DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES No 9 | 2007

UNIVERSITY OF KONSTANZ
Research Group Sociology of Knowledge

Crime & Culture

Crime as a Cultural Problem
The Relevance of Perceptions of Corruption to Crime Prevention. A Comparative Cultural Study in the EU-Accession States Bulgaria and Romania, the EU-Candidate States Turkey and Croatia and the EU-States Germany, Greece and United Kingdom

Zeynep Sarlak, Besim Bulent Bali

Corruption in Turkey: „Is the donor content when the recipient is content?"

Sixth Framework Programme of the European Commission
Specific Targeted Research Project

Email: crimeandculture@uni-konstanz.de | Project Website: www.uni-konstanz.de/crimeandculture/index.htm

Crime & Culture
Discussion Paper Series No 9 | 2007

SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION

RESEARCH PROJECT: CRIME AND CULTURE

Crime as a Cultural Problem. The Relevance of Perceptions of Corruption to Crime Prevention. A Comparative Cultural Study in the EU-Accession States Bulgaria and Romania, the EU-Candidate States Turkey and Croatia and the EU-States Germany, Greece and United Kingdom

Zeynep Sarlak
Besim Bulent Bali

Corruption in Turkey: *"Is the donor content when the recipient is content?"*

Discussion Paper Series

No 9

2007

1. Introduction: An Overview of Corruption and Anti-Corruption Measures in Turkey

In a nation-wide survey carried out in Turkey about two years ago, just suitable to the above questioned saying in Turkish ("when the recipient is content, the donor is content"), only 2 percent of respondents said "almost no one accepts bribes," while 83 percent were of the opinion that "almost everyone or most people" do[1]. Whereas a sizeable proportion of the Turkish economy is "unrecorded" or "black" (some estimates go as high as 50 percent of the GDP), combating corruption and improving the rule of law will figure prominently in the accession negotiations between Turkey and the EU. As Michael has recently noticed, Turkey certainly has less control of corruption than the "first wave" accession countries. However, Turkey is closer to the "second wave" countries of Bulgaria and Romania, being statistically indistinguishable from either of them.[2] Two major factors that contribute to corruption are ineffective enforcement and a favourable culture. A citizen who pays a small bribe to a civil servant may complain about it, but most regard it as the "normal state of affairs" and certainly do not have a guilty conscience as a result.

On paper actually, Turkey looks well poised to meet the criteria related to corruption by having adopted a number of conventions by organizations with largely European membership.[3] This allowed Turkey to become a member in the Group of States against corruption that monitors compliance with European anti-corruption standards. However, in the past decade all anti-corruption efforts appear to have been used as political weapons to damage opposition parties, not to set principles and implement systemic improvements in a general movement towards a clean society. Political and government officials and the press calculate that corruption in Turkey has cost the country a minimum of $150 billion in recent

[1] See: Global Integrity. An Investigative Report Tracking Corruption, Openness and Accountability in 25 Countries, *Turkey*. The Centre for Public Integrity, p. 4, available at: http://www.publicintegrity.org/ga/country.aspx?cc=tr. Overall, Turkey ranks 21st out of 25 countries on this Public Integrity Index, scoring in the moderate tier for the category "Civil Society, Public Information and Media", in the weak tier for categories "Electoral and Political Processes", "Branches of Government" and "Oversight and Regulatory Mechanisms", and in the very weak tier for categories "Administration and Civil Service" and "Anti-Corruption Mechanisms and Rule of Law". The country's level of corruption remains still high: TI ranked it at 77th place in 2004 and in 65th place in 2005 (Transparency International: Corruption Perception Index 2004/2005).

[2] For a comparison, see Bryane Michael: Anti-Corruption in the Turkey's EU Accession. Winter 2004, available at: http://www.esiweb.org/pdf/esi_turkey_tpq_id_14.pdf. For articles, pronouncements, and summaries of Toplumsal Saydamlik Hareketi Dernegi (TSHD, Transparency International Turkish Chapter) see the TSHD web site: www.saydamlik.org.

[3] Turkey signed the Council of Europe Civil Law Convention on Corruption on 17 December 1997 and the Turkish Parliament has ratified it on 1 January 2000. On 2 January 2002 Turkey enacted implementing legislation in the form of the *"Amendment to the Law regarding Prevention of Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International business Transactions"* which entered into force on 11 January 2003, see: OECD: Turkey. Phase 1. Review of Implementation of the Convention and 1997 Recommendation. November 2004, available at: www.oecd.org/dataoecd/17/6/33967367.pdf

years, particularly through siphoning off bank funds. Within the state-centred constraints of the "September 12 regime" the political parties, whose capacities for action in the political sphere had been restricted, had no choice but to shape their political activities according to the periodic fluctuations of economic activity and, thus, politics became subjected to the distribution of economic spoils. The rapid erosion of the public's confidence in the future further strengthened the instability of economic life.

The crisis of February 2001, in fact not only an economic crisis but also a sign of the institutional collapse of this regime[4], paved the way for the election victory of the AKP (Justice and Development Party). As Insel has noticed, the AKP was able to channel the reactions against the corruption affairs and the unjust distribution of wealth that had become even more severe in the wake of the November 2002 elections. It has undertaken the mission of ending the September 12 regime whether it likes it or not. However, its capacity to fulfil this undertaking should be assessed by considering the characteristics of the social groups it represents. [5]

With different accentuation and jargon, the literature on the political economy of Turkey points to the fact that the paternalistic mode of governance, a legacy of the Ottoman Empire, turned itself into a web of patronage based networks with the introduction of multi-party democracy in the 1950s. Turkish political corruption has its roots also in Cold War politics and financial flows which did not punish Turkish policymakers for self-serving behaviour. The sectors most susceptible to corruption are the media, the government, the construction business, and the health sector (In addition, 80% of entrepreneurs believe that the prevalence of corruption has a negative impact on the willingness of foreign investors to bring their capital to Turkey). The economic crisis of 2001 was partly blamed on a loss of market confidence in the Turkish economic reform which was stalled by corruption. The severity of the 1999 earthquake was more than likely exacerbated by corruption in the procurement and contracting of state construction services.

The related studies have asserted that both central and local governments in Turkey are infested with patron-client networks and bribery. People in Turkey on the one hand seem to perceive a high intensity of corruptive activities in both central and local governments and on

[4] For the February 2001 crisis, see: *Turkey's Crisis: Corruption at the Core*. The CSIS Turkey Update, March 2001, available at: www.csis.org/turkey/TU/TU010305.pdf

[5] The AKP is a culturally conservative movement that harbours strong authoritarian tendencies and a vigorous nationalistic vein. The authoritarian patriarchal reflexes of the family tradition rooted in the Turkish soil are reflected in the values and the behaviour of the AKP cadres in the form of traditionalism. For a brief assessment of this problem, see Ahmet Insel: "The AKP and Normalizing Democracy in Turkey", *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 102.2/3 (2003), pp. 293-308.

the other hand seem to have quite clearly internalised the corruptive nature of government in the country. The first finding is interpreted as the existence of a high demand for a reform programme, whereas the second finding seems to severely decrease this demand for a reform.[6] It is clear that when one starts to deal with a reform program, then comes the issue of how the costs of implementing such a move will be distributed among society's members. The first type of cost is expected to occur due to the fact that, although the system as a whole would benefit from efficiency increases, those who benefit under the existence of corruption networks will be ready to block this initiative as they expect to be worse off under the new regime. The second type of cost is associated with all transactional costs that are expected to occur due to modifying the system's organizational and legal features. Thus a *prisoners' dilemma* type situation emerges. But these issues clearly necessitate further research, with which one can better understand people's position towards a reform programme that will aim to cure the corruption problem in the country.

Administration and Civil Service

Patronage is a basic characteristic of Turkish politics, and finding civil service jobs for supporters is the major form of patronage. Every political party in power is bombarded with requests for civil service jobs, and local party officers as well as deputies try their best to meet these demands. When national civil service recruitment rules appear to be an insurmountable barrier, mayors belonging to the party in power are called upon. Turkish bureaucratic culture favours stalling rather than meeting citizens' requests. Ordinary citizens dread going to a government office for any reason. "Public servant" mentality is nonexistent and officials have a condescending attitude toward citizens.

One can certainly talk about a culture of "endemic political corruption" in Turkey. Turkey has seen its share of high level politicians under the spotlight – including Cumhur Ersumer and Zeki Cakan, (energy ministry), Mesut Yilmaz (a former prime minister), Koray Aydin (housing and public works ministry) and Yasar Topcu (public works ministry), former deputy prime minister Husamettin Ozkan and former economics minister Recep Onal.[7] It is also difficult to argue that media groups give all political parties fair coverage roughly

[6] Fikret Adaman, A. Carkoglu: *Engagement in Corruptive Activities at Local and Central Governments in Turkey: Perceptions of Urban Settlers*. March 2001, available at: http://www.femise.org/PDF/Carkoglu_A_0301.pdf; see also: Fikret Adaman, A. Carkoglu and B. Senatalar: *Corruption in Turkey, Results of Diagnostic Household Survey.* TESEV (The Economic and Social Studies Foundation of Turkey), February 2001, available at: www.econ.boun.edu.tr/staff/adaman/research/Corruption.PDF;

[7] See: V. Boland. "Former Turkish energy ministers head to court on corruption charges," *Financial Times* (24 November 2004).

proportional to their electoral support. Rather, various groups each have a party or parties that they both favour and oppose. Thus, the coverage, reporting style and commentaries are greatly skewed.

Despite the fact that the application of parliamentary immunity has been identified as a significant problem in the context of corruption in Turkish public life, no development can be reported in this area. No progress has been made concerning the transparency of the financing of political parties. Although public officials are required to submit asset declarations, there is a need to extend the scope and frequency of declarations. As a rule, the executive can count on its majority in the legislature to pass any legislation it wants and to block any attempts of removing ministers from office, impeachment, and so on. Although a solid majority of citizens favours doing away with parliamentary immunity, and civil society organizations have organized a number of campaigns to that effect, legislators have so far remained blind to these demands and have been successful in keeping the immunity rule intact. One might call this a "full-coverage immunity" which protects legislators from prosecution not only for corruption charges but for all ordinary crimes, as well. Although this immunity can be lifted for an individual legislator by a vote of Parliament, this is extremely rare. All legislators and ministers are required to file asset-disclosure forms. However, these are kept under lock and key and usually do not have any function beyond fulfilling a legal requirement. Putting together a corruption case as a result of ad hoc examination of these forms is not a rule, but an exception. The system works—if at all—not as intended: When a person is faced with serious accusations of corruption, only then may his asset disclosures be examined. But again, legislators are immune from prosecution. To sum up, the legislature is not a check on the executive.

Another crucial issue is the inefficiency of the court system, which renders it ineffective in reaching swift and fair verdicts. A single judge has to deal with tens of cases each day, and litigation is a very lengthy process. As regards public administration, there has been some progress in terms of reforms at provincial and local level. However, there have been certain difficulties in pursuing a comprehensive process of reform, especially concerning the central administration, thus leading to a fragmented approach.[8] The question of strengthening

[8] The Framework Law on Public Administration adopted in 2004 was vetoed by the President in July 2004 on the grounds that it conflicted with constitutional provisions related to the unitary character of the State. This Law was intended to be the centrepiece of the reform process. In particular, it provided for a new distribution of duties and powers between local and central government, for rationalizing administrative bodies and for an increased responsiveness and transparency vis à vis the citizen. Currently the Parliament is still in the process of reviewing the legislation.
A number of laws were nonetheless adopted as regards local government. The Law on Municipalities was first adopted in 2004 and then vetoed by the President. Subsequently it entered into force in July 2005 with minor amendments. The Law on Special Provincial Administrations was first adopted in 2004 and then vetoed by the

parliamentary oversight of defence expenditure has also become a subject of interest for the media and civil society. As regards parliamentary oversight of defence expenditures, the amendments to the Law on Public Financial Management and Control (PFMC), which was adopted in December 2003 and entered into force in January 2005, have the potential to improve budgetary transparency concerning military and defence expenditures. Extra-budgetary funds have been included in the general defence budget and will be dissolved by 31 December 2007. The adoption and implementation of appropriate secondary legislation should allow full ex-ante parliamentary oversight over military expenditures.[9]

Legal regulations adopted in May 2004, including a constitutional amendment, have enhanced the ex-post audit of defence expenditure. The Court of Auditors has been authorised to audit defence expenditures on behalf of Parliament. With the amendment to Article 160 of the Constitution the exemption of state property owned by the Turkish armed forces from auditing has been removed. However, since the appropriate enabling legislation has not yet been adopted, the Turkish Court of Auditors is not yet in a position to carry out this task as provided for by Article 160 of the Constitution.[10] In addition to the reforms to the legal and institutional framework, it is important that the civilian authorities fully exercise their supervisory functions in practice. Further efforts are needed to raise awareness among

President. It subsequently entered into force in March 2005 with some minor amendments. However, the President applied to the Constitutional Court on the basis of possible conflicts with constitutional provisions related to the unitary character of the State. The Law on Association of Local Governments was adopted in June 2005. Thus, together with the Law on Metropolitan Municipalities which was adopted in 2004, four basic local government reform laws are now in force.

The Law on Municipalities and the Law on Special Provincial Administrations aim at strengthening the capacity of local government to deal with the challenges of rapid urbanization and mass immigration from rural areas. To this end these laws introduce modern public management concepts in order to create efficient, result oriented and transparent local government.

[9] The General Staff Military Court has launched proceedings against former high-ranking generals in relation to allegations of corruption. After the General Staff Military Prosecutor's investigation the case was submitted to the High Military Court on 8 November 2004. There has been no further progress with regard to the provisions of the Military Criminal Code permitting the trial of civilians before military courts. However, a reduction in the number of civilians tried before military courts can be observed between 2004 and the first five months of 2005. On the other hand, the Gendarmerie is connected to the General Staff in terms of its military functions, but affiliated to the Ministry of Interior in terms of its law enforcement functions. The control of the Ministry of Interior, of governors and district governors over the Gendarmerie should be strengthened in order to allow full civilian oversight on internal security policy.

[10] There are three audit bodies in Turkey: Turkish Court of Accounts (TCA); High Audit Board under the Prime Minister's Department (YDK); and State Audit Board under the Presidency (DDK). The first two report to Parliament. TCA on the general and annexed budgets, revolving funds, special funds, municipalities and special provincial administrations and YDK on SEEs. However, there are many laws which exclude the general and annexed budget administrations and funds from the TCA audit. The Turkish Court of Accounts is the Supreme Audit Institution of Turkey. It was established as a court in the last century and operates under the Constitution. The Constitution requires it to audit the government accounts relating to revenue, expenditure and property financed by the general and annexed budgets on behalf of the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA). TCA has two main functions: judicial and auditing. The judicial work is carried out by specialized chambers in which court members try accounts and either acquit or hold liable those responsible for them. The audit work is carried out by auditors. TCA is independent of both the legislative and executive branches of the government.

elected members of Parliament and to continue to build up the relevant expertise among civilians.

Anti-corruption Policy

In the last years, some progress has been achieved in adopting anti-corruption measures. The new Penal Code contains provisions concerning bribery, trading in influence, abuse of power and embezzlement. The Code also introduces the concept of liability of legal persons in cases of corruption. It contains detailed provisions concerning corruption in public procurement. As offences of corruption are now dealt with by the Code, the proposed law on corruption has been withdrawn. However, surveys continue to indicate that corruption remains a serious problem in Turkey. Sceptics see the announcement of such anti-corruption efforts as whitewash – non-credible commitments to avoid tackling corruption.[11] The Law on Access to Information which was adopted in 2003 was an important step in enhancing transparency. However, this law needs to be broadened in scope and classified as well as unclassified public records need to be clearly defined in order to ensure effective implementation.

The establishment of an independent and efficient judiciary is of paramount importance. Impartiality, integrity and high standards of adjudication by the courts are essential for safeguarding the rule of law. This requires a firm commitment to eliminating external influences over the judiciary and to devoting adequate financial resources and training. The Supreme Council of Judges and Public Prosecutors deal also with appointments, transfers, the delegation of temporary powers, promotion and the allocation of posts. It can debar people from the profession and impose disciplinary penalties and removal from office. However, the Supreme Council of Judges and Public Prosecutors is chaired by the Minister of Justice, who is an MP and a member of a political party. In addition, prosecutors can be taken off a case and moved to another.[12]

[11] In 2005 two corruption-related commissions were established in parliament to investigate the gasoline smuggling, and illegal public offering (money collection) and misuse of depositors. A parliamentary anti-corruption committee has issued a long report (1,200 pages!) and started investigations into a number of high level improprieties. In January 2004, a working group was brought together to assist the parliamentary committee in charge of the Action Plan on Enhancing Transparency and Good Governance in the Public Sector. The working group consists of employees from the Prime Ministry Inspection Board, the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Interior, Finance, the Treasury and the State Planning Organization.

[12] As regards independence and impartiality of the judiciary, various provisions of the Turkish Constitution guarantee judicial independence. Article 9 provides that judicial power is exercised by independent courts. Under Article 138 judges are protected from receiving instructions, recommendations or suggestions that may influence them in the exercise of their judicial power. Furthermore, no legislative debate may be held concerning the exercise of judicial power in a pending trial, and both the legislative and the executive are required to comply with court decisions without alteration or delay. Article 140 requires judges to discharge their duties in accordance with the principles of the independence of the courts and the security of tenure of

In relation to the quality and efficiency of the judiciary The Ministry of Justice and the Judicial Academy, which was established in 2003, organised extensive *training* for judges and prosecutors on the Penal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure, as well as in areas such as human rights, asylum law, money laundering, trafficking in persons and intellectual property rights. The Judicial Academy has been responsible for training all candidate judges and prosecutors since 2004 and is gradually taking over in-service training of judges and prosecutors from the Ministry of Justice.[13]

In sum, although the AKP passed several harmonisation laws in order to fulfil the political criteria, it has not kept, for example, its pre-election promise to abolish immunity and its Emergency Action Plan, including anti-corruption measures, appears to be taking the same dead-end road of the recent past political establishment. Enhanced transparency in political party finance, increased access to information, the lifting of parliamentary immunity, and

---

judges. However, Article 40(6) provides that judges and public prosecutors are attached to the Ministry of Justice in so far as their administrative functions are concerned. These constitutional guarantees of an independent judiciary are reflected in various provisions of domestic law, including the Law on Judges and Public Prosecutors, the Criminal Procedure Law, the Civil Procedure Code and the Penal Code.

The High Council of Judges and Prosecutors is the supreme governing body of the judiciary. The judicial members of the High Council are appointed by the President of the Republic. The High Council is composed of five judges, the Minister of Justice and the Undersecretary of the Ministry of Justice. The High Council does not have its own secretariat or budget and its premises are inside the Ministry of Justice building. The Undersecretary to the Minister of Justice, appointed by the Minister, is an ex-officio member of the Council.

The High Council of Judges and Prosecutors and the Ministry of Justice are responsible for the appointment of graduates of the Judicial Academy as judges and prosecutors. Graduates seeking entry to the judicial profession, as either judges or prosecutors, first take a written examination administered by the School Selection and Placement Centre which administers all examinations for entry to higher education institutes in Turkey. Candidates who pass the written examination are then interviewed by a panel composed of representatives of the Ministry of Justice, and the successful candidates are admitted to the Judicial Academy for two years' training. The oral examination enables the Ministry of Justice to exercise considerable influence over the recruitment of candidate judges and prosecutors. Although *salaries for judges and prosecutors* have been increased significantly in recent years, they nevertheless remain modest.

[13] The budget of the Ministry of Justice was increased by 16.5% in 2005 compared to 2004. Nevertheless, expenditure on the judicial system remains low compared to the average in the EU Member States. The number of judges and prosecutors has remained largely stable; there are currently 5,952 judges and 3,179 prosecutors in service and a further 1,053 judges and prosecutors in training.

A law adopted in December 2004 provided for the recruitment of 4,000 additional judges and prosecutors, 100 judicial inspectors and 6,619 court administrative staff. This recruitment would represent an increase of almost 50% in the number of judges and prosecutors in Turkey and would contribute significantly to reducing delays in court proceedings. However, concern has been expressed by the senior judiciary in Turkey that the influence of the Ministry of Justice in the recruitment of such a substantial number of additional judges and prosecutors may gravely undermine the independence of the judiciary.

The Ethical Board for Public Servants started to operate in September 2004. A circular was adopted in 2004 instructing public bodies to cooperate fully with the Board. A regulation on the code of ethics for public employees was adopted in April 2005. The regulation sets out a detailed code of behaviour for senior public officials and grants members of the public the right to petition the Ethical Board concerning contraventions of the code. It does not apply to other categories such as elected officials, academics, military personnel or the judiciary. One former Prime Minister and seven former ministers were tried before the High Tribunal on charges of corruption.

enhanced dialogue between Government and civil society have met with some resistance. Even the Erdogan Administration's success in investigating corruption has been tainted by allegations that these investigations constitute a purge of past government officials and leave those close to the AKP untouched. The success of the government's anti-corruption programme will depend on the anti-corruption systems it can establish more than the political "big fish" the Erdogan administration can fry.

Research Methodology

In this project, we expect to gain fundamental insights into the cultural context within which deviant and criminal behaviour occurs *–not only* at the macro/formal institutional *but also* the micro/informal practical level– and into the respective preconditions under which criminality can be combated successfully. To be able to accomplish such a task, a *top-down* perspective *per se* would fall short of unveiling the existent social reality since speaking in sociological terms, corruption can above all be defined as a type of social relation. In other words, seen from an impartial perspective, phenomena such as nepotism and bribery can be very well characterized as mechanisms for achieving solidarity within and between kinship groups in various cultures.

The project, therefore adopts a *'bottom-up'* empirical approach to corruption to reveal the normative standards of different cultures, through bringing together the respective "modes of perception and recognition of the phenomenon by different social actors in each society."[14] Hence, the project's methodology follows the guidelines of *Grounded Theory* developed by Anselm Strauss and accordingly all the relevant data collected and classified related to the specified target groups is subjected to a qualitative content analysis.

Data Generation

As advocated by the grounded theory the research documents were collected randomly and yet they manifest the reflections and the perspectives of the six different target groups of the project (Politics, Judiciary, Police, Media, Civil Society and Economy) on corruption. Moreover, a great deal of secondary resources (documents that did not belong to any of the target groups but giving background information on the cases) were reviewed.

[14] See "REPORT: Project Crime and Culture, Kick-Off-Meeting", Sofia, 2-3 February 2006.

Certain materials were difficult to collect. In particular, although demanded according to the "right to get information" (Interrogation protocols related with the case 1 were requested from the I. Penal Court of Fatih, Istanbul that passed the first sentence in February 1996 at the beginning of the research phase), documents regarding the interrogation protocols of the public prosecutors/police in both cases are missing. Besides, it was also hard to find case-specific materials produced by the business associations and trade unions.

Nevertheless, in order to overcome these problems, alternative documents were used. That is, firstly, parallel the guidelines of the project, where directly relevant material was absent, material from the same target group on the most closely relating case was used. Secondly, where the case-specific documents were unavailable the Turkish team made use of other relevant documents belonging to target groups which approach the problem of corruption in general.

However, it can be stated that the quality of the data was satisfactory. Documents related to the rest of the target groups were well documented.

In regard to the type of materials collected (see Appendix), our database contains a wide range of documents which includes the following materials:

(1) *Related to the first target group (Politics)*, the parliamentary debate on the Refahyol coalition protocol and the protocols of the parliamentary debates on the motion
   (a) to establish an "inquiry committee" regarding the corruption claims about (the former) Welfare Party's "secret cashier" Suleyman Mercumek in the Bosnia donations scandal (1996-97);
   (b) to establish an "investigation committee" regarding the allegations of widespread fraud (in tenders, bankruptcies, banking reforms and power projects) related with the former ministers M. Yilmaz & G. Taner, H. Ozkan & R. Onal, Z. Cakan & C. Ersumer, Y. Topcu and K. Aydin (2003-04) and the following reports of the respective committees (the debates in "the second case" resulted in assembly decisions to send the concerned ex-ministers to be tried at the High Constitutional Court);
   (c) to form an "inquiry committee" regarding "the reasons, social and economic dimensions of corruption" (Jan. 03) and the following report (Nov. 03); as well as various allegations of fraud in public tenders related to the AKP-government;

(2) *Related to the second target group (Judiciary)***,** verdicts of the (11^{th} and 5^{th} Sections of Criminal Law) of The Supreme Court of Appeals as of May, 1996 and November, 2002; White Energy Indictment of Ankara State Security Court (Indictment NO:

2001/73). Since there is no "ombudsman's office" in Turkey yet, the Turkish team also examined the investigation reports of the parliament and ministerial boards (of the Prime Ministry, Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Justice), as well as the related reports of the audit bodies (Turkish Court of Accounts, High Audit Board under the Prime Minister's Department and the State Audit Board under the Presidency).

(3) *Related to the third target group (Police),* "Corruption in Turkey", General Directorate of Security, July 2004.

(4) *Related to the fourth target group (Civil Society),* the statements/surveys and strategy papers issued by national initiatives for the prevention of corruption (TSHD, TESEV, TUSEV, TEDMER, etc.)

(5) *Related to the fifth target group (Media),* commentaries and news of the magazines and dailies such as "Aksiyon", "Hurriyet", "Zaman", "Turkish Daily News", etc., as well as news reporting of "TRT", "CNN-Turk" and "NTV" television channels on the related cases on "corruption" in general.

(6) *Related to the sixth target group (Economy),* Publications and public statements of TUSIAD (Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association), ATO (Ankara Chamber of Commerce), TBB (The Banks Association of Turkey), TURK-IS (The Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions), DISK (The Confederation of Revolutionary Trade Unions), Kamu-Sen (The Confederation of Public Employees of Turkey).

Case Studies

As with each of the participating research groups in the project, the first case study addresses the issue of corruption in party financing. Called the 'Case of Mercumek' by the public, this scandal is of utmost importance on the grounds that it is not only the one and only scandal related to party financing against which a lawsuit was filed, but also it is related to a political party which is alleged to be an "enemy of the regime" by certain circles in Turkey. In other words, the 'Case of Mercumek' is a multi-dimensional case in the sense that it could help to picture how certain groups involved in the processes of making and applying decisions, questioning, and creating public opinions perceived major problems of Turkey during the 1990s, the period in which a considerable number of consecutive large-scale corruption cases which caused both the treasury department and the people of Turkey to suffer giant losses when it ended with a devastating economic and governance crisis in 2001.

The second case study was selected due to its aspects complementary to the observation described above about the 1990s. In December 2003, Turkish Parliament (TBMM) approved

a petition demanding investigations against former Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz and a number of former ministers on the grounds of certain corruptions allegedly committed by them in 1998. Investigation Commission of TBMM concluded in its report that the allegations made against the former ministers of state in said petition were actionable before the Supreme State Council. This report was put to vote in July 2004, so that TBMM passed a resolution to file lawsuits with the Supreme State Council against said former ministers of state. At this stage, the Turkbank case was selected as the primary one of the corruption cases mentioned above.

The reason for the selection in question was that the Turkbank case was a good example of multi-dimensional corruption where the organized crime, top business circles and top politicians were involved. Furthermore, this scandal culminated in the fall of the 55th government i.e. the Mesut Yilmaz administration through an interpellation, and what's more, ex-prime minister Mesut Yilmaz has become the first-ever prime minister to appear before the Supreme State Council in the history of Turkish Republic on the grounds of the corruptions alleged with regard to this case.

Case 1: Brief Description

The Welfare Party (*Refah Partisi*, RP), whose predecessors (*Milli Nizam Partisi*, National Order Party, MNP), and *Milli Selamet Partisi*, National Salvation Party, MSP), had been periodically banned since 25 years by the Constitutional Court for threatening the "laic principle" of the Republic, and had been re-established several times under different names and re-banned in 1998.

It was alleged that when Yugoslavia was undergoing disintegration, a foundation named Insan Hak ve Hurriyetleri Insani Yardim Vakfi (Humanitarian Relief Foundation for Human Rights and Freedoms) collected donations in Germany in 1992 and 1993 to provide the Muslims living in Bosnia with relief, that said funds were transferred to the bank account of Suleyman Mercumek who was a chartered financial advisor and who was believed to be the unofficial treasurer of RP, that Mercumek did not transfer said funds to Bosnia and helped them to be used for financing the general election campaigns of RP. This scandal originally broke out when it was discovered that Suleyman Mercumek had several accounts worth millions of German Marks with the three banks which went bankrupt at that time, and that said accounts contained the above mentioned funds. This allegation was first made by Tansu Ciller, Secretary General of Dogru Yol Partisi (True Path Party, DYP). Ciller accused RP of collecting donations from people located abroad through unlawful means and

misappropriating those funds. In the meantime, the Bosnian authorities announced that the former imam and present militia to whom RP alleged to have delivered the funds in question was not authorized to collect donations on behalf the Bosnian government. These events led TBMM to appoint a commission to investigate the unlawful financial relations between RP and Mercumek.

The legal dimension of this event with regard to Mercumek turned out to be as follows: 1st Court of Crime in Fatih in Istanbul found Suleyman Mercumek guilty of "breach of confidence" and "violation of the Law of Donations" and sentenced him to imprisonment of 4 years and 1 month and a heavy fine of 20 trillion 63 billion 905 million TL. However, the sentence was reversed by the Supreme Court on the grounds that said court had no jurisdiction over this case, and the case file was transferred to 2nd Court of Crime in Konya for trial on the grounds of "embezzlement" and "unfair interest". The case file was sent back and forth between Istanbul and Konya several times with the prosecutor's demand of imprisonment of 12 years. The trials lasted 8 years, and finally the case was dismissed in 2002 by the 7th Court of Crime in Istanbul on the grounds of time-bar. The case was closed when the 5th Division of the Supreme Court approved the local court's verdict of dismissal due to time-bar on the grounds that the verdict in question had not been appealed, despite the fact that the local court concluded that the offence of embezzlement had been committed.

Case 2: Brief Description

The Competition Council approved the privatization of Turk Ticaret Bankasi AS. (Turkbank) and therefore the transfer of 84.52 percent of Turkbank shares owned by the Central Bank to Korkmaz Yigit Insaat Taahhut ve Ticaret AS, a Turkish construction and finance group in August 1998. Turkbank had been brought under Treasury control in 1994 during a domestic financial crisis that left it substantially weakened. The state-owned shares of the Turkbank were to be sold to Korkmaz Yigit, whose company won out over five other companies for $600 million.

However, the sale was postponed due to the parliamentary investigation proposed by the opposition Republican People's Party (CHP) Icel Deputy Fikri Saglar and his fellow deputies, following the questions over whether the company that won the privatization bid has fulfilled all the necessary financial obligations and bidding requirements.

CHP also made public the tape recording of a telephone conversation between [mafia boss then imprisoned in France] Alaattin Cakici and businessman Korkmaz Yigit, where they

were discussing how to prevent other contestants from taking part in the bidding process for Turkbank.

The Treasury suspended the handover to Korkmaz of the Turkbank shares. Central Bank Deposit Insurance Fund, in whose possession the Turkbank shares continue to be, filed a complaint with a prosecutor on the grounds that the bidding process was rigged. After receiving tip-offs, the government created a three-member committee to look into the financial resources used in cases of "mysterious purchases" of Korkmaz Yigit.[15] The controversy, as mentioned above, resulted in the collapse of the Yilmaz government after it lost a confidence vote in late November 1998.

ANAP (Motherland Party) leader Yilmaz testified before two different commissions in 2000; one investigating allegations of wrongdoing during his time as prime minister, relating to the Turkbank bid, and the other investigating the Yilmaz government's alleged ties to gangs. Then State Minister Gunes Taner also gave testimony to the commission investigating the allegations of corruption in the Turkbank bid. The investigative committee, chaired by DSP deputy Necati Albay ruled by nine votes to five to acquit Yilmaz.[16] Mesut Yilmaz and his former state minister Gunes Taner could not be brought to court although the Turkbank sell-off was cancelled and Korkmaz Yigit was tried later on.

According to the Constitution a minister or a prime minister could be tried only if Parliament hands them over to the Supreme Court in conclusion to a parliament probation. The decision required a minimum vote of 276 MPs, which was then a difficult number to achieve amid Turkey's patchy political scene. However in 2003, thanks to the new distribution in the parliament the Parliamentary Commission Investigating Irregularities demanded a commission to investigate former Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz and Gunes Taner on the Turkbank bidding. After, drafting the report in around 4 months, the Commission decided unanimously that former Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz and former State Minister Gunes Taner would have to come before the Supreme State Council for corruption during the privatization of Turkbank.[17]

It took the Constitutional Court, which acts as the Supreme State Council according to the Constitution, one year to try the case. Finally, Nuri Ok, Prosecutor with the Supreme Court,

[15] In a striking series of large purchases at the same time, Yigit had already bought another bank, Bankekspres; two other dailies, Yeni Yuzyil and Ates; and two TV stations, Kanal E and Kanal 6.
[16] The nine who voted for the acquittal were from the DSP, ANAP and the MHP. The True Path Party (DYP) and FP committee members voted to have him put on trial. MHP member Resat Dogru abstained.
[17] The Decision of the Parliament related to the former prime minister A. Mesut YILMAZ and former minister of state Gunes TANER", Decision No: 815, Decision Date: 13.7.2004, (Official Gazette: 17 July 2004 - 25525)

stated on March 3, 2006 that the alleged offence was no longer classified as "conspiracy against a tender" under the new Turkish Criminal Law (TCK), but as a "misuse of official powers". He added that the 5-year time-bar elapsed, and demanded that the case be dismissed. Supreme State Council reviewed the acts committed by Yilmaz and Taner from this new classification, and concluded that the acts had been committed before 1999, and that the misuse of official powers is now included in the scope of the Law of Probation which covers certain types of offences committed before 1999. Therefore, the Supreme State Council allowed this case to be eligible for probation without arriving at a verdict.

Findings: Perceptions of Corruption[18]

Target Group Politics

In reviewing the documents about this group, we tried to define the MPs general perception of the cases of corruption by focusing on the comments and expressions they made in the parliamentary sessions, party group meetings, Investigation Commission's meetings, and relevant reports. Furthermore, we reviewed the stated perception's connections with the political identities and parliamentary positions (administration/opposition) of the MPs.

Case I

The documents we reviewed with regard to the case known to the public as the "Case of Mercumek" were the petition (dated 17.4.1996) submitted to demand a parliamentary investigation on the connections and material relations between RP and Suleyman Mercumek and on alleged unlawful financial resources of RP, minutes of the sessions held in Parliament until said petition was approved, discussions made by the MPs on the official program of the 54th government i.e. the RP-DYP coalition government where they did frequent references to political corruption in general and the Case of Mercumek in particular, the report issued by investigation commission appointed by Parliament after said petition was approved, and minutes of the sessions held by Parliament on the said report.

In accordance with the applicable regulations of Parliament, in these sessions, two sets of a pair of MPs who applied to deliver a speech in favour of and against the relevant issue

[18] In this chapter the findings of qualitative analyses are presented. For the target groups for which no case-specific material was available only the results of general analysis are given.

respectively deliver their speeches. Furthermore, during the general sessions, the parties who hold MP positions in Parliament announce the opinion of their parliamentary groups. Thus we could review the MPs perception of corruption in a considerably broad spectrum. Furthermore, the fact that many MPs for the opposition parties had voiced their views on the case of Mercumek while sessions were held on the official program of the RP-DYP coalition government helps us to find out that the parliamentary investigation was rather seen as a political manoeuvre than a struggle against corruption.

The petition submitted to demand a parliamentary investigation on the connections and material relations between RP and Suleyman Mercumek and on alleged unlawful financial resources of RP was reviewed by Parliament, and as a result an investigation commission was appointed during the session held on May 15, 1996. However, the activities by this Investigation Commission were disrupted due to various disagreements for nearly a year, before the chairman of the commission resigned. Finally, the commission issued a report in favour of RP, concluding that there was no sufficient evidence on the alleged connection between Suleyman Mercumek and RP, and said report was approved by the representatives of the then-current coalition government (5 positive votes against 4 negative votes).

The most interesting aspect of the meetings and discussions mentioned above was that the administration changed after the petition was submitted and before the Investigation Commission issued its report. When the petition was submitted, the coalition government of ANAP and DYP was in power. After Parliament resolved to approve the petition and to start an investigation, a local election was held, as a result of which the coalition government of ANAP and DYP resigned on June 2, 1996, and RP and DYP formed a new coalition government on June 28, 1996. In other words, the MPs who had submitted the petition in question found themselves just two months later as partners of the political party accused in the petition.

This change to the balance of political powers did not reflect to the general comments made by the MPs about their perception of corruption, but it definitely reflected their specific comments about this case. For example, Ali Riza Gonul was a prominent member of the group of MPs for DYP who issued and submitted the petition and had made some harsh accusations against RP during the parliamentary sessions held to discuss the petition, but he preferred to make some considerably polite comments while the report was discussed, refrained from emphasizing that he was one of the signatories of the petition at his free will, and did not talk about struggle against corruption in financial affairs of the political parties.

Case II

Most of the documents we reviewed with regard to this case, which culminated in causing a former prime minister to appear before the Supreme State Council for the first time in the history of Turkish Parliament (TBMM), are minutes of parliamentary sessions. The rest are the petition entitled "Petition on starting parliamentary investigation against former Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz and former Minister of State Gunes Taner on the grounds of their conspiratorial relations and discussions about the Turkbank tender to violate Section 205 of the Turkish Criminal Law", minutes of the sessions held to discuss said petition, the report issued by the Investigation Commission appointed by TBMM as a result of said petition, and minutes of the sessions held to discuss said report.

Since the petition was re-submitted to a new Parliament formed after the general elections held on November 3, 2002 against Yilmaz and Taner who were no longer members of the new Parliament, comments of the MPs in the related documents are expected to view the problem of political corruption in a rather objective way. In a session held to discuss said petition, the spokesman of the party in power said that the relationships between the three estates (legislative, executive, judicial) need to be rearranged, that such a rearrangement needs to be based on superiority of law, creation of dedication to law and enforcement of judicial verdicts, and that only this way it would be possible to prevent political corruption and to stop the malpractices which are a "special form of corruption". The spokesman of the opposition party reminded the administration of its promise given before the general elections to abolish the immunity of the MPs, and suggested that the issue of immunity of MPs should be solved within the term of the present parliament. Comments made by the spokesmen of both parties indicate that although they focused on different points, they felt insecure about the corruption, worried about the future, and feared that unless measures are taken, past negative experiences might be suffered again.

The impression we get here is that the MPs who expressed their views or served as members of the investigation commission this time were enjoying the satisfaction of having performed their duties. They made frequent references to the severe outcomes of such corruption cases for Turkey. Furthermore, they expressed their wish that the activities and decisions made by TMBB on this case should be considered an exemplary effort to stop political corruption in the future. They commented that the sufferings experienced as a result of the Turkbank affair were one of the worst and ugliest examples of the politician-organized crime-bureaucrat-businessman gang which inflicted deed wounds on Turkey.

The documents we reviewed with regard to these two cases can be summarized in a comparative way as follows: Turkish politicians' perception of corruption has undergone a significant change within the time which elapsed between the two cases, or the importance assigned to corruption has at least increased in time.

MPs for CHP who delivered speeches about the first case commented that Turkey faced more important problems, and therefore the alleged corruptive acts should be finalized as soon as possible in order to proceed to so-called more important problems. (As Nihat Matkap, who is a MP for CHP and who objected the suggested postponement of the sessions held to discuss alleged corruptive acts committed by RP, put it: "Both the national agenda and the parliamentary agenda should be cleaned of these alleged corruptive acts as soon as possible. Turkey faces gravely serious problems. The national agenda so focuses on and is shaped around those alleged corruptive acts that we are nearly about to forget about the real problems. Turkey suffers the high cost of living problem, internal and external financing problem, investment problem, employment problem, and democratization problem. All these problems hang in the air, but our national agenda almost exclusively consists of the alleged corruptive acts. I would like to express that this fact disturbs the group to which I am a member in the extreme". We deduce from this and other similar comments that although certain politicians want to solve the corruption problem, they do not consider it a basic problem and therefore they fail to understand that the corruption problem is the underlying factor of many other problems ranging from foreign investments to unbalanced public expenditures, political stability to democratization.

Parliament discussed the second case in 2004, and this time political corruption and malpractices were defined as the underlying factor of all problems this country faced. Certain notions and expressions frequently pop up in both cases to give us a clue about the way the politicians perceive corruption in general, including "transparency", "openness", "discussing everything in Parliament", "the public's yearning for a clean society", "honest politics", "clean society", "clean politics". However, it is also observed that some MPs use these notions and ideas as a tool of propaganda, deliver speeches resembling an election campaign, ignore discussing about the case and prefer to explain how this or that party is honest and clean. Another similar attitude observed is that the politicians use the investigations on corruption as a tool to speak ill of their political competitors or to damage their respectability in the public's eye instead of ensuring them to serve such common interests as ensuring them to be transparent and stopping corruption.

Almost all of the politicians agree that the investigations carried out by Parliament are very important in terms of the struggle against corruption. They believe that such investigations

are events which provide information about and prove corruption, so that they will lead to very important political outcomes and said outcomes will reflect to all fields. Furthermore, they underline Parliament's duty of informing the public, and emphasize that the discussions they hold are for the sake of the nation. They also frequently emphasize that irrespective of the issues, the legal frame must be respected. It is observed that such expressions as "superiority of the law", "independency of the judiciary", "enforcement of judicial verdicts", "respect for judicial verdicts", "respect for the Constitution", and "compliance with the Constitution" form the backbone of the discourse adopted during the sessions held on corruption.

An interesting point observed after reviewing the documents on both cases is that the politicians consider the submission of petitions of investigation as a party activity. However, the Constitution orders that a petition of investigation can only be submitted after it is signed by a certain number of MPs, not by a party itself or a party's group of MPs. Therefore, reducing such petition to a matter of argument between political parties is contrary to the Constitution. However, such arguments lead to a stereotyped identity around the problem of corruption and provide an opportunity to politicians to declare themselves to be "pro-transparency", "honest", "clean" and "unstained", to position themselves on the axis of a moral conflict and to advertise themselves to be moral.

As a result of the reviews we conducted on these cases, we can conclude that in Turkey, the politicians' perception of corruption is closely related with their relations with power. This observation is also valid for certain documents which were not used as primary ones but served as a background for our review. Politicians of the parties which are not worried about losing power in short term can voice more explicit, more courageous and more definite expressions on corruption, just like the politicians who are not alleged to have committed corruption.

Target Group Judiciary

In reviewing the legal system target group's perception of corruption, we had some difficulties to gain access to primary sources due to various reasons. Since the lawsuit for Case II is still pending before the Supreme State Council, no judicial documents have been published yet. Furthermore, the report issued by the Investigation Committee of Parliament and already reviewed by us under the heading Target Group Politics was used as an indictment for Case II by the Prosecutor's Office of the Supreme Court. Therefore, it is not re-analyzed here.

Therefore, we used some other documents which can shed light on the legal system's perception of corruption and which can form the background for our review. Said documents include the Turkish Criminal Law's sections on corruption. (It will be useful to note at this point that after coming to power as a result of the general elections held in 2002, the AKP administration prepared a draft Corruption Law to stipulate rules and methods for investigation and prosecution of corruptive acts falling in the scope of said new law, but it later transferred some of the rules of said draft to a new revised version of the Criminal Law and withdrew said draft.)

The revised version of Turkish Criminal Law which was put in effect in 2005 does not contain the legal notion of "corruption", but it stipulates in great detail both the offences falling under the category of corruption and the rules governing investigation and prosecution of such offences. Corruption offences and punishments against such offences are defined under the headings "Economic, Industrial and Commercial Offences" (i.e. malpractice concerning public procurements and completion of tender works, etc.) and "Offences Against Trustworthiness of the Public Administration" (i.e. embezzlement, misappropriation, negligence to supervise, bribe, breach of confidence, etc.), and the new Law also introduces the concept of liability of legal persons in cases of corruption. It contains detailed provisions concerning corruption in public procurement.

In general, we observe that the judges refrain from voicing an opinion about a case before the relevant lawsuit is about to be finished. However, the prosecutors do not hesitate to make explanations when they are asked about an indictment and the progress of a lawsuit, and do not hide their political standing in making so. In both cases, the additional petitions, demands or indictments presented by the prosecutors to the judges while the relevant lawsuits were pending helped us to understand the judicial authorities' opinions about the progress of the lawsuits.

The role played by the judiciary and the way it perceives itself through the cases reviewed here are partially apparent in the debates made after it was understood that the second case might be subject to time-bar, and in the circular issued by the Ministry of Justice as a result of said debates. The roots of this debate lied in the criticism that the court procrastinated the lawsuit filed against Yilmaz and Taner.

As a response to these criticisms the judicial authorities expressed their belief that sometimes the politicians and even the laws themselves hinder the judiciary to fulfil their duties, as in the above mentioned example of time-bar (according to the allegations of the members of the

judiciary certain files were not processed on time and were delivered to the courts only one or one and a half months before the time-bar date). The circular in question is sent by the Ministry of Justice to all prosecutors' offices in 2004. The circulars defined corruption as "a social wound endangering the supremacy of law, weakening the democratic institutions and values as well as justice and moral values, threatening political stability, hindering economic and social development, degrades social peace and safety, and wasting economic values to an extent so wide to represent a significant portion of the natural resources (…)", and reminded that offences of embezzlement, misappropriation, negligence to supervise, bribe, breach of confidence, etc. committed by certain civil servants should be prosecuted as soon as possible, and the offenders who would be found guilty should be sentenced on time subject to the applicable laws. The circulars also emphasized that such prosecution and sentences would increase the public's respect for the law and trust in justice.

In summary, we might conclude from the judicial documents of the both cases that the legal system's actors stick to the official legal language in their texts in order to emphasize the independence of the judiciary. At this point, it is observed that there is a definite difference between the legal system's actors and the politicians with regard to perception of corruption, because the politicians look unable to escape from conjuncture effects. The judiciary authorities cling to the laws to a tee and refrain from making clear comments or even interpretations about cases of corruption to act impartial beyond the conjuncture effects. In doing so, however, they pass the actual responsibility to the legislative and in turn, to the politicians who hinder or delay the judicial processes.

Target Group Police

Apart from the mission statement of the Department of Anti-Smuggling and Organized Crime that relates the fiscal crimes to cultural reasons among others the only available document provided during the first phase of the research where the perceptions of corruption in regard to police could be analyzed is a report prepared by the General Directorate of Security in July 2004. The report, with no coincidence, was made public, while a new anti-corruption law was being discussed in the General Assembly. Though not sufficient in terms of the targets of this research, it deserves serious attention not only because it was the first and so far the only document in which the police draw a schema of corruption cases in Turkey but also it contained policy recommendations to fight against corruption.

The report groups, the corruption cases in Turkey under four major headings: corruptions related to banking sector, subsidies in agricultural sector, customs and finally misconduct in

awarding of contracts. The report in question states that the "Treasury Department" is the only resource which supports corruption. In other words, the police believe that corruption refers to distribution of Treasury funds through illegal channels by the State itself. The report describes the reasons leading to corruption as follows: non-transparent governance and applications, insufficient governmental control, quality and complexity of the bureaucracy, uncertain aspects of the tender award and payment decision-making processes, and salary level of the civil servants. It is emphasized that these negative conditions cause the State system to corrupt, and the official positions to turn into places providing services to a small group for the consideration of interest and benefit.

The report indicates that the law enforcement forces and the judicial organs are the only institutions authorized to fight corruption. Therefore, the report comments that the biggest obstacle for the fight against corruption is the present inefficient state of the judiciary organs and of the law enforcement forces. The report suggests that regional prosecutor's offices or regional specialized courts should be created in such a manner to have full authority to fight corruption.

In summary, the police force's perception of corruption is misuse of the public funds, and its self-criticism in terms of fight against corruption is limited with the indicators of performance depending on efficiency. We also observe that the report does not make any reference to or comment about a number of corruptive acts committed by the police, ranging from such small-scale bribes as given by motorists to traffic police officers to large-scale offences committed by high and middle ranking police officers in cooperation with the organized crime, as discovered by the courts.
This report contains conclusions very reasonable in objective terms, but it looks to have been composed from a perspective seeing the phenomenon of corruption as an issue of security. Therefore, it over-presents the police force's responsibility for the phenomenon of corruption.

Target Group Media

By and large, it is observed that the Media's perception of corruption improved during the period elapsing between the two cases. Political grouping was the prominent attitude of the Press for the first case, but the Press generally managed to focus on the corruption problem for the second case in a considerably impartial way, free from any kind of political influence. Thus it can be said that the Press tries to declare its independence against political labels and make efforts to emerge as the 'fourth estate'.

Case I

The analysis we conducted on the Media reports about the case of Mercumek gives us interesting findings about Turkey in the 1990s which were defined as the "darkest period"[19] of corruption. We observe that the articles and editorials published by the pro-Islam newspapers and pro-secular newspapers on corruption are polar opposites to each other.

Pro-Islam Newspapers

It is observed that after the Investigation Commission of Parliament began to investigate the allegations that Suleyman Mercumek had transferred the donations collected for Bosnia-Herzegovina to RP, the pro-Islam newspapers began to favour Mercumek (see *Aksiyon*, issue no. 17, 01.04.1995). Said newspapers rather gave partisan-like support to RP, whose political views match theirs, than focus on the alleged corruptions. They quoted Lutfu Esengun, who was MP for the city of Erzurum for RP and a member of the Investigation Commission, announcing that the Investigation Commission has not found evidence yet, and commenting indirectly that the allegations and accusations were made to slander RP, the conservative foundation *Insan Hak ve Hurriyetleri Insani Yardim Vakfi*, and the Islamic solidarity networks[20].

As the lawsuit proceeded, the pro-Islam newspapers preferred to dedicate their pages to defend institutions (such as Avrupa Milli Gorus Teskilati, *National View Organization in Europe*) which are known to have been connected with Mercumek and to have organic connections with RP. Another example of the way the pro-Islam press perceived this case is that they did not make any reference to the allegations brought against Suleyman Mercumek, mentioning his name only as an ordinary member of RP in their articles and editorials about events organized by RP. In general, it is observed that the pro-Islam press turned a blind eye to this case instead of reviewing it in accordance with the standards of journalism, and defended Mercumek.

[19] Nedim Sener, *Tepeden Tirnaga Yolsuzluk* (Corruption from Head to Toe), Metis Yayinevi, Istanbul, 2001, p. 74.
[20] They complained that after the "rumours" against Mercumek started, donations made to pro-Islam International Human Relief Organization (IHH) decreased.

Pro-secular Press

On the other hand, it is observed that the articles and editorial published in the pro-secular newspapers mostly instead blamed the case on the politicians who were considered to have been connected with it than corruption itself. They directed their criticism to RP as a threat to the regime via the case of Mercumek, and indirectly to Tansu Ciller who gave RP an opportunity to come to power as a partner of her coalition government. The fact that RP and DYP saved each other from various corruption investigation files was criticized by the pro-secular press with such harsh headlines as “They sold their conscience for power”, “They hide their dirt”, “The hush-up gang”.

As the lawsuit proceeded, these newspapers alleged a connection between the alleged corruption committed by Mercumek and dangers imposed by pro-Islam holding companies, foundations, societies, non-governmental organizations, publications, sects and the so-called international “green capital” against Turkey. During the case demanding the closure of RP, these press organs advocated that RP must not be paid of its official support funds from the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1998 on the grounds that the court might adjudge to close RP down. While saying so, they made frequent references to the case of Mercumek. After RP was closed down under court order, the Prosecutor of the State Security Court in Ankara filed another lawsuit against 33 members of RP, including its secretary general Necmettin Erbakan. Similarly during this case, though without any clear evidence, the pro-secular newspapers continued to comment that the funds transferred to Suleyman Mercumek’s bank accounts were used by certain circles for conspiracies against the secular and democratic regime of this country and for planting their supporters in the civil servant system. It is observed that the comments of the media on pending cases related to RP were almost the same (sometimes even harsher) as the accusations made by the Public Prosecutors. Except for a few columnists, all pro-secular newspapers made comments which could be described as ‘shoot to kill’ against RP before the lawsuits were finalized.

In summary, on the one hand the pro-Islam press which is known to have been connected with religious sects in Turkey demonstrated an attitude complying with the old Turkish proverb “if your arm is broken, use your sleeve to hide it”, meaning one should hide all of his wrongdoing in order to avoid prosecution, and on the other hand the pro-secularism press rather connected the case the with RP which they consider to be the most powerful representative of political Islam than focus on the problems suffered by the regime and the society because of corruption, so that they pushed the phenomenon of corruption down to a lower portion of the list of current problems.

Case II

Unlike the case of Mercumek, the case of Turkbank brought almost similar comments from the media. Although the reasons of said similarity are not directly related with our research, they might be defined as the governance crisis suffered in the 1990s, that the disputes arising between various governmental authorities around the principle of secularism mostly disappeared, said authorities (i.e. the administration, the opposition parties, the President, and the Armed Forces) achieved to agree on a common attitude against corruption as part of the project of future membership to European Union, and Turkey had to pay a considerable amount of social costs, worth billions of dollars due to the corruptive acts committed in the banking sector. In our opinion, the reasons why all the Media organs, irrespective of their political views, focused on the problem of corruption to an extent seen never before, lie to a great extent in the above mentioned factors.

The political stability provided by the government formed by AKP after the general elections held in 2002, the fact that AKP adopted a conservative democrat identity, as opposed to an Islamic one, after it was started by former members of the innovative group of RP, and said administration's emphasis of the project of future membership to EU gathered support by the public and the Press at least in the initial period. It is observed that the Press did not treat AKP in the harsh and aggressive way it once used for RP, and made positive comments about the statements given by Cemil Cicek, Minister of Justice for the AKP administration, about the methods used by his government against corruption. There are also some indicators that in the same period, the Press, which gave considerable coverage to the statements made by the military on their full support to the project of future membership to EU, was impressed by the "determined" attitude demonstrated by the top political and governmental authorities against corruption.

We observe that after the Supreme State Council arrived a verdict in 2003 on the lawsuits filed against Mesut Yilmaz, Gunes Taner and other former ministers, the Press focused on the phenomenon of corruption in a non-partisan and impartial way, with some self-criticism thrown for good measure, proceeding from commenting about corruption to suggesting solutions for the problem.

While highlighting that Turkey has been passing through a "historic" process for the corruption problem, the Press, made certain comments to the effect that supporting corruption would be a "hara-kiri" or "suicide" for itself. At the same time, the Press emphasized that the corruption problem should be handled without discriminating between

the political, business and military circles, and agree on the common opinion that since the judiciary intervenes now, the evidence, suspects and witnesses are known at last, and concrete accusations are made in a transparent way, the Press should avoid trying to hide the cases where suspects have been found guilty by the courts. Otherwise the public will have a negative opinion about the Press.

It is observed that as a natural outcome of this approach, the qualitative standards of the debates published by the Press increased in comparison with the 1990s thanks to its detailed review of the reasons underlying corruption in the normative, official and social context, in parallel with references frequently made to social ethics, business ethics, democratic and transparent society, etc.

Review of the documents on the case of Turkbank indicates that in general, the Press perceive the corruption problem of Turkey as "habitual and/or endemic". Another common argument is that corruption is a disease spreading especially in the last 15 years. We observe that in the same period, the Media accused the politicians of making and distributing unfair income. Such accusations as "graft", "favouritism" and "misuse of office" were frequently made. Another estate criticized at the same level by the Press is the judiciary. Many references were made to the effect that the Turkish system of justice works in a strangely twisted way at times. In this context, the Media looked to share the common opinion that too many lawsuits remain pending years and years due to the immense backlog of the courts, problems of the legal infrastructure, and the respondents' use of the gaps in the laws to their own benefit, so that said lawsuits are dismissed on the grounds of time-bar.

In this context, the Press launched severe criticism when the Prosecutor of the Supreme Court demanded that the lawsuits filed against Mesut Yilmaz and Gunes Taner should be dismissed on the grounds that the time-bar period of 5 years for them has elapsed (headlines included "The existing judicial system is a garbage dumping area full of time-barred cases", "The time-bar system looks like a law of pardoning remaining in effect forever"). The day after the mentioned demand was announced, the Press gave major coverage to lawyers and law professors who made comments opposing the demand. The Prosecutor's demand was commented to be a "rescue operation". Another common point was that the Parliament's control was ineffective. The Press also commented that the time-bar system should be viewed for its possible effects on the social conscience instead of a legal technique. In this context, the Press began to re-question the rules stipulated in the new Criminal Law for the politicians (i.e. immunity of the MPs). On the other hand, the fact that the new Criminal Law extends the time-bar period for offences committed after June 1, 2004 was perceived as a positive development.

Target Group Civil Society

In the category of NGOs we used the documents (reports, surveys, press releases, and speeches) of TESEV (Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation) and Toplumsal Saydamlik Hareketi Dernegi (TSHD, Transparency International Turkish Chapter). As in the case of the Target Group Economy, these documents do not directly deal with our two specific cases of corruption.

TESEV has been conducting its "Perceptions of Corruption in Turkey" project since 1999 in order to analyse the social and administrative basis of corruption and to produce policy measures that aim to address the problems at hand. TESEV's anti-corruption project is supported by the World Bank as well as by the Turkish Interior Ministry. As the Chairperson of TESEV, Can Paker argues “it is part of an endeavour to uncover and put an end to the corruption which prevents Turkey’s further integration with global markets and the emerging global information society that is based on transparency and accountability.”
Within this context, a three level study about the perceptions of corruption in different segments of society was conducted. The first stage of the study, "Household View on the Causes of Corruption in Turkey and Suggested Preventive Measures" was completed in 2001. This study aims to account for views and experiences of citizens about corruption, and tries to understand its effects on society as well as suggesting ways to combat the corruption problem in general.

The second study, "Business View on the Causes of Corruption in Turkey and Suggested Preventive Measures" which was concluded in 2002, intends to ascertain the levels and nature of corruption that arise from relations between the private sector, central bureaucracy and local administrations. "Society's View of Public Administration, Public Services and Reform" is the final phase of the project and it was completed in 2004. The goal of this study is to present the comparative performances of central and local administrations from the viewpoint of residents living in cities in order to contribute to the ongoing restructuring efforts of the public administration in Turkey.

TESEV argues that corruption in Turkey is of such a degree as to bring about economic and social collapse. By giving references to economic crises that took place in Asia and Russia, it defines the corruption as one of the main reasons that leads to economic collapse. Furthermore, corruption for TESEF not only erodes economic well-being but also leads to the social decay and the decline of ethical values. According to TESEV while civil society is obliged to bring order and transparency to its own activities has right to demand the same

from the state actors. The state, as the recipient of public funds, is and must be accountable to civil society. For this reason, TESEV believes that civil society should go directly to the treasury and demand that all forthcoming political developments be transparent. Civil society has or should have the capacity to monitor political activities and to make open criticisms of the government.

TESEV argues that the fundamental roots of the corruption lie in the structure of the public sector, its interactions with the private sector, and the way in which these factors shape incentives and behavioural environment in a broader sense. Therefore, TESEV believes that a comprehensive approach must be put into force so as to improve governance and transparency in a way that it should reach beyond the issue of enforcement, and establish a more deep-rooted transformation. TESEV puts the accent on the necessity of a national strategy with an action plan of priority objectives covering specific reforms to increase transparency and accountability in the political system, the judicial system, and public administration.

On the other hand for TSHD the problem of corruption has been "dynamiting" the very mechanisms of Turkey's economic and social welfare for years. According to this institution, in Turkey corruption is widespread in all sectors (in public procurement, at customs, in tax offices, police departments, deed offices, etc.) and actions of public management (rentals of public property and forested lands, granting of credit from public banks, etc.). According to TSHD, the main reason why corruption has reached such levels in Turkey is that the notions of transparency and accountability have not been internalized by the actors of public management. Another important reason is that in the political life of Turkey, rather than reinforcing their political power by representing the will and the interests of citizens as should be the case in a democracy, the leaders prefer to seek political and social support mainly via networks of private relationships based on distribution of benefits and services which finally ends up with creation of a leader sultanate.

In the light of these perceptions, TSHD proposes the following measures as the essential means to rid public administration of corruption: the internalization of transparency in public operations, accountability to citizens, the right to have access to information related to all kinds of public operations. The institution argues that massive civil mobilization against corruption is a must and in order for Turkey fully to integrate into the values and to implement the standards of the western world, civil society must be conscious of the empowerment provided them by democracy, and to demand increased transparency and accountability in the decision-making procedures that take place on behalf of the people.

Target Group Economy (Business Associations and Trade Unions)

In the category of business associations and trade unions, we used the documents of the following economic agents:

- TUSIAD (Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association)
- TEPAV/EPRI (Economic Policy Research Institute)
- TOBB (Turkish Union of Chambers of Commerce)
- ATO (Ankara Chamber of Commerce)
- ISO (Istanbul Chamber of Industry)
- Kayseri Chamber of Commerce
- Hak-Is (The Confederation of Turkish Real Trade Unions)

Unfortunately, none of these documents deal with our specific cases of corruption but all provide important insights if not specific definitions, in regard to the perception of corruption of our target group.

These institutions consider corruption as an important cause of underdevelopment and poverty. They argue that corruption

- reduces investment, and as a consequence, it reduces the rate of growth;
- reduces social expenditures such as expenditures for health or education;
- increases public investment;
- distorts the effects of industrial policy on investment;
- reduces foreign direct investment;
- reduces tax revenue;
- reduces productivity of public investment and of country's infrastructure.

Corruption is also perceived as one of the most difficult obstacles by start-up firms. The list of common points raised by these institutions regarding the factors promoting corruption are as such:

- Regulations and authorizations
- Certain characteristics of the tax system
- Certain spending decisions
- Bureaucratic tradition

[21] Nedim Sener, *Tepeden Tirnaga Yolsuzluk* (Corruption from Head to Toe), Metis Yayinevi, Istanbul, 2001, p. 74.

[22] They complained that after the "rumours" against Mercumek started, donations made to pro-Islam International Human Relief Organization (IHH) decreased.

- Level of public sector wages
- Penalty system
- Institutional controls
- Transparency of rules, laws, and processes.

Surprisingly or not, the views of these institutions are almost in every respect similar to those developed by IMF or the World Bank.

Another point that deserves to be mentioned is the agreement of TOBB and TUSIAD members not to engage in corruption and report it every time they come across with. According to the article 5 of by-laws of TUSIAD, all members agree to comply with the "Principles of Business Ethics" set by the Board of Directors. One of these principles asserts that members of TUSIAD shall not hire deputies and civil servants that are in charge and they shall not use their employees' existent relationships with political parties so as to enjoy individual or institutional benefits.

All of the above-mentioned institutions believe that the elimination of corruption would promote Turkey's political and economic stability. All share the idea that Turkey has suffered from chronic inflation and budget deficits for the last 25 years, partly because of corruption. The economic crisis of 2001 is to a great extent blamed on a loss of market confidence in the economic reform measures in process which is also stalled by corruption. All the documents recommend that urgent action be taken to fight against corruption and yet argue that the problem cannot be seen separately from the need to reform the state system. It is agreed that the mobilization of civil society is a must to develop a broad strategy to combat corruption and structural and institutional reforms should be implemented in order to improve the quality of governance at all levels of public administration.

Conclusions

Issuing a detailed report in 2003 entitled "Investigation of Reasons and Social and Economic Scale of Corruption, and Determination of Anti-Corruption Measures in Turkey", the parliamentary investigation commission defined corruption in broadest sense as "any misuse of public administration powers in such a manner to damage public and private interests". According to the commission, corruption is the indicator of a negativity and moral weakness irrespective of the way it is defined, indicates that the society has undergone degradation in general, and can happen in such various fields as the public sector, private sector, civilian-military bureaucracies, politics or media. Terms and expressions used by other target groups

in the primary and background documents reviewed here indicate that said groups' perception of corruption is not far from the definition given above.

All target groups believe that corruption is widespread in Turkey and consider it an integral part and a special form of a general degradation. Corruption was described as "dirty", "ugly" and "immoral", while corruptive acts were described as a "disgrace" and "scandal". Such expressions as "honest politics" and "clean society" turn out to be the common wishes of the target groups. Perceptions of the two cases throughout two different periods of time indicate that both the corruption problem and efforts to solve said problem were considered more and more important. As to the second case, all target groups including those possessing power to make reforms agreed that what was needed was a large-scale reform movement, and although not defined, a paradigm shift.

The study conducted up to this point reveals that all target audience groups concur with the opinion that corruption is one of the leading obstacles in Turkey, maintaining a consensus on the leading causes and consequences of such improprieties. All target groups shared the same conclusion that the starting point of the spread of corruption is the public sector. It is striking however how each group contends that corruption is more widespread in other groups, excluding of its own. Thus, there is divergence to a degree in proposals to deter corruption on various levels. A variety of arguments can be provided to uphold this claim. The judicial branch, for example, asserts that amending laws to deter corruption is insufficient, emphasizing that it is more important to prevent politicians from intervening in the legal system. Meanwhile, corruption in the ranks of the police force is basically specified as a matter of high security concern, presenting the case that the real obstacle facing this struggle is the inefficiency of the legal system. The private sector, all the while, claiming that corruption is rooted in the public sector and that transgressions could be reduced under a smaller administration, seems to have forgotten how privatization applications have lead to corruption in the past. TÜSİAD's (Turkish Industrialists and Businessmen's Association) demand that all its members adhere to regulations on ethical grounds, terminating memberships of those who don't, is a step in the right direction, yet insufficient at this juncture.

A closer look at the target groups reveals the following.

Target Group Politics

A basic leading factor in politicians' perception regarding corruption is the change in their attitudes based on whether they are a member of the ruling or the opposition party in power.

Fighting corruption is among the leading tools of propaganda exploited by all politicians; devotion and determination to accomplish "political transparency" is the cornerstone of all political jargon. Likewise, lifting political immunity ranks at the top of the list of all tenets opposition members somehow forget once they become members of the ruling party. Politicians believe that the correlation between corruption and politics is exaggerated and that they are as spotless and/or as corrupt as the rest of the society. Placing the reality of politicians being regarded as some of the least trustworthy members of society aside, as based on various polls conducted, politicians have expanded their arguments based on an inter-dependency mentality. Politics-corruption correlation is founded on the direct and/or indirect support of political funding. Politicians make various allegations, specifically regarding election expenditures of members of other parties. However, no politician has taken any steps with respect to restructuring inspection procedures of election campaign expenditures of politicians and political parties, which, by the way, is enforced in accordance with the last paragraph of article 69 of the Turkish Constitution. Political, administrative and national accountability are terms abused at every opportunity by politicians, who are far from lifting a finger when it comes to taking action.

Target Group Judiciary

Lawmakers, as indicated above, recognize/ regard themselves as the body that is least influenced by corruption with respect to other target groups. While the legal system places political intervention on the forefront of its agenda, it also underlines the "conscience vs. lining pockets" conflict faced by politicians. The "retain a judge, not an attorney" attitude widely accepted among various circles in the business world is a manifestation of this so-called conflict. Recognition of the existence of setbacks generated by laws, as ineffective punishment, time constraints, cases that exhaust expert/professional institutions, lack of records and material shortages, insufficient number of judges and attorneys, case overloading, lack of aides, etc., are among the complaints of the courts, not to mention the widespread acceptance or indifference regarding corruption, especially petit corruption by the masses.

Target Group Police

The police force, more precisely the men in arms, regards corruption as a crime and confers due punishment in accordance with existing laws. In other words, the situation is quite clear-cut from their perspective: since bribery, embezzlement, misuse of authority, contractual

malice, conspiracy, and intentional fraud are all considered criminal in action, the fight against corruption through such transgressions and others as listed under the Turkish Criminal Code fall within the scope of the police force's duties. However, it is nevertheless possible to run across such language as the following in both official and in other security personnel's reports: "The success of the struggle against corruption is achievable only through permanent and not short-term applications. Other decision-making institutions, the media, non-governmental organizations and universities, in addition to the police force, must shoulder a great deal of the responsibility in fighting corruption. If all such establishments fulfil their commitments accordingly, the community will rid itself of such transgressions and future generations will be given the opportunity to live in a better society."

Target Group Media

Print and broadcast media in addition to other publication organizations claim that they carry out an important task in disclosing and deterring cases of corruption, particularly of organized corruption. However, the media's stand against corruption as being open, objective and unbiased, receives very little support from the general public. This is due to its customary affiliation with enterprises that carry out other commercial activities outside of organized media reporting (as in the banking, construction-contracts, energy sectors, etc.). Such activities place media bosses on the opposite end of the ring against politicians and bureaucrats. Politicians who seek media backing or who fear the start of a negative campaign by the media are quite well-known individuals. Various target groups have published, exposed and documented how their opponents got involved in corruption schemes, finding a gap, especially during times of "media-wars" among media bosses which transpire from time to time. Despite the media's stand that certain actions are necessary to achieve a more transparent society, the general public consensus of media accountability for "all other cases yet to be exposed" has gained strength. In other words, the conviction that there are many more cases that the media does not intentionally expose, has gained more ground. Meanwhile, the media has taken various important positions in exposing corruption to the masses without disclosing the identity of sources. The magnitude of news regarding corruption has appreciated due to the media's meagre treatment of it as another ordinary, run-of-the-mill incident, coupled with the escalation in public, especially in the face of grand corruption schemes. The Turkish media usually points the finger at politicians (rarely the political system) and the legal system as the source of corruption. Another interesting point to highlight is the claim that corruption has gained ground and has sprawled especially since 1983.

Target Group Civil Society

NGO's in Turkey are as committed in their fight against corruption as their brethren in other parts of the world. They are especially active in informing the public, focusing on the leading causes of corruption and providing guidance as to its containment. Exposing cases of corruption in addition to educating and enlightening the public on such transgressions outline non-governmental organizations' foundational structure. Corruption is construed as the lack of accountability and opaqueness in the public sector in its foundation. NGO's foreseeing reforms, to be implemented in the political, legal and public sphere within the framework of proper management as tools in reducing corruption, seem to have set-up a better link between the system vis-à-vis corruption in contrast to other target groups.

Target Group Economy

The economy is the leading target group with a better understanding for corruption. According to this group which has compiled various studies in line with those of the IMF and the World Bank, corruption has a negative impact on economic growth, tax system legitimacy, the level of public expenditures and consequences thereof, the volume of foreign currency entering the country, and the effective and productive utilization of human resources. Corruption increases public investment in numbers yet decreases productivity and output. Furthermore, corruption elevates poverty levels further due to the current unequal distribution of wealth. This target group which measures corruption against the role and the level of state involvement in the economy instead of blaming cultural factors, the legal system, or politicians attitudes' for the transgression, prescribes lower level of state involvement in economic affairs as the leading cure. This group, calling for a more orderly state with a institutionalized check and balances system, one that arbitrates and mediates, instead of playing a divisive role, chooses to voice its conviction of private sector involvement in corruption (as in privatization applications). No one, however, dares to question the possibility of a relationship between capital profits versus corruption, even if one were to ponder over it.

Overall, the dosage and direction of criticism brought against corruption appears to be directly related with the political conjuncture and the actors' positions within the balance of political power. The actors' discourse about corruption changes depending on their proximity to the administration or the opposition, and their position in the accusing or accused side. The approaches of the politicians and the Media to the two cases we review here especially

support the deduction described above. It could be stated that the criteria required by EU, World Bank and IMF for the consideration of membership or financial support appear to have made a serious positive impact on the change of the perception of corruption in Turkey. Especially the 'ambition' experienced in 2003 and 2004 by both the public authorities and the society with regard to integration with EU caused many actors to adapt a more courageous discourse about the certain principles (democracy, human rights, etc.). It might be commented that this general transformation caused the overall perception of corruption to change.

It is observed that IMF and World Bank make a very strong impact on especially the private sector and the civil society. We observe that said segments of our target groups undisputedly admit and repeat that the criteria required by IMF, World Bank and EU to solve the corruption problem are preliminary conditions for integration with the "modern West". On the other hand, most of the target groups voice their worries of the future of the fight against corruption between the lines. This point indicates that the notion of fight against corruption has not settled in the political culture of Turkey yet.

The Media, non-governmental organizations and economic agents frequently expresses their worry that unless permanent measures are taken, the political agenda might quickly shift to populism in the future. It is observed at this point that they emphasize that the supportive role of EU is as important as the determination of the Turkish actors. All of the target groups including the politicians admit that it is true that in Turkey, politics are based on a mechanism of distribution of favours.

As the final word, it is not found at this stage of our review any emphasis on petit corruption which is so widespread in this country and which has turned into a kind of 'normal' practice. However, a number of colloquial expressions that spread (or were coined) in the Turkish language in the last 10 to 15 years, which are impossible to translate but can be described as variations to the English expression "riding the gravy train", do not have much negative connation. This approach brings an understanding which will be able easily to create some kind of legality for corruption as defined above. When the value shift that took place on the individual ground thanks to the distorted, uncontrolled, unplanned liberal reform process right after the coup d'etat of 1980 coincided with the existent "communitarian" and "solidarist" social values, the situation becomes even more complex. A general tentative explanation on that would be that petit corruption is perceived as a means to speed completion of official formalities while grand corruption is perceived as wasting economic resources.

APPENDIX : Research Data

Documents studied (by Target Groups)

Target Group Politics

1. (a) Protocols of the parliamentary debates on the motion to establish an "inquiry committee" regarding the corruption claims about (the former) Welfare Party's "secret cashier" Suleyman Mercumek in Bosnia donations scandal (1996-1997) (Case I)
   (b) Protocols from the parliamentary sittings related to the motion (48th, 52nd, 55th sittings, May 1996)
2. (a) The report of the inquiry committee on Case I (March 1997)
   (b) Protocols of the parliamentary debates on the report of the inquiry committee (March 25, 1997)
3. Protocols of the parliamentary debates on the motion to establish an "inquiry committee" to investigate the relationship between the Welfare Party and the International Human Relief Organization (May 15, 1996)
4. Protocols of parliamentary debates on the Refahyol government coalition protocol (72nd sitting, July 6, 1996)
5. (a) Protocols of the parliamentary debates on the motion to establish "investigation committees" regarding the allegations of widespread fraud (in tenders, bankruptcies, banking reforms and power projects) related with the former ministers M. Yilmaz & G. Taner, H. Ozkan & R. Onal, Z. Cakan & C. Ersumer, Y. Topcu & K Aydin (2003-2004) (Case II)
   (b) The report of the investigation committee on Case II (July 2004)
   (c) Protocols of the parliamentary debates on the report of the investigation committee (July 13, 2004)
6. Protocols of the parliamentary debates on the motion to form an "inquiry committee" regarding "the reasons, social and economic dimensions of corruption" (January 2003) and the following report (November 2003)

Target Group Judiciary

1. Verdicts of the 11th and 5th Sections of Criminal Law of the Supreme Court of Appeals as of May, 1996 and November 2002

2. White Energy Indictment of Ankara State Security Court (Indictment NO: 2001/73)
3. Circular NO: 2006/007 of the Ministry of Justice on investigation and prosecution of the corruptive acts

Target Group Police

1. Corruption Report from the General Directorate of Security

Target Group Civil Society

1. "Perceptions of Corruption in Turkey" Project Reports, TESEV, 1999-2004.
2. Financial Transparency Report, TESEV, 2004.
3. Party Financing Report, TSHD, 2004.

Target Group Media

Articles and materials published in the following printed media:

1. *Tempo*, weekly
2. *Aksiyon*, weekly
3. *Radikal*, daily
4. *Hurriyet*, daily
5. *Milliyet*, daily
6. *Yeni Safak*, daily
7. *Zaman*, daily
8. *Turkish Daily News*

Target Group Economy (Business Associations and Trade Unions)

Publications and public statements of TUSIAD (Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association), TEPAV/EPRI (Economic Policy Research Institute), TOBB (Turkish Union of Chambers of Commerce), ATO (Ankara Chamber of Commerce), TBB (The Banks Association of Turkey), ISO (Istanbul Chamber of Industry), Kayseri Chamber of Industry, TURK-IS (The Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions), HAK-IS (Confederation of Turkish

Real Trade Unions), DISK (The Confederation of Revolutionary Trade Unions), Kamu-Sen (The Confederation of Public Employees of Turkey).

General Documents

1. Turkish Criminal Law (2005)
2. Turkish Political Party Law
3. Protocols of parliamentary debates on Transparency International Report (2005)
4. Saydamligin Artirilmasi ve Kamuda Etkin Yonetimin Gelistirilmesi Eylem Plani (Action Plan for the promotion of the transparency and the development of efficiency in public administration) (2002)

Literature Review

Adaman, F., A. Carkoglu: *Engagement in Corruptive Activities at Local and Central Governments in Turkey: Perceptions of Urban Settlers*. March 2001, available at: http://www.femise.org/PDF/Carkoglu_A_0301.pdf

Adaman, F., A. Carkoglu and B. Senatalar: *Corruption in Turkey, Results of Diagnostic Household Survey.* TESEV (The Economic and Social Studies Foundation of Turkey), February 2001, available at: www.econ.boun.edu.tr/staff/adaman/research/Corruption.PDF; in Turkish: *Is Dunyası Gozunden Turkiye'de Yolsuzlugun Nedenleri ve Onlenmesine Iliskin Oneriler* (Business's perspective of the causes of corruption in Turkey and future prevention), February 2003, available at: http://www.tesev.org.tr/etkinlik/yolsuzluk_anasayfa.php; *Turkiye'de Yerel ve Merkezi Yonetimlerde Hizmetlerden Tatmin, Patronaj Iliskileri ve Reform* (Service, Patronage Relations and Reform in Turkish Local and Central Administrations), March 2004 (for summaries in English, see: http://www.tesev.org.tr/eng/publication/good_ govern.php).

Aktan, C. Can: *Yolsuzlukla Mucadele Stratejileri*, Hak-Is Yayinlari, Ankara 2002.

--- : "Siyasal Yozlasmaların Incelenmesine Yonelik Çozum Onerileri", *Yeni Turkiye*, Siyasette Yozlasma Ozel Sayısı II, Ankara 1997.

ATO (Ankara Ticaret Odasi, Ankara Chamber of Commerce), *Yolsuzluk Kiskacinda Turkiye*, Ankara: ATO Publications, 2001.

Atiyas, I. and S. Sayin: "Devletin Mali Performans Saydamligi," *Kamu Maliyesinde Saydamlik*, Istanbul: TESEV Publication, 2001.

Ayata, S.: "Patronage, Party, and State: The Politicization of Islam in Turkey", *Middle East Journal*, 50(1) 1996: 40-56.

Baran, Z.: "Corruption: The Turkish Challenge", *Journal of International Affairs*, September, 2000.

Berberoglu, E.: *Susurluk 20 Yillik Domino Oyunu*. 4. Edition, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari, 1998.

Bryane, M.: "Anti-Corruption in the Turkey's EU Accession", Winter 2004, available at: http://www.esiweb.org/pdf/esi_turkey_tpq_id_14.pdf.

Bugra, A.: *State and Business in Modern Turkey: A Comparative Study*, New York: SUNY Press,1994.

CSIS Turkey Update: *Turkey's Crisis: Corruption at the Core*. March 2001, available at: www.csis.org/turkey/TU/TU010305.pdf

Carkoglu, A. "The Interdependence of Politics and Economics in Turkey: Some Findings at the Aggregate Level of Analysis", *Bogazici Journal*, 9, 1995: 85-108.

--- : "Macro Economic Determinants of Electoral Support for Incumbents in Turkey, 1950-1995", *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 17, 1997: 75-96.

Carkoglu, A.: "The Turkish Party System in Transition: Party Performance and Agenda Transformation", *Political Studies*, XLVI, 1998: 544-571.

Corbin, J.; Strauss, A.: "Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons, and Evauative Criteria", *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), 1990:3-21.

Doganer, S.: *Soygunun Oteki Adi- Devlet Ihalesi*. Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari, 1999.

DPT (State Planning Organization): Kamu Mali Yonetiminin Yeniden Yapilandirilmasi ve Mali Saydamlik (Ozel Ihtisas Komisyonu Raporu), DPT Pub. No: 2517, Ankara 2000;

---*: Kayitdisi Ekonomi.* Sekizinci Bes Yillik Kalkinma Plani (Ozel Ihtisas Komisyonu Raporu), DPT Pub., Ankara 2001.

Ergun, T.: "Kamu Yonetiminde Yolsuzluklar ve Burokrasinin Sorumlulugu", *Yeni Turkiye* (Siyasette Yozlasma Ozel Sayısı), January-February 1997(13).

Erguder, U.: *Turkiye'de Tarım Destek Siyasası ve Siyaset*, Istanbul: Bogazici University Press, 1981.

--- : *Devrim, Evrim, Statuko: Turkiye'de Sosyal, Siyasal, Ekonomik Degerler* (Revolution, Evolution, Status-quo: Social, Political and Economic Values in Turkey), in Turkish , Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) Publications. Istanbul, 1999.

---: "Piyasa Ekonomisi, Ozellestirme ve Ekonominin Kanunları", *Toplum ve Ekonomi*, 4, 1993: 5-12.

European Union: *Regular Report on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession*, 2004. Available at: http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/report_2004/pdf/rr_tr_2004_en.pdf.

Falay, N., E. Kalaycioglu and U. Ozkirimli: *Belediyelerin Mali Yonetimi: Iktisadi ve Siyasal Bir Cozumleme* (Fiscal Management of Municipalities: A Political and Economic Framework), in Turkish, Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) Publications: Istanbul, 1996.

Frey, F.W.: "Patterns of Elite Politics in Turkey", in G . Lenczowski (ed.), *Political Elites in the Middle East*, Washington D .C., 1975: 41-82.

Genckaya, O. Faruk: "Siyasi Partilere ve Adaylara Devlet Destegi, Bagislar ve Secim Giderlerinin Sinirlandirilmasi", *Siyasi Partilerde Reform*, Istanbul: TESEV Pub., 2000.

---: "Turkiye'de Parlamento Reformu: Tarihsel Bir Degerlendirme," *TBMM'nin Etkinligi*, Istanbul: TESEV Pub., 2000.

---: *Devletlesen Partiler, Turkiye'de Siyasi Partilerin Baslica Gelir Kaynaklari*. Ankara: ANSAV Yayinlari, 2002.

Global Integrity. An Investigative Report Tracking Corruption, Openness and Accountability in 25 Countries, *Turkey*. The Center for Public Integrity, available at: http://www.publicintegrity.org/ga/ country.aspx?cc=tr.

Gole, N.: "Toward an Autonomisation of Politics and Civil Society in Turkey," in M. Heper and A. Evin (eds.), *Politics in the Third Turkish Republic.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994: 213-222.

Gunes-Ayata, A.: "Clientalism: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern", in L. Roniger and A. Gunes-Ayata (eds.) *Democracy, Clientelism, and Civil Society*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994a: 19-28.

---: (1994b). "Roots and Trends of Clientelism in Turkey", in L. Roniger and A. Gunes-Ayata (eds.) *Democracy, Clientelism, and Civil Society*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994b: 49-64.

Gurkan A.A. and H. Kasnakoglu: "The Political Economy of Agricultural Price Support in Turkey: An Empirical Assessment", *Public Choice*, 70, 1991: 277-298.

Heper, M. and F. Keyman: "Double-Faced State: Political Patronage and the Consolidation of Democracy in Turkey", *Middle Eastern Studies*, 34 (4), 1998: 259-276.

Iba, S.: *Parlamenterler Denetim Yollari, Etkinligi Ve Susurluk Ornegi*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayinevi,1997.

IRI: *Turkey, Survey Results: Attitudes and Priorities of City Dwellers*, Washington D.C.: IRI, 1995a.

---: *Turkey, Survey Results: Attitudes and Priorities of Citizens of Urban Areas*, Washington D.C.: IRI, 1995b.

Insel, A.: *Duzen ve Kalkınma Kıskacında Turkiye*, Istanbul: Ayrinti, 1996.

Kalaycıoglu, E.: "Division of Responsibility", in M. Heper (ed.) *Local Government in Turkey, Governing Istanbul*, Routledge, 1989: 12-29.

Keles, R.: *Turkiye'de Kent Yonetimi* (City Administration in Turkey), in Turkish, Turkish Association of Social Sciences Publications, 1988.

Kelkitlioglu, M.: *Hortum-Egebank Nasil Soyuldu?* Istanbul: Metis Yayinlari, 2001.

Kose, H.Omer: *Dunyada ve Turkiye'de Yuksek Denetim*, Ankara: Sayistay Yayinlari, 2000.

Mardin, S.: "Center-Periphery Relations: A Key to Turkish Politics", *Deadalus*, Winter 1973: 169-190.

Meclis Arastırma Komisyonu Raporu (Corruption Report of the Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry): Bir Olgu Olarak Yolsuzluk: Nedenler, Etkiler ve Cozum Onerileri, in Turkish, available at: www.tbmm.gov.tr/komisyon/yolsuzluk_arastirma/kaynaklar/Kisim_1.pdf

Mumcu, A.: Tarih Icindeki Genel Gelisimiyle Birlikte Osmanlida Rusvet (Ozellikle Adli Rusvet), 2. Edition, Istanbul: Inkilap Kitabevi, 1985.

OECD: Reviews of Regulatory Reform. Turkey: Crucial Support for Economic Recovery, Paris: OECD, 2002.

--- : Turkey. Phase 1. Review of Implementation of the Convention and 1997 Recommendation. November 2004, available at: www.oecd.org/dataoecd/17/6/33967367.pdf

Okcesiz, H.: *Istanbul Barosu Cevresi Adli Yargida Yolsuzluk Arastirmasi*. 2. Edition, Istanbul: Ekol Kitapligi, 2001.

Ozbudun, E.: "Turkey: The Politics of Clientelism", in S.N. Eisenstadt and R. Lemarchand (eds.), *Political Clientelism, Patronage and Development*, Beverly Hills, Sage, London, 1981: 249-268.

Ozsemerci, K.: *Turk Kamu Yonetiminde Yolsuzluklar, Nedenleri, Zararlari ve Cozum Onerileri*. Yuksek Lisans Tezi, TODAİE, Ankara, Ekim 2002.

Ozsoylu, A. Fazil: *Turkiye'de Kayit Disi Ekonomi*. Istanbul: Baglam Yayincilik, 1996.

Resmi Gazete (*Official Gazette*) No: 24990: "Amendment to the Law regarding Prevention of Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International business Transactions" (Law No: 4782 of 2 January 2003, which entered into force on 11 January 2003).

TESEV (*The Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation*): *Turkish Debt 1990-2002: How did we get here?* Caroline Van Rijckeghem, December 2004, available at: http://www.tesev.org.tr/etkinlik/Caroline_Kamu_Borcu_Son_Rapor_Aralik_2004.pdf; in Turkish: *Kamu Borcu Nasıl Olustu?* Ferhat Emil, Hakan Yilmaz, available at: http://www.tesev.org.tr/etkinlik/KAMU_BORCU_DECEMBER_2004.pdf . For summaries of other research publications given below, see: http://www.tesev.org.tr/eng/publication/good_govern.php

---: "Political Accountability, Managerial Accountability and the Budget System: Towards a Proposal for Restructuring" (Turkish) Izak Atiyas, Serif Sayın; 1997.

---: "Transparency in Public Finances", Izak Atiyas, Serif Sayın; 2000.

---: "Public Personnel Management Reform", Gencay Saylan, 2000.

---: "Auditing in the State", Necdet Kesmez, Tulay Arin, Ihsan Goren; 2000.

---: "Regulatory Functions of the State: Privatisation and Competition in the Turkish Electricity and Telecommunications Sectors", Izak Atiyas, 2000.

Saner, A. Ihsan: *Devletin Ranti Deniz*. Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari, 2000.

Sayari, S.: "Political Patronage in Turkey", in E. Gellner and J. Waterbury (eds), *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth, 1977: 103-130.

Schonbohm, W. E.: "Korruption in der Turkei eine großere Gefahr als der Terrorismus", available at: http://www.kas.de/publikationen/2001/3785_dokument.html

Strateji|MORI: *Turkiye'nin Nabzi, Siyasi ve Ekonomik Indikatorler Arastırmasi*, October, 25-November, 15, 1997, Istanbul, 1997.

Sunar, I.: "Populism and Patronage: The Demokrat Party and its Legacy in Turkey", *Il Politico*, 4, 1990: 745-757.

---: "The Politics of State Interventionism in 'Populist' Egypt and Turkey", in A. Oncu, C. Keyder and S. E. Ibrahim (eds) , *Developmentalism and Beyond*, The American University in Cairo Press, 1995: 94-111.

---: "State, Society, and Democracy in Turkey", in V. Mastny and R.C. Nation (eds), *Turkey between East and West*, Colorado: Westview Press, 1996.

Sener, N.: *Tepeden Tirnaga Yolsuzluk*. Istanbul: Metis Yayinlari, 2001.

Tachau, F.: *Turkey: The Politics of Authority, Democracy and Development*, New York: Praeger, 1984.

TBMM (Turkish Grand National Assembly): *Susurluk Komisyonu Raporu*. Ankara: Ayyildiz Yayinlari, 1997.

TOBB : *Avrupa Birligine Tam Uyelik Surecinde Turkiye'de Yonetimin Yeniden Yapilanmasi*, Ankara: TOBB Pub., 2000;

---: *Savurganlik Ekonomisi*, Ankara: TOBB Pub., 2001.

Toker, M.: *Mali Saydamlik ve Turkiye*. Ankara: Sayistay Baskanligi Yayinlari, 2002.

Transparency International: "Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index", available at: http://www.transparency.org

TSHD: Toplumsal Saydamlik Hareketi Dernegi (Transparency International Turkish Chapter), for articles see the TSHD web site: www.saydamlik.org.

Turan, I.: *TBMM'nin Etkinligi.* Istanbul: TESEV Pub., 2000.

TUSIAD: *Kamu Yonetimi Reformu Arastirmasi*. Istanbul: TUSIAD Pub., 2002;

---: *Bagimsiz Duzenleyici Kurumlar ve Turkiye Uygulamasi*. Istanbul: TUSIAD Pub., 2002.

UNDP: *Human Development Report(s) - Turkey*, UNDP Ankara.

Yalcindag, S.: *Yerel Yonetimler, Sorunlar Cozumler* (Local Administrations, Problems and Solutions), in Turkish, TUSIAD Publications, 1995.

Yeldan, E.: "Behind the 2000/2001 Turkish Crisis: Stability, Credibility, and Governance, for Whom?" (2002), available at: www.bilkent.edu.tr/~yeldane/Chennai_Yeldan2002.pdf.

---: "The Impact of Financial Liberalization and the Rise of Financial Rents on Income Inequality, The Case of Turkey", Working Papers No. 206, The United Nations University, November 2000.

SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION PRIORITY 7, FP6-2004-CITIZENS-5

SPECIFIC TARGETED RESEARCH PROJECT: CRIME AND CULTURE

Crime as a Cultural Problem. The Relevance of Perceptions of Corruption to Crime Prevention. A Comparative Cultural Study in the EU-Accession States Bulgaria and Romania, the EU-Candidate States Turkey and Croatia and the EU-States Germany, Greece and United Kingdom

Members of the Project Consortium

University of Konstanz, Germany (Co-ordinator)
University of Tübingen, Germany
Police University, German Federal State of Baden-Württemberg (Affiliated)
Centre for Liberal Strategies, Sofia, Bulgaria
Research Institute for Quality of Life (Romanian Academy), Bucharest, Romania
Galatasaray University, Istanbul, Turkey
University of Zagreb, Croatia
National School of Public Administration and Local Government, Athens, Greece
Panteion University, Athens, Greece
South East European Studies at Oxford (SEESOX), United Kingdom
Center for Research and Policy Making (CRPM), FYR Macedonia (Affiliated)

Contact

- Prof. Dr. Hans-Georg Soeffner, Person in Charge
  Hans-Georg.Soeffner@uni-konstanz.de
- Dr. habil. Dirk Tänzler, Scientific Co-ordinator
  Dirk.Taenzler@uni-konstanz.de
- Dr. Angelos Giannakopoulos, Head of the Project Office
  Angelos.Giannakopoulos@uni-konstanz.de

University of Konstanz
Research Group Sociology of Knowledge
Universitätsstr. 10
Box D 35
D-78457 Konstanz
Germany
Phone: ++49 (0)7531 88 3129
Fax: ++49 7531 88 3194

Project Homepage: www.uni-konstanz.de/crimeandculture/index.htm

Email: crimeandculture@uni-konstanz.de