Eren Dergisi, Sayı 8, Yıl 2026, s.39-50.
Journal of Eren, Issue 8, Year 2026, pp. 39-50.
ROR ID: https://ror.org/00mm4ys28

The Constraints of IMF Conditionality and a Theoritical Evaluation of National Sovereignty

Özgür KIZILTOPRAK, Emircan SABUR

Abstract: International Monetary Fund (IMF) stabilization programs impose significant constraints on national sovereignty and decision-making autonomy through the mechanism of conditionality. By analyzing the impact of IMF conditionality on sovereignty within the frameworks of dependency theory and governmentality, this article highlights a state of IMF-based digital governmentality grounded in Foucault's socio-political analysis of the Panopticon. While dependency theory perceives the IMF as a tool of financial imperialism that sustains global economic hierarchy, governmentality theory argues that the IMF establishes an auto-control mechanism—through normative discourses such as 'good governance'—wherein countries monitor themselves. Emphasizing that conditionality narrows the 'policy space' and leads to institutional hypocrisy, this study asserts that a panopticon order based on digital governmentality has been established over countries whose sovereignties have been eroded. Consequent to IMF mandates, nation-states internalize the surveillance of international financial institutions in a manner akin to subjects within a disciplinary framework, resulting in the voluntary circumscription of their sovereign power Consequently, it is argued that IMF conditionality is a multidimensional technology of power that erodes national sovereignty not only at the economic level but also at the political and discursive levels.

Keywords: IMF, Conditionality, National Sovereignty, Decision-Making Autonomy, Dependency Theory, Governmentality, Panopticon

IMF'in Koşulluk Kıskacı ve Ulusal Egemenlik Üzerine Teorik Değerlendirme

Öz: Uluslararası Para Fonu (IMF) istikrar programları, borçlu ülkelere dayattığı koşulluluk mekanizması aracılığıyla ulusal egemenlik ve karar alma özerkliği üzerinde önemli kısıtlamalar yaratmaktadır. Bu makale, IMF koşulluluğunun egemenlik üzerindeki etkisini Bağımlılık Okulu ve Yönetimsellik (Governmentality) teorileri çerçevesinde analiz ederek Foucault'nun Panoptikon'a yönelik sosyo-politik çözümlemesi esas alan IMF temelli dijital yönetimsellik durumuna dikkat çekmektedir. Bağımlılık Okulu, IMF'yi küresel ekonomik hiyerarşiyi sürdüren bir finansal emperyalizm aracı olarak görürken, Yönetimsellik teorisi, IMF'nin "iyi yönetişim" gibi normatif söylemlerle ülkelerin kendi kendilerini denetlediği bir oto-kontrol mekanizması kurduğunu savunmaktadır. Çalışmada, koşulluluğun "politika alanı"nı daralttığı ve kurumsal ikiyüzlülüğe sebep olduğu vurgulanarak, egemenlikleri aşındırılmış ülkelerin sosyal ve ekonomik politikaları üzerinde dijital yönetimsellik temelli panoptikon düzeninin kurulduğu savunulmuştur. IMF dayatmalarının bir sonucu olarak uluslar, tıpkı disipliner bir çerçeve içindeki özneler gibi, uluslararası finans kuruluşlarının bakışını (gözetimini) içselleştirmekte ve böylece kendi egemenliklerini gönüllü olarak sınırlandırmaktadırlar. Sonuç olarak, IMF koşulluluğunun, ulusal egemenliği sadece ekonomik değil, aynı zamanda siyasi ve söylemsel düzeylerde de aşındıran çok boyutlu bir iktidar teknolojisi olduğu kabul edilmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: IMF, Koşulluluk, Ulusal Egemenlik, Karar Alma Özerkliği, Bağımlılık Okulu, Yönetimsellik, Panoptikon

Atıf için/To cite:
Kızıltoprak, Ö., Sabur, E. (2026). The Constraints of IMF Conditionality and a Theoritical Evaluation of National Sovereignty. *Eren Dergisi*, *VIII*, 39-50.

Özgür KIZILTOPRAK
Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, Bitlis, Türkiye
ORCID: https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-1798-3352
E-posta: okiziltoprak@beu.edu.tr

Emircan SABUR
ORCID: https://orcid.org/ 0009-0001-9266-9312
E-posta: emir.sbr1311@gmail.com

Etik Beyan / Ethical Statement:
Bu çalışma etik kurul izni gerektirmemektedir. / This study does not require an ethics committee approval.

Yapay Zeka Kullanımı / AI Use Declaration:
Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde yazım dili İngilizce olduğu için dil ve gramer kontrolü için yapay zeka tabanlı uygulamalar kullanılmıştır. / As the manuscript was prepared in English, AI-based applications were utilized for language and grammar checks during the drafting process.

Makale Türü / Article Type	Teorik Makale / Theoretical Article
Geliş Tarihi (Received Date)	16/03/2026
Kabul Tarihi (Accepted Date)	09/06/2026
Yayın Tarihi (Published Date)	30/06/2026
Lisans Bilgisi / Copyright	Bu çalışma, yazar(lar) tarafından üretilmiş olup, telif hakları yazar(lar)a aittir. Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) lisansı altında açık erişim olarak yayımlanmaktadır. This work is produced by the author(s) and the copyright belongs to the author(s). It is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license as open access.

Yazar(lar)ın Beyanı / Authors' Declarations:

Araştırmacıların katkı oranı beyanı: %50 Özgür Kızıltoprak, %50 Emircan Sabur. Etik Kurul Kararı: Etik Kurul iznine gerek yoktur. Çatışma beyanı: Çalışma kapsamında herhangi bir kurum veya kişi ile çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır. Destek ve teşekkür: Çalışma herhangi bir destek almamıştır. Teşekkür edilecek bir kurum veya kişi bulunmamaktadır.

Introduction

Financial assistance provided by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) plays a critical role in maintaining global economic stability. However, this support is generally subject to a series of economic and structural reform requirements imposed on debtor nations, known as 'conditionality.' While the primary objective of these conditions is to ensure the borrowing country regains its solvency and to safeguard global financial stability, this mechanism exerts profound and controversial effects on the national sovereignty and decision-making autonomy of debtor states. This article aims to examine the restrictive impact of IMF stabilization programs on the decision-making autonomy of, particularly, developing nations through a comprehensive theoretical analysis. As Rodrik (2018) argues in his updated analysis of the "globalization paradox," the tension between international economic integration and national democratic choice has reached a critical juncture where IMF mandates often serve as the primary vehicle for bypassing domestic legislative processes.

Although IMF conditionality is traditionally viewed as a technical instrument for ensuring fiscal discipline, in practice, it has transformed into a political tool that directly influences, and even dictates, the budgetary, monetary, and social policy preferences of national governments. This situation raises the issue of the transfer or restriction of policy-making authority—one of the fundamental pillars of national sovereignty—to or by an international institution. This article will analyze this tension in depth through two primary theoretical frameworks: Dependency Theory and Governmentality.

From the perspective of Dependency School, IMF programs will be examined as a mechanism that makes developing countries dependent on Western powers at the center of the global economic hierarchy and their financial interests. Furthermore, the article will examine the effects of IMF programs on sovereignty in terms of Policy Space Contraction, Institutional Hypocrisy, and Legitimacy. The study argues that IMF conditionality is not only an economic necessity but also a political power technology that redefines and constrains national sovereignty. Crucially, these two frameworks are not parallel but deeply intertwined: Dependency Theory reveals the macro-structural conditions—asymmetric core-periphery relations—under which the IMF operates, while Foucault's Governmentality explains the micro-political mechanisms through which those structural constraints are internalized as the state's own rationality. They complement each other insofar as structural dependency creates the material vulnerability that renders governmentality techniques effective. Yet they also generate a productive analytical tension: whereas Dependency Theory foregrounds external economic coercion and structural determination, Governmentality emphasizes the productive, self-fashioning dimension of power, suggesting that states are not merely passive victims but active participants in their own disciplining. It is at this intersection—between structural subjugation and subjectivized self-regulation—that IMF conditionality operates most powerfully.

Conceptual Framework

Conditionality refers to the set of macroeconomic and structural reforms that the IMF requires a country to implement in exchange for providing it with a loan. These conditions typically include policies such as fiscal tightening, privatization, trade liberalization, and central bank independence. National sovereignty, on the other hand, means that a state has the highest and final decision-making authority over its own territory. IMF conditionality effectively erodes this principle of sovereignty by forcing national governments to conform their economic policies to a framework determined externally.

The effects of IMF conditionality on sovereignty have been a subject of debate in the International Political Economy (IPE) literature for decades. While early studies viewed conditionality as a technical necessity, critical approaches have gained prominence since the 1990s. National sovereignties have been eroded alongside IMF conditionality. The resulting erosion of national sovereignty has formed the basis of all conceptual approaches.

One of the strongest empirical pieces of evidence regarding how IMF conditionality constrains national sovereignty centers around the concept of "Policy Space". Building on earlier findings, Kentikelenis and Babb

(2019) demonstrate that while the number of conditions per program seemed to decline, the “depth” and “intrusiveness” of structural requirements—targeting core legislative functions—have actually intensified in the post-2015 era. Alexander E. Kentikelenis, Thomas H. Stubbs, and Lawrence King (2016), in their study examining IMF programs between 1985 and 2014, showed that the scope of conditionality has expanded over time and narrowed the policy tools that debtor countries can use to achieve their development goals. Structural conditionality, in particular, targets not only macroeconomic stability but also areas such as labor markets, social security, and environmental regulations, significantly restricting the maneuvering room of national governments. This narrowing finds theoretical ground in Dani Rodrik's (2000) concept of the “Political Trilemma of the World Economy.” In his more recent work, Rodrik (2024) emphasizes that “hyper-globalization” via institutional impositions has further hollowed out the state’s capacity to respond to its citizens’ demands, prioritizing external “market credibility” over internal “social contracts” (Rodrik, 2024). Rodrik argues that only two of global economic integration, national sovereignty, and democratic politics can be sustained at the same time. IMF programs tend to sacrifice national sovereignty and democracy by prioritizing global integration (the liberalization of capital movements). One of the concepts developed regarding the IMF’s conditionality-based lending policies is the concept of organized hypocrisy.

One of the harshest criticisms of IMF policies came from Joseph Stiglitz. In Globalization and Its Discontents Revisited (2018), Stiglitz reinforces his argument that the Fund’s approach remains trapped in a neoliberal orthodoxy that fails to account for market imperfections. In his book *Globalization and Its Discontents* (2002), Stiglitz, former Chief Economist of the World Bank, argues that the IMF's policies based on the “Washington Consensus” have plunged developing countries into crisis rather than pulling them out, and that these policies are driven by ideological blindness. According to Stiglitz, the IMF's one-size-fits-all prescriptions undermine national decision-making processes and create legitimacy problems by ignoring local conditions and social costs.

The concept of Institutional Hypocrisy has been used to analyze the inconsistency between the IMF's rhetoric and actions. Developed by Nils Brunsson (2002), this concept argues that international organizations develop discourses containing high moral standards (e.g., fighting poverty, transparency) to maintain their legitimacy, but engage in actions that contradict these discourses due to operational requirements (e.g., debt repayment, financial stability). Academics such as Selin Metinsoy (2019) characterize the IMF's reform efforts as “Organized Hypocrisy,” arguing that the institution has undergone a rhetorical shift to manage its legitimacy crisis, but that its fundamental policies have not changed.

The effects of IMF programs on domestic politics, on the other hand, have been examined in detail through the quantitative studies of James R. Vreeland (2019). Vreeland (2019) further elaborates that the “scapegoat” function of the IMF has become more complex in the digital age; while leaders use the Fund to deflect blame for unpopular reforms, the resulting “democratic deficit” fuels populist backlashes that ultimately destabilize the very global financial order the IMF seeks to protect (Vreeland, 2019). In his book *The IMF and Economic Development* and his articles, Vreeland has shown that participation in IMF programs negatively affects countries' economic growth and increases political instability. Vreeland's analysis reveals that the IMF's conditionality allows local politicians to use the IMF as a “scapegoat” for implementing unpopular reforms (e.g., devaluation), but that this increases political costs and undermines democratic accountability. These findings show that conditionality deeply affects not only foreign policy but also the dynamics of domestic politics.

Dependency School and Financial Imperialism

One of the most powerful critical frameworks for understanding the impact of IMF conditionality on national sovereignty is Dependency Theory. Emerging in Latin America in the 1960s, this theory argues that the global economic system is inherently unequal and enriches developed “core” countries by transferring resources from developing “periphery” countries. According to this perspective, international financial institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank are tools that perpetuate and legitimize this unequal structure.

The School of Dependency views IMF programs as a mechanism that deepens the structural dependency of developing countries. The policies demanded by the IMF (e.g., trade liberalization, capital movement liberalization, privatization) aim to facilitate easier access for global capital from core countries to the markets and resources of peripheral countries. This situation eliminates the ability of peripheral countries to determine their own national development strategies.

Financial Imperialism and Decision-Making Autonomy

According to dependency theorists, IMF conditionality represents a new form of financial imperialism. Instead of direct military or political control, sovereignty is constrained through economic tools (debt and conditionality). Debt-ridden countries are forced to implement the policies imposed by the IMF, even if they are not in line with their national interests; otherwise, they face the risk of being excluded from the international financial system. This situation reinforces the perception that decisions are made not in national capitals, but at the IMF headquarters in Washington, D.C.

For example, the liberalization of capital markets, which the IMF frequently demands, makes developing countries more vulnerable to global financial fluctuations. Joseph Stiglitz (2002) argues that these policies, particularly during the Asian Financial Crisis, pushed countries into crisis rather than pulling them out, and handed control of national economies over to international speculators. The Dependency School's fundamental thesis is that such policies serve the interests of financial institutions in core countries and surrender the sovereignty of peripheral countries to this global capital at the expense of their own citizens' welfare.

The Erosion of Structural Dependency and Decision-Making Autonomy

The programs presented by the IMF under the name of “structural adjustment” are profound intervention tools directed at the state's autonomous decision-making sphere, rather than mere technical economic reform packages. When evaluated from the perspective of the Dependency School, this situation reveals a relationship of “financial tutelage” that reinforces the structural dependency of peripheral countries on the core and turns the debt spiral into a long-term condition. In his work *Kicking Away the Ladder* (2003), Ha-Joon Chang concretizes this process using the metaphor of “kicking away the ladder.” According to Chang, developed countries are indirectly pulling the development ladder out from under developing countries by prohibiting them, via the IMF, from utilizing the very protectionist policies that historically enabled their own development.

As Joseph Stiglitz (2002) emphasizes, this theoretical constriction transforms into an empirical devastation through a 'one-size-fits-all' approach that disregards local conditions. Indeed, Argentina’s experience during the 2001 crisis painfully demonstrated how indexing monetary policy to an external anchor eliminated the room for maneuver, leading to decisions being made by IMF boards in Washington rather than in Buenos Aires. A similar process was observed in South Korea during the 1997 Asian Crisis and more recently in the case of Greece. In these countries, while the jurisdiction of parliaments narrowed, decisions directly affecting the public—ranging from labor laws to pension systems—were transformed into 'conditions' in exchange for credit approval. Ultimately, the issue is not merely one of financial assistance; it is the institutionalization of the rationality of 'governmentality,' as Michel Foucault (2007) termed it. States now prioritize the reactions of creditors when determining their policies, which weakens democratic legitimacy while confining sovereignty within a restrictive sphere. In this process, it is observed that sovereignty is eroded from within, and the societal reflections of structural dependency become manifest in unemployment data.

The concept of 'financial tutelage' discussed above has not only locked the decision-making mechanisms of the state but has also pushed social costs to unavoidable levels through the implementation of 'austerity' policies. As Dani Rodrik (2011) states in his 'trilemma' of globalization, the IMF's crisis management policies are built upon the sacrifice of national democracy and social welfare for the sake of global financial integration. The operation of this mechanism is quite straightforward: to release credit tranches, the IMF mandates budget cuts and the 'flexibilization' of the labor market as preconditions. In this process, which David Harvey (2005) defines as the 'restoration of class power,' the restriction of public spending in Argentina, the neutralization of the union system in South Korea, and the collapse of the social security net under the impositions of the Troika in Greece have turned unemployment into a structural issue. The following table summarizes the balance sheet of the human condition created by these 'stability' programs at the point where the state, by exercising its sovereign power, loses its reflex to protect its citizens.

Governmentality and Mechanisms of Self-Control

Another powerful theoretical framework analyzing the impact of IMF conditionality on sovereignty is Michel Foucault's concept of Governmentality (Foucault, 2007). This approach examines how power operates not only through the state's repressive apparatus but also through more subtle, normative mechanisms that encourage subjects to govern themselves.

From a governance perspective, the IMF's power stems not so much from issuing direct orders as from promoting a certain rationality of government. The IMF presents concepts such as “good governance,” “transparency,” “accountability,” and “market discipline” as universal and technically neutral standards. These standards are internalized by the governments and bureaucrats of debtor countries, and as a result, countries begin to see acting in accordance with the IMF's expectations not as an external obligation, but as a necessity for their own “good.”

Three concrete institutional mechanisms operationalize this Foucauldian rationality of government. First, Article IV Consultations—the IMF’s annual bilateral surveillance exercise mandated by its Articles of Agreement—function as a ritual of governmentality: national finance ministries and central banks are compelled to submit detailed macroeconomic data and to engage in a structured dialogue whose very grammar is set by the Fund’s analytical frameworks (IMF, 2024). As Foucault (2007) theorized, the examination is never merely diagnostic; it simultaneously normalizes, because the subjects begin to anticipate the examiner’s gaze and adjust their conduct accordingly. Second, real-time data monitoring systems—such as the IMF’s Special Data Dissemination Standards Plus (SDDS Plus) and the IMF Data Portal—extend this surveillance beyond the annual consultation into a continuous, 24/7 regime of fiscal transparency, transforming the budgetary process from a sovereign deliberative act into a performance staged for an always-watching audience. Third, credit-rating algorithms deployed by agencies such as Moody’s, S&P, and Fitch translate the IMF’s normative expectations into quantified, market-readable scores (Sinclair, 2005). A sovereign downgrade is not merely a financial event; it is a disciplinary verdict that triggers capital flight, currency depreciation, and social unrest, thereby creating powerful incentives for governments to self-correct fiscal behavior well before any formal IMF program is initiated. Taken together, these three mechanisms constitute what Foucault (2007) would recognize as an apparatus (dispositif) of governmentality: a heterogeneous ensemble of institutions, procedures, calculations, and discourses that produce and manage fiscally “responsible” state subjects.

IMF conditionality operates in a manner similar to the disciplinary mechanisms discussed by Foucault. Conditionality compels national decision-making processes to conform to a framework acceptable to the IMF. This involves restructuring the structure and functioning of national institutions (e.g., the Central Bank, the Treasury) in accordance with the norms prescribed by the IMF. For example, demanding the independence of the Central Bank means removing monetary policy from national political pressures; however, it also means bringing these policies into line with the IMF's rationale of global financial stability.

In this process, national sovereignty is not directly rejected; rather, it is redefined. “Sovereignty” is no longer presented as the ability of the national government to implement the policies it desires, but rather as the ability to govern in a “rational” and “responsible” manner, in line with IMF standards. The better a country meets the “good governance” criteria set by the IMF, the more ‘sovereign’ and “reliable” it is considered. This creates a self-control mechanism: the country establishes its own internal control and discipline mechanisms to meet the IMF's conditions. Thus, the IMF can control national decision-making processes remotely and normatively, without the need for direct intervention.

At this juncture, it is necessary to map systematically how Dependency Theory and Governmentality both complement and strain against each other in analyzing IMF conditionality. Their complementarity is most visible at the structural level: Dependency Theory—rooted in Cardoso and Faletto's (1979) analysis of associated-dependent development—identifies the macro-historical conditions of asymmetric capital flows, technological dependence, and surplus extraction that predispose peripheral states to accept IMF terms. 0n the other hand, will argue that the IMF establishes then explains why such acceptance does not require overt coercion: once a state's fiscal rationality has been reconstituted around IMF benchmarks—debt-to-GDP targets, primary surplus requirements, inflation ceilings—the external constraint becomes an internal norm (Larner & Walters, 2004). The state no longer needs to be forced to implement austerity; it polices itself. Yet the two frameworks also generate a productive theoretical tension. Dependency Theory implies a relatively determined structure in which peripheral agency is minimal and the center-periphery hierarchy reproduces itself through economic coercion. Foucauldian Governmentality, by contrast, is fundamentally a theory of productive power: power does not merely repress but creates subjects, rationalities, and desires. Applied to the IMF context, this means that governmentality theory can account for cases that Dependency Theory struggles to explain—such as why some middle-income countries voluntarily adopt IMF-style fiscal frameworks even without a formal lending program, or why technocratic elites in debtor countries often become genuine advocates of neoliberal conditionality. A fully adequate theory of IMF power must therefore operate on two levels simultaneously: the structural (dependency) and the subjectivizing (governmentality).

The Convergence of the Panopticon and Governmentality: A Synthesis of IMF Conditionality

Based on the socio-political analysis of Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon model, as further developed by Michel Foucault, this study examines the structural tension between contemporary digital surveillance practices and the principles of the rule of law. By adapting Bentham's Panopticon to contemporary IMF conditionality, the following synthesis emerges:

In the Panoptic model, the inmate internalizes the "gaze" of an invisible observer, leading to self-regulation. Similarly, IMF conditionality functions as a global financial Panopticon. Through Article IV consultations and continuous data-reporting mechanisms, national economies are rendered transparent to the "central tower" of international financial institutions.

To ground this analogy theoretically, three Foucauldian mechanisms from "Discipline and Punish" (Foucault, 1977) are operative in Article IV consultations. First, hierarchical observation is enacted through IMF Staff Country Reports, in which Fund economists assess national fiscal "health" against a standardized set of indicators and implicitly rank countries against an idealized norm of macroeconomic prudence. Second, normalizing judgment occurs through the public dissemination of Article IV Staff Reports, which converts a bilateral consultation into a public verdict read by financial markets. Third, the examination takes the form of the Debt Sustainability Analysis (DSA) framework, which generates a "sustainable" debt trajectory and defines all deviations from it as "irresponsible." When integrated with real-time credit-rating algorithmic surveillance—whereby any fiscal deviation is immediately penalized through sovereign spread widening—the system achieves what Foucault (1977) described as the "automatic functioning of power": surveillance need not be constant because it has been internalized. Dependency theory explains why peripheral states are structurally compelled to submit to this apparatus; governmentality theory explains why they come to desire it.

This internalization process is significantly amplified in the digital era through what can be termed the "Algorithmic Panopticon." Unlike the traditional architectural model, the digital version operates through real-time data streams and high-frequency fiscal monitoring. The "central tower" is no longer a physical structure in Washington D.C., but a decentralized network of databases, credit rating algorithms, and Bloomberg terminals. When a developing nation integrates into this digital architecture, its fiscal "vital signs"—debt-to-GDP ratios, central bank reserves, and inflation targets—are broadcasted 24/7. This constant visibility creates a state of "permanent fiscal anxiety." The state, fearing an algorithmic downgrade or a sudden capital flight triggered by a misinterpreted data point, engages in a radical form of self-discipline.

Foucault’s concept of governmentality explains how power reshapes the state’s own rationality. Under IMF programs, sovereignty is not overtly annexed; rather, it is redefined through **normative normalization**. States are encouraged to adopt “disciplined” fiscal policies—such as austerity measures and structural reforms—not solely through external coercion, but through the internalization of global financial standards. This represents a shift from sovereign command to a form of conduct where the state governs itself according to the gaze of the international community.

This shift signifies the birth of the “Managerial State,” where the traditional “Social Contract” between the citizen and the sovereign is replaced by a “Financial Contract” between the state and global creditors. Governmentality, in this context, acts as a software update for the state's operating system. The rationality of the state is no longer grounded in the “Common Good” (Bonum Commune) but in “Fiscal Solvency.” Consequently, the democratic deliberation of a national parliament is viewed as a “noise” or an “interference” that disrupts the clean transmission of economic data. The political sphere is thus depoliticized; sensitive issues like labor rights, pension ages, and healthcare subsidies are transformed into mere technical variables within a stability equation. The state, through this internalized governmentality, begins to view its own population as a collection of “risks” or “assets” to be managed in accordance with the IMF’s structural adjustment benchmarks. The citizen is no longer an agent of sovereignty but a data point in a debt-sustainbility analysis.

The synthesis reveals a profound tension between this panoptic surveillance and the **rule of law**. While the rule of law demands legal certainty, transparency, and democratic accountability, the panoptic nature of IMF conditionality often operates through technocratic, discretionary, and “invisible” decision-making processes. This renders the “power of the purse”—the core of national parliamentary sovereignty—subordinate to the invisible requirements of global financial surveillance.

The erosion of the Rule of Law is most evident in the “Legal Exceptionalism” that often accompanies IMF interventions. To comply with “Prior Actions” demanded by the Fund, governments frequently resort to executive decrees or fast-track legislation, bypassing the slow, deliberative processes of constitutional democracy. This creates a dual legal reality: a formal constitution that promises social rights, and a “shadow constitution” dictated by the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). In this digital panopticon, the “judge” is the market, and the “verdict” is rendered in basis points. There is no right to appeal against an algorithmic assessment. The discretionary power of IMF technocrats, combined with the automated surveillance of digital finance, creates a zone of “legal invisibility” where the protection of the vulnerable is sacrificed for the protection of the currency.

Ultimately, contemporary IMF conditionality transforms the sovereign state into a subject within a digital Panopticon. As Foucault argued, this state of being observed induces a process of **self-censorship** and normalization. Sovereignty is no longer a shield against external interference; instead, it has become a performance space where the state must constantly prove its “compliance” with the normative gaze of the global financial architecture. In the final analysis, the “Digital Panopticon” does not just watch the state; it re-engineers it. The state’s “autonomy” becomes a scripted performance, a ritual of “good governance” that conceals the hollowing out of democratic substance. The sovereign, once the highest decider of the state's destiny, is reduced to a “compliance officer” in a global architectural system of debt and data.

Technocratic Governance and the Shrinking of Policy Space: Structural Adjustment in the Turkish Economy Between 2000-2008 (An Illustrative Case)

In terms of concretizing the restrictive impact of IMF conditionality on national decision-making autonomy, the transformation process Turkey experienced following the 2001 crisis serves as a classic case for the discussions on 'shrinking policy space' in the literature. During this period, Turkey experienced not only a macroeconomic stability program but also a 'structural adjustment' process in which the administrative reality of the state was reorganized according to global financial norms.

The Detachment of Politics from Action and Technocratic Tutelage

The appointment of Kemal Derviş, who hailed from the World Bank, as the Minister of State responsible for the economy immediately following the 2001 crisis is a concrete example of the 'transfer of technocrats from the core to the periphery'—a phenomenon presented by the Dependency School regarding core-periphery relations (Öniş & Şenses, 2005). During this process, sovereignty was withheld from the representatives or the will of the people and devolved to 'independent' regulatory boards that, in reality, operated according to the norms of global capital. Although this phenomenon may appear as a decentralization of power in the Foucaultian sense, it is, in fact, the evolution of national politics into an 'auto-control' mechanism under IMF supervision.

15 Laws in 15 Days" and the Limits of Legislative Autonomy

The legislative process, publicly known as '15 Laws in 15 Days' and presented by the IMF as a precondition for releasing credit tranches, demonstrated how the right to legislate—the most fundamental element of national sovereignty—was surrendered to an external will. Specifically, regulations such as the Sugar Law and the Tobacco Law restricted the state's powers in agricultural subsidies and strategic planning, thereby narrowing the 'policy space' by exposing the agricultural sector directly to global market dynamics (Yalman, 2009). The rapid passage of these laws under the pressure of 'conditionality,' rather than through parliamentary deliberations, shaped the tension between democratic legitimacy and financial necessity.

Fiscal Discipline and the 6.5% Primary Surplus Target

The most characteristic 'governmentality' tool of the Turkish economy during this period was the 'primary surplus' target, set at 6.5% of the GDP. This target restricted the state's power to formulate a budget—which is the most primary sovereign right of the modern state—at the expense of social spending and public investment, for the sake of a commitment made to the IMF (Yeldan, 2006). This disciplined fiscal stance went beyond external coercion and evolved into a process of 'internalized auditing,' where governments defined their own success criteria according to the 'confidence' index of global financial markets.

In light of all these data, the Turkish experience demonstrates that IMF programs are far from being mere technical economic prescriptions; instead, they serve as strategic intervention tools that radically transform national decision-making mechanisms. This process is the manifestation of a multi-layered technology of power, in which politics is 'depoliticized' by being confined to a technocratic level, and sovereign rights are redefined around 'market-friendly' criteria.

Sociological and Economic Consequences: The Social Balance Sheet of Austerity

The gap between the targeted macroeconomic recovery on paper and the reality on the street is the most controversial legacy of IMF prescriptions. To reduce the success of stability programs merely to budget balances or inflation rates means overlooking the actual destruction these policies inflict on the capillaries of society—namely, the 'human cost'.

While 'austerity' policies diminish the role of the state in the economy, they effectively liquidate the principle of the 'social state,' which is the most fundamental source of legitimacy for the modern state. In particular, sharp cuts in public spending lead to the commodification of essential services such as education and healthcare, transferring the cost of the crisis from capital groups to the most vulnerable segments of society. This approach, which Joseph Stiglitz (2002) criticizes as 'market fundamentalism,' leads to the chronicization of poverty alongside the weakening of social safety nets.

The most concrete area where economic rationality clashes with sociological reality is the labor markets. As confirmed by the unemployment data presented under the title 'Evaluation of Structural Dependency and Decision-Making Autonomy Through Case Studies: Ha-Joon Chang (2022) updates his "Kicking Away the Ladder" thesis by arguing that modern IMF conditionality now includes "green" and "digital" conditionalities which, while appearing progressive, often function as new barriers to entry for developing nations, preventing them from using the same industrial policy tools once employed by the West (Chang, 2022). The 'labor market flexibility' demanded by the IMF entails the elimination of job security, the suppression of real wages, and the erosion of union rights. This situation has not only created a statistical increase in unemployment but has also constructed a 'regime of precariousness' (Standing, 2011) where the working class is impoverished (the working poor) and future anxiety triggers social insecurity. The cycle of political impotence pointed out in Vreeland's (2003) work comes into play precisely at this point: when a state that has lost its economic sovereignty fails to fulfill its commitment to protect the welfare of its citizens, the 'social contract' between the state and the citizen is damaged, and the resulting legitimacy gap is filled with social unrest. Consequently, IMF conditionality is seen not merely as a tool for economic restoration, but as a structural intervention that widens the income distribution gap between social classes and threatens the sociological existence of the state.

Total Utility and Decision-Making Autonomy: The Paradox of Stability and Destruction

Whether the constraints imposed by IMF interventions—which render countries' decision-making lenses ineffective—provide a 'total utility' in the global system creates a chronic polarization. At the heart of the debate lies the question of whether the intervention is a tool for fiscal discipline or a yoke that erodes sovereignty. In his fundamental critique, James Vreeland (2003) argues that far from increasing economic growth, IMF programs generally slow it down and deepen income inequality. According to Vreeland, the devolution of decision-making authority to a supranational institution damages the democratic accountability of governments toward their own rights, while turning the IMF into a mere 'tool' for the implementation of unpopular policies. From this perspective, the violation of sovereignty ceases to be a mere technical choice and becomes a process in which the welfare of the vulnerable segments of society is sacrificed for the sake of global financial institutions."

In contrast, figures such as Kenneth Rogoff (2003) within neoclassical literature view this intervention as a 'necessary surgical operation,' reminding us that the IMF intervenes in economies that have already lost the ability to produce rational policies and are spiraling into chaos. From this viewpoint, the temporary restriction of autonomy is defended as a price that must be paid to preserve long-term total utility. Proponents of this view argue that without IMF assistance, historical unemployment figures would have reached far more chaotic levels, asserting that these interventions are not an instrument of destruction but rather an 'effort to prevent the worst-case scenario.

When considering the situation we have encountered in the past through the data in Table 1, the vast gap between statistical successes and human realities is laid bare. If reducing inflation in an economy brings millions of people face-to-face with unemployment and welfare crises, the question arises: for what sake was the state's sovereignty to protect its citizens' welfare devolved? The disconnect between the decision-making lens in Washington and the society that personally pays the price for those decisions represents the greatest legitimacy crisis of global governance. Sovereignty gains a democratic meaning only as long as it can guarantee the welfare of the people.

In conclusion, although interference with decision-making autonomy may ensure short-term debt sustainability, it disrupts the sociological bond between the state and its people in the long run. Reducing the concept of 'total utility' solely to financial indicators marginalizes the human element and hollows out sovereignty, transforming it into a mere technical procedure.

Conclusion

This article examines the multidimensional and restrictive effects of IMF conditionality on the national sovereignty and decision-making autonomy of debtor countries. The analysis reveals that IMF programs are not merely a technical financial aid instrument, but also a powerful political power technology that redefines and constrains national sovereignty.

The main findings of the article are supported by Dependency School and Governance theories. The Dependency School positions IMF conditionality as a form of financial imperialism that binds developing countries to the center of the global economic hierarchy. Governance theory, on the other hand, emphasizes that the IMF's power operates not through direct coercion but through normative discourses such as "good governance," thereby establishing a self-monitoring mechanism that enables countries to regulate themselves.

The analysis deepens the impact of conditionality on sovereignty in three practical dimensions: Policy Space Constraint, Institutional Hypocrisy, and Legitimacy Crisis. In the digital era, this impact has evolved into an "Algorithmic Panopticon," where the sovereign state is subjected to real-time fiscal surveillance through decentralized data networks and credit-scoring mechanisms. This technological transformation forces nations to internalize a state of "permanent fiscal anxiety," leading to a radical form of self-discipline that preempts social needs to satisfy the perceived "gaze" of global markets. Consequently, the traditional "Social Contract" is being superseded by a "Financial Contract," effectively hollowing out democratic substance and transforming the sovereign into a mere "compliance officer" within a global architectural system of debt and data. Consequently, IMF conditionality is a phenomenon that reflects the complex nature of national sovereignty in the modern world. Sovereignty is no longer an absolute and indivisible concept; it has become an area that is constantly negotiated and constrained under the normative and structural pressures of international financial institutions.

Furthermore, IMF conditionality emerges as a manifestation of digital governmentality, reflecting Foucault's socio-political analysis of the Panopticon. The state, much like Bentham's inmate, internalizes the gaze of international financial institutions, thereby voluntarily circumscribing its own sovereignty. Ultimately, the legal and democratic deliberation of parliaments is increasingly marginalized by the "legal exceptionalism" inherent in IMF mandates, where the protection of the vulnerable is sacrificed for the technical stability of the currency.

Future research should examine in greater depth the long-term social and political costs of IMF programs, particularly their impact on areas of social sovereignty such as health and education. Furthermore, the IMF's recent reform efforts should be critically assessed to determine whether they have broken the cycle of institutional hypocrisy and whether they have truly opened up more policy space for debtor countries.

References

Brunsson, N. (2002). *The organization of hypocrisy: Talk, decisions and actions in organizations*. Stanford University Press.

Cardoso, F. H., & Faletto, E. (1979). *Dependency and development in Latin America*. University of California Press.

Chang, H. J. (2003). *Kalkınma Reçetelerinin Gerçek Yüzü* (Çev. A. Toker). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Chang, H.-J. (2022). *Edible economics: A hungry economist explains the world*. PublicAffairs.

Derviş, K., Asker, S., & Işık, Y. (2006). *Recovery from the Crisis and Beyond*. The World Bank.

Drazen, A. (2004). Conditionality and ownership in IMF lending: A political economy approach. *Globalization and the nation state* içinde (ss. 177-208). Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (2007). "Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–1978". Palgrave Macmillan.

Harvey, D. (2005). "A brief history of neoliberalism". Oxford University Press.

International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2024). *International Financial Statistics (IFS)*. https://data.imf.org

Kentikelenis, A. E., Stubbs, T. H., & King, L. P. (2016). IMF conditionality and development policy space, 1985–2014. "Review of International Political Economy", 23(4), 543–582. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2016.1174953

Kentikelenis, A. E., & Babb, S. (2019). The International Monetary Fund and the production of austerity. *Critical Sociology*, *45*(4–5), 641–659. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920517745409

Larner, W., & Walters, W. (Eds.). (2004). *Global governmentality: Governing international spaces*. Routledge.

Metinsoy, S. (2019). "Unending reform attempts at the IMF: Organized hypocrisy or bricolage". E-International Relations. https://www.e-ir.info/2019/11/18/unending-reform-attempts-at-the-imf-organized-hypocrisy-or-bricolage/

Öniş, Z., & Şenses, F. (2005). Turkey and the Global Economy: Neo-liberal Restructuring and Integration in the Post-Crisis Era. *Routledge*.

Rodrik, D. (2000). How far will international economic integration go? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *14*(1), 177–186. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.14.1.177

Rodrik, D. (2011). *The globalization paradox: Democracy and the future of the world economy*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Rodrik, D. (2018). *Straight talk on trade: Ideas for a sane world economy*. Princeton University Press.

Rodrik, D. (2024). *The new era of industrial policy*. Oxford Review of Economic Policy. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grad056

Rogoff, K. (2003). The IMF Strikes Back. *Foreign Policy*, (134), 38-46

Seabrooke, L. (2007). Legitimacy gaps in the world economy: Explaining the sources of the IMF's legitimacy crisis. "International Politics", 44 (2-3), 289-305. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ip.8800189

Sinclair, T. J. (2005). *The new masters of capital: American bond rating agencies and the politics of creditworthiness*. Cornell University Press.

Shandra, J. M., & Wolcott, M. D. (2011). A cross-national analysis of forest loss: The role of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. "International Journal of Comparative Sociology", 52 (1), 3-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715210377155

Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). "Globalization and its discontents". W. W. Norton & Company.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2018). *Globalization and its discontents revisited: Anti-globalization in the era of Trump*. W. W. Norton & Company.

T.C. Hazine Müsteşarlığı. (2001). *Türkiye'nin Güçlü Ekonomiye Geçiş Programı*. Ankara.

T.C. Ticaret Bakanlığı. (2021). *Yeşil Mutabakat Eylem Planı 2021*. Ankara: Ticaret Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Vreeland, J. R. (2003). "The IMF and economic development". Cambridge University Press.

Vreeland, J. R. (2019). The International Monetary Fund: Politics of conditional lending. In *The Oxford Handbook of International Organizations*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199672202.013.23

Wade, R. H. (2003). What strategies are viable for developing countries today? The World Trade Organization and the shrinking of 'development space'. "Review of International Political Economy", 10 (4), 621-644. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290310001601902

World Bank. (2024). *Unemployment, total (% of total labor force) (modeled ILO estimate) - Argentina, Korea, Rep., Greece*. World Bank Open Data. https://data.worldbank.org

Yalman, G. L. (2009). *Transition to Neoliberalism: The Case of Turkey in the 1980s*. İstanbul Bilgi University Press.

Yeldan, E. (2006). *Küreselleşme Kimin İçin? Türkiye'de Sermaye Akımları, Kriz ve İstihdam*. Yordam Kitap.