HIGH ANXIETY: MIGRATION, IDENTITY AND MEDIA IN CRISIS IN LATE MODERN PERIOD

Devrim ÖZKAN[*]

Abstract

This study analyses the social and political developments which bring national states and societies face to face with migration and identity problems in the late modern period. The fact that modern times are seeing the government being centralised day by day, increases identity and migration-related social problems. With the increase in ethnical and cultural variety, modern states face many problems with regards to regulating and controlling society. The fact that media are no longer a functional apparatus for organising and manipulating society leads to weakness in management. In this context, the present addresses the social problems and crises which have appeared in the late modern period in relation to migration, identity and media; indeed, these issues are analysed within the scope of the "high anxiety" concept. Moreover, discussion also focuses on the social relationship of anxiety, and the fact that it should be handled as one of the main factors affecting policy. There is also an analysis of the political and social problems which have arisen because of the crises of modern times. Indeed, modern society's structural nature has increased "anxiety" levels very rapidly. In conclusion, it is considered that the problems stemming from the structural nature of modernity can be overcome with structural changes.

Keywords: Centralised power, high anxiety, migration, media, late modern period.

Jel Codes: O15, O19, P16, Z00

---

[*] PhD, Max Beloff Centre for the Study of Liberty, University of Buckingham, United Kingdom, ozkandev@hotmail.com, devrim.ozkan@buckingham.ac.uk

1. Introduction

Modern policy and the structural nature of the economy prompt each and every individual to act in coordination. In modernity, individuals are inclined to think that "their future" and "their ability for survival" depends on their acting in coordination with the whole society and state. This condition not only undermines their "autonomies", but also makes it impossible for individuals to be free. If an individual's life depends on a very large scale "nation" and "state", to which he thinks he belongs, then this provides some administrative advantages. Prompting individuals and institutions to act in coordination unprecedentedly, modernity acquires new opportunities and apparatuses by further empowering states, at the expense of harming freedoms. Adopting modern ideologies thanks to such coordination, states get the opportunity to build a "new society". The development gained from the dynamism led by all these ensures various economic and political advantages. However, individuals face new social problems which increase "anxieties" and "risks" in modernity where institutions, identities and cultures become abstract as a consequence of becoming artificial.

Indeed, the early modern period saw the implementation of policies which led to the political power being collected in a single centre; this was achieved by accelerating the economic development. Finding solutions to these problems becomes harder day by day in the late modern period. Economic and political centralisation causes individuals to become easily manipulated, weak and deprived of their freedom against the state and nation, which are huge institutions[1]. This situation increases individuals' anxiety level and also makes them inclined to get rid of their anxieties by means of showing further fidelity to state and nation. As long as the inclination of modern centralised power to regulate and control the society in its sovereignty forces individuals to act in coordination, conditions which cause the private life to depend on factors that cannot be controlled by individuals become more dominant. Therefore, in a society where abstract determinants affect the lives of

individuals directly, risk expectations, crises and anxieties inevitably become dominant.

Modern centralised states have more power thanks to the fact that modern ideologies and applications become determinants in economic and political areas. As such, these states claim that they ensure the highest farewell to their citizens. Giving profit shares to their citizens after winning a competition with their rivals, modern states continue their development by means of developing new apparatuses to shape society. However, their achievement depends on society being uniform. With this said, it is very hard for a modern centralised state to regulate a society consisting of different cultural, religious and ethnical groups and keep them under control. The main reasons for this are that applications of modern economics and policy make it a must for all subjects to function in coordination. When everything which damages the harmony between individuals is considered as a factor that undermines the system, then pressure and control mechanisms become determinant. Indeed, this causes states to exert great effort in making identities and culture "uniform" in order to maintain their power. As such, "soft despotism" is established perfectly, and a society which consists of individuals who are forced to have a "uniform" turns into a "mass". Following this, groups and individuals who want to keep their autonomy and authenticity against the despotic implementations of modern centralised states are accused of being "non-adaptive".

Whitmeyer (1997, p. 211) stresses that "power", which he defines as the skill to have influence over the behaviours of others, is also a centralised concept in political sociology. Therefore, the power structure of a society should be analysed in order to perfectly understand it. In fact, the inclination of modern centralised power to regulate and control all of the area under its sovereignty is the main feature which determines its social structure. Regulating society and individuals by not only creating laws but also making culture and forming identities, modern centralised power wants to become the absolute determinant in all areas. However, if

modern centralised power's regulation and control mechanisms function perfectly, they cause various social problems. Modern centralised power, which has been trying to be further determinant day by day in the late modern period increases the expectations of conflict and crisis. Applications which cause economies and societies to be centralised and uniform increase risks and crisis expectations. This situation increases the "anxiety" level of individuals and society up to the highest point, and "ambivalence" becomes the main factor influencing the formation of life. Therefore, the number of studies addressing "anxiety", "fear" and "risk" in political psychology, political sociology and political science has increased (Beck, 1992 & 1998; Stearns, 2006; Bourke, 2006; Glassner, 2010).

This article is based on the view that "fear", "risk" and "high anxiety" concepts are the main factors determining the central problems of the late modern period. The more that modern centralised power makes an effort to "uniform" society in order to supervise and control it perfectly, the higher the anxiety level becomes. Increases in global migration toward western nations also leads to an increase in societal insecurity[2] (Rudolph, 2003, p. 610). As such, social crises make risk expectation an ordinary part of life, and lead to an increasingly uncertain future day by day. The fact that the media modern state has been utilised for a long time in order to achieve uniformity hardly meets the needs of power in the late modern period. This situation requires a synthesis of the insights and methods of different scientific fields (such as communication sciences, political sciences and political psychology) in order to analyse the basic problems of the late modern period. Therefore, this study analyses the impact of economic and political implementations of modern centralised states on migration, media and identity problems; indeed, an interdisciplinary approach is employed.

2. Impact of Anxiety on Establishment of Society in Circumstances of Modernity

The main feature of human beings, and one which differentiates them from other beings, is that human beings change their nature in order to make things more convenient for themselves. While other living things remain alive by adapting to the nature, human beings establish autonomy in nature by means of utilising natural resources. This is the main structural feature of human beings. Moreover, human beings have the ability to re-build their social structure in order to transform the nature. Human beings always make important breakthroughs in order to transform the nature more effectively and create more qualified social structures; thus, they maintain their development.

Nature is full of potential threats to human beings. Human beings develop new apparatuses in order to eliminate these external threats in the nature. Anxiety is the main motivation for human beings, and motivates them to overcome the threats in the nature. Anxiety has a different meaning from "wince". While a wincing being gives an instinctive reaction, anxiety comes into being as a result of humans' pondering about themselves and threatening factors, as well as the developing fictions. In this context, anxiety can be either real or artificial. In both cases, anxiety provides human beings with a high motivation level so that they are able to transform nature, themselves, and their social structure. In effort to ensure their own security considering not only actual threats but also potential risks, human beings acquire new qualifications and skills while transforming the nature. The most important skill is using "language" and "communication" in the most effective way. Using the motivation provided by "anxiety," human beings develop "language" in order to act in coordination and more effectively with the members of a community. Human beings' inclination to help is the main motive for all communicative actions and cooperation (Tomasello, 2008, p. 240). On the one hand, language makes it possible for the members of the community to have more effective cooperation;

on the other hand, it keeps away the other communities that speak a different language. Developing different languages from one another, communities protect their own resources and areas against other communities because other human beings pose a threat. As such, human beings differentiate themselves from other communities by means of visual differences through "tags" and by using a different language. Thus, human beings make an effort to be autonomous, as this makes them less anxious and ensures their security.

Human beings' efforts to change nature and themselves lead to a never-ending period of change. Transformation of nature by human beings leads to the rise of new resources and apparatuses, and increases the potential for human beings to change. On the other hand, the way in which human beings live by using different languages in different communities and societies is a factor that increases competition. Increased competition between communities leads to different fields of power, which thus increases the creative skills of human beings. Indeed, human beings make an effort to constantly develop their potential, fighting nature on the one hand, and battling communities on the other hand. Thus, "competition" causes the development of not only "language", which is the main apparatus used by human beings, but also that of their architectural, artistic, fighting and social skills. Indeed, this is the main driving power which leads to the development of civilisation.

Since "human communication" minimises social conflict risks by establishing harmony and coordination between individuals, it is one of the main apparatuses when it comes to building society. Thanks to constantly reconstructed "human communication", there has always been an effort, throughout human history, to build a culture to minimise the possible conflicts between members of society. By this means, it is hoped that crises and risks, which make individuals anxious over whether to continue their own existence, will be eliminated. Moreover, human beings' ability to act in coordination more effectively depends on how developed their "communication" is. The very basic motive of most insights, from religions to philosophies, is to establish a secure social

structure by means of making "human communication" perfect. It is possible for individuals to feel that they are in a secure area when coordination is provided between them through an ideal communication system. Otherwise, it would be impossible to keep order because constant conflicts would be inevitable.

With modernity, "communication" between people is unprecedentedly unlimited with space. Since modernity has made a continuous communication system between different spaces a must, communication technologies have been developing very rapidly. Thanks to this, people can continuously communicate with others who do not share the same location. On the one hand, modern means of communication, which have facilitated communication between individuals, groups and communities living in different places, lead to the development of dynamics of change; on the other hand, however, these means make messages abstract. The fact that different spaces can have continuous communication makes change an integral part of life. In conditions when change is constant, it is almost impossible for a person to feel the "life-world" (lebenswelt)), in which he lives, completely concrete, which undermines the feeling of "security" provided by this ideal communication medium. In this way, "communication" increases anxiety levels under conditions where ambivalences are dominant because the dominance and interests of "centralised power" become more determinant day by day. Indeed, said dominance and interests lead to the manipulation of communication processes.

The main reason why modernity has led to increased communication between spaces which were independent from one another previously, is that modern centralised power wants to regulate and control all of the area under its sovereignty by making it uniform. Society becomes uniform with communication, which was mainly created in one space, being made between different spaces. Because the messages sent through modern communication technologies replace the communication which was made directly between members of the community, it is possible for

centralised power to manipulate the communication processes. This is a factor which leads to dramatic increases in "anxiety" levels. Indeed, "communication" has made it possible for individuals to feel secure by decreasing anxiety; the more abstract and manipulable this concept becomes, the greater the number of ambivalences, crisis expectations and risks that arise.

Giddens (1990, p. 112) believes that modern abstract systems are more successful in providing security, compared to pre-modern orders. However, the fact that communication is no longer limited by space and is created on a large scale that an individual cannot perceive, increases not only "ambivalences", but also anxiety levels. This condition has a direct impact on the constitution process of society, as many facts, from laws to customs, habits and behaviour patterns depend on how communication and relationships between people are made. Although people feel more secured in a life-world which they understand, modernity causes uncertainty by subjecting the life-world of individuals to the effects of many factors. Therefore, because individuals have to have "communication" and "interaction" with too many people out of their space, it is becoming harder for them to regulate their own life-worlds with their will. Since modernity develops applications which undermine localities and strengthen centralised power, individuals are separated from their previous spaces, where they could use their will effectively, and are instead made manipulable. Thus, the social security felt by an individual who has ideal communication with other people is weakened rapidly.

In modernity, oppressive applications which make it possible for centralised power to organise and control the area under its hegemony are dominant. The more indirect communication, which is made through communication technologies, replaces direct communication between individuals, the more opportunities the state has to manipulate public opinion. In this way, there is no need for states to dominate by means of oppression; however, it does cause individuals to turn into apparatuses serving the aims of centralised power. In conditions where the

communication medium is controlled by the state, it is quite easy for centralised power to manipulate public opinion because it creates the information in circulation. Centralised power determines not only information, but also what is threatening and anxious. In conditions where a national state determines for the individual and society (1) "their priorities," (2) "what their interests are" and (3) "what they should or should not risk," it is quite possible to have an absolute hegemony. In time, centralised power begins to interfere with the daily behaviours and habits of individuals. Thus, it becomes possible to build a society which embraces what is determined by a centre.

In terms of modern policy and economies, where all localities are undermined and affiliated with centralised power, when a national state gets the opportunity to determine the information, as well as the anxieties of individuals and what their interests are, the society is governed very actively. The modern state, which has the opportunity to govern a society consisting of uniform individuals who act in harmony and coordination like the arms of a clock, implements soft despotism perfectly. Unlike ancient empires, modern centralised power has no control over the bodies of individuals, but does have influence over their minds; indeed, it gets opportunities to make use of all protests in order to increase its hegemony. Building and determining anxieties just like it does with regards to information, modern centralised power makes it possible for society to be uniform and dependant. Knowing what causes anxiety and determining the anxiety level, a centralised state deprives individuals of their ability to use their own will. Thereby, society turns into an object which is shaped by the implementations and manipulation of centralised power.

3. State and Society in Late Modern Period

The arrival of modernity promised new breakthroughs in political, economic and cultural areas. Although its intellectual, ideological and social influence was felt in the first quarter of the 16th century, it became a determinant of the re-structuring of societies and states in the 19th and

20th centuries. Establishing democratisation processes very rapidly and making it possible for society to become effective in political area, modernity made "nation" the main factor in structuring a state. Coordination of nation and state is one of the main features of modernity. "National interest" "national economy" and "national state" are some of the concepts presented by modernity to political science literature.

Bauman (1991: 4) asserts that undertaking the task of keeping order is one of the features of modernity. Restructuring the whole society so that it acts in coordination with the state requires breakthroughs for re-building a broad spectrum of areas, ranging from culture to economy. In this context, on the one hand, modernity is in inclination to spread out all over the world, while on the other hand, it makes use of the whole bureaucracy in order to regulate and control the society under its hegemony through national state. Because the modern state is inclined to develop all mechanisms for the coordination of all subjects constituting society, it wants to employ its method, determining information, perceptions, habits, culture and purposes of individuals and society. As such, the modern state tries to build a uniform nation, since it is impossible for individuals who have different information, perceptions and purposes to act in coordination. Likewise, as modernity makes it impossible for members of a society which consists of individuals with different local cultures to act in harmony and in coordination, modern policy and economy make an effort to uniform individuals.

One of the main reasons why "mass media" are developing with unprecedented speed in the modern period is that the conditions which require states and all subjects constituting the society to act in coordination are more dominant. The rapid development in communication technologies, which started with the telegraph and is evident in the internet today, has made "state apparatuses" determinant in terms of creating opinions and public opinion. Privileged to orient society with these apparatuses in any direction in desires, states get the opportunity to structure their political regime and economy in a "centralist" way. As long as many issues, from every-day life to political

choices, are in coordination with the functioning of centralised power, modern soft despotism strengthens its hegemony. All possibilities for freedom are rapidly weakened by centralist applications of modern despotism because, in modernity, any subject that does not act in coordination with centralised power is kept out of economic, political and social activities.

During the early modern period, the coordination of communities, which had similar culture, was effectively ensured. Despite religious conflicts, it was possible to re-build the nation with national culture, which was constructed by the national state, which isolated nation from the political and cultural impact of the Catholic Church. The democratisation processes were developed rapidly by means of melting political regime and nation in the same pot; at the end of these processes, and after successfully integrating the entire society into itself, the modern centralised state managed to become a large scale structure which enabled it to be absolutely determinant in all areas, from culture to economy. Since cultural, economic and legal diversities are undermined, as local differences in language were rapidly eliminated by centralised tendency, it has been possible for the modern centralised state to have an absolute hegemony.

Moreover, in conditions where "scientism" has an absolute dominance over thought and culture, the centralised state's implementations, which make the life uniform, become legitimate. This is because universalism, which has been made dominant by scientism, claims that it has absolute knowledge about what the "right" policy, economy and culture are. With this claim, the apparatuses that make it possible for the centralised power to regulate and control society become dominant, undermining all local political, economic and cultural applications. The fact that all laws are made by a "world-view" claiming that it has absolute knowledge regarding what is right about culture and identities makes centralised power despotic. This is because individuals have to structure their lives day by day, in accordance with a style introduced by the absolute truth.

Having the opportunity to determine what the right knowledge is by means of educational and cultural institutions, centralised states rapidly increase their opportunities to manipulate society. Despite this, all of the institutional and cultural apparatuses that ensured the development of national states in the early modern period, have been undermined in the late modern period. During the early modern period, the communities with similar customs in the same geographical region were effectively manipulated by "national culture" by means of facilitating coordination between them. As long as centralist cultural and educational institutions make great effort so that all individuals and societies have a "uniform" national identity, citizens will also have similar attitudes, behaviours and actions for the same purpose. Completely unlike other political systems, the modern political system, which is highly advanced with regards to structuring and manipulating society, paves the way so that individuals devote themselves to their nation by means of creating "artificial" identities. Thus, public space rapidly undermines the whole infrastructure of "negative liberty", developing rapidly and becoming dominant so that it includes individual autonomies. However, modernity cannot be limited by coordinating subjects that constitute only one nation. Being for different nations, modernity establishes an infrastructure which develops mutual dependence relations in economic and political areas in the international arena. Thus, modernity goes beyond being a political, economic and cultural development under the control of a national state. Pointing out the fact that the "national security state" has been undermined by the effect of rapidly strengthening global social forces, Ripsman and Paul (2005, p. 199) assert that conventional state centric security planning falls short in the face of new developments. Indeed, this is because modernity creates a dependence relationship which obliges a nation to act in coordination with the other active nations in the international arena. Moreover, the universalist discourse of enlightenment causes nations to conduct activities in accordance with the requirements of the modern world system in the cause of artificial ideals. Therefore, all apparatuses used by a national state to manipulate its own nation start to undermine the state itself because the modern world

system builds an economic, cultural and political system. This system makes it impossible for any subject, including national states, to act independent of the supranational centralised power. All of these points are the main reasons for the risks and crises faced by nations and national states in the late modern period.

The modern world system increases the determination of centralisation, which obliges all localities to act in coordination over national states and individuals. All national sates are gradually being obliged to take their positions in international policy, considering the absolute rightness presented by universalist world-views. Therefore, academic studies on supranational networks and diasporas are often based on the opinion that economic factors pave the way for the appearance of various identity formations (Vora, 2008, p. 378). Indeed, the necessities required by the centralised power, which is supranational, directly determine the economic and political choices of national states. Being manipulated for the insurance of getting the international interests, individuals act in consideration of abstract ideals, rightness and requirements which they will never comprehend. Thus, it becomes possible to build a system through which nations are manipulated by the "centralised power" and act in coordination. The emergence of dominant conditions which oblige nations and individuals to act in coordination with all other subjects when they use their will is possible by means of life being determined by mutual dependence relationships. Therefore, a social life in which obligations determine the actions and preferences of individuals has no other alternative.

4. Impact of Centralisation on Migration and Formation of Identity Problems

Modernity requires hard work in order to build a national and cultural identity which will ensure that all individuals work in coordination for the same objective. As such, it is essential that the conditions affecting all political discourses of nationalism become dominant. Riggs (1994, p. 583) stresses that modern states which created the infrastructure of the

industrial revolution and which were created by political revolution, caused modern ethnical nationalism. However, although the apparatuses used for structuring identity and culture help develop nationalist ideologies, they may lead to unpredicted consequences. Indeed, the discourses used for structuring national identity and culture, both of which distinguish a nation from other nations, may lead to different political and social problems. This modernity, which is based on determinist and universalist discourses using science as a base[3], contradicts the condition that a nation belongs to a definite geography. On the one hand, "modernity" requires national and political apparatuses to work in coordination, although on the other hand, it claims that it is based on universal truths thanks to rational thought. Here, there is a contradiction between the interest and welfare which the "national state" wants to develop against other states and the universalism tendency to equalise everything. While universalism claims that the right thing should be applicable for all, nationalism has a tendency to legitimise a "discourse" in order to gain a bigger share of power and welfare against others. Most of the time, a nation makes use of apparatuses of science and universalism in order to increase its power and welfare. However, a national state has to prioritise the consents and interests of its nation in all of its activities. There are often battles when it comes to international relations, as there exist conflicting interests. It is a sheer contradiction that "national states", which claim that they have universal truths which are reached through rational thought, try to achieve different goals.

The sovereignty problem is an important topic in studies related to migration and migration law, as building a nation state is possible with its control over the population in the territory where it has sovereignty (Dauvergne, 2004, p. 594). However, a national state being squeezed between its own interests and universal truth leads to problems regarding migration and the formation of identity; this also undermines "sovereignty". In a democratic political regime, centralised power needs to make great effort in order to increase its citizens' welfare. Indeed, in a democratic regime which is structured in a centralist way, when the

government fails to increase the welfare of its citizens, it must be replaced by another government, thus promoting politicians to make a considerable effort to form a government. The most effective way to be successful in policy is to increase the welfare of citizens[4]. Therefore, there is a contradiction between the scientific Universalist discourse used by a state which is obliged to increase welfare by means of looking out for its nation's interests, and the subjectivity of its activities. This contradiction becomes apparent in controversy between the centralist nature of the national state and the supranationalist centralist nature of the modern world system. While scientism has a "discourse" obliging nations to integrate themselves into the modern world system for universal values, national states, which have to look out for their own "national interests", object to it[5]. This is the main reason when the conflict continues between "national states", thus ensuring that the modern world system works further for the sake of their own national interests.

Modernism necessitates the rebuilding of the "state" for the sake of the future and the interests of the whole nation. Thus, the whole societies, as well as all individuals, are redesigned in accordance with the requirements of modern policy. However, conditions which necessitate the national state to act in coordination with other national states are a consequence of the modern economy. Coordination between "national states" becomes obligatory when it is needed to utilise different natural resources that are available in different geographic areas. Of particular note here is energy, which is the main resource for production, and necessitates nations and states in different geographies to act in coordination in the most effective way. By this means, a supranational centralisation becomes a disadvantage for national states. It is observed that "international corporations" (TNCs) often interfere with the sovereignty and autonomy of states (Goodhart, 2001, p. 527). Indeed, this means that national states which do not act in coordination with other national states in the modern world system are pushed out of the system and lose their welfare and power.

Using the individuals and communities that are not connected with the state, modernity creates a new society in which everybody has a state and nation. National identity and culture, which are strengthened by the motherland myth, are the main apparatuses used in building a "national state" and "nation". The legitimacy gained by means of replacing scientific truth with "religion", which used to be the main apparatus used to regulate society in the conventional world, now enables modernity to rebuild both national identity and culture. Citizens who come together for common interests try to ensure their future and welfare, sharing a common fate by means of the state. By this means, "general will"[6] becomes determinant in all political and economic choices. Although forced by the "supranational modern world system", the national state works as a perfect means of administration, ensuring national integrity and order. However, the national state is extremely sensitive to social problems, which could possibly cause differences which impair the national integrity. As such, the identity problems caused by migrations as a consequence of economic and political necessities posed by the modern world system undermine the features of the nation state which enable it to be an effective apparatus with which to keep order. Because of the national state's continued existence, it is crucial to build a society so that it acts in coordination with all activities of the state. This activity of the national state is the main reason for its existence. However, there are consequences when the political and economic impacts of globalisation make national states face migration and identity problems; indeed, the more this happens, the more minorities and diasporas, which make the nation not "uniform", undermine coordinated actions and cause diversification of "interests" in society based on ethnical, cultural and religious differences. Moreover, it is possible that new migrants will create "transregional" identities (Clifford, 1994, p. 311), which is another factor that strengthens supranational factors and undermines the sovereignty of national states. Since controlling migration becomes a paramount issue day by day, the number of activities undertaken to develop international coordination so as to control international migration also increases (Koser, 2010, p. 313; Ghosh, 2010, p. 320).

Newland (2010, p. 331) draws attention to the fact that international migrations which national states fail to control are the pillars of globalisation. International migration, which can be considered a part of the revolutionary globalisation process, reshapes all cultural parameters, political systems and economies (Munck, 2008, p. 1229). With this said however, we do not have a qualified theoretical framework to analyse the impact of migration on state sovereignty, which is a highly important issue (Moses, 2005, p. 56). It is clear that "centralisation" causes conflict and tension between natives and religions, as well as ethnic and cultural groups which are incompatible with the uniform nature of nations. As long as such conflicts and tensions incite social crises and increase uncertainty, risks become the main factors when it comes to building a new life. Migrants who are, on the one hand, demanded for economic development and, on the other hand, criticised for undermining social harmony and coordination, are the main reason for political disputes. The national state is in dilemma between international laws which claim universal truth, and national interests. National states which try to comply with the requirements of the modern world system have difficulty in overcoming domestic problems. However, "national states" which prioritise their domestic problems weaken after they are marginalised by the centralised political and economic applications of the modern world system. Therefore, making effort to balance between the conflict of international developments and domestic developments, the "national state" fails to develop permanent solutions for problems related to migration and identity.

Focusing on locations in UK and US metropolitan cities, diaspora activities try to reshape our understanding of "nation" and "migration" in the globalisation context (Lukose, 2007, p. 407). Indeed, having increased very rapidly following the impact of globalisation in the second half of the 21st century, global migrations result from an influx of cheap workforce into industrialised countries. Such workforce influxes give rise to extensive economic and political factors. Another reason for these migrations, which have caused diaspora, is that some nations and

communities cannot live in their homelands because of civil wars caused by ethnical, religious and political conflicts. As a result of these conflicts, "nations" and "national boundaries", which were clearly specified in the 20th century as a result of intense wars in the 19th century, are now questioned. Indeed, there is the chance that a "nation" which consists of individuals who have a sense of belonging to a definite state through compacting citizenship will be disintegrated because of groups which have different values, habits, cultures and identities. If this does happen, then the order and coordination which modernism tries to ensure cannot be maintained. In conditions where many nations which define themselves by different features live under the hegemony of only one national state, it becomes harder and harder for coherent and coordinated social activities to happen. The distinctive feature of modernity, and what differentiates it from the other political and social systems is that it makes social actions integrated and coordinated through an "artificial" identity and culture. Despite this, however, the fact that ghettoes have appeared in public is a very serious problem, primarily because of communities which have different interests and targets.

The prediction is that there will be a need to make more effort in order to develop cooperation between states, and thus achieve supranational arrangements in the global labour policy domain (Chaykowski, 2002, p. 89); indeed, this is because the rise of "xenophobia" and extremist right movements increases the risk of international conflicts. François, Magni-Berton and Matthews (2013, p. 48) draw attention to the fact that there is a tolerance against migrants when unemployment rates are low, and there is also an increase in intolerance against migrants when unemployment rates rise[7]. Although international migration can be controlled when it increases welfare, it is seen as the cause of many social problems in conditions where welfare decreases. The fact that a definite part of society is being accused of political and economic problems is due to widespread xenophobia. While different communities are tired of being assimilated, the "majority" (i.e., natives), who claim that they have the basic characteristics of the nation, define their identities based on how

they differ from minorities and diaspora. This causes assimilation of diaspora, or makes their integration with society impossible. On the one hand, political, cultural and social centralisation is felt everywhere, while on the other hand, it functions very well in "division of labour" out of the centre. Although migrants make a considerable contribution to the perfect division of labour, which is the main characteristic of modernity, centralist policies "undermine" social integrity, causing polarisation between natives and diasporas.

5. Media, as an apparatus of centralised power to build identities, and risks

The development of modernity and media is in coordination. Telegraph, newspaper, magazine, radio, TV and internet are the main apparatuses used by modern centralised states to manipulate public opinion. The main reason why these apparatuses developed rapidly in parallel with modernity is not related to technological developments. Individuals and powers decide what will be developed by science and technology. Therefore, rapid development in communication technology is a result of modern centralised power's desire to create a "uniform" state, which works in coordination. The fact that national states control all information across the whole area over which they have sovereignty, motivates the rapid development of technology. Modern states control society, regulate the resources which provide information to people, and use all designed "information" and "knowledge". Media accompany the coordination between civil society and centralised states through democracy. Setting the agenda, centralised power determines which problem has priority. Obtaining the opportunity to determine the factors and issues which "individuals" should be concerned about, the power regulates and controls society not through pressure but by acquiring the consent of individuals. Media continue to develop rapidly because modern centralised states need effective apparatuses in order to regulate and control society.

The fact that modern centralised power has the privilege to determine what the main social problems are, by means of media, has social and political impacts. In a society where the state informs all of its citizens through the same media, all individuals' behaviours, habits, choices and purposes are manipulated by the "general will". Moreover, public opinion considers individual choices to be incompatible with the "general will" as a factor undermining the social integrity. Individuals' opinions about "what the social problems are", "how a good life should be", and "who is friend and who is foe" are shaped by the information they receive through media. As such, a "uniform" society can be built by media. Modern states' effort to control everything and to undermine all potential alternative powers is possible by controlling "information". In conditions when different "knowledge structures" can affect "public life," it is impossible for a "uniform" social structure, which is indispensable for the sovereignty of modernity, to occur. As such, in modernity, "information" is organised and controlled not only by scientific and cultural institutions, but also by media.

However, the social and political developments which result from globalisation make it difficult for a "national state" to control all information in society. The modern world system's connection of different geographies, both economically and politically, leads to a diversity of information resources. The fact that individuals can access information that is alternative to the information provided by their own state makes it difficult for a national state to manipulate information. Moreover, diasporas who have migrated from their own countries lead the way for the development of "media", which provide alternative information, in their host countries. Dealing with ethnical, cultural and religious differences, people not only have different interests, but also different choices about which information they should consider as true information from that provided to them. Thus, it is becoming increasingly difficult to have integrity and uniformity in a society which consists of individuals who determine their own lives, choices and purposes based on the information they receive from different resources.

In contrast, modern centralised power becomes dominated by developing a division of labour and social coordination perfectly. A rise in the diversity of groups of different interests and choices, as well as the possibility for conflicts and crises mean that risk expectations determine the public life.

To become dominant, modern national states need that media, which enables it to manipulate the decisions and opinions of a "nation" which it has integrated into the system through democracy; indeed, this approach works effectively. If public opinion is not under the control of centralised power, a modern power cannot be ensured. A modern state which rules effectively through "soft despotism" is undermined in the face of political and economic crises which possibly occur in conditions when cultural diversity and different information resources increase. The more the centralised power tries to manipulate society, the stronger social opposition becomes with the help of opportunities provided by globalisation. The fact that various ghettos also appear in "media" where citizens can access them in order to gain information has an impact on the structure of the modern public and shapes public opinion. They focus solely on their own interests and concerns in order to prevent different religious, cultural and ethnical groups from having a dialogue with one another; indeed, this makes it impossible to take rational decisions.

An identity does not only consist of the features of subjects who possess it. Identity also means the way in which individuals or groups differ from one another. Ruling a society consisting of individuals who define themselves by their features, which are different from others, causes some risks. Closed communities' mainly following their own media strengthens radicalism. Moreover, when the information they get from their resources, which are different from the media of their own ghetto, let them know how they are defined by other groups, their "anxiety" level rises dramatically. Division of labour and coordination cannot be ensured perfectly simply through applying law forcefully. For this, there should be a "public life" in which individuals feel safe and secure. In a society

which is fragmented because of groups that have different interests and concerns, "designed fears" determine the direction of the life, as long as individuals ponder about possible conflicts with the impact of "high anxiety". This condition develops rapidly with the effect of globalisation, which has made it impossible for modern centralised power to control media. Being supranational, the "centralised modern world system", on the one hand, undermines the sovereignty of national states; however, on the other hand, it leads to mass migrations which ruin "national integrity". Moreover, centralisation, which is established by national states under their sovereignty, is undermined rapidly as long as it is turned into an apparatus of the supranational system. By this means, individuals gradually lose trust in the "national state". Indeed, this loss of trust leads to high anxiety over whether it will provide them with "safety and security"; this, in turn, means that the "national state", on the one hand, loses power, but on the other hand, uses pressure apparatuses more frequently.

6. Conclusion

Modern collectivism is based on the mind-set that all subjects need to act in coordination in order to build a new society. One of the main features of modernity, and one which differentiates it from the other "historical periods", is that there is perfect coordination between citizens and institutions thanks to the rapidly developed bureaucracy. As such, the "modern social system", which has many advantages compared to conventional administrative systems and societies perfectly ensures "organisation" and "control" everywhere in its sovereignty. Prompting the areas of specialisation to act in coordination and increasing their diversity, modern centralised power is the main "determinant" over all social factors. Thanks to this, modern centralised power can apply "soft despotism" to all areas of its sovereignty.

Modernity is not only about how to ensure political and economic regimes. It also wants to be the main determinant for all issues ranging from culture of the "nation", to its culture. It obtains "apparatuses" which

enable it to regulate and control society by building a centralised national identity and culture at the expense of destroying local features. All mass media, from novels to TV, are apparatuses used to build a common identity and culture. Coordination between all subjects is ensured thanks to said apparatuses. These communication apparatuses make it possible to build a "uniform" society, helping the "national state" orient individuals, groups and communities. As long as society consists of "local individuals" who are "uniform" and have lost their originality and locality, modern centralised power has the opportunity to govern society with authoritarianism. In this way, modern centralised power undermines "negative liberty", which means that an individual has the ability to take a decision by him/herself, unaffected by external factors. In conditions when identity and culture are built by "centralised power", a "uniform" lifestyle becomes dominant, while individualism and freedom are undermined[8].

All of these issues essentially originate from modernity's new grasp of "security". The opinion that security can be ensured perfectly when differences are reduced is the main factor in building modern political regimes. The opinion that administration will be more effective if society is "uniformed" formulates the modernisation practices. Moreover, it is thought that any subject who does not comply with these standards undermines social order and security. Thus, as long as security helps the centralisation of power and ensures that the whole society is "uniform," "soft despotism" becomes dominant by itself, and freedoms are undermined rapidly. All of this is done to control "high anxiety". Indeed, while society's being integrated and "uniform" ensures a more effective administration, the security measures provided by modern centralised power are expected to reduce "high anxiety".

Adamson (2006, p. 197) asserts that "migration" undermines the autonomy and capacity of the state, with international migration and human mobility viewed as two factors which risk national security. The obligations imposed by globalisation cause the "national state" to

gradually fail both in international relations and in controlling its own society. Modernity leads to the development of the apparatuses which are used by the national state to manipulate its society. On the other hand, the fact that international relations makes national states economically and politically dependant undermines the national state. This dichotomy tends to result in a world order whereby "national states" are effectively manipulated by the "centralist" implementations of the modern world system. The "soft despotic" administration of national states enables them to regulate and control their own nations. As along as this administration turns into an apparatus of modern world system, supranational centralised power finds opportunities which enable it to become dominant all over the world. This situation enlarges the political field so much so that individuals cannot perceive or affect it. When individuals do not use their will effectively to change and transform their lives, the "soft despotism" of centralised power becomes dominant in all social and private spheres; this, in turn, increases the "anxiety" level of individuals, thus leading to uncertainty over their security and future.

Media represent one of the most important apparatuses used by national states in order to manipulate society. However, the effects of globalisation, which have resulted in cultural diversity in societies under the sovereignty of the national state, increase the risk of social conflict. A national state's opportunity to manipulate society is undermined by differing information resources such as media of minorities and diaspora. This situation undermines not only the project aiming to build a "uniform" society, which is the main motive of modernity, but also makes it hard for "centralised power" to manipulate society, economy and policy. In the late modern period, all apparatuses ensuring that modernity establishes an effective administration start to undermine modernity. Modernity becomes rapidly overspread as it makes economic and political connections between different places. As a natural consequence, modernity occurs. As long as supranational centralised power becomes a body which has control over all national states, reaching behind national boundaries, the number of possible crises and

risks increases, both within states and in the international arena. When centralised power becomes supranational, the conditions in which any crisis in any geography affects the whole world become dominant. Thus, while both international and national risks increase rapidly, "high anxiety" becomes one of the determinants of social and individual lives.

The political and social problems which occurred in the late modern period are the consequence of modernity's inclination for centralisation. Therefore, the political and social problems in the late modern period are a consequence of the structural nature of modernity. The centralised power which becomes supranational increases social conflicts, causing an increase in identity problems. "High anxiety" becomes the main determinant, both in individual and social life. The increase of ambivalences and risks makes people dependant on centralised power day by day. Therefore, the political and social problems which occur because of the structural problems of modernity can be solved only with structural transformations.

References

Adamson, F. B. (2006). Crossing Borders: International Migration and National Security. *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 1, 165-199.

Arrow, K. J. (1951). *Social Choice and Individual Values*. NYSE: John Wiley & Sons.

Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Mark Ritter (Trans.). London: Sage Publications.

Beck, U. (1998). *World Risk Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bergson, Henri. ([1907] 1944). *Creative Evolution*. Translation by Arthur Mitchell. New York: The Modern Library.

Bertram, C. (2012). Rousseau's Legacy in Two Conceptions of the General Will: Democratic and Transcendent. *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 74, No. 3, pp. 403-419.

Bourke, J. (2006). *Fear: A Cultural History*. London: Virago.

Buchanan, J. (1991). *The Economics and the Ethics of Constitutional Order*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Buchanan, J. and Tullock, G. (1962). *The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Chaykowski, R. P. (2002). Globalization and the Modernization of Canadian Labour Policy. *Canadian Public Policy/Analyse de Politiques*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 81-91.

Clifford, J. (1994). Diasporas. *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 302-338.

Darwin, C. (1859). *On the Origin of Species*. London: John Murray.

Dauvergne, C. (2004). Sovereignty, Migration and the Rule of Law in Global Times. *The Modern Law Review*, Vol. 67, No. 4, 588-615.

Downs, A. (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.

François, A., Magni-Berton, R. & Matthews, T. (2013). The Effects of Contact and Competition on Tolerance of Immigrants in France. *Revue française de sociologie* (English Edition), Vol. 54, No. 1, 47-75.

Ghosh, B. (2010). The Global Financial and Economic Crisis and Migration Governance. *Global Governance*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 317-321.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Glassner, Barry (2010). *The Culture of Fear: Why Americans Are Afraid of the Wrong Things: Crime, Drugs, Minorities, Teen Moms, Killer Kids, Mutant Microbes, Plane Crashes, Road Rage, & So Much More*. New York: Basic Books.

Goodhart, M. (2001). Democracy, Globalization, and the Problem of the State. *Polity*, Vol. 33, No. 4, 527-546.

Kasinitz, P. (2012). The Sociology of International Migration: Where We Have Been; Where Do We Go from Here? *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 27, No. 3, 579-590.

Koser, K. (2010). Introduction: International Migration and Global Governance. *Global Governance*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 301-315.

Kuehnelt-Leddihn, E., 1952. *Liberty or Equality: The Challenge of our Time*. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers Ltd.

Lukose, R. A. (2007). The Difference That Diaspora Makes: Thinking through the Anthropology of Immigrant Education in the United States. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, Vol. 38, No. 4, 405-418.

Mises, L. v. ([1920] 1935). Economic Calculation in the Socialist Common- wealth. Reprinted in *Collectivist Economic Planning*. F. A. Hayek, ed. London: George Routledge and Sons. 87-130.

Mises, L. v. ([1944] 1969). *Omnipotent Government: The Rise of the Total State and Total War*. Westport, CT: Arlington House.

Mises, L. v. ([1949] 1998). *Human Action A Treatise on Economics*. San Francisco: Fox & Wilkes.

Mises, L. v. (1944). *Bureaucracy*. New Haven: Yale University.

Moses, J. W. (2005). Exit, Vote and Sovereignty: Migration, States and Globalization. *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 53-77.

Munck, R. (2008). Globalisation, Governance and Migration: An Introduction. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 7, 1227-1246.

Newland, K. (2010). The Governance of International Migration: Mechanisms, Processes, and Institutions. *Global Governance*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 331-343.

Nisbet, R. A. (1988). *The Present Age: Progress and Anarchy in Modern America*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.

Riggs, F. W. (1994). Ethnonationalism, Industrialism, and the Modern State. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 4, 583-611.

Ripsman, N. M. & Paul, T. V. (2005). Globalization and the National Security State: A Framework for Analysis. *International Studies Review*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 199-227.

Rudolph, C. (2003). Security and the Political Economy of International Migration. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4, 603-620.

Stearns, Peter N. (2006). *American Fear: The Causes and Consequences of High Anxiety*. New York: Routledge.

Tomasello, M. (2008). *Origins of Human Communication*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Tullock, G. (1965). *The Politics of Bureaucracy*. Washington: Public Affairs Press.

Vora, N. (2008). Producing Diasporas and Globalization: Indian Middle-Class Migrants in Dubai. *Anthropological Quarterly*, Vol. 81, No. 2, 377-406.

Whitmeyer, J. M. (1997). Mann's Theory of Power - A (Sympathetic) Critique. *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 48, No. 2, 210-225.

Williams, D. L. (2010). Spinoza and the General Will. *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 72, No. 2, 341-356.

---

[1] One of the most qualified critics on such a centralisation is Ludwig von Mises, whose economic and political understanding is very impressive ([1920] 1935; [1944] 1969; [1949] 1998; 1944). Claiming that centralised economic policies are doomed to fail, Mises ([1949] 1998, p. 706) criticises the economic and political consequences of ideologies which try to ensure an unrestricted centralisation by delegating all affairs which rapidly developed in the 20th century to only one authority.

[2] As long as modern national states build a "uniform" society in order to have an absolute dominance despite needing migrants because of economic difficulties, they face various problems which are hard to solve.

[3] Despite a rejection of certain insights, such as that of Bergson ([1907] 1944) who explains "evolution" through "creativism" and "free will" of human beings, there are comprehensive results related to the fact that Darwin's (1859) determinist evolutionism became dominant in the science world. Indeed, in conditions when the deterministic worldview becomes determinant, centralised powers rapidly becomes stronger.

[4] "Public choice theory", which is one of the most qualified insights developed to analyse political behaviour, has led to a considerable increase of the critics labour welfare state (Arrow, 1951; Downs, 1957; Buchanan and Tullock, 1962; Tullock, 1965; Buchanan, 1991). The unlimited actions of the "national state" after it receives consent from society results in social, economic and political problems. As such, "how to limit the state" has become a very important issue in political science. It is important that politicians make use of public resources in order to achieve their individual objectives as a natural consequence of centralisation. In the modern political system, politicians who manipulate democratic decision making processes often use public resources for their own interests by misinforming the public. Since centralisation leads to the elimination of all counterweights which balance the powers of state, politicians take

decisions which restrict the freedoms and will of individuals, exhibiting their own interests as public interests.

[5] The process of the "United Kingdom's" withdrawal from the "European Union", known as "Brexit", is considered one of the most important examples of how national states object to supranational organisations.

[6] Although Williams (2010, p. 349) alleges that there are important differences between the "general will" insights of Spinoza, Hobbes and Rousseau, the political and social consequences of all of them lead to modern "soft despotism", even if all of them have different styles. As asserted by Nisbet (1988, p. 55), when an individual is involved in the social contract, he/she is deprived of all of his/her rights and freedoms, as is determined by the absolute power of "general will". As has been seen, the insight of "general will" has consequences which eliminate rights and freedoms. Nevertheless, today there are many followers of Rousseau's "general will" insight, such as Rawls and Habermas (Bertram, 2012, p. 419).

[7] Likewise, Kasinitz (2012, p. 588) asserts that "political events" can change "native" populations' perception and reactions to migrants, as well as migrants' opinion on their own identity.

[8] Kuehnelt-Leddihn (1952, p. 52) believes that enmity for "personality" and "tradition" shapes the processes of democratisation, centralisation and bureaucratisation which are interrelated. All these processes truly undermine individual freedoms and personality, meaning that "soft despotism" becomes dominant. Modernity rapidly decreases opportunities for human life by centralising power and undermining negative liberty.