining power. The soldiers were enrolled as natural members to important institutions like the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) and thus the military pressure regime continued to influence all areas of the society and the bureaucratic structure, which was established as a need in the period of Atatürk, did not wanted to hand over the sovereignty to the public. Some of the organizations, which were institutionalized by the coup of 1960, established by the Bureaucratic Power on politics or enchained by the the National Intelligence Organization (MIT)

5.1.4. Senate of the Republic

Assembly of Senators established after the coup of 1960 is the first control mechanism applied on TBMM. The first assembly of senates also served as the constituent assembly. Some of its members were the members of the National Unity Committee (MBK) who directly staged the coup and others were assigned with an elite method among those who were not from the Democratic Party. Accordingly, it is possible to state that the Constituent Assembly established upon the coup of May 27 was a structure formed by MBK and CHP [11]. A part of this assembly was elected by public in the forthcoming period, but the natural members permanently remained in this assembly. “The Senate of the Republic had significant authorities in the discussions of draft laws and proposals. Pursuant to the Constitution of 1961, the process of approving a draft law was subject to a long and complicated procedure in TBMM. The National Assembly and Senate of the Republic had equal authorities in the amendment of the constitution [13]”.

Considering the fact that MBK members were natural members of this assembly until the assembly was closed in 1980, it is impossible to claim that it was a democratic assembly. The matters discussed in the national assembly were also discussed in this assembly dominated by the bureaucratic structure. In this regard, an elite control mechanism was established on the domination of the assembly.

5.1.5. The Constitutional Court

The Constitution of 1961 was issued after the military intervention performed on the grounds of protecting the “constitutional order”. In other words, the aim was not to “protect democracy”, but to protect the “constitutional order” covered up with a certain ideological approach. As a matter of fact, the constitutional

order was guarded by the Constitutional Court In a certain sense, establishment of the Constitutional Court in Turkey did not arise from the reflex of protecting the liberal democratic order, but from the reflex of protecting the constitutional order under an ideological cover. Attitude of the Constitutional Court from the day it was established until that moment supports this claim. The number of the closed parties was the highest when compared to other liberal democratic countries [14]. It is obvious that the Constitutional Court, which was established in 1961 and has subsisted through the Constitution of 1982, has functioned as a bureaucratic control instrument on the mechanism of politics as one of the most effective institutions in the late political history. In this context, the coup perpetrators, who assumed that that the President could not be elected without the approval of the bureaucratic structure, assigned the election of members to the Constitutional Court to the President to a large extent and thus guaranteed that members of the court were the persons acceptable to them.

The coup perpetrators positioned this court above the political powers and kept themselves exempt from the control. “The Constitutions of 1961 and 1982 suggested forming the order of the real state of law by granting jurisdictional immunity for certain legislative acts. The last clause of the provisional article 4 of the Constitution of 1961, which was issued by a Constituent Assembly consisting of military leaders who staged the intervention of May 27, included a provision that exempted the legal acts approved by the management of the National Unity Committee from the judicial control by the Constitutional Court [15]”.

The Constitutional Court held the closure case of the Justice and Development Party (AKP), which held the power for seven years (2002-2007), in 2009 and this also proves that the Constitutional Court was positioned as a control mechanism on the mechanism of politics, rather than as a means of protecting the constitution. In consequence of the case doubted to be opened for political reasons rather than legal reasons, the party was not closed. However, it was decided to cut down a certain part of the subsidies and a considerable discussion aroused about the legitimacy of the party.

5.1.6. *The National Security Council (MGJK) and Armed Forces Pension Fund (OYAK)*

The new military bureaucracy formed in consequence of the coup of May 27 was totally different from the previous one and the most effective institution of the military bureaucracy for politics was MGK.

It is specified in Article 4 of the Law on the National Security Council and General Secretariat of the National Security Council No. 2945 that “It makes recommendations about the assignment, determination and implementation of the national security policies, presents opinions for the necessary coordination, notifies the Cabinet of these recommendations and opinions and fulfills the duties stipulated by laws”. In frame of this definition, soldiers and politicians sit around the same table for all kinds of external and internal threats. Through MGK, politicians and soldiers met around the same table and thus politicians could call them to account about political matters.

Having an impact on politics through MGK that aroused upon the issue of the coup of 1961, the military also took its place in economy through OYAK, which was founded as a professional solidarity fund and turned into a financial force after a while. This may be construed as the result of a transformation experienced in the

beginning of 1960s. The military bureaucracy, which was economically strengthened by virtue of OYAK supported with tax exemptions and formed an arms-based power hegemony in consequence of the coups, had the change to directly intervene in politics by means of the National Security Council.

5.1.7. National Intelligence Organization (MİT)

Another important change after the coup of 1960 was about MİT. This significant organization was managed like a union under the control of Turkish Armed Forces by the lieutenant generals to be promoted. As changing the undersecretary was subject to the approval of the President, governments could not make this change whenever they want. A government could not appoint an undersecretary without agreeing with the President. In short, appointments of MIT undersecretaries was subject to the approval of the President, just like members of the Constitutional Court, and thus intervention of political powers was limited.

The Assembly Report of the Coup and Memorandum Research Council (2012) contains descriptive information about the impact of an institution, which is seemingly an intelligence service, on politics. According to the report, the military bureaucracy used this institution actively in order to influence politics and prepare the necessary environment for coups. "Cooperation between the Special Warfare Department of the General Staff and MIT has been present as from the foundation of the department. It has been an interlock beyond cooperation. The primary reason behind this situation was that the leading names of both organizations had taken the same trainings in Special Warfare camps in America and Germany. The secondary reason was that MIT was mostly ruled by soldiers (between 1960-1992) and an important part of the soldiers had received Special Warfare training. The Special Warfare Department always had command superiority in this interlock and cooperation [16].

MİT, which is a vital institution for the Republic of Turkey, was used to influence politics by the Military Bureaucracy for long years. In this regard, MİT may be considered as one of the important institutions of the bureaucratic power.

5.1.8. State Security Courts

After the State Security Courts established in 1973 under the Constitution of 1961 were closed by the Constitutional Court, they were established again upon the coup of 1982. "The State Security Court consisted of two civil (not military) judges and one military judge. Presence of a soldier (military officer) who use judicial power on civil individuals appearing in the court is always criticized by both national and international institutions, as of the foundation of the court [17]".

Military judges of the State Security Court continue to receive orders from their superiors as they were within a military hierarchy during their duty term and therefore they are considered as the representatives of the military bureaucracy.

Considering the foundation and working methods of these courts, it may be suggested that the Military Bureaucracy attempt to control the civil items by judicial means.

6. Efforts to achieve contemporary politics and government

6.1. *Political Leaders and Bureaucratic Power*

The characteristics of leaders should be particularly analyzed during the examination of the history of Republic. Atatürk, İsmet İnönü and Celal Bayar are politicians from the culture of the Committee of Union and Progress and this culture dominates their characteristics. Although these three actors, who became presidents respectively, were sometimes of different opinions, their expressions and actions were parallel to each other.

6.2. *Politicians Having Entered into Politics After the Coup of 1960*

There was a limited number of political leader in the multi-party period after 1950. There was only Adnan Menderes between the years 1950-1960 and Süleyman Demirel, who would become the deputy prime minister in the age of 41, started to do politics in 1962, one year after the execution of Menderes. Alparslan Türkeş, “*the powerful colonel*” of the coup of May 27, came to the stage again in 1965 as a civil politician. Bülent Ecevit became the General Secretary of CHP in 1966. In 1970, Necmettin Erbakan founded the National Order Party and thus entered into politics. These leaders, who entered into politics at close intervals after the coup of 1960, have a great importance for their direct impact on Turkish political life.

However, none of these politicians, who entered the new political arena created by the influence of the military junta after the experience of the Democratic Party, could not quit the “statist” approach or had the change to take firm steps on this matter maybe because of their origin. As they could not make any achievement against the bureaucratic power due to this attitude of theirs, they always lost against the successive coups and memorandums. It should be noted that these politicians were active in politics during the Memorandum of 1971, Coup of 1980 and Post-Modern Coup of February 28. These leaders got through a period of political ban from the coup of 1980 to the year 1987.

6.3. *The Coup of 1980 and Özal’s Struggle Against the Bureaucratic Power*

Turgut Özal came to the scene after the coup of 1980. “Özal was the most reliable man of Demirel. The coup commanders carried on the policy of Demirel and Özal was kept in charge [18]”. The military junta allowed Özal to found a party for elections, but they were sure that Turgut Sunal, their own candidate who was of military origin, would be selected. Kenan Evren went on television and requested votes for Sunalp. In the elections of 1983, Özal received a great support from the public against the coup perpetrators and came to power, just like the support given to Menderes after İnönü. “Özal had entrepreneurial, business and engineering intelligence and evaluated Turkey in these terms [18]”. Just like the period of Menderes, liberal policies were primarily applied and the practices interestingly increased both the economic potential and courage of enterprise of the public.

“The most important practice of Özal was to amend laws and regulations in a relentless and unhesitant manner[18]”. The bureaucratic power, having gained an incremental competence after the coup, had a clear disturbance about Özal. The end point of this disturbance was the change of the chief of general staff in 1987.

“Özal prevented the attempt of Necdet Üruğ, the Chief of General Staff, to direct the system by one-month early retirement by determining the army commanders and chiefs of general staff to take charge after him and bind this to an unchangeable basis and this brought reputation to Özal in the domestic and foreign public opinions. However, this created troubles for a side of the army [19]”. Özal retired Necdet Öztoran, to whom Üruğ thought to hand over his position, and thus intervened in the order of appointment, which was an ordinary situation for the Military bureaucracy. Özal was wounded in an armed assassin attempt in 1988, nearly one year after the foregoing incident.

Özal was elected as the President for the first time as a civil in 1989 and this was his most important victory against the bureaucratic power. After coming into Presidency positioned as the center of the bureaucratic power system, Özal started to use his authorities in many critical appointments from the members of the Constitutional Court to the Rectors and thus drew a considerable reaction within the new military bureaucracy that aroused in the end of the coup of 1980.

As from the period in which Özal was the President, a number of assassinations and social incidents occurred in Turkey. Muammer Aksoy (January 31, 1990), Hiram Abas (September 26, 1990), Bahriye Üçok (October 6, 1990), Prime Ministry Chief Advisor and Retired Lieutenant Hulusi Sayın (January 30, 1991), Brigadier Temel Cinöz and, on the same day, Retired Lieutenant İsmail Selen (May 23, 1991), Journalist Uğur Mumcu (January 24, 1993), Adnan Kahveci (February 5, 1993), Gendarme Commander Army General Eşref Bitlis (February 17, 1993), Brigadier Bahtiyar Aydın (October 22, 1993), Squadron Leader Ahmet Cem Ersever (November 4, 1993), Colonel Kazım Çillioğlu (February 3, 1994) and Colonel Rıdvan Özden (August 14, 1995) passed away. In this period, important names who closely worked with Özal lost their lives with suspicious death incidents. Years later, investigations would be started on some of these deaths, including the one of Özal, and their graves would be opened.

Together with this serial murders, Turgut Özal, the 8th President, suspiciously passed away on April 17, 1993. [20] Besides the Army General Eşref Bitlis who died in a plane crash and other generals died in consequence of assassinations, it is remarkable that Adnan Kahveci and Hiram Abas had close relationships with Özal [21].

The military, which was deemed as the unusual power of politics in Turkey, came to the scene with the Coup of 1960 and always looked for a way to hold key points of the regime (as seen in the election of Presidency in 1960, 1966, 1973 and 1980) and generals were mostly active in the area of politics apart from the duty of defending the country [11]. The military bureaucracy, which considered the chair of Presidency as a guarantor position for their own power and therefore achieved to have their candidate elected in every election, got into trouble when Özal became the president. However, this new period ended when Özal passed away in 1993.

Military men were intensively active in politics and this was one of the most significant aspects of Turkey in the period after 1960. [11] The period, in which the “statist” approach was replaced with “liberal” policies with the practices of Özal, ended upon his death. However, the tradition of civil president had started and therefore Süleyman Demirel, another civil, would be elected for this position.

6.4. *The Coup of February 28 and Bureaucratic Power*

In addition to many murders by unknown assailants, incidents such as the death of 39 people in Sivas Madımak Hotel, Başlağlar Massacre, execution of 33 soldiers by firing squad in Bingöl, Gazi Quarter Incidents, Gendarmerie Intelligence Organization (JİTEM) and the alleged executions by this organization in the Southeastern Region led to public indignation after 1990 and are still discussed today. Besides these complicated incidents, “*deep state and counter-guerrilla*” discussions were discussed clearly for the first time following the incident known as “Susurluk Car Crash” in 1996. “One minute of darkness for constant light” actions, which were started to reveal the deep state after this car crash, went beyond its purpose in a short time and turned into a subversion operation with “Aczmeni Group” and other popular reactionary incidents. In the National Security Council meeting held on February 28, 1997, a “*post-modern*” coup was staged against the government of the Welfare Party (Refahiyol) and the government was subverted. Just like the previous ones, this coup did not only aim to subvert the government, but also aimed to reshape politics and, of course, the bureaucracy.

The coup of February 28 resembles to the coup of 1960 most, among the previous coups. Out of four military coups, two were staged by the junta and the other two were staged by obeying the chain of command. As the coups arising from the chain of command ground their legitimacy on their institutional structure, they contented themselves with an ambiguous and flexible Kemalism rather than getting in ideological quests. The process of February 28 is the work of a junta, just like May 27. As we all know, name of the junta, namely the gang, is Batı Çalışma Grubu (BÇG - West Study Group). Like all juntas, this junta also needed an ideological support and stuck into national socialism that it found gropingly. Ideology of February 28 is a Turkish-type national socialism [22]. Military regimes having come into power with coups under the National Socialist movement aroused in 1960s in the Middle East and Ba’ath ideology (Iraq-Syria-Libya) might influence the supporters of May 27.

Following May 27, conflicts appeared in the committee that staged the coup and the committee was divided into two groups. One of the groups consisted of those named extremists who planned the coup from the beginning. The extremists had cooperated with others by necessity and their aim was to rule the country with military regime. The interesting point is that, out of 21 military officers known as the extremists, 14 (including Alparslan Türkeş) were discharged with an operation on November 13, 1960 and exiled to foreign countries .[11] Army General Çevik Bir was in the forefront in the period of February 28. Çevik Bir had the slogan “Loyalty to the Army is Our Honor” written on the walls. This is the translation of the words “Unsere Ehre Heisst Treue” on Nazi Flags and SS bayonets and discloses the root idea of “loyalty is our honor” of the fascist ideology seeking loyalty beyond question [22].

Army and civil men who were deemed as suspects by the military junta having staged the coup, as in May 28, were dismissed and universities were put through liquidation. In short, a restructuring was carried out in the military and civil bureaucracy, similar to the one in the coup of 1960. It is stated that cost of the monies lost in the bankrupting banks in this period sums up to forty billion dollars for Turkey. In this regard, a large crisis occurred in 2001 in Turkey.

6.5. Foundation of the Justice and Development Party (AKP)

After the mentioned coups and memorandums, the public has always preferred right-wing and conservative politics. This is the reason why Süleyman Demirel, heir of the Democratic Party, came into power after 1960 and Özal came into power after 1980. It would be right to similarly evaluate the facts that politicians, who could not quit their statist approach after February 28, went out of existence in politics and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and the Justice and Development Party (AKP) came into power for the first time in 2002. It is observed that the period of AKP have differences from the traditional political process of Turkey in terms of bureaucratic structuring and political appearance. Politics and bureaucratic power in the period of AKP will be analyzed in another study, as it is difficult to make an objective evaluation about a party, which is still in power, and because of the dimensions of the study.

7. Conclusion

Members of the first assembly that convened before the proclamation of the Republic did not aim to found a new state with consensus. However, the Republic was declared after a short while and a new process of state, in which the Ottoman Empire was totally left behind, was initiated. The constituent power established a centralist state structure in the early periods in order to create a unity. A structure based on a “single-man and single-party” rule was formed as a requirement of this situation, but it was a usual and acceptable process for the first period. However, it caused the opponents to seek alternative ways because the opposition was prevented and other people and groups were silenced.

Those, who understood that they could not take part in politics if they opposed, got involved in the single-party system and carried on their political lives or gravitated towards bureaucracy and endeavored to gain an effective footing. On the other hand, bureaucrats of the single-party period were active people with considerably broad authorities. In this period, bureaucracy turned into a structure with an effectiveness in the state government, independent from politics. The power struggle between the Political Power and bureaucracy, which aimed to keep its position and power in all periods, reveals itself exactly at this point. As a result of the decrease of its effectiveness in the struggle on the state government upon the development of democracy criteria, the bureaucratic power tried to protect its place through coups and memorandums.

Especially the period between 1923 and 1950 is a period in which CHP ruled the country as a party state, all opposing actions were prevented and the public had no impact on politics due to the system of open voting-secret counting. Implementation of the great reforms by partial and unstable governments was another problem. Considering the reforms implemented, it would be right to evaluate the long period between 1923 and 1950 on the basis the period of Atatürk, period of İsmet İnönü and, covering both periods, the period of CHP-centered Bureaucratic Government, rather than on the basis of governments.

We may suggest two different arguments regarding the change of governments and ministers at short intervals in Turkey of those days when the understanding of party state was dominant, political actors and bureaucratic actors were interlocked and open voting-secret counting system was used in elections under the supervision of

gendarme. The first argument is that there was no alternative to CHP for the public. It is doubtful whether the elections reflected the will of public due to the applied system (open voting-secret counting). For these reasons, a counter measure may have been developed against the concepts of “*dictatorship*” or “*fascism*” that might arise in the eyes of the public by means of changes in governments and changes of ministers made frequently within every government. The second argument is that the non-systematic personal attempts of opposition within the party were eliminated by means of changes in governments and changes of ministers made frequently within every government. It is possible to suggest that the balance was provided by sharing the position of ministry among different persons through change of ministers.

The election system was changed in 1950 (open voting-secret counting system was replaced with secret voting-open counting system) and the real multi-party system was initiated. However, considering the fact that 43 governments were formed in 62 years (1950-2012), it is impossible to talk about stability in politics and government. On the other side, “*bureaucratic power*” have always sustained stability, considering that 4 coups were staged in a systematic manner and these coups re-designed the country at intervals of ten years. However, this stability cannot be mentioned as a favorable situation as the main reason behind the instability in politics is the military coups staged.

The bureaucratic structure, which began in the single-party period, became institutionalized with the coup of 1960 and neutralized the assembly and politics. By virtue of the support of parties and politicians with no chance to gain political power and also the support provided by the actors from the intelligence service, media, mafia, capital and bureaucracy for the purpose of taking part in the power, the bureaucratic power considered itself as the only owner of the state. In this regard, it is believed that examining only the governments in the analysis of our political life would be insufficient.

Military coups re-designed the state system after each intervention, attempted to carry out social engineering in order to shape the society and reduced the self-confidence and courage of the society with its relentless practices. The coup perpetrators, who formed an “*elite group*”, have always seen the people of Turkey as crowds in need of being controlled. Any power that use the armed force of the state against its own country and public cannot be legal and it is impossible to have a good opinion about the military coups that seize the people’s right of sovereignty.

Particularly two leaders attract attention for their attitude towards the bureaucratic power. These leaders are Menderes and Özal. Menderes came into power with the slogan of “Enough! Nation speaks!”, but he could not realize the bureaucratic power and the limits of its power. As a result, he was executed by the coup perpetrators and thus a message was left to the following politicians that they would always remember. Özal heavily fought against this structure and made expansions, which were underestimated in that period but gained importance in the long run.

References

- [1] İ. Söğütlü. “Cumhuriyet Türkiye’sinde Modernleşme ve Bürokratik Vesayet” *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 19:, ss. 49 – 68, 2010.
- [2] B. Aykaç. *Kamu Bürokrasisi ve Türk Kamu Personel Yönetiminde Bürokratik Eğilimler*. Ankara:YÖK Matbaası, 1997.
- [3] Z. Çoker. “Mülki İdare Amirleri, Bürokrasi ve Politika”, *TİD.*, C.67, S.409, ss. 2, Aralık, 1995.
- [4] İ. Ortaylı. *Türkiye’nin Yakın Tarihi*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2012.
- [5] C. Koçak. vd. *Türkiye Tarihi 4 Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 2008.
- [6] M. K. Atatürk. *Nutuk*. Ankara: Tutku Yayınevi, 2010.
- [7] K. Karabekir. *İstiklal Savaşımızın Esasları*. İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 2000.
- [8] M. Akyol. *Gayri Resmi Yakın Tarih*. İstanbul: Etkileşim Yayınları, 2011.
- [9] K. Boratav. vd. *Türkiye Tarihi 4 Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 2008.
- [10] Y. Yıldırım. “Modernleşen Türkiye’de Sürekliliğin Siyasal Temsili: TCF”, *Sosyoloji Notları Dergisi*, Sayı 6, Kasım 2008.
- [11] H. Özdemir. *Siyasal Tarih(1960-1980), Türkiye Tarihi 4 Çağdaş Türkiye (1908-1980)*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 2008.
- [12] M. Türköne. *Siyaset*. İstanbul: Etkileşim, 2010.
- [13] K. Gözler. *Türk Anayasa Hukuku Dersleri*. Bursa: Ekin Kitabevi Yayınları, 2007.
- [14] A. Eren. “Yeni Anayasa Arayışında, Avrupa Standartları Açısından, Siyasi Partilerle İlgili Düzenlemeler”, *Erzincan Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* Cilt: 13, Sayı: 1-2, ss. 28-58, Haziran. 2009.
- [15] S. Yazıcı. “Avrupa Birliği Süreci: Ulus Devletten Ulusüstü Devlete Geçişte Hukuk Devletinin Değişen İçeriği”, *AÜHFD*, ss.78-118, 2005.
- [16]TBMM. “Meclis Darbeleri Araştırma Komisyonu Raporu” http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/sirasayi/donem24/yil01/ss376_Cilt2.pdf , (2012) [İndirme Tarihi: 12.06.2013]
- [17] K. Bjornberg. and P. Richmond. “The Functioning of the Judicial System in the Republic of Turkey” *EU Report of an Advisory Visit*, Brussels, 2003.

- [18] İ. Ortaylı. *Cumhuriyetin İlk Yüzyılı, 1923-2023*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınevi, 2012.
- [19] A. Özgürel. *Osmanlıdan Cumhuriyete İktidar Oyunu*. İstanbul: Etkileşim Yayınları, 2009.
- [20] Devlet Denetleme Kurulu Raporu Turgut Özal'ın ölümü hakkındaki rapordan özet.
- [21] TRT tarafından hazırlanan 25.02.2011 tarihli "Faili Meçhul Programı Kazım Çillioğlu ve Rıdvan Özden Cinayetleri" hakkındaki bölümden özetle.
- [22] M. Türköne. *Darbe Peşinde Koşan Bir Nesil 68 Kuşağı*. İstanbul: Nesil Yayınları, 2009.