Editorial

Examining the past by dividing it into periods is a methodology that is both frequently utilized and widely criticized. Do people perceive themselves as passing through distinct historical moments as they live them? Do they attribute meaning to the passing of time? Does time flow independently of such subjectivities? Is historical periodization an intellectual exercise peculiar to researchers, conducted strictly *ex post facto* rather than experienced concurrently? These questions delineate both the periods themselves and the meanings ascribed to them. Aside from this dimension, and more crucial for our purposes, the question is to what extent our current questions and debates are separate from this endeavor and discourse of periodization. It is difficult to argue that periodization is an intellectual act exclusive solely to the past and historical studies. Indeed, the scope of the human's search for meaning is boundless and entails endless inquiries regarding the very era in which one lives.

In recent years, certain questions have persistently occupied our minds: What kind of age are we living in? Is a new era dawning in which nothing will ever be the same again? What awaits humanity at the end of this age of great transformation?

In fact, it is naive to think that this inquiry itself is exclusive to the present day, as it is not confined to the past. When the world of the 1980s and 1990s was termed the "end of history," it was similarly believed that a radical shift was underway. The perceived change was seen as so profound that such a metaphor could be deployed, implying it possessed the power to halt time itself. In the 2000s, it was frequently stated that "the only constant is change itself," portraying an era where "all that is solid melts into air." Evidently, human beings continuously periodize its contemporary time and endeavors to give it meaning. Moreover, there is often a tendency to perceive one's own era as unique.

Whether in the past or the present, the more routinized our inclination to continuously divide time into distinct periods, the further we distance ourselves from the question of how exactly we construct the content of these periods. We forget that it is us who name these eras. We need to re-establish our critical distance. When viewed from a certain distance, however, we realize the significance of what we emphasize or marginalize for that period. That is, what we abstract from the whole and bring to the fore. We begin to see that periodization and the meaning ascribed to historical eras are, in fact, products of our own perspective.

For the present day, which we are currently living through and claiming to be utterly unlike any other era, what, in fact, are we choosing to specifically foreground and what are we choosing to marginalize? As in many previous eras, technological advancements are leading the way today. However, this time, distinct from other eras, technological developments are emerging that open the door to a new age that transcends not just a single period, but humanity itself. Generative artificial intelligence, robotic technologies, and the like are opening the gates not merely to an appetite for sheer productivity, but to a new world. It is argued that the post-modern will give way to a post-Anthropocene era. This is a new era in which everything we know about the human being and the public sphere they have constructed is, and will be, upended. In an era where agents and concepts of agency are shifting, traditional methods of knowledge production and transmission are naturally being shaken and interrogated as well. Peter Fleming's book (2025), *Dark Academia: How Universities Die*, leaves an increasingly profound mark on this era day by day.

This chronological landscape presents itself as an unconditional, unquestioned reality that encompasses us as we live within it. As is characteristic of the hegemonic perception of any given era, what is to be foregrounded and what is to be marginalized becomes

standardized. Parallel to this, the abstraction of the era, and the very manner in which we abstract it, undergoes a similar standardization.

However, with every new headline, every new decision made, every new regulation enacted, every new signature penned, every new lawsuit filed, and every ongoing public policy, we observe that this standardized world simultaneously generates its own contradictions. Consequently, the premise that this reality can be reduced merely to technological advancements grows increasingly blurred. The questions and insights encountered within the pages of books do not merely remain confined to paper; they resonate directly with our own lives. Our blood runs cold when Yuval Noah Harari (2018), in his *21 Lessons for the 21st Century*, asks: "What will happen when humans, like horses, are no longer needed?" Similarly, when we read Bourdieu and Sayad (1964) tracking the forced resettlement policies of French colonialism in Algeria where they note that "[this] state of forced short-sightedness [which prevents envisioning the future] is the expression of an absolute disbelief in the future, condemning one to a fatalistic resignation", we feel as though we are reading not just about that century, but about our very own.[2]

Therefore, by viewing the present and the future as integral components of the long expanse of human history, as much in their divergence and singularity, we require new abstractions that enable us to explain and anticipate all these contradictions within their specific nodes of conflict, limitations, and possibilities. We cannot achieve this through a sequence of prompts written for a chatbot. No generative artificial intelligence technology is capable of identifying a situation we have not defined, formulating the question, and devising the solution.

[2] See for the original version "L'imprévoyance forcée est l'expression d'une défiance totale en l'avenir qui condamne à l'abandon fataliste." (Bourdieu ve Sayad, 1964, s.19).

Furthermore, under no circumstances will it internalize or bear the burden of our problems on our behalf. These are concrete situations and problems belonging to our own concrete world. Even if we ascribe agency to an artificial intelligence technology, the knowledge it produces impacts our concrete world, as evidenced by initial applications in fields such as military technology and healthcare systems. Consequently, we must orient ourselves toward this concrete reality, derive our inquiries from it, and remain critical in the face of the "post-truth" perception that a departure from concrete reality would engender. It is precisely these abstractions that will facilitate new modalities of scientific knowledge production.

***

In this current issue, *Publicus* continues to feature articles that pose original research questions and seek answers within new domains along these lines. It presents one comment article, six research articles, two review articles, two event reports, an interview, and an obituary. Although it is the final piece in this issue of the journal, the text we wish to address first is the obituary written by Hasan Yönten in memory of our esteemed professor, Nermin Abadan-Unat. By virtue of this text, we would also like to primarily commemorate our professor, who left an indelible mark on various fields of social sciences through her research and educational endeavors spanning many decades and, more importantly, mentored and guided numerous academics. Professor Abadan-Unat was a figure who produced scholarship, taught courses, and trained future academics across a multitude of disciplines, including political science, sociology, law, political communication, and public administration. For us, however, her most significant legacy lies in demonstrating that social sciences must concentrate on the concrete, real-world problem areas of society. Her pioneering works in fields such as gender studies, migration, political behavior, and

communication, along with her status as one of the founding figures of these disciplines, stands as the clearest testament to this.

Publicus, in this issue, features a study concerning the potential to overcome emerging challenges in various domains of public administration through innovative tools. Gözde Atalay's comment article, titled "Overcoming Barriers to Local Participation: Serious Board Game Experience," examines City Making 101, a serious board game that serves as both a policy instrument and a research tool. Through this gaming experience, the study explores the possibilities of analyzing, discussing, and generating distinct practices regarding the psycho-social barriers encountered in local participation, particularly framed within a green public space scenario.

There are numerous contemporary public administration practices that generate issues, cases, and public policies that remain overshadowed. In her research article titled "Public Oversight and Inspections in Amusement Parks and Similar Venues: A Legal Analysis," Özlem Temizel highlights the need for the inspection and control of amusement parks and similar entertainment venues, which constitute a domain of public service. Drawing on accidents that have occurred over the last fifteen years, she reveals the legislative gaps and inadequacies that hinder the provision of life safety and public well-being in these areas, which fall under the oversight and control of public institutions and organizations, particularly municipalities. Furthermore, Nuray E. Keskin's event report, titled "Event Report on the "Ali Dincer 1'st Social Democratic Local Government Days" (18-19 April 2026, Ankara) allows us to reflect upon local government practices by bringing exemplary and pioneering initiatives into the pages of our journal through the lens of social democratic local governance experiences.

There are numerous significant problem areas shared globally. Rendering this commonality visible can facilitate a body of

comparative literature and ensure that the accumulated knowledge is transformed into lived experience. Cevdet Kılıç and Oytun Meçik's research article, titled "Land Readjustment and Disaster Management Planning Integration: An Assessment on Public Resource Optimization," draws upon the examples of the 1994 Northridge Earthquake in the USA and the 1999 Chi-Chi Earthquake in Taiwan, while comparing the cases of Turkey and Japan through their legal infrastructures and planning systems. The authors discuss the prospects of ensuring the sustainable and effective management of public resources by establishing both life and property safety and resilient settlements through integrated planning practices and land regulations aligned with disaster plans that mitigate pre-disaster risks. In his research article titled "Reflections of the New Public Management Paradigm in Policy Documents: An Analysis of the Climate Law No. 7552," Fatih Tolga offers an example that approaches this comparative genre. Even though he did not structure the article around country case studies, he opts to address climate policy in Turkey along a broad paradigmatic axis. Tolga examines the Climate Law through the paradigmatic framework analytically outlined by Christopher Hood, one of the prominent authors of New Public Management, and demonstrates the points where the Law converges with this line of paradigm.

Apart from comparative studies, scholarship focusing on specific country examples holds a unique significance. It offers the opportunity to bring case studies from different nations to the fore, conduct in-depth analyses, and initiate critical discussions. Beyza Güngör's research article, titled "Institutionalisation Of Gender Mainstreaming In Urban Governance: A Comparative Analysis Of Barcelona's Gender Justice Plans (2016–2020 And 2021-2025)," and Burak Göçmen's review article, titled "The Implementation of Public Oriented Policies in Latin American Countries (1998-2015)," illustrate this approach. By focusing

on Barcelona and Latin America respectively, Güngör and Göçmen scrutinize implementation practices. We can add Hilal Kara's event report to these two articles. The report, titled "The Logistics of Democracy: An Inside Look at the Ontario Elections," transports us into an election administration process in which Kara was personally involved: the 2025 Ontario provincial elections. While opening the doors to Canada's electoral system and its logistics for us, Kara sheds light on the public employees and the administrative structure behind a democratic process.

Having featured articles on public personnel and high-level executives in its previous issues, *Publicus* continues this trajectory in the current issue by presenting a study that concentrates on Ministers of Justice, who hold a significant position in the composition of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches with their duties, authorities, and responsibilities. Çağrı Çolak's research article, titled "A Study on the Profile of Justice Ministers in Türkiye (1920-2026)," examines the 74 ministers who have served from 1920 to 2026 in terms of age, gender, educational background, profession, birthplace, ministerial experience in other portfolios, and their mode of appointment.

The development of any knowledge production process is attainable only through self-reflexivity. Therefore, articles that engage with the literature and the discipline through a critical lens while offering constructive recommendations are of immense value. Esra Nur Tuğan's research article, titled "Examining Public Administration Education in Türkiye through Graduate Theses: A Case Study of Hacettepe University," draws upon the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at Hacettepe University to focus on graduate theses spanning a thirteen-year period. On the other hand, Necmi Kavuşturan's review article, titled "The Transformation of Administrative Reason: An Administrative Search From The Ideal Good to the Technical and Pragmatic Good," presents a long-term and

multi-layered literature review demonstrating how the "ideal of being a good human/good administration" has retreated in favor of the technical and pragmatic good. Asserting that this condition "stems from the exclusion of human search for meaning from administrative processes," Kavuşturan discusses whether a new approach to administration, interwoven with new values and purposes, is possible.

The guest for this issue in our interview series with experts, which we have maintained for the past three issues, is Assoc. Prof. Dr. Selim Çapar, President of the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Interior Research and Studies Center (AREM) and Secretary-General of the Turkish Administrative Research Foundation (TIAV). The interview conducted by Kaan Akman conveys Çapar's extensive experience and accumulated knowledge, which span many years and a broad domain. In addition to recounting his experiences within the civil administration and the ministry, Çapar demonstrates how professional expertise can be seamlessly integrated with a researcher identity, and the ways in which this synergy can transform into particular institutionalization experiences.

***

Finally, in this editorial note, we would like to share two important milestones for *Publicus*. *Publicus*'s application for Crossref DOI (Digital Object Identifier) has been approved. Within this scope, a DOI will be assigned to all articles published and to be published. DOI is an international system that provides a unique, persistent, and direct identification for academic articles, books, and data in electronic environments. It ensures uninterrupted access even if URLs change, guarantees the accurate tracking of citations, and enhances the visibility and reliability of scholarly work.

Furthermore, *Publicus* has been indexed in DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals). DOAJ is an international index widely recognized as

the "gold standard" of open-access publishing, collaborating with organizations such as DOAB, Crossref, and COPE. Admission to DOAJ signifies international recognition of our journal's academic quality, peer-review processes, and commitment to publication ethics. This development will significantly augment the visibility and accessibility of research published in *Publicus*. Our articles are now part of a global open-access ecosystem operating across 45 countries in 36 different languages. Owing to DOAJ's principles of independence and openness, the works published in our journal will be freely and seamlessly accessible to researchers worldwide. We extend our heartfelt gratitude to all our past and present editorial team members, authors, and reviewers who have contributed to this achievement.

Editor

Fatma Eda Çelik

EPHE / Université PSL, France-Paris

References

Bourdieu, P. ve Sayad, A. (1964). *Le Déracinement – La Crise de l'Agriculture Traditionnelle en Algérie*. Les Éditions de Minuit.

Fleming, P. (2025). *Karanlık Akademi – Üniversiteler Nasıl Ölür?* Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Harari, Y.N. (2018). *21. Yüzyıl İçin 21 Ders*. Kolektif Kitap.