COMPARISON OF MICHEL FOUCAULT'S "GOVERNMENTALITY" AND MICHAEL MANN'S "INFRASTRUCTURAL POWER"

MICHEL FOUCAULT'NUN "YÖNETİMSELLİK"İ İLE MICHAEL MANN'İN "ALTYAPISAL İKTİDAR"ININ KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

Turgay Kahveci

Doktora Öğrencisi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Türkiye
Phd Student, Ankara University, Türkiye
tkahveci@ankara.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0003-1781-8776

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to discuss the position of two thinkers who stand out with their theoretical approaches to the capabilities of modern state power. Michel Foucault and Michael Mann provide important roadmaps to understand the current skills of the state through their conceptual developments. In this context, contemplating Foucault's "governmentality" alongside Mann's "infrastructural power" will offer an enlightening reading on the modern state. Accordingly, the first section explains Foucault's theoretical approach and specifically elaborates on the concept of governmentality. The second section delves into Mann's concept of infrastructural power. The final section discusses the similarities and differences between the concepts. The original contribution of the article lies in this exploration. In conclusion, this article attempts to provide a comprehensive definition of modern state power in the context of "capacity" and "rationality" by highlighting the similarities and differences between the concepts of the two thinkers.

Keywords: Michel Foucault, governmentality, state reason, Michael Mann, infrastructural power, state capacity

Öz

Bu makalenin amacı modern devlet iktidarının kabiliyetlerine dair teorik yaklaşımlarıyla öne çıkan iki düşünürün yaklaşımlarını tartışmaktır. Michel Foucault ve Michael Mann kavramsal açılımlarıyla devletin bugünkü becerilerini anlamak için önemli bir yol haritası sunarlar. Bu bağlamda Foucault'nun "yönetimsellik"i ile Mann'ın "altyapısal iktidar"ını bir arada düşünmek modern devlet üzerine aydınlatıcı bir okuma sağlayacaktır. Bu doğrultuda birinci bölümde Foucault'nun teorik yaklaşımı ve spesifik olarak yönetimsellik kavramı açıklanmaktadır. İkinci bölümde Mann'ın altyapısal iktidar kavramı ele alınmaktadır. Son bölümde ise kavramların benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları tartışılmaktadır. Makalenin orijinal katkısı bu başlıktadır. Sonuç olarak iki düşünürün kavramları, benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları ortaya konularak modern devlet iktidarının "kapasite" ve "rasyonellik" bağlamında bütüncül bir tanımı sunulmaya çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kavramlar: Michel Foucault, yönetimsellik, devlet aklı, Michael Mann, altyapısal iktidar, devlet kapasitesi

INTRODUCTION

Although the history of the state dates back to ancient times, the modern state is one of the main areas of inquiry in contemporary political philosophy. What has developed continuously since the construction of modern nation states is the rationality and capacity of the state. Indeed, the modern state's ability to infiltrate society, its ability and rationality to govern, its power to collect and mobilize material resources, the ability to acquire knowledge of the population and to exercise power through this knowledge, and the capacity to mobilize infrastructural changes and transformations is constantly evolving. This is a governing skill, and the modern state has developed a whole new rationality to implement these skills. On the other hand, while the modern state rationalizes regulatory and supervisory devices in order to perpetuate the knowledge-power relationship, it also intensifies its technical and infrastructural power. In addition to its power to discipline the bodies and regulate the population, the state also develops the capacity to implement all political decisions, including the collection and use of resources, even to the farthest corners of the state. This leads us to two important thinkers in the analysis of the modern state power. Michel Foucault and Michael Mann are two thinkers who analyzed the power and density of governance exercised by states today. Both thinkers tried to bring the understanding of 'government techniques-capacity' against the power form that applies an inefficient power rather than managing, and they tried to introduce this kind of 'administrative', 'penetrating' power. At this point, Foucault focused on the changing rationality of the state, the knowledge-power relation and the development of scientific expertise, while Mann focused on the state's development of infrastructural institutions, skills, and the power to implement decisions. In particular, both thinkers focused on the capabilities of the modern state power, which are much more developed than at any other time in history. In this regard, the ideas developed by both thinkers regarding the power of the state to govern and penetrate, and the convergence, similarities, and differences in these ideas will be investigated throughout the article. Since the modern state discussion is a very wide literature, state theories (Weberian theory, Marxist theory etc.) will be bracketed and only the concepts of the specified thinkers will be focused on. Because of this, the article does not cover the extensive literature on the modern state, only the conceptual expansions of the two thinkers toward the modern state, similarities and differences are revealed. In this context, the first stop will be Foucault's idea of 'governmentality'. Secondly, Mann and the concept of 'infrastructural power' will be evaluated and the discussion will be concluded by making a comparison. In the conclusion, the importance of the two concepts in the context of the modern state's ability to govern will be pointed out.

GENERAL OUTLINES OF MICHEL FOUCAULT'S PHILOSOPHY

Michel Foucault (1929-1984), a French thinker who worked in philosophy, history and politics during the 1970s and 1980s in the second half of the twentieth century, divided the focus of his work into concepts such as 'subject', 'power', 'knowledge', 'truth', and 'discourse'. At the same time, he focused on archaeological excavations in his works, the formation and functioning of power strategies and discourses, which he called 'practices', the question of what knowledge means for modern power and the practices of the self,

which he called the practices in which the subject establishes himself/herself. Central to his studies, which contain integrity, is the idea of the most efficient managing of the individual and society as a form of liberal managing emerged by the birth and development of liberalism. His main purpose was to examine a new governing ethic that had been established throughout the historical development of liberalism and the forms of punishment, confinement and reform that have undergone changes in this direction. In this regard, Foucault completed his doctoral thesis entitled 'History of Madness', which he constructed as the history of psychiatry in 1961. In 1963, he published 'The Birth of the Clinic', which is the epistemology of medical science, and in 1966, he published 'Words and Things', in which he examined the conditions of knowing that led to the emergence of human sciences. He published 'The Archeology of Knowledge' in 1969 and continued to lecture at the Collége de France until 1984, which he took over in 1970 (Foucault, 2015c).

While the course of his work showed a tendency in the early periods in areas such as discourse and power relations, penal institutions and punishment theories, psychiatry, and anomalies, over time, he began to focus on a period in which the perspective of governments changed. He focused on body and population policies based on the controlled governance of freedom, and 'the government of living being' based on the regulatory and efficient governing ethics of modern governments. Ultimately, in the last years of his life, he focused on the construction processes in which the subject establishes itself rather than a theory of the subject. However, it should be known that Foucault, while progressing step-by-step in his genealogical studies, theorized the facts with a holistic and homogeneous logical path. In particular, despite the retrospective comments saying that he returned to the "subject" in the last period of his lectures, the theme contains a consistency throughout this whole process. In a general expression, the whole content is how subjective experience and the subject are established through all discursive and non-discursive practices (Keskin, 2015, p. VII).

Behind the establishment of the subject, there is a broad concept set ranging from discourse and power to the birth of modernity based on the control of bodies and the management of populations, from liberal truth regimes to exclusionary practices and the form of confinement of exclusion. However, the basic dynamic of practices that reach modern forms of confinement, punishment and reform is the dominance of economic liberalism and the development of scientific disciplines that have a truth-determining mission. What Foucault tried to do in 'Security, Territory, Population (1977-1978)' and 'The Birth of Biopolitics (1978-1979)' was to examine the process he called 'new state rationality'. Before moving on to the developing rationality of the modern state, it is necessary to clarify the discourse and the power/knowledge relationship.

From Discourse and Power/Knowledge to Neoliberal Governmentality

The concepts covered in Foucauldian analyses are layered and relational. In this context, first grasping the notion of discourse is also important in order to understand the nature of the functioning of discourse in social practices and its relationship to power. Foucault defines discourse as ritualized texts, formulas, things that are constantly transmitted, repeated and changed, recited in accordance with tightly determined conditions, things that are feared with the thought that there is a miracle and a secret in them. Therefore, it corresponds to a certain number of speech acts that are continually said, that remain said,

and that are to be further said. Within the specific cultural systems of societies, religious or legal texts, literary texts and, to some extent, scientific texts can be considered within discourse practices (Foucault, 1993, p. 16).

Discourse as a 'practice' is constantly circulated, just like a ritual, and derives its latent power from its constant enunciation. However, it should be known that the discourse acts with a mission to 'tell the truth' that enables it to create an effect that will be subordinated to it, and that the discourse should be considered together with the effects of power. Power acts through discourse and is integrated with it, and reveals its unique truth by reference only to itself. It does this through 'games of truth'. Therefore, a schema emerges in which power that markets itself as truth crystallized in discourse. In this scheme, power has a quality that determines the truth (Foucault, 2016, p. 98-106). Truth, on the other hand, is a game that Foucault states is presented as a verification-falsification regime. In the games of truth, verification-falsification regimes do not specify a true law of truth, but all the rules that enable the determination of propositions about discourse that can be defined as true or false (Foucault, 2015a, p. 32).

The discourses of truth that determine the way the ruler rules are precisely the effects created by the power/knowledge systems that are constantly reproduced and put into circulation. The discourses of truth accompanying power relations, which take their origin not only from a center or a class but also from a holistic network of relations, claim that they contain necessary and objective knowledge and that they state the truth based on knowledge. In fact, for Foucault, truth discourses are more related to the knowledge that power is constructed as truth than 'truth' (Oranlı, 2012, p. 45).

Therefore, in the guise of objectivity that determines the truth, 'knowledge' is at the center of power relations. The modern concepts introduced by the branches of science that produce scientific knowledge such as human sciences are a product of the discourse developed by the modern power to surround the body, that is, power-knowledge. It is a wheel where power reveals knowledge and knowledge expands and strengthens the power (Keskin, 2016, p. 19).

The wheel analogy is remarkable in that it depicts a sharp homogeneity between power and knowledge, not a prioritization relationship. This new power/knowledge regime, which Foucault states that it developed since the sixteenth century, created the relationship between knowledge and power and the most complex knowledge system; on the other hand, it developed the most intricate power structures (Foucault, 2014, p. 14-65).

Power/knowledge is a mode of action based on a set of actions, strategies and tactics that can always be exercised on 'others' and it can always be exercised on free subjects. As a result, space is opened for a phenomenon of resistance that will enable the possibility of reversing the conditions in every power relationship. Resistance is ontologically immanent to the power relationship (Foucault, 2014, p. 74-236). It should be underlined that when power is defined as a form of relationship (love relationship, mutual communication, institutional or economic relationship) and its relationship with knowledge is revealed, power can no longer be thought of as mere pressure, censorship, obstruction, or an upper self. Power creates desire, activates the body, and provokes pleasure (Foucault, 2012, p. 49-74). Therefore, the entire process that constitutes the subject can be explained as

follows. With the development of the human sciences (such as in medicine, psychiatry, or criminology), scientific knowledge is presented as truth discourses. Around these truth discourses, individuals engage in a game of truth. Certain forms of experience are problematized by the power of scientific knowledge (such as irrational, pathological, or criminal). Everyone who enters the game of truth tests his/her own form of experience with the norms of scientific knowledge. As a result, they either give up externalized forms of experience, or they are reformed or imprisoned. At the end of this process, three typical practices emerge; people become objectified by becoming objects of a particular discipline. They establish themselves and become subjects by being forced into a relationship with their own selves by the forms of experience offered by scientific knowledge. Finally, this process reveals the normalization mechanism that brings out divisive practices by separating them as normal/abnormal. Foucault calls this whole process 'problematization' (Foucault, 2015b, p. 15-17). Behind such a typology of power, there is a new historicity and a state mentality change brought about by capitalism. The new state rationality mentioned includes a combination of the disciplinary power that conditions the bodies to effective use and the regulatory power that regulates the population. The new state rationality that mentioned by Foucault is governmentality as a management technique of the modern state that controls life and death, keeps statistics, calculates, uses the body performatively, regulates and controls the population, disseminates knowledge, and arouses pleasure.

Regulatory Practices and Biopolitics: Governmentality as a New State Rationality

In his genealogical studies on power, Foucault refers to the period between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries as juridical power, on the grounds that it did not constitute a regime of knowledge, and that the mentality of government was based only on the bond of government and the relationship between the king and the people. All state theories, including those of Machiavelli to Hobbes, acted with a power algorithm that establishes or restricts the power with an 'external' effect and operates not within the society but 'above' the society (Urhan, 2014, p. 229-237). Machiavelli's magnum opus 'The Prince', which consists of advice to rulers, and Hobbes' statement 'treaties without swords are nothing but words and have no power to secure a man' (Hobbes, 2007, p. 295) are suitable for Foucault's description of the 'model of sovereignty'. In fact, juridical power comes to us with the direct ownership of the right to life and death. The form of power that can keep alive or kill shows that a nation has no right over itself, either alive or dead. The right to decide on death is essentially a decision about life, because it includes the end of life (Foucault, 2002, p. 246). Most importantly, the king's or prince's power to kill or keep alive is not a power that regulates life itself.

One of the main breaking moments in this regard is the French Revolution. Until the revolution, the king's body represented power wherever he went and was seen as a 'political corpus' (Saygılı, 2005, p. 324). This body gained an institutionality separated from the person of the king by Jean Bodin and with the execution of Louis XVI, the motto 'The king is dead, long live the king!' ended (Akal, 1998, p. 64-74). Both the physical body and the political body of the king disappeared. So, what has this political break in the historical process changed? What has changed is the way politics is implemented, and even the goals of politics. The old model of power that Foucault calls 'sovereignty', which kills, tortures

and punishes terribly, was replaced by a power type that keeps everything alive, protects and balances everything, and uses calculated and strategic reasoning. According to this new political rationality, what the state should do is to assume the responsibility of life, manage it and improve its biological chances. It can be said that power turned into a function of 'managing people's needs' by leaving the situation of 'managing people'. This new art of governing is not an understanding that works with the power of killing anymore, but started to act with an understanding that protects life and even produces life. The fact that the government undertakes the development and production of human life has both given a new role to the state and re-interpreted the relationship between the individual and the state (Baştürk, 2012, p. 71-76). Foucault calls this new form of government the 'biopolitics of population'.

The entire transformation, which controls the health of the population, birth and death statistics, housing problems, life expectancy, and requires a concrete, specific, measured 'knowledge' about the power of the state has initiated the era of governmentality (Foucault, 2014, p. 112). In addition to the biopolitics of the population, which reached the height of its development in the eighteenth century, the 'politics of the anatomy of the body', which completed its development towards the end of the same century, emerged (Foucault, 2015a, p. 281). According to Foucault, anatomy-politics approaches bodies one-by-one like a machine, compresses the body with discipline, and especially emphasizes control. Therefore, anatomy-politics, which concentrates on the body and corresponds to the controlling power, and the biopolitics of the population as the power of care and responsibility, which corresponds to the regulation of the population, emerge as a conceptual duo. In contrast to the killing power symbolized by the sovereignty model, the era of biopower has begun, in which the meticulous managing of bodies and the calculation of life are in question. In terms of discipline, with institutions such as the army and school, tactical ideas such as learning, education, military discipline and thoughts on the order of societies have gradually developed. Similarly, in terms of population, projections regarding demographic arrangements, use of resources and the circulation of wealth have developed (Foucault, 2003, p. 103-109).

The theoretical path that can be seen up to this point defines governmentality as the rationality of management, which constitutes the basic matrix of modern power formulation. It covers all institutions, methods, analysis and thoughts, calculations and tactics of the complex form of power, the target of which is population, knowledge form is political economy, and its technical tool is security mechanisms (Foucault, 2013, p. 97-98). Therefore, in order to analyze the development of the modern notion of power, it is necessary to examine a path from the power/knowledge to its technical tools. In other words, it is essential to examine a system and its logical arguments that ranges from a political economy to security society. Liberalism, which emerged on the stage of history as the 'order of things', is connected with discipline and security. Liberalism resorts to the practices of confinement and punishment. Its rationality of management and the ability to use knowledge have developed. The culture of liberalism to manage the life of the population forms the main body of the concept of governmentality and modern state power.

The new rationality of the modern state is embodied in the managing technique, which operates on the basis of power-knowledge and transforms 'management' into an 'art'.

Although pursuing this type of aestheticization of government, Foucault did not focus much on infrastructural power in the context of the modernization of the 'art of government'. Mann fills this gap with the idea of infrastructural power. Foucault's biopolitics and the logic of governmentality are only one aspect of the modern state power. However, the state cannot be conceived through biopolitics, being fixed only on the function of 'disciplining' and 'regulating'. Apart from making the body efficient and managing the population, it is necessary to make the material resources, political and administrative capacity and all the infrastructure 'productive'. It is also necessary to be able to penetrate the society as 'infrastructural'.

THE "CAPACITY" OF THE MODERN STATE IN MICHAEL MANN'S PHILOSOPHY

In the field of state theory, Mann follows a theoretical argument that adopts the approach of the relative autonomy of the state. He also emphasizes that all Marxist, liberal, and militarist theories of the state, including those of Franz Oppenheimer and Max Weber, are functionalist. While the Marxist approach sees the state as an area of class interests, the liberal state theory sees the state as an expression of people's struggles for profit and an area of institutionalization. Although Weberian state theory refers to the monopoly of legitimate use of physical force, Mann states that this approach is also insufficient.

Mann follows the intellectual line from Nicos Poulantzas[1] to Ralph Miliband by taking part in the approach of relative autonomy of the state against institutionalist and functionalist state approaches, but he also differs from them. Mann is a follower of Weber and a member of the 'Bringing the State Back' School (Skocpol et al. 1985). It goes beyond Charles Tilly's[2] approach of treating the state as an autonomous subject from groups and classes that want political and administrative coercive power and war. Mann states that the main mistake in all these approaches is the development of purely institutional or purely functional analysis. This is because when we start from how the state looks, an institutionalist analysis will emerge and when we act from its functions, a functionalist analysis will emerge. However, the state is 'essentially an arena and a square' (Mann, 1992, p. 3). The approach required to define the state as a relational field must incorporate both institutionalist and functionalist analyzes as a whole. Therefore, four titles stand out in

---

[1] Since the discussion of the capitalist state was not adequately addressed in the classical texts of Marxist thought, it was extensively discussed by Marxists in the later period and especially in the twentieth century. The most influential texts on this field, called the relative autonomy of the state, were discussed by Poulantzas and Miliband, reciprocally.
Please see following link: https://newleftreview.org/issues/i82/articles/ralph-miliband-poulantzas-and-the-capitalist-state. Accessed: 24.05.2023.
[2] Tilly explains the formation of the state as the isolation of violence from civilians, the disarmament of civil society, and the accumulation of armament power by the state. As an example, he shows the suppression of riots, the collection of weapons, the prohibition of dueling, and the control of the production of weapons. Artificial fears enable the state to achieve such power. Feeding 'created fears' constantly, ensures a constant state of 'precaution' and therefore the continuation of tax resources. While the source for military war expenditure is provided by the people, at the same time, the state, as the political, military and administrative coercive device, becomes the sole subject. In summary, the state emerged with wars and was founded on force and capital. Tilly refers to this as "War makes states and states make war" (Tilly, 1992). With this brief explanation, it should also be noted that discussions about the state theories in the literature are beyond the scope of this article. Only, in the second part, a brief general information about the state theory is given.

Mann's (1992) analysis of the state. These four titles are the integrity of the different institutions that make up the state and the state's own personnel in all institutions, the state's ability to convey its political relations from the center to the most remote corners, territorial sovereignty and the monopoly of physical violence. As a result, Mann reformulates the intellectual elements inherited from Weber within the framework of the autonomous state understanding.

Neo-Weberian theorists of the state, including Mann, refuse to explain the state solely through class conflict (for an empirical and neo-positivist class conflict approach see Miliband, 1977), capitalist functionalism and relational approach (see Poulantzas, 2000), or pluralistic interest groups (see Dahl, 1971). Although there are different levels, the state always has a certain autonomy (Seabrooke, 2002, p. 4). The definition of the state in the context of Neo-Weberian theories focuses on the institutional and territorially centralized nature of the state and highlights the concept of 'state capacity' (Mann, 1984; Seabrooke, 2002, p. 1). The concept of 'state capacity' corresponds to the following definitions: (1) the capacity to influence society and implement political decisions logistically; (2) the capacity to collect resources to meet the state's expenses; (3) the ability of the state to formulate policies and implement/enforce these policies under all circumstances; and (4) the ability to obtain and manage both material and non-material resources to be used in the provision of public services (Gökçe & Gökçe, 2015, p. 4). In fact, in the analysis of the state in the light of Neo-Weberian approaches, it is stated that the modern state has an institutional and regionally centralized nature and spreads power over the entire political geography by maintaining its dominance from the center (Mann, 1984, p. 185). While this approach suggests that the state has a certain autonomy, it refers to the level of dependency between the state and society (Seabrooke, 2002, p. 4; Mann, 1984, p. 185). Therefore, by a general definition, the capacity of the modern state can be listed as follows: 'the capacity to penetrate the society and to implement political decisions logistically' (Mann, 1984); 'the capacity to collect resources or taxes' (Tilly, 1992); and 'the ability of the state to determine policies and to implement/enforce these policies under all circumstances' (Fukuyama, 2005). At this point, Mann's concept of 'infrastructural power' comes to the fore. Mann defines this concept based on the concept of state capacity and classifies modern state power as 'despotic' and 'infrastructural' power (Mann, 1984, p. 185).

Mann's Concept Pair: Despotic Power – Infrastructural Power
The relationship between the state and society is the relationship of independence and autonomy. Mann states that the state exercises its autonomy not in a way that operates separately from or above civil society, but through a form of power that operates 'through' civil society. While explaining the power model of the modern state, Mann draws two different typologies of power: despotic power and infrastructural power. The two types of power can be expressed simply as follows: while despotic power acts 'on civil society', infrastructural power acts 'through civil society' (Lucas, 1998, p. 91).

Despotic power refers to the oppressive capacity of the state. Despotic power, with a broader definition, refers to 'the range of actions that the manager and those under his command are authorized to implement without entering into routine, institutionalized negotiations with civil society groups' (Mann, 1984). In this context, despotic power manifests itself in various ways: the consolidation of the legislative-executive and the

judiciary in one person; in the control of dissidents of the regime and in their arrest if necessary; in the use of force against all dissidents; in the restriction of freedom of expression; in the strict repressive attitude towards the organization of opposition; and in the increase of unlawfulness and corruption and in the arbitrary practices of law enforcement. Despotic power is deeply associated with the monopoly of the use of force. According to Mann (Soifer, 2008, p. 233), despotic power is more closely related to the Marxist tradition regarding state autonomy and corresponds to Max Weber's (1964) concept of power. Despotic power, emphasizing the tyrannical and bulky aspect of the state, corresponds to the type of power that operates 'over' civil society.

Infrastructural power, on the other hand, sees the state as a set of institutions that regulate social relations by taking control of the area it is in and is dependent on a Weberian tradition (Mann, 1993, p. 58-59). Infrastructural power is the capacity of the state to actually affect the daily life of society and to implement the political decisions taken in every field. In other words, infrastructural power is power through society, and is collective power (Mann, 2012, p. 68). Infrastructural power permeates society, and creates and distributes resources. It engages the capacity of accessing the social sphere and the population there ruled by the central state in a non-despotic manner, and managing them with techniques that are prioritized instead of using force. In this regard, infrastructural power is the means of communication and transportation, the resources in a country, and the capacity to direct and manage people in order to implement the decisions taken (Mann, 1998, p. 59). This type of power establishes an increasingly institutionalized cooperation between the state and civil society (Hobson, 2000, p. 6). Mann's (1984, p. 113-114) conceptualization of infrastructural power is defined as the ability of the state to encircle civil society and logistically implement political decisions. In this respect, in order to be able to talk about a powerful state in an infrastructural sense, first of all, the state must have social control mechanisms and be able to infiltrate the most remote corners of the daily life of society through these mechanisms. Infrastructural power, which Mann (2012, p. 68) describes as the power that controls social life, can also provide emotional commitment in its own representation, thanks to its ability to intervene in daily life. In this respect, it enables both the control over the borders of the state and the ability to regulate social relations (Vom Hau, 2007). It is the characteristic feature of infrastructural power that the state can reach the entire geographical area it owns and spread its power to cover every individual, even to the most remote corners. In this context, modern states are weak in terms of despotic power and strong in terms of infrastructural power. The modern state penetrates more into everyday life than any historical state. The infrastructural power of the modern state has increased enormously (Mann, 1984, p. 114).

Mann describes infrastructural power as the main power of the modern state (Soifer & Vom Hau, 2008, p. 222). In fact, in Mann's conceptualization of infrastructural power, the modern state effectively uses its power to fulfill the common interests between the state and civil society and to direct it by penetrating social life (Soifer & Vom Hau, 2008, p. 225). Thanks to the institutional architecture it has created, the state can penetrate into society, and it covers the society by spreading from the center to all territorial area. This functioning is possible mainly through communication, transportation, education and administrative means (Vom Hau, 2007). In particular, infrastructural power is a reciprocal relationship as it is defined through a relationship between the state and society. It therefore derives its power

from this.

Based on these two different definitions of power, Mann categorizes four different ideal state forms specific to situations where the levels of the two forms of power (despotic/infrastructural) are high and low. First of all, he calls the situation where both despotic power and infrastructural power are at a low level 'feudalism' and shows medieval Europe as an example of this type of power. Secondly, Mann calls the situation in which the level of despotic power is high and the level of infrastructural power is low as 'empire' and shows the Chinese empire as an example for this ideal type classification (Mann, 2008, p. 356).

In the third example, Mann clearly shows that he comes from the Weberian tradition and refers to the state as 'bureaucracy' where the infrastructural power is high and the despotic power is low. He shows the current structure of the United Kingdom and the United States as an example for this ideal type (Mann, 1984). Finally, he presents the Soviet Union as an opposite example, stating that the high level of both despotic and infrastructural power leads to an 'authoritarian' state structure (Mann, 2008, p. 356). Infrastructural power also includes the meaning of modern state capacity mentioned in previous passages. While state capacity is expressed in the ability to dominate and manage society within the borders of the state, what actually emerges, as Vom Hau (2007) emphasizes, directly points to Mann's infrastructural power. In order to be able to talk about a strong state capacity, first of all, the state must have the capacity to produce strong policies and create sufficient financial resources to implement its decisions (Migdal, 2001). This leads us to the idea that authoritarian regimes will be achieved only when the security dimension of the state capacity is strong and other factors are ignored. Parallel forces and specific power networks are formed in states that consider the state capacity equivalent only to despotic power, and these networks weaken the state by shaking it completely (Englehart, 2005).

State capacity covers various dimensions: a) policy capacity; b) administrative capacity; and c) negotiation capacity (Fazekas, 2011). Policy capacity is the ability of political power to structure and coordinate collective decision-making processes and to organize the resources necessary to conduct analysis of decision-making processes. Elements of administrative capacity include a number of parameters: human resources (management, all kinds of coordination, including meritocracy and employment); information resources (quantitative data on government and society, information flow at national and international level and tools to utilize all this information); financial resources (tax collection, investment and incentive systems, support of disadvantaged groups); quality of public services (equality and accessibility); and physical resources (institutional buildings, vehicles and technologies). Finally, negotiation capacity refers to the capacity of the state to cooperate and negotiate with non-state actors in order to ensure public support, and the capacity of society to mobilize critical resources, such as information sharing with state actors (Fazekas, 2011, p. 9-10). In this context, negotiation capacity emphasizes 'discussion' and 'deliberative capability' and functions as a bridge between policy capacity and administrative capacity, greatly influencing the functioning and success of both capacities. Consequently, state capacity covers these three capacities in the same way. Only these three capacities can enable a government to implement collective decisions and achieve its targets (Gökçe & Gökçe, 2015, p. 18).

State capacity, on the other hand, contains four types of political control techniques, and each of them has a long developmental process. These are respectively as follows (Jacoby, 2010, p. 23; Mann, 2011, p. 8-9);

1) Division of labor among the centrally executed main duties of the state,

2) Literacy culture and knowledge accumulation that enables the transmission of fixed messages through state representatives within the geographical area owned by the state and the coding and storage of legal responsibilities,

3) Printing money under the guarantee of the state in the exchange of goods in the country and determining the common units of weight,

4) Accelerating the transportation of resources, information and individuals by providing various infrastructure investments (roads, communication tools, and so on).

THE CONCEPTS OF GOVERNMENTALITY AND INFRASTRUCTURAL POWER; SIMILARITIES AND DISTINCTIONS

The general outlines of the theoretical approaches of the two thinkers have been conveyed and some similarities and differences have been reached. For Mann, modern state power and a strong state capacity stem from the source of ideological, economic, military and political power that is characteristic of social relations (Mann, 2011, p. 9). In Mann's state capacity approach, infrastructural power covers the entire economic, military, ideological and political field, while it also contains a relationality and state-civil society reciprocity. In terms of Foucault, on the other hand, power functions like a kind of social network system that is 'fluid', spreading and evolving at every moment, beyond the political, ideological, economic and military levels. This network offers a new management rationality to the modern state while spreading its power by functioning thanks to knowledge. Therefore, for Foucault, power is not state-centered, and is not rooted in the state. It spreads in society but 'accumulates' in the state. State power is the top macrofield of micropowers exercised in all social movements.

Mann's infrastructural power is a capacity exercised only by the state. For Foucault, power is exercised by everyone at every moment. However, the power-knowledge spiral, which Foucault calls governmentality, penetrates society most effectively through the state. This is a kind of 'management culture'. In Foucault, governmentality is not a closed-circuit form of power that takes its origins from the state, as in Mann's infrastructural power approach. Governmentality is a government 'mentality' that takes its origins from the power relations and knowledge networks in society. It is a power relation over all power relations.

For Mann, every state, whether despotic or democratic, must have some degree of both despotic and infrastructural forms of power. While democratic states have a wider and more effective infrastructural capacity, despotic states have more despotic capacity and less infrastructural capacity. In other words, both the democratic state and the despotic state include both types of power, but the state with more infrastructural power is effective, and the state with more despotic power is ineffective. For Foucault, Mann's term 'despotic power' most closely corresponds to what Foucault calls the 'model of sovereignty'. The

model of sovereignty only forbids, represses, captures few criminals, and punishes them terribly. Therefore, the sovereignty model is inefficient and, according to Foucault, it disappeared in the modern period. Inefficient and dysfunctional punishment practices in the sovereignty model have been replaced by discipline, control and performative management practices that use the body. Another difference between the two thinkers arises here. According to Foucault, while the model of sovereignty (or to explain it in Mann terminology the despotic type of power) completely disappeared and left its place to a new state rationality, governmentality and biopolitics in the Western world. For Mann, on the other hand, despotic powers did not disappear and, even today, it continue to exist as other power elements together with the infrastructural power of states. For Foucault, the model of sovereignty disappeared and transformed, leaving itself to the supervisory-regulatory power/knowledge. On the contrary, in Mann's thinking, despotic power did not disappear, it preserved its existence. This is because, according to Mann, social expectations cannot be met without infrastructural power, but infrastructural power cannot be 'strengthened' without despotic power. The main difference lies here. Foucault's approach argues that the 'form of sovereignty', which we can also call 'despotic power', has come to an end and has lost its functionality today. However, Mann argues that despotic power (model of sovereignty in Foucauldian thinking) continues to exist.

Another distinction is related to the intellectual line that the thinkers feed on. Foucault conducted his research based on Nietzsche and used 'genealogy' methodically in his historical analyzes, mainly borrowing the concept of 'moral genealogy' from Nietzsche (Foucault, 2011, p. 83). Mann, on the other hand, shows that he is a follower of Weber in his thoughts and analysis as one of the important advocates of state-centered approaches (Karataş, 2018, p. 4322).

Mann stands at a different point by considering the influence of material and ideological forces on social development and considering the concept of 'class' as an important historical variable. Rather than making a distinction between society and the state, Mann analyzes power by adopting a dialectical analysis method and starts from the state's relationship with society. In this respect, he thinks from within Neo-Weberian sociology (Moran, 1998, p. 160). Foucault, on the other hand, thinks that the concept of 'class' should be completely excluded from the analysis, as it evokes the concept of ideology in Marxist analysis. Ideology will always assume a given 'subject' who will adopt that ideology. However, the subject is the product of the discursively established power/knowledge process. In the same way, although Foucault classifies practices other than discourse by going to a distinction in the form of 'discursive practices' and 'non-discursive practices', he does not focus too much on material forces other than discourse. For example, Mann (1984) attaches importance to the techniques of political control logistics, which will realize the common interests of both the state and society and will ensure the visibility of the state in social life. However, Foucault does not give sufficient importance to technical, logistical, material-infrastructural possibilities and forces. Foucault does not refer to the technical/logistical capacity of the state in the context of penetrating society, except for power-knowledge, discourse and the institutionalism in which discourse is circulated. Institutionalism that disseminates knowledge-power (universities, hospitals, barracks, and prisons) is important for Foucault, but the philosopher did not lean into different aspects of the state such as human resources, financial resources, means of transportation (such as roads

and bridges), means of communication, infrastructural development for the communication of human and all social information, division of labor, printing money and determining weight units, the storage and coding of social information thanks to ever-increasing literacy rates.

On the other hand, Mann, as Foucault showed, was deficient in the 'management of bodies'. Foucault's unique analysis of the modern state sheds light on a management culture called governmentality, which enables bodies to exert power over themselves. Any analysis of the capacity of the modern state in which the 'discipline of bodies' and the 'management of population' are not considered would be incomplete. In this regard, Mann's analysis is incomplete in the context of the 'political use of the body' and the 'governmentality of the population' by the modern state.

Besides all these, there are a number of similarities between the two thinkers. To give an example, it would be meaningful to talk about the architectural prison design 'panopticon', which Foucault borrowed from Jeremy Bentham and on which he built his theory of power, in terms of power's ability to observe and gain knowledge. A self-controlled community is depicted in Bentham's panopticon design. In Foucault's thinking (1977), inheriting Bentham's legacy, panopticism refers to the social control techniques of power that manages to regulate and keep society under constant control. In this context, infrastructural power, which constitutes an important dimension of modern state power, similarly surrounds society with the acquisition of knowledge, surveillance and recording methods. In this respect, the infrastructural power conceptualization is seriously articulated with the panopticon design, which makes the individual systematically controlled and observable, thereby enabling the individual to manage herself/himself. In other words, as the infrastructural power mechanisms of the state expand, the self-control practices of individuals in society develop accordingly. Within the framework of the concept of infrastructural power and the Foucauldian panopticon, the power practices of individuals over themselves overlap with each other and broadly define the control techniques of the modern state. In addition, the panopticon design also points to the infrastructural capacity that will make the management of the human community efficient in a particular place.

Similarly, what Mann calls 'administrative capacity' is close to Foucault's 'governmentality'. Being aware of the population it manages within its borders, the state, directs its administrative capacity to keep this population under control and to adopt an attitude where the population can directly control and observe itself. Foucault's concept of governmentality (which refers to the regulation of the population as a political subject) and the direct relationship he established between the institutionalism of the state apparatus and the process of subjectivation, are important similarities (Lemke, 2007). Governmentality will naturally require the institutionalized techniques and infrastructural facilities of the state. However, in Foucault's approach to the modern state, everything related to human life, such as birth rates, housing policies, hygiene, public health and nutrition of the people, is the issue of power. From this perspective, governmentality in Foucault always includes the process of managing behavior and extends from self-management to managing 'others'. Therefore, the 'infrastructural power' and 'governmentality' concept pair defined in the context of 'territory' and 'population' articulate each other in relation to the subjectivation techniques applied by the administrative apparatus of the state. Defining the 'power' concept

through devices, practices and technologies, as predicted by Foucault's analysis of governmentality, also requires thinking about infrastructural power, indirectly.

With all this, Mann's special interest in the concept of power reminds Foucault. As explained throughout the article, for Foucault, power is "complex strategical situation in a particular society." Mann, participates in the postmodern obsession with power and deconstructs the concepts "history" and "society". He shows that power is the only thing real and tangible enough to be a valuable object of scientific investigation. However, Mann's definition of power is different from Foucault's definition of strategic, complex, fluid power. Mann clearly attaches importance to material, concrete possibilities and potentials. The modern state is powerful because it can use these potential opportunities and possibilities in the most effective way. In Mann's words, this power of the modern state is infrastructural power. But despite this difference between the concepts, both concepts "talk" to each other when it comes to the modern state. To summarize, although the concepts of governmentality and infrastructural power have some differences, these concepts can be combined as a single concept as 'knowledge-power capacity'. Since governmentality is a kind of rationality of regulating and managing the population, it needs infrastructural power and its possibilities. While Foucault's concept of governmentality emphasizes a new rationality regarding the state, Mann's infrastructural power differs from this in that it emphasizes the 'material' power of the state that can permeate every point. In addition, Foucault, as a thinker coming from the genealogical tradition of Nietzsche and including archaeological excavations in his historical studies, followed traces of the transformation of the modern state and power. Mann, on the other hand, made new expansions in the Weberian state tradition. With all these differences, the two concepts together form a strong definition of the modern state as they separately emphasize the 'rationality' of the modern state on the one hand and its 'capacity' on the other. Infrastructural-material capacity and the ability to use knowledge competently are two advanced qualities of the modern state.

CONCLUSION

The main claim of this article is that there are both similarities and differences between governmentality and infrastructural power in terms of thinking about modern state power. When Foucault's concept of governmentality and Mann's concept of infrastructural power are considered together, the development of the modern state in terms of skill and capacity will be better understood. In this context, throughout the article, the close links between the two thinkers have been revealed. At the same time, by showing the differences between the approaches of the two thinkers, an idea of parallel thinking for an encompassing definition of modern state power has been put forward and an analytical comparison was also carried out.

In the first chapter, Foucault's thinking was conveyed in general terms, and the concept of discourse and the power-knowledge mechanism were included. Within the framework of the thinker's power-knowledge approach, the transformation in the rationality of the modern state has been examined under the title 'governmentality'. It has been stated that the concept of governmentality takes place in the history of the governing culture of today's states since the 18th century.

In the second part, Mann's concepts of state capacity and despotic power-infrastructural power are given in detail. Following the Weberian tradition and developing the famous Weberian definition of the 'monopoly of the legitimate use of force', Mann, gave particular attention to the idea of 'capacity'. In addition to its political, administrative and deliberative capacity, logistical and material power has increased the management capacity of the modern state. Thus, two sets of concepts emerge that shed light on modern state power. The power-knowledge-centered historical transformation, which Foucault called the new state rationality, and the level of development of infrastructural power, which Mann called the capacity of the state, strongly explain the characteristic features of the modern state such as the rationality and capacity. The modern state debate is, of course, not limited to these two thinkers, but the concepts of governmentality and infrastructural power together provide a perfect framework when it comes to the state's ability to penetrate society and manage it. In this context, the main argument of this article is that considering modern state power as a new 'rationality' woven with a political, administrative and logistic 'capacity' network will strengthen understanding of today's state power. So, it is spesifically necessary to think about Foucault and Mann together. Today, the modern state, whose material and technical possibilities have reached a peak in terms of infrastructure, is also a management culture that creates pleasure, encourages, activates and directs bodies and cares about the life of the 'population' as well as managing it. From this perspective, the concepts of governmentality and infrastructural power are two inseparable parts of modern state's character. The skill of the modern state comes not only from the fact that it is a bio-political management culture that regulates and controls the population and bodies, but also from the fact that it is a centralized apparatus of political and administrative capacities. The modern state power is a whole that encompasses both. Although they have some similarities and differences, Foucault and Mann should be considered in parallel to understand these rationality and capacity aspects of the modern state. Throughout the article, the concepts are explained in detail, a comparison is made between the concepts, and a conclusion is reached about the modern state in terms of it's governing skill.

REFERENCES

Akal, C.A. (1998). *İktidarın Üç Yüzü*. Ankara: Dost Press.

Baştürk, E. (2012). The Criticism of Liberalism in Foucaultian Perspective: Power, Governmentality, Security. *FLSF Journal of Philosophy and Social Sciences,* 14, 71-76.

Englehart, N.A. (2005). Is Regime Change Enough for Burma? The Problem of State Capacity. *Asian Survey,* 45(4): 622-644.

Dahl, R.A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition.* London: Yale University Press.

Fazekas, M. (2011). *State Capacity in Hungary - Characteristics, Causes, Impacts a Fresh Look at the Role of Interests and Knowledge.* (https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=66d71048f1f60e0ce35804fda92c881d49c852ed).

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1993). *Michel Foucault Ders Özetleri 1970-1982.* (S. Hilav, Trans.). Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Press.

Foucault, M. (2002). *Toplumu Savunmak Gerekir.* (Ş. Aktaş, Trans.). Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Press.

Foucault, M. (2003). *Cinselliğin Tarihi.* (H.U. Tanrıöver, Trans.). Istanbul: Ayrıntı Press.

Foucault, M. (2011). *Özne ve İktidar.* (O. Akınhay & I. Ergüden, Trans.). Istanbul: Ayrıntı Press.

Foucault, M. (2012). *İktidarın Gözü.* (I. Ergüden, Trans.). Istanbul: Ayrıntı Press.

Foucault, M. (2013). *Güvenlik, Toprak, Nüfus.* (F. Taylan, Trans.). Istanbul: Bilgi University Press.

Foucault, M. (2014). *Özne ve İktidar.* (I. Ergüden & O. Akınhay, Trans.). Istanbul: Ayrıntı Press.

Foucault, M. (2015a). *Biyopolitikanın Doğuşu.* (A. Tayla, Trans.). Istanbul: Bilgi University Press.

Foucault, M. (2015b). *Büyük Kapatılma.* (F. Keskin & I. Ergüden, Trans.). Istanbul: Ayrıntı Press.

Foucault, M. (2015c). *Öznenin Yorumbilgisi.* (F. Keskin, Trans.). Istanbul: Bilgi University Press.

Foucault, M. (2016). *Özne ve İktidar.* (I. Ergüden & O. Akınhay, Trans.). Istanbul: Ayrıntı Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2005). *Devlet İnşası: 21. Yüzyılda Dünya Düzeni ve Yönetişim.* (D. Çetinkasap, Trans.). Istanbul: Remzi Publishing.

Gökçe, G. & Gökçe, O. (2015). State Capacity: Hypotheticalframe of The Concept, Its Components and Appearance of Turkey. *Gazi University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences,* 17(2), 1-34.

Hobbes. T. (2007). *Leviathan.* (S. Lim, Trans.). Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Press.

Hobson, J.M. (2000). *The State and International Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacoby, T. (2010). *Sosyal İktidar ve Türk Devleti.* (D. Evci, Trans.). Ankara: Birleşik Dağıtım Publishing.

Karataş, A. (2018). Evaluation of Hegemonia, Infrastructure and Discipline Concept on the State. *Social Sciences Studies Journal,* 4(23), 4316-4325.

Keskin, F. (2015). Sunuş. F. Keskin (ed.), *Öznenin Yorumbilgisi* (p. xi-xvii). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Keskin, F. (2016). Sunuş: Özne ve İktidar. F. Keskin (ed.), *Özne ve İktidar* (p. 11-25). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Lemke, T. (2007). An Indigestible Meal? Foucault, Governmentality and State Theory. *Distinktion Journal of Social Theory,* 8(2), 43-66.

Lucas, J. (1998). The Tension Between Despotic and Infrastructural Power: The Military and the Political Class in Nigeria, 1985–1993. *Studies in Comparative International Development,* 33(3), 90-113.

Mann, M. (1984). The Autonomous Power of the State: Its Origins, Mechanisms and Results. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Européennes de Sociologie,* 25(2), 185-213.

Mann, M. (1992). *State, War and Capitalism.* New Jersey: Blacwell Publishing.

Mann, M. (1993). *The Sources of Social Power.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mann, M. (1998). *The Sources of Social Power (1760-1914).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mann, M. (2008). Infrastructural Power Revisited. *Studies in Comparative International Development,* 43(3-4), 355-365.

Mann, M. (2011). *Devletler, Savaş ve Kapitalizm, Politik Sosyoloji İncelemeleri.* (S. Türkoğlu, Trans.). Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Press.

Mann, M. (2012). *İktidarın Tarihi: Başlangıcından MS 1760'a Kadar Toplumsal İktidarın Kaynakları.* (E. Saraçaoğlu, S. Torlak, O. Sevimli et al., Trans.). Ankara: Phoenix Press.

Migdal, J.S. (2001). *State in Society: Studying How States and Societies Transform and Constitute One Another.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miliband, R. & Saville, J. (1977). *The Socialist Register.* London: The Merlin Press.

Moran, J. (1998). Two Conceptions of State: Antonio Gramsci and Michael Mann. *Politics,* 18(3), 159-164.

Oranlı, İ. (2012). The Birth of Biopolitics and Foucauldian Critic. *Cogito,* 70-71, 39-51.

Poulantzas, N. (2000). *State, Power, Socialism.* London & New York: Verso Books.

Saygılı, A. (2005). A Brief Essay on the Modern State's Body Ideology. *Journal of Ankara University Faculty of Law,* 54(3), 323-340.

Seabrooke, L. (2002). *Bringing Legitimacy Back into Neo-Weberian State Theory and International Relations.* Canberra: Australian National University Department of International Relations Working Paper Series.

Soifer, H. & Vom Hau, M. (2008). Unpacking the Strength of the State: The Utility of State infrastructural Power. *Studies in Comparative International Development,* 43(3-4), 219-230.

Soifer, H. (2008). State Infrastructural Power: Approaches to Conceptualization and Measurement. *Studies in Comparative International Development,* 43(3-4), 231-251.

Tilly, C. (1992). *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992.* New Jersey: Blackwell

Publishing.

Urhan, V. (2014). Michel Foucault'da Disiplinci Düzenleyici İktidar Ayrımı. *Doğu Batı,* (69), 229-239.

Vom Hau, M. (2007). State Infrastructural Power and Nationalism: Comparative Lessons from Mexico and Argentina. *BWPI Working Paper,* (11), 1-17.