THE BARRIER TO SOCIAL DYNAMICS IN TURKEY: AUTHORITARIAN MENTALITY AND STATISM

Nadir ATEŞOĞLU
Kastamonu University
Kastamonu Vocational School of Higher Education
Economics and Administrative Programs
natesoglu@kastamonu.edu.tr

Öztürk AKÇAOĞLU
Kastamonu University
ozturk@kastamonu.edu.tr

Abstract

The fundamental agent that helps a society to develop is the society's ability in presenting its own dynamics – social, political and economic – freely. As far as the above mentioned notion is fulfilled, the society may enter in the process of a momentum of development by itself. Today, the people living in a variety of countries are not allowed to put forth their own dynamics regardless of the regime, whether republic or totalitarian. This is sometimes preferred to preserve the power and sometimes to impose an ideology on the society. They do not hesitate to enforce their decisions, which they regard as the representative of a noble mind, for their countries or institutions whatever the cost is. In this sense, "Statism", by its very nature, has brought about an authoritarian constitution in Turkey. A planner-statist structure, formed on reasonable grounds in the beginning, has deviated from its aim and become a barrier to the dynamism in which social class differences can be produced as long as the society continues pursuing design perception. This study aims at investigating what might be the costs of preventing social dynamics regarding the planner, statist and authoritarian state perception in Turkey.

Key Words: *Authoritarian management, statism, social dynamics*

JEL classification: Public Administration, K, H1

1- INTRODUCTION

The authoritarian mindset[1] can be defined as to maintain power (government) through the instrument of a variety of institutions and also by means of elements of oppression. In other words, in order to transform the social structure in unity, the state adopts an authoritarian mindset as a way of keeping the society under control and securing obedience. On the other hand, statism, without which the continuity of authority is unthinkable, comprises the most important part of the elements in terms of its support for the economy.

These two concepts put forth the ideological and financial aspect of any regime; in addition, the structure these two concepts have, supports each other. Indeed, statism is the economic system of authoritarianism and totalitarianism.

Most of the time, no authority can maintain continuity without monetary source. When the Turkish administrative system during the republic period is considered in terms of history, a transitional period can be observed. That period self-attributed the mission of imposing modernization on the public. Then, a regime that could fulfill the mission became a necessity. During the early-republic period, although the name of the regime was changed on the surface, a kind of authoritarian governance mentality, which could help impose the modernism project on the public easily and fast, was adopted. In our opinion, one of the most crucial means of imposing was "statism". In the beginning, this principle had such important and positive functions as reviving the economy and carrying out the investments by the state, which could not be accomplished by the private sector. However, the ideas that initiated statism changed in time. When the government realized that its crucial part in the economy created patronage[2] and also observed that utilizing public resources was a better way of governing and directing the public, it became reluctant to hand over its power to private sector although the conditions in the beginning was different. In this study, how the reconstruction method, which was adopted from starting from the beginning of Republic and continued till the 1950s, paved the way for an authoritarian governance perception that has continued up until now will be investigated. In addition, how the principle

[1] When we state authoritarian mentality, although we do not mean a totalitarian perception baring a totally ideological approach, we assume that the power desiring the continuity of authority, at the least, has an ideological perception.

[2] This concept which can be defined as "Security in exchange for obedience" is one of the most commonly used elements in terms of defining the power relations in the political sociology. According to the concept, the higher is the level of obedience, the higher is level of security or the higher is the level of security, the higher is the level of obedience. In addition, according to the political scientists who teach power analysis, there is a power element in all relations.

of statism detached from its original meaning in the course time and served the authoritarian state governance will be presented. Furthermore, the way how it slowed down the development process by hindering social dynamics will try to be put forward.

2- MODERNIZATION IN TURKEY AND AUTHORITERIAN STRUCTURE

The presence of the West depends on its overt structure to the external effects and its protection of internal dynamics. By protecting the dynamics that help internalize mentality changes, the West succeeded in the mental transition provided by the "Enlightment". Western civilization came up as a product of a mentality, a mental state or a point of view regarding the events and creatures. Western civilization has gained its existence through the freedom it gives to the individuals and their thoughts and actions. (Ceylan,2002:6)

Because the developing societies are unsuccessful in stimulating their internal dynamics and exposing their potential, they are faced with only one option which is westernization. (Ceylan,2002:6)

Following the decline of the Ottoman Empire, a rationalization process, which is named as "modernization" in Turkey and takes the "West" as a model, generated different social tensions. These tensions emerged because of the ignorant behavior of the elitist towards the internal dynamics and relations. In addition, the social engineering methods imposed on the public in a top-down fashion played a fundamental role. Modernist elites and the Turkish nation-state, which was guided by them, established its own legality on the "others". (Kentel,2007).

Within the framework of Turkish modernization history, Westernization should be regarded as an agent aiming at transforming the traditional society into a modern society and also an agent that is state-based and brings the reign of the state into a privileged position rather than a transition from the traditional society to a modern society.

Republic, which regarded modernization as a way of absolute authority, could not or perhaps did not perceive the society beyond a republican view and was only capable of thinking a community under its own control, pursued largely the patrimonialism[3] tradition of the Ottoman Empire and was insistent in it.

In changing the society, Turkish modernism witnessed its greatest progress during the Republic period. Such elements as history, language, mythology, ideology, religion, culture, legal system, economy, education and so on were utilized as means of modernism by the modernizing state. A developed economy, a uniform education, intelligentsia brought about by the modernist ideology, a legal system establishing the state authority, one party or one leader system mobilizing the public as a whole, and the formal ideology, Kemalism, guiding all these building blocks to the same goal and controlling them, were the fundamental dynamics of the Turkish modernism. (Demir,2008:77)

In Turkey, this structure indicated a situation in which modernism perception was based on imposing, and which was a top-down system and was not grounded on social dynamics; therefore, it can be stated that the authoritarian nature dominated the system.

Another important issue is the modernizing mission of the state perception which symbolizes the unity of the society and is identified with the society within the

[3]The concept was coined by Max Weber for the political science. It can be defined as "state's administering the public from the outside as an upper unit". According to the concept, the public is dependent to the ruler, who is upper unit, with a constant and absolute belonging feeling. In this condition, in the state, a structure similar to the structure of traditional family structure is constituted. The father in the family is regarded as the administering and protecting figure.
The individuals in the family are responsible for obedience and respect to the father whose authority is already recognized. As a matter of fact, they fulfill these obligations. In the house, whatever the father says happens. In exchange for this obedience, the father has the responsibility to protect the members of the family. As a result, a patronage relation is constituted; obedience in return for protection. The father is a member of the family; however, he is so near to the family and yet so far; he is an authority from the upper unit. He administers the family from the outside. The existence of father comprises as a result of an obligation. Without him, there is no family. For this reason, the father is not chosen by the family. Patrimonialism is the adapted form of this classical family to the state. Such that, in patrimonial states the person in power administers the public from the outside. In other words, the power is beyond and above the public and it has an abstract structure. In the patronage relation, the more the power protects and guards the public, the more the obedience of the public increases. In patrimonial states, the powerful one is also the "father" and because he is identified with it, nearly everything is expected from the "parens patriae". The state of patrimonialism is a large family in which the father is "powerful" and the children are "public"-the ruled-.

modernization tradition and is also provided with an absolute power over the society and is centralized. This mission fostering "What is good for the state is good for everyone" belief is a reality strengthening the state with modernism. Within this tradition, the leader representing the integrity of the society, nation and state is a crucial modernizing agent. The leader's commands and decisions determine the course and form of modernization. (Çetin,2003:24)

The leader carries out the best form of everything for the public and in this respect; he or she does not need the approval of the public. Because, although the claim was to change the patrimonial structure taken over from the Ottoman Empire, the methods used in the system were just the same. Since changing the name of the system does not mean a similar change in the sociologic events.

On the contrary to the process encountered by the developed western countries, the state having a centralized, planner and authoritarian mentality could not restrict the management and assimilated the voices that were against the system. This condition, on the one hand, hindered the emergence of social dynamics and on the other hand resulted in the continuity of authoritarian governance perception.

According to Mahçupyan, "Kemalism is the project of changing the things, which will not be and cannot be changed, by an elitist authority". Because of society's being religious and the assumption that the society was against a categorical change and the urgency of the change, the idea of Kemalism was put into a sudden and unexpected, repressive and authoritarian course of action. As a result Kemalism was actualized as a strategy to guide the public to a change for the better by the individuals determining what was good for the public.

The state perception, which was acquainted with good and right and considered that it had the absolute right to intervene in any field without any objection to put itself into effect, could accuse the ones talking about social dynamics and participation of defeatism (or reactionism) without hesitation. This system could not continue its existence without an authoritarian administrative structure. However, a financial infrastructure was also needed for the continuity of authority. To this end, the principle of statism was used as an agent to fill in this "financial gap".

The principle of statism gave the state the opportunity to intervene in any field, especially economy. The state, as a requirement of statism, represented the distributor source of any economic power, facility and wealth to which it could intervene in. (Çetin, 2003: 26).

This structure that became concrete with the principle of statism can be observed in many other fields besides economy.

Populism, which was articulated as “a revolution mythology” by Feroz Ahmad (1995: 91-95) and overemphasized by Kemalism, did not regard the public as composing of different categories but considered it as a community divided into different occupations based on the requirements of the division of labor both in their individual and social lives.

Religion became a matter of conscience as a result of the principle of secularism and the idea of a religion under the control of the state became widespread. It became clear that the state had a regulating role over the religion and as a result, secularism, itself, became an alternative of religion. As a matter of fact, in this sense, with the advent of Kemalism, “an official religion” was established and in another sense, the idea of “religionisation of secularism” emerged. (Erdoğan, 2000:309-313)

The claim of the Republic, which emerged as a result of the assertion that the public cannot decide for themselves regarding what is right, was in fact a result of the principle traditionalized by the past centuries and maintained in the same manner during the Republic. This principle asserted that priority and predominance always belonged to the state as for the state-society relations. A modernization process was realized as a continuity of the basic principles of the Ottoman citizen system and patrimonialism; “fidelity and obedience”. (Çetin,2003:27) Such a state perception during the modernization process resulted in the necessity of modernizing the citizens by the state which regarded them as subjects.

Hence, in fact, the modernization of the society by the state initially lived on patrimonial relation and later fostered the structure itself. In addition, to the extent it accomplished this with the help of statism and other formal ideological principles; an authoritarian administration was necessarily put into effect.

3- ECONOMIC SIDE OF AUTHORITY: STATISM AND COOPERATISM

A planner and authoritarian regime can be observed in the process starting from the early years of the Republic till 1950s. Within this process, economic restructuring was performed in order to control the society. It is unfair to state that there was an absolute totalitarian system in this period. However, it must be admitted that there was a structure resembling to a totalitarian system. Before presenting detailed information regarding the topic, the definitions of the concepts will be given.

3.1 Corporatism and Statism

It is an economic system in which all the production factors of the state organizations are carried out by corporation which is under and in command of the state. The system is tried to be implemented by fascism and even it was the economic system implemented by Mussolini and Hitler during their reign.

Corporatism means organizing the society by encompassing it as a whole according to its own political governance principles by Totalitarianism[4]. According to Schmitter, corporatism can be defined as "a system of interest intermediation in which the constituent units are organized into a limited number of singular, compulsory, noncompetitive, hierarchically ordered and functionally differentiated categories, recognized or licensed (if not created) by the state and granted a deliberate representational monopoly within their respective categories in exchange for observing certain controls on their selection of leaders and articulation of demands and supports" (Linz,1984:190).

According to Linz, this structure can also be defined as "organic statism" or "financial dictatorship". (Linz, 1984:.191) In this system, which was defined as totalitarian and authoritarian by Linz and was organized with regard to a corporative understanding, "final power is in the hands of a governing group of individuals who organizes the system, distributes the shares regarding representation, arbitrates any conflict of interest and resolves all the problems. The leader has the highest share regarding the power". (Linz, 1984:.194)

Such power increases its interventions and control power over the social sphere by using the hierarchical system and the distribution of the benefits established through statism.

It also organizes economic power distribution, besides political power distribution, within the power hierarchy by utilizing governance elements it possesses which are such economical institutions as national banks, money, state economic enterprises and so on. Because, this type distribution helps, on the one hand, maintaining and keeping the hierarchical system determined by the political power and on the other hand, it does not allow denominational and individual disintegrations. This means supporting the sources that support the power. (Çetin,2003:24)

[4] The dictionary meaning of the word derived from the French word "totalitaire" is "A nondemocratic form of a state or regime in which democratic rights and freedom are restrained and all the powers are controlled by one person or a small administrative group."

Statism perception in Turkey is a crucial means of power, because it comprises the most extensive and widest field of intervention opportunity of the state to the public. According to an authoritarian statism perception, the meaning and function of economy is to unify the society as a whole under common interests and shared ideological goals. This perception was used to create a wholistic economic organism. To this end, the state, as the upmost institution of political power, plans the society in terms of economy and there is a centrally governed and controlled economy as in any type of power phenomenon. (Hayek,1999:48)

In corporatism, "there has to be a plan in order to carry out centralized administration and supervision. State, together with the economy, gives instructions regarding what to produce and how much to produce and how to allocate limited sources by utilizing which incentives. In this respect, whole economic system is organized under the control of the state with 3 and 5-year development plans. In fact, this planning effort creates "the way to serfdom" and thanks to the plans, state's opportunities and fields to regulate the society will be broadened. (Fiedrich-Brzezinski, 1964:181).

3.2 Authoritarian State

Although social change is a natural phenomenon, it is also possible to intervene in the process and realize the change in a planned way. This type of change is also called alteration. The change in Turkish modernization or Westernization can be considered in this type. Although the direction and goal of the change, which is realized through planning, is evident in the beginning of the process, reaching the goal is not always possible. Since it is really hard to control and manipulate the factors affecting the change process.

Presenting a proposal for a change without taking the social structure and cultural values into consideration will not be appropriate for the social structure and bring about serious problems. It is inevitable that the society will resist against such a proposal. Indeed, this resistance is the result of its own nature. At this very point, an "authoritarian governance style" emerges in order to change the social structure.

In heading for the goal by eliminating the social resistance emerged during the Westernization process; using oppression and constraint instead of persuasion hinders the idea of progression with self-dynamics of the society. This condition, which is regarded as the biggest drawback of authoritarian structure, produces unquestionably the same results in the social organizations starting from the

smallest to the biggest one: A social structure with an inability to express thoughts, reluctance in codetermination, inhibition and lack of self-confidence.

3.3 Totalitarianism and Statism

Totalitarian state directs the society through the use of such strong claims as production, distribution, development, strong state and so on in order to legitimize the ideological order of the political power in the social consent by way of economy.

Because the totalitarian planning takes the form of the goals determined by the ideology, the extent of it is collective and it is a part of total control of the society by the ideology and this is called as command economy. (Fiedrich-Brzezinski, 1964:188-189)

Therefore, economy becomes an agent of creating a society dependent of political power in the framework of the principles determined by ideological principles. The aim of totalitarian power is to develop the society by favor of the state. Within the scope of centralized, powerful and rational state vision under national development discourse, the basis for the governance of the society by the political power is formed. Development and powerful state discourses create the economic basis of the political power. Because the state is the only source of development in the totalitarian tradition, ideological characterization and commissioning are realized. (İnsel,1993:187-192).

As the economic legitimate sources of the state expand, its power and command to order the society expands. (İnsel,1993:187-192).

When totalitarianism gives economic development to state monopoly, it causes authoritarianism. In order to transform social structure, the heart of authoritarianism, in unity, the state utilizes economic development as a way to control the society and ensure obedience.

Totalitarianism is a structure which regulates the economy with the claim of a common interest, organizes economic relations according to this and takes the system under its own protection. As a matter of course, within this system, the political power controlled by the state leads up to economic power. Because of this, the relations regarding common interest reflects a power relation at every level. The state organizes the political power against individual interest, private ownership and free enterprise and in favor of the integrity of its power by stating that it represents the common interest of the whole society and public's will and asserting that political structure and public's will are the same concepts. As stated

by Hayek, the common characteristic of all collectivist systems is to organize social work in accordance with a specific social goal. According to him, all the collectivist[5] systems are "totalitarian" (Hayek, 1999:80).

State in totalitarian regime not only puts the economic relations into order for the sake of interest but also realizes 'socialization' by means of economy. The society is unified as a whole around common interests and national goals. Together with the society, both the means of compulsion of the state and the ideological elements enter in the process of statism. Within this process, state is the guard and defender of common interest. The real aim and function of this socialization and statism is to secure dominance of the common interest continually. As a result, the corporatist and organizing system based on individual-society-state identity is maintained.

In our opinion, statism, which was constituted because of only economic requirements during the early years of Turkish Republic and resulted in the great influence of the state regarding economy, bares many elements of totalitarianism although it cannot be called a pure totalitarianism. At least, there was a specific ideology and this ideology was imposed on a vast majority of public. For this purpose, as in social and political fields, economy was utilized for statism.

4. RESULT

The authority, which controls economic operations, will not renounce controlling other fields regarding the individuals. The same authority will also decide on the provision of the means that are required by the individuals to realize their own goals. Which individual goals will be allowed and whether they will be allowed or not will also be determined by the same authority. Economic control is not restricted only to one side of individual field, it means controlling all the individual fields. The government controlling these fields will determine about which faith and thoughts and aims are permissible and rightful. (Hayek, 1999:127).

The principle of statism, which came out in the form a solution to development goals during the early years of Republic, became an agent fostering and maintaining the patrimonial relation structure in the process of time. Today, although decreasing in number, the institutions that are only in the public domain indicates that authoritarian statism has not been completely removed yet. Even today, public housings, guest houses, holiday camps, public economic enterprises (e.g. sugar factories) can only be taken advantage of by the elite! staff of the state.

[5] It is an economic policy exercised by the state that monopolizes all the economic institutions.

Because, the state as the conversant of the only existent truth still continues looking down on and governing its own public – in a slightly insulting manner. In fact, at present public bureaucracy, although not much as in the past, is still unwilling to distribute resources to private sector and inclined to continue patronage.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, F. (1995), Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu, Çev. Yavuz Alogan, Sarmal Yayınevi, istanbul.

Akay, A. "Modernliğin Başlangıcı", Hürriyet Gösteri Dergisi, <http://www.felsefeekibi.com/site/default.asp?PG=1171>, 11/10/2007.

Akçura, Y. (2005), Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset, Lotus Yayınevi, Ankara.

Allard, E. (1971), Institionalized Radicalism in Decline of Ideology. (New York).

Altan, M. "Avrupa Parlamentosu'ndaki Konusma", <http://www.ikincicumhuriyet.org/arsiv/arsiv4912.htm>, 30 Mart 2005

Althuser, Louis. (1991), İdeoloji ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları. (Çev: Yusuf Alp-Mahmut Özışık).İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Ardigo, Archillo. (1987), "The Moral Question and Legitimation". Current Sociology. V:5-2,

Sum. Arent,Hannah. (1998), Totalitarizmin Kaynakları II: Emperyalizm.(Çev: Bahadır Sina Şener). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Berger Peter L.-Thomas Luckmann. (1967), The Social Construction of Reality. (New York:Anchor).

Black, Cyril E. (1989), Çağdaşlaşmanın İtici Güçleri. (Çev: M. Fatih Gümüş). Ankara: Verso Yayınları.

Bourricaut, François. (1987), "Legitimacy and Legtimation". Current Sociology. V:5-2, Sum.

Cangızbay, K. (2000), Hiçkimsenin Cumhuriyeti, Ütopya Yayınları, Ankara.

Ceylan T,(2002), Batı ve Batılılaşma Eleştirisi, EKEV Akademi Dergisi, Yıl: 6 Sayı: 13

Çetin H, (2003), "*Gelenek ve Degisim Arasında Kriz: Türk Modernlesmesi*", Dogu- Batı Dergisi, Yıl: 7, Sayı: 25, Kasım-Aralık-Ocak 2003-2004, ss.11-40.

Dagı, D. i. (2001), "Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye: Batılılaşmanın Neresindeyiz?",

Demir,S. & Sesli,M. & Yılmaz,V., Türk Modernleşmesi: Eleştirel Bir Bakış / Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2, (2008: 77-90)

Dietz, M. (1993), "*Baglam Herseydir: Feminizm ve Yurttaslık Teorileri*", (Çev. Esin Asena), Birikim Dergisi, 55: 82-94.

Erdogan. M. (2000), Demokrasi, Laiklik, Resmi İdeoloji, 2. Baskı, Liberte Yay.Ankara.

Erdoğan, Mustafa. (1995), Demokrasi, Laiklik, Resmi İdeoloji. Ankara: LDT.Yayınları.

Friedrich, Carl J.-Zbigniev K. Brzezinski. (1964), Totaliter Diktatörlük ve Otokrasi. (Çev: Oğuz Onaran). Ankara: Türk Siyasi İlimler Derneği Yayınları.

Hayek, Friedrich A.von. (1999), Kölelik Yolu. (Çev:Turhan Feyzioğlu-Yıldıray Arsan). Ankara: Liberte Yay.

Horkheimer, M. ve Adorno, W. T. (1996), Aydınlanmanın Diyalektiği Felsefi Fragmanlar-2, Kabalcı Yayınları, istanbul.

İnsel, A. "Ilerleme ve Ikinci Modernlik", Radikal, 29/09/1996.

İnsel, Ahmet. (1993) İktisat İdeolojisinin Eleştirisi. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları

Kentel, F. "Tepeden inmeci "Çağdaşlığın" Teyakkuz Hali" <http://www.gazetem.net/fkentelyazi.asp?yaziid=338>, 04/10/2007

Kolakowskı, Leszek. (1993), "Totalitarizm ve Yalan", Sosyal-Siyasal Teori. (Çev: Aydın Yalçın, Der: Atilla Yayla).Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi Yayınları.

Köker, L. (2004), Modernlesme, Kemalizm Ve Demokrasi, iletisim Yayınları, istanbul.

Linz, Juan J. (1984), Totaliter ve Otoriter Rejimler. (Çev: Ergun Özbudun). Ankara: Siyasi İlimler Türk Derneği, S Yayınları.

Mahçupyan, E. "Kemalistler Degisimi Niçin Hazmedemiyor?" <http://www.gazetem.net/emahcupyan.asp?yaziid=318>, 10/10/2007.

Mannheım, Karl. (1950) Ideology and Utopia. (Oxford).

Mardin, S. (1997), Türk Modernleşmesi, Der. M. Türköne-T. Önder, İletisim Yayınları, istanbul.

Ortaylı, İ. (2001), İmparatorlugun En Uzun Yüzyılı, İletisim Yay., İstanbul.

Özkul, O. "Modernlesme Ile Insanilesme Iliskisi/Iliskisizliği", <http://www.koprudergisi.com/index.asp?Bolum=EskiSayilar&Goster=Yazi&YaziNo=356>, 05/10/2007.

Tekeli, i. "Modernizm ve Postmodernizm Kavramları Üzerine", <http://www.felsefeekibi.com/site/default.asp?PG=1855>, 10/10/2007.

Türkiye'nin Dıs *Politika Gündemi, Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik*, (Der. Saban H. Çalıs, İhsan D. Dağı, Ramazan Gözen), Liberte Yayınları, Ankara.

Türköne. M. (1994), Türk Modernlesmesi, Lotus Yayınevi, Ankara.

Üsür, S. S. (2004), Otoriter Türk Modernlesmesinin Cinsiyet Rejimi, Bu yazı, Dogu-Batı Dergisi Kasım 2004 sayısında yayınlanmak üzere yazılmıstır. <http://www.fikritakip.com/news.asp?pg=1&yazi=1122>, 24/10/2007.

Wagner, Helmut. (1993), "Parti Diktatörlüğünün Çöküşü, Komünist Yönetimin Safhaları", Sosyal-Siyasal Teori. (Çev: Mustafa Erdoğan) (Der: Atilla Yayla). Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi Yayınları.

Yeşilay B, (2005) Devletçiliğin Türkiye Ekonomisindeki Izdüşümleri, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt: 19 Nisan Sayı: 1

Weber, Max. (1993), Sosyoloji Yazıları, (Çev: Taha Parla).İstanbul: Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları