Journal of Social Sciences of Mus Alparslan University

anemon

Derginin ana sayfası: http://dergipark.gov.tr/anemon

Araştırma Makalesi ● Research Article

Seeking Meaning in the East with Western Concepts: The Case of Public Policy

*Batı'nın Kavramları ile Doğu'da Anlam Aramak: Kamu Politikası Örneği**

Yusuf Çifci [a,**]

[a] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü, Muş/Türkiye.
ORCID: 0000-0001-6453-0084

MAKALE BİLGİSİ

Makale Geçmişi:
Başvuru tarihi: 03 Ocak 2020
Düzeltme tarihi: 11 Ocak 2020
Kabul tarihi: 16 Ocak 2020

Anahtar Kelimeler:
West
East
Concept
Meaning
Public Policy

A B S T R A C T

Concepts are contextual. The relationship between the concept and the meaning is always formed within the context of time/space and society. The contextual relationship a society develops with the concept shows the meaning the said society attributes to it. Concepts are the object of theories while theories are the subject of concepts. In the traditional period, each society used concepts and theories suitable for their contexts. However, this has changed due to modernism, with which all societies in the world have started using Western-centric concepts and theories. Engaging in scientific activities with concepts and theories imported from the West distorts the web of significance in the East or, in other words, transforms this web of significance with a Westward orientation. Moving from this point, this study examines concepts and theory of public policy imported from the West and underlines the necessity of novel concepts and theory unique to Eastern societies in the general sense and to the society of Turkey in the specific sense.

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article history:
Received 03 January 2020
Received in revised form 11 January 2020
Accepted 16 January 2020

Keywords:
Batı
Doğu
Kavram
Anlam
Kamu Politikası

Ö Z

Kavramlar bağlamsaldırlar. Kavram ve anlam ilişkisi bir zaman / mekân ve toplum bağlamında şekillenmektedir. Bir toplumun şey ile kurduğu bağlamsal ilişki o toplumun şeye verdiği anlamı göstermektedir. Kavramlar kuramların nesnesi, kuramlar ise kavramların öznesidirler. Geleneksel dönemde her toplum kendi bağlamına uygun kavram ve kuramları kullanmıştır. Ancak bu durum modernleşme ile değişmiştir. Modernleşme ile bütün dünya toplumları Batı merkezli kavramları ve kuramları kullanmaya başlamışlardır. Batı'dan ithal edilen kavram ve kuramlarla bilimsel bir eyleme girişilmesi Doğu'daki anlam ağını bozmakta ya da bu anlam ağını Batı'ya doğru dönüştürmektedir. Buradan hareketle bu çalışmada Batı'dan ithal edilen kamu politikası kavram ve kuramı mercek altına alınmış ve genelde Doğu toplumlarının özelde ise Türkiye'nin yeni ve kendi toplumuna özgü kavram ve kuram ihtiyacına dikkat çekilmiştir.

1. Introduction

Theories have the same significance for everyone dealing with science. However, "concepts" are to the social scientist what test tubes are to the natural scientist (Türköne, 2007: IX). Test tubes, used universally among natural scientists, are substituted by concepts subject to cultural realities in social sciences. In this context, "concepts", simple signifiers of objects in one's mind (Kök, 1985: 670), are in the central position for any analysis within the scope of social sciences[1].

[1] Social sciences emerged with modernism (Kızılçelik, 2004: 1). From this point of view, social sciences are Western centric. In other words, the modern scientific paradigm forms the basis of the interpretation of the "social" perception in the world. In this respect, it must be indicated that social sciences, emerging in the 19th century, are Western social sciences, because it is known that the positivist philosophy in Western social sciences

* The conceptual framework used in this essay, has been used before in the essay called "Theoretical and Conceptual Dilemmas in Turkey: A Study on Laicism" at the center of the concept of secularism.

** Sorumlu yazar/*Corresponding author*
e-posta: y.cifci@alparslan.edu.tr

e-ISSN: 2149-4622. © 2013-2020 Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi. TÜBİTAK ULAKBİM Dergi Park ev sahipliğinde. Her hakkı saklıdır.
http://dx.doi.org/10.18506/anemon.670052

With the advent of modernism, everything has been started to be periodised. In this respect, it can be said that information has also been modernised with modernism[2]. The indications of "modern", "pre-modern/traditional" and "post-modern" are some examples of this periodisation. From this point of view, after the modern period, the existence of a constantly growing black hole[3] imposing the Western-centric scientific paradigm can be claimed within the sciences like "philosophy-sociology-politics-governance-literature-etc.", because it is possible to indicate that a Western-centric thought system dominates all scientific paradigms in the modern period as the "theory-paradigm" (Latouche, 1993).

The production of concepts around Western-centric theories creates similar problems in non-Western societies around the globe. Western-centric theories used to make sense of things draw concepts to the black hole of "the modern". In this way, the Western-centric superiority of theories used to create information is the reality of all other societies in the world in the general sense and in Turkey in the specific sense because, as it is the case in everywhere else, scientific research is conducted from the perspective of Western-centric theories[4].

Moving from the argument stating that those creating the theories control the agenda (Aydınlı & Mathews, 2008: 163), this article first deals with the origin of "concepts". Then, it examines the origin of theories and, finally, the conundrums of the Western-centric scientific thought are analysed within the signification of the concept of "public policy", recently flourishing in Turkey. The purpose of this article is to indicate that concepts and theories have a weight in the time and space within which they emerge and to show that the same concepts do not have the same weight in other times and spaces when they are taken from their own. Within this context, after the examination of the origins of "concepts" and "theories", the conceptual conundrum regarding "public policy", occupying the global agenda and the Turkish scene is put forward. Even though there are many similar concepts and theories within the scope of the modern Republic in Turkey, the concept of "public policy", attempted to be epitomised from the US, is considered to be the best example in this respect.

2. What are concepts? The Relationship between Concepts, Meaning and Context

What is a concept? What kind of a relationship exists between a concept and meaning? Can the societal realities of the society concerned be disregarded while making sense of concepts? What kind of problems might occur due to the use of a concept that does not exist in the essence of social reality while analysing or describing the society in question? These are some of the possible questions regarding contexts. However, the key question here should be about the position of the concept within the scope of "language".

In Turkish, the word for "concept" (kavram) derives from the root "kav-ır". The word has Turkish origins and its first use dates back to 8th and 11th centuries, to Central Asian written Turkish (Nişanyan, 2018: 427). The counterpart of this word in Ottoman Turkish is "mefhum", which originates from the Arabic word "fehva" meaning "significance, concept" (Parlatır, 2006: 445). The word "concept" also takes different meanings in different disciplines. For example, in sociology, concepts are tools used by social scientists to define social phenomena and to attach meaning to these phenomena by explaining them (Marshall, 2009: 395). In the philosophical sense, it signifies the cumulative information carried by the word (Cevizci, 2005: 988). As for the field of educational sciences, concepts are defined as abstract thoughts given significance by the denomination of its scope or content with a sign or phrase (TÜBA, 2011: 687).

As it can be observed with the examples provided above, there are multiple meanings assigned to the word "concept". However, the common point of these meanings is the term "phenomenon". In all definitions, concepts are described as the signifiers of phenomena, the "forms" perceived by senses in the material world (Cevizci, 2005: 698-699), in the human mind. With that being said, it is important to highlight that phenomena and relationships between phenomena cannot be separated from time and space[5] because relationships between phenomena and their perception occur in a variety

defines itself in this very process as "the God of modern science" (Çiğdem, 1997: 3).

[2] Another thing brought about by modernism is that the traditional person is guided by religion while the modern person by reason and science. (Oktay, 2009: 242-243). In this regard, it can be claimed that approaching knowledge solely with rationalism is also problematic. As the periodisation of knowledge with reference to the modern will constantly point to the "latest" knowledge, it might be stated that this creates a vicious cycle and that this cycle develops in favour of the modern.

[3] Here, with the metaphor of a "black hole", the implication is that the "Eurocentric" (Amin, 2007: 111) is the foundation of all scientific paradigms.

[4] The understanding of originality in science has undergone a profound transformation in the modern period. Before modernism, the scientific thought seeking originality within its own character was substituted by imitation, continuation and translation. The new scientific understanding based on the "sameness" of all societies in the world has entered a vicious cycle. This is also valid for the dominant scientific paradigm in Turkey, because it is a known fact that a Western-centric scientific paradigm is applied through "translation" in Turkey. In this regard, the following remarks by Ahmet Buran are noteworthy: "It is possible to describe the transfer of concepts in a technical manner as follows: There are two aspects of linguistic signs. One of them is the signifier and the other is the signified. The signifier is mostly represented by sounds or writing. As for the signified, it is what the signifier corresponds to or represents. In the translations of concepts, we only take the signified from the source language and substitute the signifier with elements from our own language. As the foreignness in such transfers is not noticed from outside, a mixed structure whose appearance is from us, but the essence is from somewhere else" (author's translation). It might be claimed that this is also valid for the concept of "public policy".

[5] It is necessary to elaborate on the term "context" here, because concepts are dependent on the social reality within which they have flourished in terms of time and space. In this respect, the following statements can be helpful in understanding the connection between concepts, context, meaning and social reality: "Thoughts are created with concepts and transferred by means of concepts. The process of creation and articulation of a thought depends on the features displayed by the concepts used. Concepts, on the other hand, are contextual; they owe their existence to contexts shaped with historical, social, economic, political etc. processes. The fundamental component of thought creation, concepts are identified within the framework of contexts from which they originated." (Altun, 2005: 7) (author's translation). As it can be inferred from this, concepts rely on social time and space. Moving from this point of view, the concept and context of "public policy" examined within the scope of the present study is adapted from the American concept to Turkey. It is possible to argue that this adaptation is problematic in terms of the concept and meaning map. This subject is analysed in detail based on the sample in the final chapter of this study.

of ways in different places and different times[6]. In order to observe the roles and differences associated with the concept, one needs to analyse the relationships between phenomena within any given "time and scape". In this respect, "phenomena" within different "times and spaces" and the differences in the relationships between phenomena can be said to alter the semantic weight of concepts.

The question of how concepts are made sense of is answered from the point of phenomena and the relationships between phenomena. In this regard, stances, relationships and directions of phenomena within two different "times and spaces" can be said to progress differently. Moving from this, the most significant illusion concerning the interpretation of concepts in the modern period is the presupposition of the "sameness" of phenomena in each "time and space". In other words, the meaning of things does not have the same weight in every social space. So, can the denomination of concepts can vary based on social reality? The answer to this question is affirmative. Due to the differentiation of phenomena and the changes in relationships, it can easily be argued that "social realities" and the perceptions of reality are shifting. In this context, in each social space, the change of meanings of concepts retains its validity. In fact, the argument that social phenomena are inherently referenced (Searle, 2005: 52-53), therefore leading to the change of phenomena, seems to be quite natural. The following incident in the UK manifests the differentiation of the concept of crime between British and Nigerian societies:

> "Adesanya was charged at the Old Bailey, the Central Criminal Court in London, with assault occasioning actual bodily harm under section 47 of the Offences against the Person Act 1861. She pleaded not guilty to the charge of assault and offered a cultural defense. From her cultural viewpoint, failure to make the facial scars would be condemned: 'Without such markings, her boys would be unable to participate as adults in their culture. A failure to assure one's children of such scarification would thus be viewed as neglectful or abusive within the cultural context of her tribe…'" (Renteln, 2004: 49-50)

As it can be inferred from these statement by Renteln, the case concerning the concept of crime clearly shows that phenomena, underlined to be the foundations of concepts, change and transform based on social reality. An action considered to be a crime according to the court in the UK is regarded to be a cultural necessity in Nigeria. From this point of view, it can be expressed that this case proves that concepts have different semantic weights in different cultural realities.

Ultimately, it must be emphasised that social reality[7] plays a leading role in the interpretation of concepts, described as the meaning derived from words (Seyyar, 2007: 559). However, it must be stated that theories used to denominate concepts in the modern period pulls concepts to its modern centre and that all denominations are made within the modern "black hole". In this respect, one needs to analyse the origins of modern theories creating a "synthetic[8]" "concept" and "concept map" in non-Western societies.

3. Confusion of Concept and Theory: Concepts from a Theoretical Point of View[9]

In scientific literature, the concepts of theory and paradigm are usually used interchangeably. However, these concepts have different etymological contexts and different meanings. In this respect, theory derives from Greek and signifies "hypothesis or interpretation assumed to be true, based on which phenomena are explained and predictions regarding phenomena are made" (Cevizci, 2005: 1611) (author's translation). On the other hand, "paradigm", another word of Greek origin, means "in science, the model determining the world view of the scientist and enabling them to explain phenomena" (Cevizci, 2005: 1319) or "case arguments" (Outhwaite, 2003: 459).[10]

---

[6] The common presupposition made while analysing and interpreting "the modern" is that modernisation puts forward a reality of phenomena accepted by all societies. The fact that each social organism going through the process of modernisation propounds sameness is the core of this presupposition. For example, within the scope of the relationships between "the individual, the society and the state", the signified of the concept of "public policy" analysed in this study, the general assumption is that, in the phenomenal sense, all societies progress in the "same" direction. However, it must be particularly stated that the relationships between "the individual", "the society" and "the state" are formed in a plethora of ways in each social organism. On the other hand, it is possible to indicate that the ideologization of modernisation under the title of "globalisation" challenges the basic argument put forward in this article. Yet globalisation, in particular, can be said to confirm the argument of the article. As a matter of fact, even though there are some discussions regarding relationships between phenomena "becoming the same", what "becomes the same" seems to be the phenomena of "the modern" only. When the social organism is thought as a whole, proposition that the difference of phenomena and that of relationships between phenomena will last forever can be based upon the differentiation of time and space. In this regard, upon examining studies on "public policy", it can be said that there is a presupposition of sameness between the social existence of the US and the societal aspects of Turkey and that this presupposition is problematic in terms of concepts, meaning and context.

[7] There are many possible interpretations of social reality. However, what needs to be underlined there is that the perception of "reality" occurs in the material plane, that of "truth" in the moral plane and that of "authenticity" in both planes. The material and moral dimensions of "thought" (Politzer, 2010: 33-35; Descartes, 1989: 51-108), on which all philosophers agree within the scope of initial principles of philosophy, need to be considered alongside the perception of social reality. In this context, the following definition of social reality is noteworthy: "Social reality, as a network of relationships, is an extensive domain in which our life, individuality and actions occur in an integrated manner" (Sarıbay, 2006: 107) (author's translation)

[8] Here, the adjective "synthetic" is used deliberately, because it can be argued that interpretations made based on "modern" theories separate concepts from social reality and connects them to an artificial social reality. In this regard, the word "synthetic" as used here can be signified as "distant from social reality".

[9] While discussing the conundrums of paradigms and theories, their meanings can be said to create a conundrum of their own because for many years, their meanings are conveyed through the concept of "speculation" within the framework of social reality. In this respect, using the metaphor of "weight" repeated in the article, it can be easily said that signifiers like theory or paradigm in Western-centric philosophy has a weight of ten units while it does not weigh the same in the social reality of Turkey.

[10] Another example of the description of the modern as a "black hole" can be given regarding the language used in the dictionaries referred to for the article because in all of these dictionaries, denominations of concepts are made with a focus on certain [Eurocentric] philosophers or geographies. For example, the concept of paradigm is explained with references only from Kuhn and all examples are given from Kuhn's book titled "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" (Kuhn, 1970). In this regard, while the concept of "paradigm" can attain its own weight within the "language, geography, time and space" from which Kuhn comes, it might not be the same case for other societies.

The most basic thing to be highlighted concerning theories and paradigms is that they inherently carry their objectives[11]. It must be also indicated that each paradigm and theory have certain assumed truths and realities. In this context, it can be argued that all theories put their own realities in the centre during a scientific analysis. Moving from this point, it should be underlined once more that the social reality from which theories and paradigms originate is vital. In this respect, it is possible to claim that each theory or paradigm in the centre of such an analysis, in fact, serves its own essence and pulls the social reality of the society in question towards its own essence (like a black hole).

Theories and paradigms lay the ground for all sociological studies (Arda, 2003: 368). If the theories, determining the approach of the scientist towards the problem as well as the methods and procedures of the scientific study (Güçlü et al., 2008: 1124), belongs to the society in question, meaning and concept maps in alignment with the essence of the society can be created. Every theory and paradigm are put forward within a certain systematic framework and includes an established answer to a wide-range question (Timuçin, 2004: 336). However, each theory relies on the systematic framework of the setting in which it flourishes and creates meaning and concept maps accordingly. Moving from this point, it can be argued that each analysis within the framework of Western-centric theories pulls the semantic and conceptual world of the society in question increasingly closer to the "black hole"[12] of the modern.

In the traditional period, each society created its own meaning and concept maps with theories using theories developed within its own boundaries. However, this has changed in the modern age. The conceptual void denominated as a "black hole" in the article is manifest especially among Eastern societies modernising later. Based on the fact that modern theories are accepted by all social organisms in the world, it can be claimed that the black hole created "the modern" becomes larger with each passing day.

In science, theories are the initial moving point (Türkdoğan, 2012: 208) because with theories or paradigms, relationships between phenomena[13] are defined. Moving from this point, trying to explain a phenomenal relationship in the society [M] with a theory or paradigm originating from the society [K] might cause significant problems. These problems can be briefly listed as follows: (1) The society [M] (although implicitly) admits the superiority of the society [K], the balance of power and authority between the societies [K] and [M] can be shifted in favour of [K]. (2) The phenomena and the relationships between phenomena in the society [M] can be distorted and the semantic and conceptual of the society [M] can become barren or messed up[14]. (3) As the phenomenon of the social reality in the society [K] cannot be completely codified in the society [M], "synthetic" phenomena and phenomenal relationships can occur.

As can be seen, the relationship between concepts, meaning and context basically progresses based on theories. Analysing the East with Western-centric theories or vice versa brings about grave social problems. In this regard, due to the interwoven structure of concepts and theories, conducting scientific research on the basis of concepts and theories imported from another society causes the study in question to be positioned on incorrect grounds. As it is the case in many other societies modernising later, there are many concepts and theories that can cause such incorrect positioning in Turkey. Based on this, analysing the concept of "public policy" can make the fundamental argument in the present study more comprehensible.

4. Studying Conceptual Chaos: The Case of Public Policy

One of the modern concepts thrived in the Western Christian cultural and religious context in which modernity flourished (Sifil, 2011: 129), public policy ("*kamu politikası*"[15] in Turkish) is a frequently cited concept during the recent years. Nowadays, books with the title of "public policy" are translated into Turkish while articles and dissertations are written on the same topic. However, while public policy develops in the intellectual and literary sense, it is possible to state that social reality is overlooked. The conceptual and theoretical void expressed as the black hole of the modern is also present within the scope of the science of "public policy" as well as for the concepts and theories used in this discipline. In this context, it can be claimed that the social reality in Turkey gradually gets closer to a US-centric way (i.e. to the modern black hole) as a result of importing the concept of public policy.

Public policy is regarded to be a scientific discipline emerged as a result of a series of "social, political, technical,

[11] The best example of theories and paradigms inherently carrying their objectives within themselves is the concept of "ideology". As far as the "socialist" paradigm, an ideology, is concerned, it is instantly understood that it emphasises a time and space. Upon examining the general course of this paradigm in Turkey, it can be argued that meaning, as its weapon, (Skinner, 1997: 24), produces the concept of socialism and that it actually signifies its own objective.

[12] Science and scientific thought have a significant place in human history. However, science becoming the subject of biased discourses or serving a group, class or ideology can be described as "science losing its character". In this context, it seems appropriate to name the conundrums of the modern within the scope of theories and paradigms as a "black hole". Meriç's statements about this case in relation to literature are noteworthy: "From time to time, people were not able to quench their thirst with the sources of science and faith. They looked at the dark well, believing that it will spout fresher and more fulfilling truths. However, this is an 'angoisse' rather than a concern, the crisis of our civilisation…" (Meriç, 2008a: 397) (author's translation)

[13] A phenomenon is defined as the real or the realised as opposed to the thought (Akarsu, 2007: 135). Phenomenon or a signifier named as "x" has different meanings in different cultures. Upon examining social organisms in the world, thousands of different "signifiers", "signifieds" and "meanings" even for the phenomenon of "marriage". In this context, it must be borne in mind that the significance of the term "phenomenon" can change from one culture to another (i.e. from one time and space to another). This is also valid for other concepts in the article.

[14] Baydur's following statements can be provided as examples for this case: "Born as the Turks were under the influence of the Islamic civilisation, Ottoman Turkish was insufficient (!) to express novel concepts emerging as they became influenced by the European civilisation instead" (Meriç, 2008b: 268) (author's translation).

[15] Upon analysing the concepts of "*kamu* (public)" and "*politika* (policy)" separately, it can be seen that the former is of Turkish origin, that it means "to gather, to assemble" and that it is used for the first time in the Orkhon Inscriptions written in Old Turkish. As for the latter, it derives from Ancient Greek and means the art of governance. On the other hand, it is a known fact that the interpretation of the concept of "public policy" as a conceptual conundrum is also difficult to interpret in the American academic literature. As a matter of fact, making analysis on the subject of public policy, Hill states that public policy is a unique, integrated phenomenon and, therefore, there is a problem of definition in this matter (Hill, 2005: 7).

economic, cultural, etc." developments in the US[16]. In this context, public policy is defined as the body of things that a government chooses to or not to do (Dye, 1992: 2; Cochran & Malone, 2005: 1). Even though this is the definition in the academic literature in Turkey, the concept is interpreted in a more detailed manner in the American academic literature: It is an interdisciplinary domain related with politics, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, geography, history and mathematics (Nagel, 1984: 2). As can be seen, public policy emerges as a discipline related to almost every phenomenon within social reality. In this context, an analysis made using the theories of public policy can be assumed to be based on certain US-centric presuppositions.

The concept of public policy certainly bears significant meaning in the geographical context in which it has flourished. However, as far as Turkey is concerned, this might not be the case. The study of "public policy" as a case of conceptual and theoretical conundrums in Turkey and the explanation of this concept using the metaphor of "weight" are the main objectives of the present article. The following questions can be asked to underline the predicaments of this concept: Do the phenomena concerning the triad of "individual-society-state" have the same weight in Turkey and the US? Or the relationships between the phenomena in question progress in the same trajectory? Are the foundations of public policy the same in both societies? Does the policy process take place in the same direction within both social existences? Are the aforementioned actors in policymaking equally effective in both societies? Do both societies show the same reflexes while evaluating policy outcomes? Are the ontological assumptions and social reality perceptions of both societies the same? This list of questions can, of course, be extended further. However, the key question is whether phenomena marked by political science have the same weight in both social settings. Moving from this, one needs to analyse the differences between phenomena within the conceptual and theoretical scope of public policy or, in other words, to examine the entirety of public policy in order to reveal the phenomenal gaps within two societies.

Foundations of Public Policy[17]**:** Public policy is a discipline of problem-solving based on social and political philosophy, social expertise, hard evidence, methods and theories (Dunn, 2004: 1). In this context, as a discipline, public policy stems from certain theoretical assumptions. As for the phenomena constituting these assumptions, they originate from events occurring within the course of history. In fact, upon examining the philosophical framework of public policy, it can be claimed that the ideas of Machiavelli, Bacon, Bentham, Mill, James, Dewey, Rawls, Nozick, Popper, Hayek, Etzioni and Habermas form the basis of this discipline (Parsons, 1995: 41). In this respect, the theory denotes the Euro-American thought-action system. In other words, the concept in question and all of its theories are based on Euro-American ontological foundations. The concept of public policy and the theories formulated for this concept have generally arisen from the American social context.

The phenomenal integrity within the scope of "social meaning" can be indicated as the foundation of public policy. It can be argued that the phenomenon of social meaning contributes to public policy as a whole. Based on this, Fischer, a public policy theoretician himself, underlines the phenomena of "social meaning" and "social reality and describes social meaning as follows: "Social meaning is an integrated ensemble[18] of connections between images and ideas that appear in various modes of presentation, such as perception, remembrance, and imagination" (Fischer, 2003: 139). In this regard, as far as the US and Turkey are concerned, the foundations for public policy can be identified as completely different from one another.

Presuppositions of Public Policy[19]**:** Like all other concepts and theories, public policy aims to make definitions, provide explanations and give information on the future based on certain "perceptions of reality". In fact, it is stated that a good theory of public policy should include the three main features of "definition, explanation and prediction" (Simon, 2007: 26). In this respect, it can be said that social events occurring within the historical dynamics of the US lead to certain presuppositions and that the theory of public policy defines and explains social problems and makes assumptions and predictions about the future based on these presuppositions. On the other hand, it is known that the concept of public policy makes references to cultural codes regarding the question of what are and are not problems in the social setting. In this context, Considine states that cultural codes, as far as public policy is concerned, reveal what is possible and what is not (Considine, 2005: 64-65). Based on this, it is possible to suggest that the ontological foundation is vital for a social entity. Considering the context of Turkey, it is observed that public policy analyses generally do not include clear discussions of ontological presuppositions. However, it is constantly indicated that the ontological presuppositions in question constitute the hidden[20] (Morçöl, 2002: 13) centre in every analysis. Ultimately, it can be stated that the US and

[16] Political science developed with the works of Harold D. Laswell in the 1940s and 1950s and appears as an academic discipline ever since (Deleon ve Martell, 2006: 31). Initially emerging as a technocratic discipline (Fischer, 1995: 207), public policy, in a sense, is based on the Northern American behaviouralism (John, 1998: 1). As it can be inferred from this definition, the time and space indicated by the concept is the United States of the 1940s and 1950s.

[17] The foundations placed in the centre while making public policy in Turkey and the US are different. In this respect, Turkey's "resource" substitutions originating from the US for concepts and theories can be regarded as an example of the shift in power relations between societies, as indicated in the previous section. In light of this, the "power" of the US over Turkey is seen to be an undeniable reality.

[18] The achievement harmony in the societal setting, the attainment the "common good" in each society or the formulation of societal networks of trust is crucial considering the integrality of the concepts of "individual, state and society". Looking from the point of view of public policy, the formulation of the networks of trust within the triangle of "individual-society-state" is vital for the strength of the foundations of policy designs and the reception of positive reactions (Tilly, 2011). In light of this, it should be clearly stated that the depth, width and quality of networks of trust change with shifts in time and space. In conclusion, it is possible to suggest that while seeking for societal harmony within the process of public policymaking, certain conceptual conundrums arise at the theoretical and paradigmatic level. As frequently emphasised in the present article, it can be argued that the solution lies in the conceptualisation and theorisation of "policy" as well as a "policy" process based on social reality.

[19] The presuppositions of public policy in the social settings of Turkey and the US follow different paths. In this context, Turkey's "resource" substitutions originating from the US for concepts and theories may lead to the distortion of relationships between phenomena in the social setting as indicated in the previous section.

[20] The word "hidden" used in this sentence clearly indicates conceptual and theoretical conundrums constituting the subject of this article. The meaning

Turkey do not carry a "sameness" within their social existences and that the "ontological deviation" as the black hole of the modern gradually becomes more apparent in every "public policy" process based on US-centric theories and concepts.

Actors of Public Policy[21]**:** The unique feature of public policy is that it is formulated, applied and evaluated *ex post* by authorities in the political system like the legislative, judiciary and executive branches (Lester & Stewart, 2000: 4). Based on this, certain actors can be listed for public policymaking. While the actors indicated in the first sentence are considered to be official actors; parties, individuals (voters) and pressure groups (i.e. civil society organisations, the media and international actors) are described in the literature as civil actors (Çevik & Demirci, 2012: 35-49). In this context, public policy can include everything and everyone that can affect and be affected by "the political" as actors. So, do these actors, as phenomena, have the same weight in both societies? The answer to this question would be negative because upon looking at the phenomena and their relationships described in the first chapter of this article, it is observed that their existences and qualities go through sudden changes when there is a differentiation in terms of time and space. In fact, it is known that even the political landscape in the US went through changes within itself between 1940 and 1990 (Shapiro, 1995: 3). In this context, it is possible to indicate that the triangle of "individual-society-state" in the US changed in 50 years. It must be emphasised that despite this, insisting on using a US-centric concept or theory with an assumption that the political portraits of Turkey and the US are "the same" and, therefore, so are the actors affecting "public policymaking" (even if a common international practice is developed) makes the black hole of the modern, underlined constantly in the article, bigger.

Process of Public Policy[22]**:** Public policy is a discipline focusing on processes and applicability (Nagel, 1984: 3). In this context, public policy is a historical and dynamic course considering processes, policy designs, institutions, power relations, identities of the targeted human society and the social construction of knowledge[23] (Schneider & Ingram, 1997: 5). It can be clearly indicated that concepts and theories owe this dynamism to the social setting and conditions within which they flourish.

As far as Turkey is concerned, is it possible to argue that the process of public policymaking show similarities with the US? Upon looking at the phenomenal differences to answer this question, the shifts in phenomena in the societal setting are revealed. It can thus be said that the US and Turkey show considerable differences in terms of both the system and the application of the system. In this context, significant problems might occur as a result of applying the theory of public policy, emerging from the American historical and social reality, in Turkey due to the "dissimilarity of policy processes[24]". On the other hand, the unsuccessful study of the process within the framework of policy analyses employing these concepts and theories exacerbates the problem or lead to the impossibility of its prediction.

Theories of Public Policy: Theories provide scientists with an integrated thought system about phenomena (Simon, 2007: 26). Theories of public policy allow one to observe the process starting from a public issue entering the agenda to its resolution and evaluation. There are eight principal theories of public policy: the rational model, the incrementalist model, the public preference model, the group theory, the system theory, the institutional model, the elite theory and the game theory[25] (Simon, 2007: 26-45).

It is without a doubt that virtually all of these theories were proposed to explain a societal situation arising in either the US or continental Europe. In other words, all these theories, concerning their phenomena and within the context of relationships between these phenomena, have come into existence in Euro-American thoughts-actions and most of them are used in the disciplines of sociology, political science and international relations as well. In addition to these, there are also certain policy analysis models. These models are classified in a variety of ways. However, one of the most frequent manners of classification is the one in accordance with methods based on established conditions. These can be separated into five categories including timing analysis, mixed analysis, level analysis, risk analysis and optimum preference analysis (Nagel, 1995: XIV).

To perceive the variety of powers and actors creating social processes and problems, one formulates models and maps by making a simplification or thinks based on the metaphors in question (Parsons, 1995: 57). All the theories mentioned above are the simplified versions of the Euro-American thought system. For example, the Chambers dictionary defines public policy as a roadmap predicated on overt and considerable principles (Hill, 2005: 6). So, can the theory of public policy, as a roadmap, be a solution for the social processes and problems in Turkey? Upon analysing the foundations, presuppositions, actors and process of public policy and considering its perception of reality, it seems to be difficult to give a positive answer to this question. In fact,

---

to be interpreted from this is that each concept and piece of information used for public policy analysis intrinsically points out the Euro-American centre at the ontological level.

[21] The actors used while executing public policy in Turkey and the US are different. Thus, as stated in the previous session, synthetic phenomena might emerge in the societal setting as a result of Turkey using US-centric concepts and theories.

[22] Within the process of public policy, Turkey's "resource" substitutions originating from the US for concepts and theories may lead to, as indicated in the previous chapter, synthetic phenomena in the societal setting.

[23] The expression "the social construction of information" used here points out the phenomenon of "social reality", whose necessity to be used and taken as a starting point by every social organism for their concepts and theories is underlined in the article. In light of this, it can be manifestly argued that modern theories based on the assumption of the commonness of "knowledge" continuously refer to their own spatiotemporal contexts as social reality.

[24] It is known that schools of public policy have their visions of a "spectacular society" (Wildavsky, 1979: XXIII). However, this is the right time to analyse the perception of a "spectacular society". In fact, upon examining the concept of "goodness" in the eyes of the individual and the society, it can be said that the theory of public policy emerges and that there are profound differences between the US and Turkey. The case of the Nigerian woman named Adesanya in the UK is a perfect example in this respect.

[25] Upon examining the American academic literature for the evolutionary course of these theories, it can be seen that each theory was developed to fill the gaps or solve the problems of the previous one. Based on this, it can be argued that all these theories follow the changing line of the "social reality" in the US.

it is known that "public policy" has stemmed from a simplification within the scope of phenomena and interphenomenal relationships in the US. In this context, public policy is an integrated and unique phenomenon and encounters problems of definition even within its own "time and space" (Hill, 2005: 7), because public policy is a science encompassing a wide range of actions. In this respect, it utilises the methods and ideas of policy analysis, economics, political science, sociology, psychology and philosophy as well as many technical domains (Kraft & Furlong, 2004: 102-103). Ultimately, using a theory of public policy originating from the US as a tool of analysis or formalisation can be regarded as an assumption of sameness of economic, political, sociological, psychological and philosophical perceptions within both societies.

Upon analysing phenomena and interphenomenal relationships, the fact that the US and Turkey, despite not having any similarities, go through the same public policy process leads to a long series of problems. On the other hand, policy analysis has a unique and probably critical role in the development of social sciences (Johnson, 1975: 75). However, analysing policies with these theories might bring about many problems as far as social sciences are concerned as well. Taking into account the metaphor of "policy paradox" (Stone, 2002: 384-385) put forward by Stone, who has made the effectiveness of public policy, policies founded on something else outside its own social reality can be considered as paradoxes[26]. In this respect, Stone describes the paradoxes encountered during policymaking with the metaphor of hunting elephants with mousetraps. Here, while the "mousetrap" can be understood as a concept or theory flourished in a different social setting, the "elephant" is the phenomenon of "social reality" of the society concerned.

Is public policy a science or an art? (Çevik & Demirci, 2012: 112-116) It can be considered a science when it is constructed and analysed with theories substituted from another society, but it can be regarded as an art when it is analysed using concepts and theories sourcing from the society's own social reality. In this regard, it seems to be imperative to find sources unique to the public policy in Turkey, to develop concepts and theories exclusive to the social reality in Turkey and to take the phenomenon of "social reality" in Turkey as the common assumption underlying public policy analysis (Karkın, 2012; Altınok & Metin, 2003; Çevik, 1998; Demir, 2011; Çelik, 2011; Çorbacıoğlu, 2008).

5. Conclusion

Social existences or social organism differing from one another in terms of time and space have divergent worlds of meaning, context and concept. These differences form the unique social realities of social organisms. Each society has different worlds of perception and instant variables within these worlds as far as time and space are concerned. These instant variables are reflected in concepts and theories, and societies develop their own concepts or theories that can be employed to analyse the phenomena and interphenomenal relationships within their social existences.

Analysing a society by means of a theory present in its own codes of existence and, in this context, emerging from its own "social reality" is suitable for the characteristics of each society. However, "the normal" has been substituted with "the modern" as modernisation has spread among societies around the globe and the social phenomena of these societies (e.g. individual, religion, state, faith, legitimacy, society). It is possible to find many indications regarding the argument that the normal being substituted by the modern creates a conundrum and that every social organism needs to turn back into its own essence and the theoretical tools in its own arsenal. However, it can be stated that the most important one of these indications is the conference titled "Open the Social Sciences" organised by the Gulbenkian Commission. There are many references to the necessity of developing local theoretical tools instead of modern ones in this conference (Gulbenkian Komisyonu, 1996: 50-55)

Concepts and theories are contextual. In other words, they depend on ambient factors such as time and space. In this respect, separating any concept or theory from its context and using it for another social existence in any way changes the phenomena of "social reality" of the societies in question and substitute them with "synthetic" phenomena. This is not exclusive to the dichotomy of East vs. West and the substitutions made by Eastern societies using concepts and theories imported from Western societies. This can also be stated for the opposite scenario. In other words, analysing any issue in the US using a concept or theory originating from Turkey would also trigger the same chain of problems.

The emergence of the discipline of public policy, recently flourishing in Turkey, as a conceptual conundrum must be studied as a problem created by frequently used Eurocentric theories. The main reason behind this problem can be stated as the disharmony between the time and space indicated by "public policy" as a concept and that of the social existence of Turkey. The concept of public policy is completely within the American context as far as its foundations, presuppositions, actors, level of effectiveness of these actors, process and theories are concerned. In this respect, taking this concept and its related theories outside the US and evaluating them in a different setting creates unpredictable cases and bring about novel and synthetic contexts regarding the ideology, community, class and group to which one "belongs", as it is the case of Turkey. These synthetic phenomena and interphenomenal relationships, in turn, triggers profound problems in the social memory concerned. The distortion of the world of perceptions and the disorder and confusion in significations are the leading problems in this regard. In fact, what Shayegan describes as "cultural schizophrenia" (Shayegan, 2012) in traditional societies fundamentally makes this situation more visible.

Upon looking at the problems created by substitutions of concepts and theories in Turkey, the need for a new glossary of concepts and original theories becomes manifest. In fact, this is observed in the case study of the concept of "public policy". Since the initial years of the Republic, the

[26] Regarding the policy paradox, it must be underlined that Stone invites her readers to reposition themselves and question themselves about their beliefs (Stone, 2002: 385).

significations of "policy" leading to a long chain of problems renew themselves in each era and change in accordance with the "ideology, community, society and class" in which one belongs. In this respect, it can be claimed that the main problem lies in the significations not based on the social reality in question.

The situation described in the article can be better understood if the metaphor of "root" in Yahya Kemal Beyatlı's statement that can be roughly translated as "The absence of roots is the worst version of orphanhood" (Türkdoğan, 2011) is interpreted as concepts and theories. In this regard, the necessity of concepts and theories flourishing from its own roots for the social existence in Turkey poses an undeniable reality because after a certain amount of time, concepts that are intellectually worn down need to be renewed. In this context, the claim that Eurocentric concepts and theories are in this stage of wearing down is accepted by many scientists (Skinner, 1997).

What needs to be underlined here is that this article does not defend pure essentialism. A society can borrow or translate concepts and theories from another society. However, taking them as the only way of analysis would lead to problems regarding the social reality of the society in question. It is undeniable that there is an interaction between civilisations by means of translations. In fact, it is a known fact that there are many translated scientific works taught in Turkey for centuries. However, approaching the "translation" in a critical manner rather than affirming it as it is might contribute to the efforts to attain originality frequently cited in the article. In this respect, the following statement by Hilmi Ziya Ülken is noteworthy: "It is impossible for societies that withdraw to themselves and looking for solutions to everything exclusively within themselves to create something new. One cannot become a master without being an apprentice first" (Ülken, 2011: 2-3) (author's translation). In conclusion, it seems that the way to be emancipated from conceptual and theoretical conundrums is to establish the academia or a scientific organisation looking for reality in its own roots.

Bibliography

Akarsu, B. (2007). *Felsefe Terimleri Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: İnkılâp.

Altınok, M., & Metin, H. (2003). Karşılaştırmalı Yaklaşımla Karar Verme. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi Volume: 2003-2, Number:7*, pp. 93-104.

Altun, F. (2005). *Modernleşme Kuramı – Eleştirel Bir Giriş*. İstanbul: Küre.

Amin, S. (2007). *Avrupa-Merkezcilik Bir İdeolojisinin Eleştirisi*. Trans. Mehmet Sert, İstanbul: Chiviyazıları.

Arda, E. (2003). *Sosyal Bilimler El Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Alfa.

Aydınlı, E., & Mathews, J. (2008). Türkiye Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplininde Özgün Kuram Potansiyeli: Anadolu Ekolü Oluşturmak Mümkün mü?. *Uluslar arası İlişkiler Vol 5, Number: 17*, pp. 161-187.

Cevizci, A. (2005). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Paradigma.

Cochran, C. L., & Malone, E. F. (2005). *Public Policy – Perspectives and Choices*. London: Lynne Rienner.

Considine, M. (2005). *Making Public Policy*. UK: Polity.

Çelik, S. (2011). Kamu Politikası Analizinde Doğrusal Modelin Yetersizliği: Karmaşık Bir Model Önerisi. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 11(1)*, pp. 217-234.

Çevik, H. H. (1998). Kamu Politikaları Analizi Çalışmaları Üzerine Türkiye Açısından Bir Değerlendirme. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi, Volume 31, Number 2*, pp. 102-112.

Çevik, H. H., & Demirci, S. (2012), *Kamu Politikası – Kavramlar, Aktörler, Süreç, Modeller, Analiz, Karar Verme*, Ankara: Seçkin.

Çiğdem, A. (1997). Çağdaş Temel Kuramlara Sunuş. *Çağdaş Temel Kuramlar*. Ed. Qentin Skinner, trans. Ahmet Demirhan, Ankara: Vadi.

Çorbacıoğlu, S. (2008). Kamu Politikaları Analizinde Görünmez Üniversite: Altı Bilim Adamı Arasındaki Bilişsel ve Sosyal Bağ. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi, Vol: 41, Number:4*, pp.23-48.

Deleon, P., & Martell, C. R. (2006). The Policy Sciences: Past, Present and Future. Edited by: B. Guy Peters & Jon Pierre, *Handbook of Public Policy*, New Delhi: Sage.

Demir, F. (2011). Kamu Politikası ve Politika Analizi Çalışmalarının Teorik Çerçevesi. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Number 30*, pp.107-120.

Descartes. (1989). *Felsefenin İlkeleri*. Trans. Mesut Akın, İstanbul: Say.

Dye, T. R. (1992). *Understanding Public Policy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Dunn, W. N. (2004). *Public Policy Analysis – An Introduction*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Fischer, F. (1995). *Evaluating Public Policy.* Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Fischer, F. (2003). *Reframing Public Policy – Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Güçlü, A., Uzun, E., Uzun, S., & Yolsal, Ü. H. (2008). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Bilim Sanat.

Gülbenkian Komisyonu. (1996). *Sosyal Bilimleri Açın - Sosyal Bilimlerin Yeniden Yapılanması Üzerine Rapor*. Trans. Şirin Tekeli, İstanbul: Metis.

Hill, M. (2005). *The Public Policy Process*. UK: Pearson.

John, P. (1998). *Analysing Public Policy*. London: Pinter.

Johnson, R. W. (1975). Research Objectives for Policy Analysis. *Public Policy Evaluation*, Ed. Kennet M. Dolbeare, London: Sage.

Karkın, N. (2012). e-Katılım Kavramı ve Süreci: Kamu Siyasa Oluşum Sürecine Vatandaş Katkısının Olabilirliği. *Sosyoekonomi 2012-1*, pp. 42-62.

Kraft, M. E., & Furlong, S. R. (2004). *Public Policy – Politics, Analysis and Alternatives*. Washington: CO.

Kızılçelik, S. (2004). *Sosyal Bilimleri Yeniden Yapılandırmak*. Ankara: Anı.

Kök, M. (1985). *Kamus-i Türkî, Cilt 1*. İstanbul: Karakuşak.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revoluations*. Chiago: The University of Chiago Press.

Latouche, S. (1993). *Dünyanın Batılılaşması – Gezegenimizin Bir Örnekleşmesinin Anlamı Önemi ve Sınırları Üzerine Bir Deneme*. Trans. Temel Keşoğlu, İstanbul: Ayrıntı.

Lester, J. P., & Stewart, J. (2000). *Public Policy – An Evolutionary Approach*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Marshall, G. (2009). *Sosyoloji Sözlüğü*. Trans. Osman Akınhay ve Derya Kömürcü, Ankara: Bilim Sanat.

Meriç, C. (2008a). *Jurnal Cilt 1 – 1955/65*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Meriç, C. (2008b). *Mağaradakiler*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Morçöl, G. (2002). *A New Mind For Policy Analysis*. London: Peager.

Nagel, S. S. (1984). *Contemporary Public Policy Analysis*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.

Nagel, S. S. (1995). *Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management*. Greenwich: JAI.

Nişanyan, S. (2018). *Nişanyan Sözlük - Çağdaş Türkçenin Etimolojisi*. İstanbul: Liber.

Parlatır, İ. (2006). *Osmanlı Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Yargı.

Parsons, W. (1995). *Public Policy – An Introduction to The Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis*. Vermont: Edward Elgar.

Politzer, G. (2010). *Felsefenin Başlangıç İlkeleri*. Trans. Hasan İlhan, Ankara: Alter.

Renteln, A. D. (2004). *The Cultural Defence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sarıbay, A. Y. (2006). *Toplumun Mantığı - Bir Mantıksal Anlatı Olarak Sosyoloji*. İstanbul: Alfa Aktüel.

Sarup, M. (2010). *Post-Yapısalcılık ve Postmodernizm - Eleştirel Bir Giriş*. Trans. Abdülbaki Güçlü, İstanbul: Kırk gece.

Schneider, A. L., & Ingram, H. (1997). *Policy Design For Democracy*. Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Searle, J. R. (2005). *Toplumsal Gerçekliğin İnşası*. Trans. Muhittin Macit, Cüneyt Özpilavcı, İstanbul: Litera.

Seyyar, A. (2007). *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Terimleri – Ansiklopedik Sosyal Bilimler Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Değişim.

Shapiro, M. (1995). Of Interests and Values: The New Politics and The New Political Science. *The New Politics of Public Policy*, Ed. Marc K. Landy & Martin A. Levin, Baltımore: The Hohn Hopkins University Press.

Shayegan, D. (2012). *Yaralı Bilinç – Geleneksel Toplumlarda Kültürel Şizofreni*. Trans. Haldun Bayrı, İstanbul: Metis.

Sifil, E. (2011). *İslam ve Modern Çağ*. İstanbul: Rıhlekitap.

Simon, C. A. (2007). *Public Policy – Preferences and Outcomes*. New York: Pearson.

Skinner, Q. (1997). Teorinin Geri Dönüşü. *Çağdaş Temel Kuramlar*. Editör: Qentin Skinner, Trans. Ahmet Demirhan, Ankara: Vadi.

Stone, D. (2002). *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York: W.W. Norton Company.

Tilly, C. (2011). *Demokrasi*. Trans. Ebru Arıcan, Ankara: Phoenix.

Timuçin, A. (2004). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Bulut.

Türkdoğan, O. (2011). *Türk Toplum Sistemi ve Yapısal Sorunları*. İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat.

Türkdoğan, O. (2012). *Çağdaş Bilimsel Araştırma Metodolojisi ve Sorunları*. İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat.

Türköne, M. (2007). *Siyaset*. Ankara: Lotus.

TÜBA. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimler Türkçe Bilim Terimleri Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi.

Oktay, C. (2009). *Siyaset Bilimi İncelemeleri*. İstanbul: Alfa.

Outhwaite, W. (2003). *Modern Toplumsal Düşünce Sözlüğü*. Trans. Melih Pekdemir, İstanbul: İletişim.

Ülken, H. Z. (2011). *Uyanış Devirlerinde Tercümenin Rolü*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası.

Wildavsky, A. (1979). *Speaking Truth To Power, The Art and Craft Policy Analysis*. New Brunswick: Transaction.