

Domination Factory of the Governments: Universities

Özgür Bayraktar

Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University,
Political Science,
Karaman-Turkey

Abstract

The governments cannot keep governing with only physical violence. In most cases, violence is often the last choice for a government. In order to ensure their legitimacy, the authorities try to disseminate their own ideologies throughout the society. On this issue, states do not need to apply violence. The most important weapon of domination of power they use when establishing and maintaining domination that is education. Through education, the masses internalize the idea that power is legitimate, and aside from opposing power, they come to be the supporters of that power. In this context, the importance of the university in education is great. The governments try to establish their own domination on the university, which will continue their own domination. In this study, the relation of the universities with the government is studied, especially in Turkey.

Keywords: University, Education, Domination, Government

Education as Ideological State Apparatus

At the basis of class diversity, there is an attempted work division to sustain life. People needed various things, especially drinking, eating, dressing and dressing in order to keep their lives. Therefore, the first historical action has been manufacturing vehicles that meet these requirements (Marks and Engels, 2015: 51). With the division of labor initiated for production activity and the surplus value that emerged after the production, a society that has been classed over time has come to the scene. The society is basically divided into two main classes: oppressor and oppressed class. The state also functions as a means of maintaining the sovereignty of the ruling class. The ruling class wants to preserve existing production relations in order to sustain its power and uses ideology for it. Eagleton (1996: 18), indicates that there are many definitions of ideology, one of these definitions is "the whole idea that serves to legitimize a sovereign political power." When the ruling class continues its rule, it uses the classical pressure apparatuses such as army, police, courts and prisons. But there are also more efficient apparatuses in the hands of the power to legitimize itself: the Ideological State Apparatuses. Louis Althusser (2015: 50, 51) sorts the Ideological State Apparatuses as follows:

Religious

School (education system created by both private and public schools)

Family

Legal (this device belongs both to the state's press apparatus and to its ideological apparatus system).

Political (a system involving different parties)

Unionized

Communication (press-radio-television etc.)

Cultural (literature, fine arts, sports, etc.)

While the State's Press Apparatus uses violence to regenerate the power of the ruling class, the Ideological State Apparatuses do it by using ideology. Those who are in power as the official government firstly want to establish their own hegemony within and over the Ideological State Apparatuses and to hold the state power permanently (Althusser, 2015: 52, 53). Education, one of the Ideological State Apparatuses, is one of the most important areas of conflict in politics. An important part of this conflict is about what the content of the education should be. These debates are based on the fact that the new generations are directly transformed into defenseless subjects of ideological longing and ideals. Because the ultimate goal of education is to produce individuals who will obey government (Aktay, 2007: 473). The most prominent device among the Ideological State Apparatuses is the school. Because the widespread and compulsory national education system takes the children of all social classes in the period when they are most vulnerable and places the ruling ideology into their heads. No other ideological apparatus other than the school can make all the children the obligatory listener for eight hours a day for five days a week for years (Althusser, 2015: 62). That is why every power tries to design the education system according to its own ideology. Because governments are in need of education, to make permanent their power and to ensure legitimacy to their actions and their rhetoric in the eyes of the people. The rulings aim at shaping each level of education according to themselves, especially the primary schools that are the first and the universities that are the last stage. For example, in Turkey, Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi-AKP) has been trying to dominate the education apparatus and aiming to consolidate its power since the first day it came to power. AKP, especially since 2006, has established many universities and it is now highly compatible with the Higher Education Council (HEC-Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu-YÖK) and universities, which was in constant conflict in the first years of its power. Universities changed over time; the opposition stance in the first years of AKP power has been lost and they have become a totally Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA), even the IAA (the Ideological Apparatus of the AKP).

Universities: Both Ideology and Bureaucrat Production Center

Bologna University, which was established in Italy in 1088 as the first example of the universities in contemporary sense, is accepted. The University of Bologna is followed by the University of Paris in Paris in 1160 and Oxford University in the United Kingdom in 1167. From this point of view, it can be said that there is a history of about nine hundred years of the university institution in Europe (Tekeli, 2004: 4). Universities aim to raise intellectuals who are the bearers of bourgeois ideology and ethics since the Age of Enlightenment. Along with the establishment of nation states, universities have undertaken a new mission: the arbitration of national ideologies. Together with this new mission, history, language and national literature studies have become integral parts of university curricula. Later, social and political sciences, which developed as administrative tools, especially in the framework of colonial politics of England and France, have become important parts of the

universities. Thus, universities have become a device for shaping the nation state staffs and shaping the technical and ideological equipment that would be used in the nation-state economics, politics and culture (Özbudun and Demirer, 1999: 34, 35). Bourdieu treats the education system as the most functional part of the domination. According to him, the schools and, ultimately, the universities, stand for a system apparatus working to guarantee the legitimacy of the ruling class. Schools provide protection to status quo and students internalize these status quo values via education (Yel, 2007: 566, 567). Universities, the last people of the education system, can be seen as a high school that educates the managers (Kaynar and Parlak, 2005: 19). Thanks to the universities, the powers have the administrative staff that are equipped with its own ideology and to reproduce this ideology in every region, every stage where the staff is assigned.

Universities, academics and intellectuals are guarantees of the continuity of power. The ideas expressed by "educated intellectuals for years" or "professors at renowned universities" are generally perceived by the society as more valid than the words of politicians, government members. Gramsci (1967: 29) defines intellectuals as embassies of the ruling class. The tasks that the intellectuals perform are to produce social hegemony and contribute to political governance. In other words, intellectuals contribute to the approval of the views of the ruling class "without being under any pressure" of the people.

In universities, the ideology that legitimizes power is mostly produced by social sciences. Economists say that the economy is good; sociologists explain why the people should support the power; political scientists tell how correct the government's policies are (Ünal, 2007: 182). Economic science, the "queen" of social sciences, plays a role in making society accept the thesis of power and capitalism. Economics restricts itself only in the field of exchange, reflecting reality in a non-critical way. Thus, the economics which has been kept in line with the rulers argues that it also has a neutral, scientific point of view (Özel, 2008: 46, 55). Rancière (2011) suggests that science works on the side of the rulers and questions whether a science that does not produce dominance, especially social science, is built. Bourdieu (2006: 97) argues that what the social sciences do is to approve the influence of the state. According to him, the place where the state's influence is most felt is the field of symbol production. Bourdieu refers to the fact that "reality" is produced and organized by power. He gives the name of symbolic power to the relation that shapes this special domination of the reality and he calls the form of special and invisible violence that helps establish and maintain the relation of domination as symbolic violence. The symbolic power resorted to violence like all other powers to make it permanent and to endorse its legitimacy, but this violence is not visible and physical violence it is symbolic violence. Through symbolic violence, powers present their worldviews (doxa) as a universal truth. The plane where Doxa is most produced is the educational field. In general, the educational institution, in particular the academics, refers to institutional structures that work for the benefit of the government and reinforce their sovereignty. All cultural and economic institutions maintain the power of the capitalists and maintain the existing power (Türk, 2007: 608-615).

Throughout the history of the Republic of Turkey as well, universities are considered as both the control and intervention areas of the holding political power. The state regarded the university as a "useful institution" as long as it reproduced the official ideology, but did not refrain from punishing the academics who had a tendency to go out of it (Demirer and Ozbudun, 1999: 149, 150). The relationship between political powers and universities has not always been smooth. For example, from 2002, when the AKP came to power, AKP had serious discussions with HEC and universities, until the end of 2007, when the head of HEC Erdogan Tezic's term expired. Following the separation of Tezic from the Council of Higher Education, the polemics between the AKP and the Council of

Higher Education were resolved. Science and power are closely related to each other. Universities, the centers of science, have become closer to power to get support material scientific research that requires materiality; the state in search of legitimacy tried to bring the academy under its control. Science can be seen as a factor that acts as an influence on those changes in the hands of power holders who seize power and try to hold it, beyond being a force that changes the world in good or bad ways. King (1997: 104, 105) likens scientific research to a power plant that produce power for the governments.

A second turning point in the relationship between science and power was the Second World War. After the Second World War, the interest of the states, especially the politics of knowledge has increased and many political science schools have begun to be established in many universities. As a result, science has begun to help defeat the "enemies of freedom and democracy" (Mayor, 1997: 154, 155). The Cold War, which started in the aftermath of World War II, required military field research and development (R & D) activities. During the Cold War, the R & D budgets of the US and Soviet Socialist Republics (Soviet Union) governments in the military were more than half of total R & D budgets. In the 1970s, it was estimated that the number of scientists dealing with military R & D was over 500,000, more than 45 percent of scientists around the world at that time (King, 1997: 95). Practically, there is no administrative activity area or special industrial, military development area that scientists have not stamped. Public and scientific interests are often in a tightly knotted form. Science and scientists often serve existing powers (Ferrarotti, 1997: 61-68).

Science has helped governments at all times to establish national identity in the first founding times of nation states. Nation states have paid considerable attention to formal, centralized education in order to culturally homogenize society and manage it more easily (Roger, 2008: 14, 24). Aiming to create a Turkish identity, the Republic of Turkey administration gave great importance to education. In this context, the young Republic has made efforts to create a new national consciousness and historical myths to support this consciousness (Aydm, 1993: 226). In this period, the Republican regime has made an intense effort to fully control the scientific and scientific institutions. In this context, Kemalist cadres began to criticize Darülfünun (the old name of the first university of Turkey; Istanbul University). This group claimed that Darülfünun was in a negative attitude towards the revolution and that the institution did not publish original, serious, collective useful publications. As a result of these criticisms, Darülfünun was closed on July 31, 1933 and reopened on August 1, 1933 with the name of Istanbul University (Bahadır, 2007: 52). But this is not just a simple name change. Now the university's autonomy has been abolished and turned into an educational institution attached to the state. A large-scale dismantling was carried out among the Darülfünun communities, only 59 of 151 academicians were able to remain in office. The curriculum has been rearranged in detail and under strict control (Demirer and Ozbudun, 1999: 151). The effect of this preference is located in Turkey's western bloc during the Cold War was also seen in the university ranks. In this period, the academicians who showed opposing posture were accused of "communism and homeland treason". Any criticism of the government was faced with communist propaganda and accusations of treason. In 1947, Niyazi Berkes, Pertev Naili Boratav and Muzaffer Şerif were eliminated from the faculty of Language and History Geography (Açıkgöz, 2008: 71). Universities have always strived to act in harmony with power, and the government has demanded that universities be harmonious with themselves. The academics, who disrupt this reciprocal "hot" relationship, have "stepped in" without losing any time. According to the rulings, the work of academicians is not "to make politics".

Universities have continued to fulfill its mission in Turkey always Ideological State Apparatuses. *The Higher Science and Law Mission* that was created following the May 27 coup and aimed to provide

academic legitimacy to the coup was a good example. The delegation, consisting of fifteen professors who would explain the mean of the coup theoretically and which would add an academic legitimacy to this statement, was called to Ankara in the morning of the coup. The delegation prepared an immediate report and declared that the coup was a legitimate act against an illegitimate power (Kaynar, 2012: 646). On March 12, 1971, the military again intervened in politics and the army demanded that the President, the Parliament and the Senate resigned and establish a new government capable of executing the government's resignation and strong, credible, constitutional reforms (Ahmad, 2010: 165). The 1971 Memorandum attempted to take control of the universities previously considered "too free". In the Constitution, the matter related to the universities the sentence of "under the supervision and supervision of the state ..." added for the functions of the universities. In July 1973, a new University Law was enacted, the University Supervisory Board was established and the supervision of the state on universities was institutionalized (Demirer and Ozbudun, 1999: 157, 158). With the coup d'état of September 12, 1980, the supervision of the universities, the consolidation of power was fully institutionalized. Because the military, which carried out the coup, saw the universities as an anarchy nest, and some academicians as the protesters of the communists. Now, in the eyes of the state, universities and academics have become "elements that threaten the indivisible unity of the nation and the nation," provoking young people, and dragging the country into anarchy. The famous number 1402 Management Law and the opposing teaching staff were removed from the universities and teachers. In this process, thirty thousand people were dismissed. In order to better discipline the universities, HEC was established as a constitutional institution in 1982 and the universities were systematically tried to engage in the ideology of Turkish-Islamic Synthesis (Açıkgöz, 2008: 71, 72).

Another intervention of the army in politics was on February 28, 1997. In the elections held on December 24, 1995, the Welfare Party (Refah Partisi-RP) won first place, and then the RP and the True Path Party (Doğruiyol Partisi-DYP) formed a coalition government. Some activities of the government have increased the fear of fundamentalism especially in the army. The National Security Council (Milli Güvenlik Kurulu-MGK), gathered on 28 February 1997, focused on a National Intelligence Service (Milli İstihbarat Teşkilatı-MİT) report on radical religious activities, and the soldiers prepared a list of what measures would be taken against these threats. One of these measures is the coefficient change which would make it difficult for the students of Imam Hatip High School to enter a higher education institution other than the Faculty of Theology. In the period of February 28th, the issue of the compliance of the universities with the government was the subject of the turban. The Chairman of the Council of Higher Education, Kemal Gürüz, was very careful not to enter the university with the headscarf and disciplinary inquiries were opened to the students who wanted to come to the university with closed head (Tekeli, 2009: 157-162).

With the AKP coming to power in 2002, universities are no longer aligned with power and are not an ideological apparatus, but on the contrary, they have begun to stand out as power opposition institutions. AKP had a very contrary structure with the previous administrations, especially in the universities and the ruling positions in HEC. The AKP criticized the February 28 implementation, trying to lift the headscarf ban at universities. In the early years when it was in power, it had a lot of discussion with the universities and the HEC, which supported the February 28 implementation. AKP tried to transform the structure of the opposing HEC and to dissolve the opposing HEC administration, but both the rectors and HEC Chairman Kemal Gürüz gave a hard response. In October 2003, the government announced that it would make a change to overcome the coefficient problem while entering universities of Imam Hatip students and the rectors organized the a march named "Respect to

Republic" in the capital city Ankara on 25 October 2003. Meanwhile, the term of office of the HEC Chairman Kemal Gürüz ended in December 2003 and President Ahmet Necdet Sezer appoints Erdoğan Teziç to the Presidency of HEC. Teziç stated in his first press statement after his appointment as president that he would not allow turban in universities. The government, which was experiencing constant problems with the universities, has prevented the development of the resources of the state universities. The increase of the university budgets has been kept below the inflation rate and the salaries of the academicians have been kept low (Tekeli, 2009: 182-191). In August 2007, Sezer's term of office expired and he left his place to the Abdullah Gül from AKP. With the passage the presidency office to AKP, which appointed the rectors and the President of the Council of Higher Education, AKP has begun to benefit more as an ideological apparatus from universities. In December 2007, Teziç's term of office expired and President Gül appointed Yusuf Ziya Özcan as the President of the Higher Education Council in place of Teziç. Along with the appointment of Özcan, AKP has accelerated the staffing of the universities where it had previously had difficulties in staffing. Özcan, known for his Islamic researches and personality, has appointed rectors who were close to AKP in universities. The rectors of 23 new universities, which were established in 2007, were also appointed during the term of Özcan, and 16 of these rectors were brought up against the ban on the headscarf. With the new YÖK, the power-university harmony has been re-established. The people close to AKP have started to be established in newly established universities (Inal, 2009: 713-714).

After 2007, AKP began to live with less conflict with the universities. The AKP, which believes that it has staffed as much as the universities, went to improve the salaries of academic staff in 2014.

Conclusion

Every government desires the continuation of its own power. Modern states use ideology rather than violence to achieve this. States benefit from many ideological apparatuses, especially education, in order to provide them with legitimacy. Education has helped governments both in the process of national identity during the first days of nation-states, and later in the process of popular acceptance of the ideologies of power. Establishing dominance in the universities for power has always been an important goal. Because universities have a very important role in forming public opinion. The statements of an academician have more influence over the society than the propaganda of the ruling members. Conferences, seminars, or television programs where politics is discussed are unique places where this propaganda can be made. The speeches produced by academics who are pro-government scholars around them reach wide masses. Academicians do not only produce discourse, they also produce the executives of the future and the ruling cadre. Therefore, the governments always try to keep the universities that produce today and tomorrow under their sovereignty. Most of the academics prefer to work in harmony with the government or to be "neutral" by acting "scientific". Thanks to this election, academicians are free from the "terrorist traitor" mark and have not been bowed to an "adventure".

As seen in Turkey, universities often have been compatible with the governments. Governments have benefited from this as long as the universities have served them as ideological apparatus, but academics who have gone out of line have never been tolerated. The academics who refused to be the ideological apparatus of power were accused of being repressive, reactionary in the One Party era, being communist in the Cold War era, and traitorous traitors who dragged young people to anarchy in the following years. The AKP, which experienced tension with universities in the first years of its power, succeeded in transforming the universities into their own ideological apparatus with a delay of 5-6 years. The AKP, which received institutional explanations from the universities in the first years

of its rule, ie from rectors, deans or directly from the HEC, was able to obtain support statements in public debate after 2007, when the HEC President changed. As the AKP consolidated the hegemony on the universities, the voices from the universities remained as individual outings. Although the influence of the powers is increasing day by day in the Ideological State Apparatuses, Foucault argues that there will be always a resistance against power.

References

- Açıkgöz, İ. (2008), “Üniversiteler ve Siyaset”, *Bilim ve İktidar*, p. 70-75. ed. Esin Candan, Ankara: Dipnot Publications.
- Ahmad, F. (2010), *Bir Kimlik Peşinde Türkiye*, trans. Sedat Cem Karadeli, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Publications, 4th Edition.
- Aktay, Y. (2007), Pierre Bourdieu ve Bir Maxwell Cini Olarak Okul”, *Ocak ve Zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi*, ed. Güney Ceğin et al. p. 473-498, Istanbul: İletişim Publications.
- Althusser, L. (2015), *İdeoloji ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları*, trans. Alp Tümertekin, Istanbul: İthaki Publications, Second Edition.
- Aydın, S. (1993), *Modernleşme ve Milliyetçilik*, Ankara: Gündoğan Publications.
- Bahadır, O. (2007), “1933 Üniversite Reformu Niçin Yapıldı”, *Türkiye’de Üniversite Anlayışının Gelişimi I (1861-1961)*, p. 52-86. Namık Kemal Aras, et al. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Publications.
- Bourdieu, P. (2006), *Pratik Nedenler*, trans. Hülya Uğur Tanrıöver, İstanbul: Hil Publications, 2nd Edition.
- Demirer, T. and Ozbudun, S. (1999), “Egemen Eğitimin Üniversite(ler) Gerçeği”, *Eğitim: Ne İçin? Üniversite: Nasıl? YÖK: Nereye?*, p. 122-225, Ankara: Utopia Publications
- Eagleton, T. (1996), *İdeoloji*, trans. Muttalip Özcan, Istanbul: Ayrıntı Publications.
- Ferrarotti, F. (1997) “Endüstri Devrimi ve Bilim, Teknoloji ve İktidarın Yeni Nitelikleri”, *Bilim ve İktidar*, p. 41-68. Federico Mayor and Augusto Forti, trans. Mehmet Küçük, Ankara: TÜBİTAK Publications, 3rd Edition.
- Gramsci, A. (1967), *Aydınlar ve Toplum*, trans. Vedat Günyol, Istanbul: Çan Publications.
- Kaynar, K., M. (2012). “Beyaz Zambaklar Memleketi ve İhtilalin Mantığı”, *Tarihin İnşası ve Siyaset, Yazılar, II*, Mete Kaan Kaynar, p. 621-643. Sivas: Adımlar Publications,
- Kaynar, M., K. and Parlak, İ. (2005), *Her İl’e Bir Üniversite, Türkiye’de Yüksek Öğretim Sisteminin Çöküşü*, Ankara Paragraf Publications.

- King, A. (1997) & “II. Dünya Savaşı’nın Sonundan Bu Yana Bilim ve Teknoloji”, *Bilim ve İktidar*, p. 69-105. Federico Mayor and Augusto Forti, trans. Mehmet Küçük, Ankara: TÜBİTAK Publications, 3rd Edition.
- Marks, K. and Engels, F. (2015), *Alman İdeolojisi [Feurbach]* trans. Sevim Belli, Ankara: Sol Publications, Ninth Edition.
- Mayor, F. (1997), Bugün ve Yarın, Bilim ve İktidar”, *Bilim ve İktidar*, Science and Power, p. 153-192. Federico Mayor and Augusto Forti, trans. Mehmet Küçük, Ankara: TÜBİTAK Publications, 3rd Edition.
- Özbudun, S. and Demirer, T. (1999), İdeolojinin Üretimi, Yeniden Üretimi ve Üniversiteler”, *Eğitim: Ne İçin? Üniversite: Nasıl? YÖK: Nereye?*, p. 29-48, Ankara: Utopia Publications.
- Özel, H. (2008), “İktisat, İdeoloji ve İktidar”, *Bilim ve İktidar*, p. 46-57, ed. Esin Candan, Ankara: Dipnot Publications.
- Ranciére, J. (2011), *Tarihin Adları, Bilgi Poetikası Alanında Bir Deneme*, trans. Cemal Yardımcı, İstanbul: Metis Publications.
- Roger, A. (2008). *Milliyetçilik Kuramları*, trans. St. Ufuk Kılıç, İstanbul: Versus Publications.
- Tekeli, İ. (2004), “The Institutional Transformation of Universities and Its Reflection on the Evaluation of the Performance of Social Sciences”, *Evaluation of Performance in Social Sciences*, ed. İlhan Tekeli & Necdet Teymur, pp. 1-18, Ankara: Turkish Commission For UNESCO.
- Tekeli, İ. (2009), “Türkiye’de Üniversitelerin YÖK Sonrasındaki Gelişme Öyküsü (1981-2007)”, *Türkiye’de Üniversite Anlayışının Gelişimi II (1961-2007)*, p. 55-315, ed. Tarık Çelik ve İlhan Tekeli, Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Publications.
- Türk, B. (2007), “Sihirden Nefret Eden Bir İlüzyonist”: Bourdieu, Gelenek ve İdeoloji”, *Ocak ve Zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi*, ed. Güney Çeğin et al. s. 605-626, İstanbul: İletişim Publications.
- Ünal, A., Z. (2007), “Rahatsız Eden Bir Adamın Bilimi: Sosyoloji”, *Ocak ve Zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi*, ed. Güney Çeğin et al. p. 161-186, İstanbul: İletişim Publications.
- Yel, A. M. (2007), “Bourdieu ve Din Alanı: Sermaye, İktidar, Modernlik”, *Ocak ve Zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi*, ed. Güney Çeğin et al. s. 559-580, İstanbul: İletişim Publications.