

EURASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

www.eurasianpublications.com

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE STATE AND MIGRANTS IN THE RISK SOCIETY: IDENTITIES, MEDIA AND DIASPORAS*

Devrim Ozkan

The University of Buckingham, UK

E-mail:devrim.ozkan@buckingham.ac.uk, ozkandev@hotmail.com

Abstract

The tendency of modern political regimes to transform the society into becoming “uniform” causes various social problems. Modern nation states try to shape all citizens in a manner that they act in coordination with each other in all the stages of the democratic processes. However, the modern world system which makes the labor migration unavoidable in turn causes the emergence of multi-cultural metropolises. This leads to a “risk society” with a high potential of conflict; because as the modern state tries to ensure that the society acts in harmony, social groups such as minorities and diasporas that represent different identities show resistance. During this process, the media is utilized as the ideological apparatus of the state in order to attain social integrity and harmony. In this study, the social and political issues that arise due to the impact of mass migration in societies which are aimed to be made “uniform” by the modern centralized powers are to be investigated.

Keywords: Centralized Power, Risk Society, Identity, Media, Diaspora

1. Introduction

After the modern political ideas and regimes made the participation of the people to the politics their top priority, all the economic and social constructs have been restructured. The modern political practices which lead people to integrate with the state cause the emergence of a “uniform” social structure. In modern “nation states” the individuals who participate in the operation of the state institutions through democracy are shaped by the actions of the “centralized power”. However, the practices of the “modern world system” which inevitably cause labor migration leads to emergence of “cosmopolitan” metropolises. This in turn leads to a tension between the uniform and single identity structures of the nation states and metropolises with multi-cultural structure. Hence, the “risk society” which has emerged as a novel concept causes problems that have not been experienced before.

The main distinction between the modern political systems and the tyranny of the ancient times is that the former can absolutely control all the economic, cultural and social structures under their rule. The modern centralized power which is mechanically organized,

* This paper was written at The University of Buckingham in June 2016. I thank TUBITAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) for their support and The University of Buckingham. In writing this article I have benefited greatly from conversations with friends and I wish especially to thank Professor Martin Ricketts for his help. This study was supported by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (2219-International Postdoctoral Research Fellowship Programme 2015/1).

organizes each individual, group, class, community and ethnicity that constitute the society in such a fashion that they can act in coordination with each other. Modern centralized powers in which the supervision, regulation and control mechanisms are operated at their best, have the privilege of dominating all the economic and social structures. On the other hand, despite having dominion over a large area, ancient tyrannies lack the bureaucratic mechanisms that allow them to control and dominate all the economic and social structures within their sovereignty. In contrast, the modern political system seizes the privilege of creating a uniform society due to its advanced bureaucratic structures that the ancient tyrannies do not possess.

While integrating all the factors that comprise the society and the economy, in order to subject them to the practices of a centralized power, the modern political system shows despotic characteristics. Modern political system shapes the individual in order to make it depend on the operation of the centralized political power. Modern political system organizes the educational system in such a way that it enables the individual to act in coordination under the domination of the centralized power. Ensuring cooperation and harmony among the individuals who share the same cultural, religious or ethnical origin has been extremely easy for the modern centralized power. Due to the wealth attained through industrialization, the aspects of the centralized powers that destroy the liberties are partially ignored. However along with the economy and politics gaining more international characteristics, the modern powers face the difficult issue of ensuring cooperation between individuals, groups and communities with extremely different cultural, religious and ethnic backgrounds.

The process of modernization advances with the cooperation of nation states within the framework of modern world system. Thus globalization leads to all "nation states and nations" to constitute a structure in which they are integrated with each other economically, politically and culturally. Globalization also leads to emergence of various risk factors. In central cities which become more cosmopolitan, new conflicts arise in terms of culture, ethnicity and religion. In light of this situation, the concept of "risk society" was proposed by Ulrich Beck for the purpose of seeking answers to these emerging risks (Beck, 1992, 1998, 1999, 2005a, 2005b). According to Beck (2005b), with the globalization conditions at hand, the state should continuously reconstruct the power structure, taking the local administrative requirements into account. Otherwise, due to inability to adapt to the fast paced changes in the cosmopolitan societies in which numerous factors and actors are interacting, the states cannot establish a sufficient administrative and social structure.

Despite their ability to overcome the class struggles, the "modern centralized powers", which strive to make all its subjects uniform and assimilate in order to operate the power structure most efficiently, have difficulty in abolishing the risks caused by social conflicts that originate from identities, religious beliefs and cultures. The modern nation states which strive to resolve the conflicts between the diasporas which struggle to maintain their identities and the "nation" which constitutes the majority, are faced with various obstacles such as legal, economic and cultural problems. The "victimhood" caused by such conflicts are among the major problems of the modern societies. In this study, the "identity problems" due to mass migration encountered in societies which are tried to be made "uniform" by modern political regimes within the context of intercommunication between the state and the migrants. Moreover, identity problems that arise in the "risk society" which is shaped with the impact of victimhood originating from the structural characteristics of modern politics are to be analyzed. Thus, the criticisms of the philosophers that address the modern advances in the nineteenth century most qualitatively are elaborated first. On the other hand, the fact that modern state using the media effectively in order to mobilize the society and make it "uniform" renders the identity problems irresolvable. Hence in this study, the role of media on the irresolvable state of the problems in the risk society is also analyzed.

2. Centralization as the Basic Characteristic of Modern State and Society

Modern state and establishment of government continued to thrive by gathering the society around a centralized power. In time, the structure of the traditional political regimes which prioritizes locality gave way to the domination of centralized power. In Europe, as the gap

between the local governments which were shaped by the church communities and lords, and “monarchs” drew closer each day due to modernization processes, the influence of centralized powers has grown stronger. During this time, especially after Louis XIV (1638-1715) in France, all local power structures have become more dependent to centralized power (De Tocqueville, 2011). In the seventeenth century, the increase in the tendencies of the monarchs in Europe to become more in control of everything caused the government power to be centralized. As the monarchs realized that they can obtain more power when they can integrate all local authority to the center, the states’ desire to be centralized has increased. As it was realized that the primary requirement for having a larger army and collecting more taxes is increasing centralization and with the impact of the competition between states, the “modern political system” has become rapidly more essential.

As for England, the first period of modernity during 16th, 17th and 18th centuries correspond to an era where identities, economies and authorities are becoming increasingly subject to the authority of the center. On the other hand in Germany, the period of establishment of the centralized power starts in the 18th century with Frederick the Great. Frederick the Great reorganizes primarily the culture, economy and government practices so that they can be controlled from the center. In England, especially with the development of “British canal system”, all of Britain becomes increasingly more efficiently controllable from London. These centralization processes are effective in all areas from social structure to economy. As the states improve their ability to organize and control the areas under their authority, the government has started to operate mechanically (Burckhardt, 1999).

Centralized government is fully established when the administrative authority of the nation is concentrated in one location (Drescher, 1964). The modernization processes, in which all local cultures and diversities are destroyed by the actions of centralized powers, also destroy the opportunities of freedom. Especially after the French Revolution, opportunities that enable the organization of daily lives to be independent from centralized power have rapidly diminished. With the rise of bureaucratization, centralization and democratization, all individualities have become subject to the authority of the mass culture. The 19th century witnesses a process in which all local institutions have been rapidly abolished and institutions that are subject to centralized power have been established. The opportunity of existence for any local institution that can pose as a counterweight against the centralized power has increasingly diminished. Local identities, economies and authorities try to continue their existence by being in coordination with the center. As the center obtains the privilege of determining and mobilizing all manners of existence with the advantage of bureaucratic mechanism, the opportunities for independent and free existence perish.

Until bureaucracy fulfills its duty to regulate and control in a perfect manner, neither modernization nor centralization can be achieved. With modernization, bureaucracy, which seized the opportunity to develop in ways that were not possible during the time of ancient tyrannies, carries out perfectly the regulation and control functions which are essential needs of centralized power. The tendencies of the modern politics for gathering everyone in the “common denominator” are fulfilled through bureaucracy. Modern bureaucracy is structured in such a way that it can bring all subjects that constitute the society in a common denominator. While regulating education and economy, bureaucracy also organizes the culture so that its subjects can become “uniform”. Thus, by eliminating all kinds of diversity, the “mass society” which has been structured in order to contribute to the operation mechanism of the centralized power becomes the essential element of the social structure. Since the individuals become dependent to the general tendencies of the masses due to the centralist structure of the power, they cannot maintain their diversity.

Centralization, which prevents the individual from existing in the “life world” (lebenswelt) as a transforming and influential subject, creates victimhood by restricting the means of freedom. Modern nationalism which is used by the centralized powers in order to structure the society enables the establishment of cultural integrity (Gellner, 1994). Centralized powers which shape the society under their influence in accordance with their desires and with the aid of nationalist ideologies and democratization destroy genuine individualities and tradition. This destruction is achieved by using the means of communication effectively as ideological state

apparatuses. The authority of the centralized power that gains the opportunity to manipulate increasingly larger masses expands such that it can affect the private spaces of the individuals. Hence the "individuals" are compelled to organize their lives in accordance with the demands and needs of the centralized power. In a society comprising of individuals who determine the needs and goals in their private spaces by taking the central trends in the society, despotism becomes absolutely dominant.

In order for despotism and centralization to extend their impacts, an ideology that will enable the citizens to become "uniform" is needed. "Racism" provides an infrastructure that enables modern despotism and centralization establish absolute authority over the people. The racist ideologies grant each individual the opportunity to feel apart of a whole on a grander scale. Collectivist, uniformist and totalitarian tendencies of racism enable the society to be organized to form an enormous "Leviathan" as a whole. As the individuals start to acquire race based identities that are constructed by the cultural and educational institutes of the centralized power rather than developing their own unique identities, the capability of the state to rule is greatly increased. As an ideology that enables the state to rule a society in a most effective way, racism obtains the privilege of determining the attitudes, behaviors and habits of the people. Hence the modern states are armed with the opportunities to organize and mobilize their societies in such a great extent that no other state could achieve in the previous times.

One of the main reasons for the modern centralized powers to insist on implementing the same model of educational system in all the areas they have authority over is the fact that they want to structure the society to an average standard. As a natural implication of the practices of central educational system, children belong more to the state rather than their families. The decisions made by the families about the education of their children are carried out within the boundaries set by the state. Thus a system is established in which no individual can actually take actions outside the control of the state. In the modernization processes which owe their progress to the racist ideologies and the modern educational system, the society is regulated through standardization. During this regulation process, the efforts of staying outside of the cultural, political and economic regulations set by the centralized power are confronted with aggression. Due to modernization, it becomes gradually harder to sustain existence for the individuals, minorities, diasporas and groups which do not act in coordination with the regulations of the centralized power.

3. Criticism against the Modern Political System

As the bureaucratic mechanisms developed by the modern state enable the structuring of all the individuals, communities and nation under its authority, the modern state was subject to the criticism especially by the intellectuals of the nineteenth century. Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859), Benjamin de Constant (1767-1830), Juan Donoso Cortés (1809-1853) and Jacob Burckhardt (1818-1897) harshly criticized outcomes caused by the modern state becoming more prominent in determining all aspects of the society. "Victimhood" caused by the efforts of the modern state in trying to shape the citizens under its sovereignty to share the same national identity attracted criticism from the thinkers who believe that freedom should be the foremost aim of humanity. Efforts of the state in constructing the identity of the individuals which comprises of answers to what they are and what the main aspects of their existence are took place among the major political discussions that arose in the nineteenth century.

Burckhardt (1999), who articulates some of the most striking criticism against the developments caused by the modern political system, being an art historian as well, emphasizes on individuality, individual identity and humanitarian values. According to Hinde's study on Burckhardt, he condemns the fast developing centralized powers for their coercive characteristics (Hinde, 2000). Further, he believes that the free and creative aspects of human nature are oppressed by the political developments of the nineteenth century. According to him, the aspects of democracy which are against reason is the main threat that the modern politics possesses. The fact that the tendencies of the masses that constitute the society are unpredictable increases the threats caused by the centralized power which becomes a colossal structure. While the origins of the modern state lie with the centralization of power, efforts in

addressing the “public benefit” becomes the major indicator for determining the policies (Burckhardt, 1999). Burckhardt’s (1999) belief in the fact that it is inevitable for a government that aims to address all kinds of demands from the people in order to become more effective and powerful to develop practices that would cause harm to the personal liberties is a central idea in his conception of modern politics. In a political system where a colossal mass is an important figure, individuality, identity and freedom of the people are bound to fall under threat.

According to Wilson (2007), Donoso Cortés, another critic of the modern politics, represents the school of thought which suggests that the Reformation paved way for the “absolute monarchs” and “administrative centralization” by restricting the power of the Catholic Church (Wilson, 2007). Modern state consolidates its power by interconnecting all the subjects and localities it has sovereignty on. For Donoso, the “telegram” became the ultimate communication instrument due to its function of both interconnecting and controlling all groups, communities and individuals together as a whole under its sovereignty as suggested by Kuehnelt-Leddihn (1952). Modern politics disabling localities and organizing everything in a way that benefits to the centralized power destroys liberties. The belief that as the “modern political system” in which the masses comprised of uniform individuals serve the centralized power becomes dominant, all the local powers that restrict the state with their individualities would be rapidly obsolete is an essential aspect in Donoso’s conceptualization of politics. According to Spektorowski (2002), for Donoso centralization of power abolishes the intermediate bodies that protect the society against oppressing power of the state (Spektorowski, 2002). Hence modern politics paves way for colossal despotisms.

Napoleon Bonaparte (1769-1821) has been an important figure in the political and intellectual arena during the nineteenth century due to “Code civil des Français”. While Bonapartism became increasingly popular among the “enlightenment intellectuals” in the continent and aristocratic liberals who approached cautiously to the social impact of the extensive transformations. As the belief that everything can be changed in a short time with the help of military and bureaucratic power gained more widespread acceptance, revolutionary breakthroughs are encountered more frequently in the political arena as well as the world of intellect. Constant (2003) is one of the thinkers who oppose Bonapartism in both the intellectual and political arena. Moreover, Constant is a representative of the “aristocratic liberal” tradition which criticizes the democratic mechanisms developed after the French Revolution about forcing the individuals to become a trivial part of the nation and making them “uniform”. Constant (2003) states that Rousseau’s conception of “social contract” makes the life of the individual a trivial part of an abstract whole. Thus, aware of the fact that as the citizens are made to become “uniform”, it is inevitable for the despotism to achieve domination by itself. Constant is worried that in the modern political system, it is impossible for the individual to have an existence independent of the society which has become a single whole entity. The main aspiration of Constant (2003) is providing the necessary opportunities to enable the development of human potential (Rosenblatt, 2008). In cases where the “counterpowers” which can act as a counterweight for the centralized power have been destroyed, modern despotisms would continue their development unhindered. The fact that despotic governments gaining wider presence in the first half of the twentieth century actually proved Constant to be right.

De Tocqueville is also among the intellectuals who worry about the outcomes of the social and political developments that took place in the wake of French Revolution. He proposes that the developments caused by democracy increase the potential of the state to become more despotic. Centralization of power becomes inevitable in a society which is totally integrated to the state and which obtains all its opportunities through the state. Under the conditions that a single center of power is dominant, the centralized power acquires the opportunities to control everything. As a perpetuator of the Montesquieuan tradition which believes that humans would lose all their values in conditions where they lack freedom, De Tocqueville (2011) states that in modern societies designed to constitute a single whole entity, it is extremely challenging to ensure freedom. De Tocqueville is from a generation that witnessed the destruction of liberties by the practices which disabled all local aspects of locality enforced by Napoleon in order to strengthen the state by way of bringing all the citizens under a single identity. During this period, as with the increase of the power of the state and centralization of the government, people

gradually lose the control over their own lives. As De Tocqueville (2011) clearly points out, the “societary pressure” rapidly increases in line with the developments in the modern society. While the decisions taken during the operation process of the centralized power directly affect the lives of individuals, everyone start to shape their lives, desires and goals according to the centralist practices. While in free societies “secondary powers” and “counterweights” act as a balancing force against the centralized power, modern political power diminish their roles (De Tocqueville, 2011). In time, how the people’s lives should be and what their desires should be become subject to the decisions of the centralized power. It is impossible to be free in such societies.¹

It is apparent that throughout the nineteenth century, the modern political mechanisms employed by the nation states to consolidate the societies under their sovereignty are strongly criticized by intellectuals and politicians. Nation states utilized the construction of “national identity” as the main tool for consolidating the society. Local cultures, identities and powers being diminished and subject to the centralized power and its institutions removed the necessary conditions that can enable to establish freedom in time. These developments act as the source for the identity problems as well as the cultural, religious and ethnic conflict which have increased rapidly after the second half of the twentieth century. While designing everything detached from its location and replaceable in another location, “modern world system” has also caused the emergence of diasporas and new minorities on one hand, and arising of new conflicts between the minority groups and the majorities on the other. While the political structure of the nation state based on single identity continues its existence, as cities emerge in which people from various different cultural, religious and racial backgrounds live together, it is becoming increasingly difficult to provide solutions for new problems and conflicts that arise with it. These developments confirm the criticisms by the intellectuals targeted at the developments that took place throughout the nineteenth century.

4. From Modern Society to Risk Society

Construction of the modern society advances in coordination with collectivist ideas gaining a wider acceptance. In order to organize the society to form a single “totality”, culture, identity, goals and life styles need to be communized. Modern politics is designed to enable the establishment of such communization. People are encouraged to adopt the collectivist ideologies through cultural and educational institutions that enable the development of “common values”. Thus, each day, individuals find themselves in a situation where they cannot make the decisions about their lives independent from the centralized power. “National identity” becomes the sole determining factor in the creation of all values, habits and attitudes that constitute life.

Materialist ideas which have developed in coordination with the advance of modernization contribute to the establishing of the social structure where despotism can be in power. Hence all modernist ideologies are based on materialist ideas, since materialism has deterministic characteristics (Kuehnelt-Leddihn, 1952). The belief of everything being subject to the determination by universal laws gaining wide audience is due to the impact of both materialism and determinism. Accordingly, all subjects constituting the society structure their lives, ideas and actions according to the functions imposed on them by the universal laws. In a society constituting of individuals who think that under the influence of materialism, they are hopeless against the inevitability of universal laws domination of despotism becomes gradually unavoidable.

¹ The criticism of the 19th century liberal intellectuals against the central state has been directed towards the economically central planning states in the 20th century with the rise of socialism. Hayek, who sees himself as a follower of Tocqueville, proposes that the belief of modern states in their ability to construct the society from scratch transforms into totalitarianism which would destroy personal liberties. For a detailed study on this subject see Bugra Kalkan (2013), “Klasik Liberalizm Geleneğinde Kendiliğinden Doğan Düzen Kavramının Gelişimi” (The Development of the Concept of Spontaneous Order in the Classical Liberal Tradition), Unprinted Doctoral Dissertation, Gazi University Institute of Social Sciences, 2013 Ankara.

Individuals losing the belief that they can change their lives with their “free will” under the influence of determinism and under modernism conditions where increases the influence of the centralized power and the central will. Thus in time, the ideas and actions that can oppose the power to be centralized become less and less prominent. “Modern centralized power” structures the society in a way that no one can oppose the “general will”. In modern politics where the decision taken by the majority is the main leading force, it is extremely easy for the “general will” to acquire the privilege of mobilizing the will of the individuals. Under conditions where the majority is the main actor in creating legislations, the parliamentary system becomes a mere mechanism through which the minorities are manipulated. Therefore, a “uniform” society comprising of parts that resemble each other over time can be constructed.

Another factor in creating a “uniform” society is the circulation of constructed conceptualizations that individuals employ to identify and express themselves through the use of mass media. As people are constantly informed by the modern mass media on how things should be, the information that is deemed to be true by everyone is accepted as the sole truth. The sovereign majority which shapes the information through mass media can establish despotic authority over others. Under conditions where the information is designed centrally, the opportunities of freedom where alternative life styles can be possible rapidly diminish.

During the early period where the modern state and the society are established in coordination, integrating communities who speak nearly the same language with each other has been achieved much easier than the integration of communities from various different religious, cultural and national backgrounds during the “late modern period”. Rapid advances in the transportation and communication network which increase the influence of communication and interaction between the center power and the periphery, speeds up the process of economic, cultural and political centralization. Hence people start sharing more common values, common concerns and common goals with the people that do not live in the same location. Construction of national identity is actualized with the increase in number of people sharing a common culture despite living in different locations. With the centralization of economy, politics and culture individuals become directly affected by the actions of the national state. Therefore, “positive liberty” which enables the individuals to take part in decision making processes, develops gradually. On the other hand, “negative liberty” which means being closed to the influence of others quickly diminishes. In line with the development of positive liberty, individuals obtain the opportunity to participate in common decision making processes with the means provided by the representative democracy. However, with the diminishing of negative liberty, individuals become more vulnerable to the influence and manipulation from others.

Rapid increase in migration movement since the second half of the twentieth century leaves the nation states facing new problems. Integrating migrants coming from various different cultural, religious and ethnic backgrounds is more difficult than the integration of the communities which speak the same language. Especially racist and nationalist ideologies which have essential roles in construction of the national identity pose as a serious obstacle against the integration of minorities. In addition, minority groups can also show serious resistance to the integration policies. Under these circumstances, various conflicts emerge in the “multicultural” metropolises caused by the political and cultural structure of the modern state which is based on uniformity and a single nation. While nation states require the labor force of the migrants, the structure of the modern society and politics which are designed to depend on a single culture and identity increases the risk of social conflicts. The fact that the construction of modern state and society requiring the existence of a “uniform nation” leads to the problems arising in the “risk society” comprising of various communities which become more diverse each day to be irresolvable.

New social conflict risks which have been the point of interest for social scientists since 1980s have quickly become an important factor during 1990s. Beck (1992) is among the pioneers of the intellectuals who emphasize the concept of “risk society”. Indicating the problems and conflict risks caused by the diversity within risk societies, Beck (1992) states that the achievements of the technological civilization lead to new problems. Modernity reduces the possibility of predictable futures, and causes “ambivalence”. Existing and being governed under the conditions of modernity generates new risk factors. Keeping under control and managing

violence, ambivalence and crises to a certain extent is the main success of modernity. Modernism maintained its development by way of creating solutions to the emerging economic and political problems. However, the risks which cause a continuous anticipation of possible “catastrophes” originate from the structural aspects of modernism itself. The main reason for security concerns to remain constantly on the daily agenda is the fact that modernism makes “change” an essential part of life. Under the circumstances where everything changes anytime, the future remains always uncertain. This in turn causes the risks and anticipation for catastrophes constantly to be on the agenda. As the new risks that quickly arise due to the society consisting of numerous minorities and diasporas gradually make the society more difficult to organize, and the capability of modernism to create solutions for these problems diminishes.

In the late period of modernism, predicting the outcomes of interactions and conflicts between the classes, groups and minorities constituting the society becomes ever harder. Moreover, with the increase in the economic, political and cultural interaction in the international area, all the locations in the world gain the potential to affect one another. Risks and uncertainties in a “location” which becomes vulnerable to the economic, political and cultural developments from all other locations increase. Hence, the complex results of internal and external factors constantly keep the expectation of “catastrophe” on the agenda and together with the increase of risks, reduce the possibilities of maintaining the economy and politics under control. Therefore, in the eventually inevitable “risk society”, racism and xenophobia quickly spreads. The discourse of migrants causing social problems by threatening the socio-economic security is the main foundation of racist and xenophobic conceptions (O'Brien, 1996). On one hand, the economic conditions which require people with different ethnical, cultural and religious origins to act in cooperation rapidly thrive, while on the other hand popularization of racist and xenophobic approaches caused by uncertainties increase the risks of conflicts. Under these circumstances, it is inevitable for the economic and political structure of the modernism which is based on the “uniform” society to continuously face new crises.

5. Identities, Diasporas and Migration in Risk Society

The tension between the national characteristics of the modern political system and the international characteristic of the economy is one of the essential factors that shape the late modernism period. As obtaining the raw materials needed for production processes becomes more difficult from just one location, national economies become more and more interdependent. Additionally, development of design and engineering knowledge required for production also needs more international cooperation. Establishment of international political bodies (such as European Union) have been opted as a solution in order to address the requirement for the economy shifting to be more international in nature. However, these solutions which aim to reduce the risks of probable conflicts that may arise in the international area, poses new risks.

The risks overflowing the national borders and become global increase the potential of conflicts not only between states, but also between ethnic, cultural and religious groups. As the globalized economy increases the competition and cooperation between countries, population movements which become inevitable rapidly change the demographical structures of national states. Since the second half of the nineteenth century, increase in migration to the countries with developed production infrastructure leads to the emergence of new global risks. It is possible to temporarily prevent the potential conflict risks with “welfare state” policies. However the inconsistencies between the complications arising from the globalized economy and the structural characteristics of the nation states increase the risks. Nations states which could manage and mobilize the society under their sovereignty with utmost perfection during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century gradually have difficulties in dealing with the crises and conflicts arising from their societies which keep getting more fractured in nature. Moreover, the potential for economic and political problems in different locations in the world creating crises that affect other parts of the world increases rapidly. These

circumstances decrease the possibility of a predictable future and render the planning, regulation and control which are the essential functions of the modern states impossible.

Ensuring coordination between groups with different identities becomes harder in a political system where the majority is dominant in decision making processes. This situation puts the minorities under the idea of constant victimhood and reduces their desire to participate in the political decision making processes. The increase of the number of individuals who think they cannot have an impact in the political decision making processes pose as the indicators of a new society that is comprised of closed groups which are not in communication and interaction with each other. While the risk society weakens the boundaries of the nation states, military alliances and economic blocks (Beck, 1992), developing economic and political mechanisms to resolve the ghettoization in the newly emerging social structures becomes more cumbersome.

As the national identities designed by the modern nation states start to become inadequate in addressing the needs of the political system, individuals tend to embrace their group identities in order to express themselves. Moreover, concerns for being subject to the assimilation by the majority leads to radicalization of diasporic group identities. Diasporic identities showing more and more radical tendencies in order to protect themselves are a factor that increases the risks. This makes harder for the state to ensure harmony and cooperation among all identities and diasporas. While continuous migration causes the policies that are implemented in order to obtain solutions in a short period of time, it becomes impossible to produce effective solutions for new problems.

As living in a society where ambivalence and risks are dominant becomes ever inevitable, the control mechanisms of modern states attain a more complex structure. Although deterioration of the harmony between the structural characteristics of nation state and the society under its sovereignty brings about the structural transformations, practices that are aimed at maintaining the order become more indicative. While democratic mechanisms urge the states to address the demands of the people, the scope of the problems widen as the conflicts between the groups that constitute the society becoming ethnical, religious and cultural in nature. While on one hand trying to act in compliance with the international developments in order to expand the economic opportunities, the states on the other hand face problems caused by political and economic crises triggered by external factors on the other hand.

Since the international developments carry the potential of causing conflicts between the groups that constitute the society, it becomes necessary to take into account all kinds of crises and risks that take place around the world. This leads to states and societies becoming more "anxious", and increase the potential for crises and risks. The fact that life cannot be spent in a location that is fully controlled and regulated increases the economic and political destruction caused by the risk potential. The fact that possible developments such as energy crises or financial crises that can arise any time (even though these crises take place in another country) can have impact on the lives of individuals increases the level of anxiety. This in turn spreads the racist discourses which hold minority groups and diasporas that are thought to prevent order and control responsible for potential risks.

6. Mass Media and Risk Society in the Identity Construction Process

One of the most important methods to the identity problems that arise under the risk society conditions of modern nation states is participating in the construction of identities as an active subject. The process of institutionalization and bureaucratization that takes place during the construction of the modern state has transformed the culture and identities. Thus, modern states are extremely experienced in shaping the identity and culture of the citizens living within the boundaries of its dominion. As the modern state has developed its power and economy and obtained the chance to provide new opportunities for its citizens it experience, it has experienced that it has become bureaucratically more efficient. Integrating the centralized power and society leads to the emergence of states that are more "powerful" beyond comparison than the pre-modern states. Since bureaucratic centralization aims for administrative harmony and unity, it weakens other powers that can pose as alternatives

(Maletz, 2002). Modern state is such a mechanism that it does not leave any alternative to share the power with, and eliminates all legitimate power alternatives. The fact that the state, rapidly increasing the opportunities to control and manipulate everything by this means, reduces the opportunities for the individuals to be free and leads to new kinds of despotisms to emerge.

Communication has a highly essential role in the establishment of bureaucratic systems of modern states. Due to rapidly advancing means of communication, all regulation and control mechanisms enable the state to have the possibility to observe all kinds of economic, cultural and political developments. Means of communication also have the function of enabling the state and the society act in a more coordinative manner. Thus, all localities can follow the practices and mobilization of the center of power. In turn, through the use of means of communication, the power center ensures that all the parts within its dominion act in harmony with each other.

The educational institutes of the modern state produce the necessary knowledge for the construction of the national identity. Citizens who acquire this knowledge from the educational institutes develop similar attitudes and behaviors to other citizens who do not share the same location. Thus, emergence of a "uniform" society that is comprised of individuals with the same knowledge, culture and identity enables the modern state to coordinate all civil society. The modern state which seizes the opportunity to shape the sources of knowledge for the people with the use of "mass media" also determines what to desire and aim for. Hence the common identity, culture and knowledge which become dominant, ensure that the society demonstrates similar attitudes and behaviors on its own. During this process, everyone participates in the actions of the government which no longer require the on purpose actions of a specific subject on the micro and macro levels.

Under the conditions of "risk society", the role of the modern state in constructing the identity of the society which it has maintained since the early stages gradually diminishes. As the various different diasporas which have become part of the society by means of "migration" show different levels of resistance to the assimilation policies of the modern state, different identities become more independent of each other. In a society where gradually all identities keep existing within their own "ghettos", it becomes much harder to ensure the coordination between different groups constituting the society. This in turn increases the potential risks and leads to a situation in which the expectation of chaos is constantly present on the agenda. As the means of communication become more widespread so that they cannot be managed from a single center, each group begins to follow the means of communication that addresses their own identity. Hence the media also becomes "ghettoized" and this causes the circulation of different and at times, conflicting information to circulate. Increase in the numbers and activity of the individuals and groups that construct their lives and identities by acquiring different information weakens the structural characteristics of modernism.

Ghettoization of the media taking place in conjunction with the ghettoization within the society ends the existence of the public space in which all parts of the society communicate. The fall of public space also renders the public opinion to form impossible. For this reason, under circumstances where the public opinion which is formed during discussion processes shaped by the state by manipulating the citizens and civil society is not present; the state imposes decisions, opinions and information by force or by means of justification through bureaucratic necessities. In cases where interests, goals and identities are becoming more differentiated over time, it becomes impossible for the state and the society to act in full cooperation. It is extremely difficult for a society comprising of groups with increasing potential for conflict among each other to be administered in accordance with the administrative requirements of modernism. During this period, the modern state tries to construct new identities that will allow social unity and "uniformity". However, this effort by the modern states becomes futile in circumstances where change is inevitable. Since the artificial identities which take a long time to construct and to become widespread wear out quite fast, they become obsolete in addressing the political needs.

Modern states that losing their ability to construct and mobilize the culture and identity causes various kinds of victimhood. Due to its structural characteristics, the modern state constantly forces all the subjects constituting the society to act in coordination. The concern for

the different and incompatible subjects weakening the social order and coordination spreads rapidly in the “risk society” conditions. As the centralized power tries to establish a practice in which differences are contained in private areas and rendered obsolete in the public spaces, discriminative approaches against all minorities and diasporas gain a wider audience. Since the majority which represents the centralized power constructs its identity through characteristics which enable distinguishing itself from others, it becomes increasingly harder for the minorities and diasporas to act in harmony with the state and the society. As the victimhood caused by the oppressive policies enforced by the centralized power in order to maintain the order leads to the popularization of the feeling of exclusion, the expectations for conflict and chaos increase. Thus, the conditions in which the private and public life is directly determined by risks become dominant.

7. Conclusion

The modern state proposes a mechanical structure in which all the parts constituting the power act in perfect coordination with each other. In this respect, throughout the development period of the “state” within human history, the modern state has the potential to establish the despotism and totalitarianism perfectly. The modern state fulfills its function of structuring and shaping not only itself, but also the society as well. In traditional states, the society and the state occupy the same space as separate entities, whereas the modern state integrates the society to itself through the means of democracy. Thus the state operates most efficiently and mechanically, and is extremely successful in achieving its goals. The state operating in a manner that establishes “uniformity” in the society against the locality, originality and individuality, is a characteristic of the modern politics that weakens liberties. The modern economy and politics which cause the people to be shaped under a single identity and be constantly manipulated, constitutes a situation in which liberties are abolished and it becomes impossible to be a “subject”. Thus, the “common interest” which is established as a result of making the people dependent on the state economically and politically can be used in order to manipulate the society most effectively. The central administration commands a substantial part of the total resources and thus weakens the individual welfare of its citizens (Buchanan, 2000).

In the nineteenth century, thinkers such as Hegel (2001) praise the new power structure established by the modern state by interconnecting the “universal” and “particularity”. In opposition to these kinds of ideas which legitimize the absolute authoritative and leading role of the state over the society, the modern state has encountered serious criticism. The modern economic and political practices which diminish the subjectivity constructed by people themselves by means of exclusively developing their individual potentials; have established an infrastructure that renders despotism dominant. The conditions that cause subjectivity to be eliminated originate from the conceptualization that reduces people to a trivial part of a production mechanism. In cases where the centralized power structures all localities, the individual loses the opportunity to make an impact on the place and time it exists in. Centralized power becomes so essential in modernism conditions that after some time, the subject of power begins to fade away. The power spreads so much from center to the periphery that everything starts to act and operate in line with the will of the center on its own.

Gellner (1983) states that modern societies inevitably constitute centralized structure. This structure is effective in modern societies in all areas from culture to politics. However, the modern nation state, which has increased its speed of development after the second half of 19th century, encountered a new problem and new oppositions since the second half of the twentieth century. Substantially establishing their national integrity culturally and economically despite all the class struggles, the national state systems have to overcome various obstacles in order to control their area of sovereignty which has started to constitute a multicultural structure. Under circumstances where “risks” have become a part of everyday life, the “future” which becomes more uncertain with time is one of the leading threats as well as security problems. Under the pressure of “risks” caused by the unpredictable future, the modern state has the tendency to make the control mechanism more effective. Thus, the conditions in which the personal and public life are determined by despotic practices become more dominant.

“Communication networks” which have rapidly advanced during modernization period, are the essential means of transforming the society to a “uniform” mass by the state. Centralized power effectively utilizes the media in order to take the “mutual knowledge” under its control and thus integrate the local powers to itself. The heavy usage of media by the state in order to shape the information and news increases the pressure on the migrants and minorities. While the national identity requires an “other” in order to identify itself; diasporas, migrants and minorities show tendencies of radicalization and ghettoization in order to maintain their individualities. This weakens the power of the modern state to govern the society. In a society comprising of groups with different characteristics, it becomes even more difficult to establish harmony, consistency and peace. This in turn creates a society where risks and expectations of conflicts are dominant.

The despotic tendencies of the modern state reveal themselves in the manipulation of information and news. The “modern state” obtains the privilege of classifying objects and actions through media, education and cultural institutes. This ability to classify also enables the state to determine what is good and what is bad. Hence the modern states also shape the identities and have the power to determine what the individuals are, that they should desire and how they should live. Being extremely successful in creating a “uniform” nation, the modern state, due to its structural characteristic, wants to establish a social integrity that can act in coordination. However, this structural characteristic of the modern state causes various problems under conditions in which the globalization has made the locations interconnected with each other.

Under circumstances where identity diversity has increased, the mechanisms of the state that enforce the individuals to act in coordination begin to operate in a more despotic manner. As the structure of the modern politics that enforces everyone's goals to be in coordination with the society's goals becomes obsolete under the conditions of globalization where different locations are intertwined with one another, the potential for conflicts and expectations of chaos increase. Thus once the “risk society” has been established and it makes it gradually impossible for the modern state to control, regulate and mobilize the society absolutely. As a result, the tension between the state and the society rapidly increase leading way to ethnic, religious and cultural conflicts.

References

- Beck, U., 1992. *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. London: Sage Publications.
- Beck, U., 1998. *World risk society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U., 1999. *What is globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U., 2005a. *Power in the global age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U., 2005b. The cosmopolitan state: Redefining power in the global age. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 18(3/4), pp.143-159.
- Buchanan, J. M., 2000. *The limits of liberty: Between anarchy and leviathan*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Burckhardt, J., 1999. *Judgments on history and historians*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Constant, B., 2003. *Principles of politics: Applicable to all governments*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- De Tocqueville, A., 2011. *The ancient regime and the French revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drescher, S., 1964. Tocqueville's two democracies. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 25(2), pp.201-216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2708012>
- Gellner, E., 1983. *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Gellner, E., 1994. *Encounters with nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hegel, G.W.F., 2001. *Philosophy of right*. Kitchener: Batoche Books.
- Hinde, J. R., 2000. *Jacob Burckhardt and the crisis of modernity*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Kalkan, B., 2013. "Klasik liberalism geleneginde kendiliginden dogan dozen kavraminin gelismisi"
[The development of the concept of spontaneous order in the classical liberal tradition].
Ph.D. Ankara: Gazi University.
- Kuehnelt-Leddihn, E., 1952. *Liberty or equality: The challenge of our time*. Caldwell, Idaho: The
Caxton Printers Ltd.
- Maletz, D. J., 2002. Tocqueville's tyranny of the majority reconsidered. *The Journal of Politics*,
64(3), pp.741-763. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2508.00148>
- O'Brien, P., 1996. Migration and its risks. *The International Migration Review*, 30(4), pp.1067-
1077. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2547604>
- Rosenblatt, H., 2008. *Liberal values: Benjamin Constant and the politics of religion*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511490729>
- Spektorowski, A., 2002. Maistre, Donoso Cortés, and the legacy of catholic authoritarianism.
Journal of the History of Ideas, 63(2), pp.283-302.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhi.2002.0018>
- Wilson, F. G., 2007. Donoso Cortes: The continuing crisis. *Journal of Inter-American Studies*,
2(1), pp.45-63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/164784>