THE CRISIS IN THE RISE OF REPRESENTATIVE LIBERAL DEMOCRACY TO POPULIST AUTHORITARIANISM WITH POST-TRUTH POLITICS

Nihal UMAR, Gencay SAYLAN

expert projects
publishing

The Crisis in the Rise of Representative Liberal Democracy to Populist Authoritarianism with Post-Truth Politics

Nihal UMAR[1], Gencay SAYLAN[2]

Abstract

In this century, representative liberal democracy is universally considered as the most perfect political regime. However, it is emphasized that the same political regime is exposed to a major crisis for the last 10-20 years as well as looking for ways out. Pursuant to many political scientists, the representative liberal democracy has the authoritarianism tendency that is defined as populism, and they relate it *post-truth* politics. It is also underlined that due to the politics with such negative elements, democracy contains paradox in terms of practice and discourse. Political regimes become functional within a certain social structure and it is obvious that democracy as a type of political system becomes functional within global world order, namely capitalism. In the research, political methodology, which studies the quantitative and qualitative methods, has been. This study aims to clarify how global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis, and the political and administrative rise of populist authoritarianism through post-trust. The sample of the study consists of academics working as lecturers in universities in Northern Cyprus. The results show that, there is a difference between demographic charecteristics of the participants responses to representative liberal democracy, know about populist authoritarianism and post truth politics. There is also a relationship between the political scientists' authoritarianism tendency and authoritaritarianism defined as populism, as well as between liberal democracy role over the major crisis and role of global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis.

Keywords: democracy, post-truth politics, populist authoritarianism, liberal democracy, crisis.

[1] Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, European University of Lefke, Lefke, Northern Cyprus, TURKEY; E-mail: numar@eul.edu.tr (Corresponding author)

[2] Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, European University of Lefke, Lefke, Northern Cyprus, TURKEY; E-mail: gsaylan@eul.edu.tr

Introduction

The term of post-truth, which has been widely used and become popular, was selected as the word of the year by Oxford Dictionaries (BBC, 2016). The term was first used by Steve Tesich, a Serbian American screenwriter, in his article called A Government of Lies published by The Nation magazine in 1992. The book by Ralph Keyes The Post-truth Era: Dishonesty and Deception in Contemporary Life published in 2004 had catalysed making post-truth a theory. Oxford Dictionaries defines post-truth as relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief (word of the year 2017). On the other hand, Ralph Keyes, who approached post-truth from its social aspect in his book The Post-Truth Era, notes that in this era, human beings live in a period where the lines between truth and lies, honesty and dishonesty, fictional and non-fictional are ambiguous (Keyes,2019). Tesich's article published by the Nation magazine in 1992 used post-truth as a concept completely related with politics and even placed it at the core of structural crisis in representative democracy (Bueger, 2015).

Ralph Keyes is known to write the first book on the concept of post-truth called The Post-truth Era where he approached the concept from sociological aspect. Pursuant to Keyes, in the post-truth era: deception has become commonplace at all levels of contemporary life" (Keyes, 2019: 11). Everyone lies, especially our leaders. What's the big deal? Dishonesty has come to feel less like the exception and more like norm. Along with our acceptance of lying as commonplace, we've developed ingenious ways to let ourselves off ethical hooks (Keyes, 2019: 21-22).

Similarly, Keyes explained under the definition of euphemasia as, "in the post-truth era, we don't just have truth and lies, but a third category of ambiguous statements that are not exactly the truth but fall short of a lie. Enhanced truth it might be called. "Neo-truth. Soft truth. Faux truth" (Keyes, 2019: 25). In the book called Lies Incorporated the World of Post Truth Politics, Ari Rabin-Havt, who discussed about the concept through correlating it with politics, noted that government has lie generation mechanisms and in the post-truth politic environments, there is an organised information industry that create and disseminate falsehood for political publicity (Suiter, 2016a). Additionally, Rabin-Havt claims that this industry can create lies in all topics possible to legitimize the interests of government (Rabin-Havt, 2016). British journalist Matthew D'ancone, who focused on the issue from another perspective, mentions the ways that society accepts post-truth rather than the post-truth created by the government, and underlines that emotions embedded into the reality perceptions of people instead of rationalism (D'Ancona, 2017). Controlling and guiding great masses with unreal information is not a new fact. The Minister of Propaganda in Nazi Germany as the second man in the top hierarchy is one of the first examples coming to mind. Legitimization of political decisions with fake news and failure to ensure mass support are also observed in countries with democracy as the political regime. For instance, USA used fake news through

the discourses as its ship was attached by North Vietnam ship in the waters of the Gulf of Tonkin to take Vietnam War to North Vietnam or Iraq had weapons of mass destruction (Ottaway & Chung ,1999). The concept of post-truth has become popular today since the extent and domain of unreal political motivation have expanded respectively (Arendt, 2005) .

Donald Trump's way to victory in American Presidency and his post-election success have been the most crucial element in the popularity of the word, post-truth and its selection as the word of the year in 2016. During the election campaign, Trump's strategy against his presidential rival Hillary Clinton based on unreal factors and fiction brought him the victory in the end (Rose, 2017)). Trump disgraced his rival Clinton with unfounded social media news with his unreal statements used during his election speeches, and made himself win the elections accordingly. This case is considered to be the best example to post-truth politics (Güçdemir, 2017). Another important example for post-truth is the lies of pro-Brexit supporters, which ended with the leave of United Kingdom (UK) from the European Union. The book by James Ball called Post-truth gives more details about the lies during Brexit referendum and Donald Trump's presidency campaign. Ball notes that pro- Brexit supporters run a campaign with the propaganda that UK was paying 350 million British pounds weekly to the European Union and their leave from EU would contribute the economy; yet, this was not the reality; EU was providing financial support to UK through various funds; the total amount paid by UK was less than half of the claimed figure. The author clarifies the statements of Trump regarding the ethnic origin of Barack Obama; that the wall for Mexica border would be paid by the Mexica government as well as all of his lies about the health status of his rival Hillary Clinton (Ball, 2007).

The concept of post-truth in populist or authoritarian administrations among countries like Poland, Hungary, and Philippines etc. with weak democratic culture and traditions has been the most significant domain in mass communication (Bueger, 2015).

Today, politics is executed by political actors through unreal fictional post-truth political strategies even in the developed countries. Political discourse or propaganda are both performed over lies far from being rational by exploiting the feelings of people that they would feel as if what they have been told are real. The issue of the Economist magazine from 2016 reflected the existing political atmosphere as follows: "There is a strong case that, in America and elsewhere, there is a shift towards a politics in which feelings trump facts more freely and with less resistance than used to be the case. Helped by new technology, a deluge of facts and a public much less given to trust than once it was, some politicians are getting away with a new depth and pervasiveness of falsehood. If this continues the power of truth as a tool for solving society's problems could be lastingly reduced" (The Economist, 2016:20).

This does not only affect political science but also public administration as well. Administrative transparency and accountability become almost meaningless respectively. In its interpretation, the magazine focused on the main item as feeling truth, i.e. accepting whatever is felt as truth, replaces the truth itself. As feelings become more significant than the facts or the focus is put on feelings rather than the truth, the portrait of world would be wrong and democratic system brakes down with a peak level of mistrust towards institutions (The Economist, 2016:11).

Therefore this study aims to clarify how global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis, and the political and administrative rise of populist authoritarianism through post-trust which will be a guide to a literature review and unique to the field.

Literature review

Post-Truth: New Concept or Phenomenon?

Before the examples of Trump and Brexit, the concept of *post-truth* was discussed and defined by Steve Tesich in the *Nation magazine* published in 1992. In his article titled "A Government of Lies", he explained the event that he named as *Watergate Syndrome* and correlated the syndrome with *post-truth*. *The Watergate Scandal* is known as the event where the President of the United States of America of that time Richard Nixon was involved to illegal wiretap of the opponent Democratic Party headquarters at Watergate Hotel. Nixon denied any knowledge about the activities by stating that his bureaucrats were involved, and democracy mechanism won a victory when he forced all bureaucrats involved to resign. Tesich emphasized that such victory had a dark side within and claimed that American society "started to escape for real" after the scandal revealed itself. "We came to equate truth with bad news and we didn't want bad news anymore, no matter how true or vital to our health as a nation. We looked to our government to protect us from the truth" (Tesich, 1992: 12). As a result of investigation, it is identified that Nixon was aware of the plan and he lied to public so that he could cover-up as if he was not involved at all. When all were clarified, Richard Nixon had to resign on the date of 8th August 1974 (Alterman, 2004). Similarly Tesich underlines that Irangate scandal, which occurred post-Watergate, complements post-truth. When President Lie: A History of Official Deception and Its Consequences talks about this matter too. The main character in the next scandal was Ronald Reagan. In order to overthrow the Nicaraguan government, Reagan administration provided economic aid to *paramilitary groups* in the country. The most outstanding issue is that such economic aid was the result of selling arms to Iran from illegal means. When the scandal was become public, Reagan first denied the event and then noted that he sold the arms to Iran to rescue the American consulate officers abducted

during the revolution. Similar to Watergate, the event caused the resignation of bureaucrats from various positions. The security advisor to President was punished with imprisonment (Berling & Bueger, 2017). Tesich stated that Reagan told many lies and covered his lies by saying that his memory simply deceived him upon public found out the truth. Pursuant to Tesich, this is enough for public, who stands idle by falsehood. Again, Steve Tesich reflected that the flight from truth paved its way with the first Gulf War. Eric Alterman indicated that falsehood had to boundaries during the administration of George W. Bush, and we lived in *post-truth* era. What Alterman meant by post-truth is about telling lies without any feeling of guilt. According to Alterman, Bush presidency is *Post-truth* presidency (Alterman, 2004: 294-314). Based on *Watergate Syndrome*, Tesich explained *post-truth* as, "we are rapidly becoming prototypes of a people that totalitarian monsters could only drool about in their dreams. All the dictators up to now have had to work hard at suppressing the truth. We, by our actions, are saying that this is no longer necessary, that we have acquired a spiritual mechanism that can denude truth of any significance. In a very fundamental way we, as a free people, have freely decided that we want to live in some post-truth world" (Tesich, 1992:13).

Post-truth as a word, statement or concept has become widely used. Moreover, some media outlets defined as having Marxist tendency do not talk about disinformation activities of media. The agenda-setting theory by Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw reflects that the choices of editors, editorial departments and publishers have major influence in determining political truth (McCombs & Shaw, 1997: 176). In other words, the obstacle between true information and information consumers claimed to be the media monopolized by the government. Jean Baudrillard, a post-modern theorist, explained coming to these days through media with technological determinist approach and reflected that we live in simulations world where the distinction between the models provided by media and truth became blurred. Loss of truth triggered the virtual power: "We moved from a capitalist-productivist society to a neo-capitalist cybernetic order that aims at total control. Baudrillard explained this period that he called 'the precession of simulacra' where brands, images, signs and graphs come prominent, and television programs look more real than natural". And he noted that 'The Loud Family' broadcasted in 1971 is still a reference point in this matter (Baudrillard, 1982: 49-50).

Shift in Liberal Democracy to Populist Authoritarian Administration with Post-truth Politics

In the last 10-20 years, the representative liberal democracy has showed a shift towards authoritarian administration defined as populism. The most important thing to consider here is to identify how democracy lost its functionality and relatively made a shift to populist and authoritarian administration via *post-truth* politics.

Today, the tendency towards authoritarian administrations may be observed even in some developed countries with democratic background. In such countries, this problem was also reflected by the prominent representatives of established order.

In consideration with common characteristics of populist politicians, they determine irrational policies like religious or ethnical or xenophobia, show the tendency to come to power with the support of desperate masses by reflecting them crises and problems occurred due to the others over us/them discrimination. The principle of the state of law is abandoned through reflecting all of these as if we are in an ordinary vital struggle with them, who would destroy us with their offsets among us, and suspending fundamental human rights and freedoms. Explained as populist, this system is executed by a charismatic leader, who is attributed with extraordinary characteristics. This populist development coincides with *post-truth* politics. In other words, it is possible to mention a symbiotic correlation between increasing authoritarianism in political regimes and popularity of *post-truth*. Populism and authoritarianism, both of which have been discussed by political scientists, are deemed as negative elements resembling the concept of fascism in 1920s and 1930s rather than representative liberal democracy (Wolff, 2015). For instance; Madeline Albright, who considers current discourse on populism as a transformation to fascism, explains the problem as the universal rise of populist politicians. In her book, Albright noted down that representative liberal democracy had a major downfall all around the world and there is a potential fascism threat available (Albright, 2018). Chantal Mouffe and other political scientists, who had worries about crises and underlined the necessity of re-functionality in democracy, reflected that representative democracy should undergo a transformation defined as radical democracy or cosmopolitan democracy or good governance (Mouffe, 2008). Condoleezza Rice, who can be considered as the representation of the most conservative decisions taken in America, discussed the problem of authoritarianism in political regime in her book *Democracy in Decline* (Rice, 2018).

The political scientist, Christoph Stefes, who is the head of a study conducted on authoritarian regimes, explained in his speech at Social Science Research Centre Berlin (WZB) that as a result of research, the related regime is a number of systems that is not legitimized through elections, yet gaining its power from violence and oppression. Stefes stated that authoritarian regimes are "everything that is not democratic", and clarified the type of state structure considered as authoritarian regime. Stefes says, "We can list absolute monarchies, military regimes and all kinds of single party systems as authoritarian regimes. However, multi-party systems in which the winner is already decided before the election also fall into this category". Christoph Stefes argued that authoritarian regimes had three pillars sustaining them as legitimation, repression and co-optation. He states that dictators allow citizens to be a part of regime and benefit from it, which create solidarity among people and ensure a significant pillar in the regime accordingly. Stefes emphasized that the strongest pillar of authoritarian leader or

anti-democratic system is legitimation where governments are legitimated through elections in democracies while in dictatorship; the ruler must create his own form of legitimation. (Stefes, 2013). In his book called *Anti-Pluralism*, Galston reflected populism as a challenge against liberal democracy, which needs to reinvent itself to comply with new social and economic world order, and argued that reasonable nationalism is the antidote for populism (Galston, 2018). The report by the former United States Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, called "Supporting Human Rights and Democracy: U.S.A 2006 Registry" noted that there is not only one single formula to ensure the progress in personal and democratic freedoms, and correlated the effective implementation and protection of human rights in an active democracy with three main elements. In her speech Rice said, "first – free and independent election process; and establishment of equal grounds that allow real competition; Second – good governance; administrations with representative, transparent and accountable institutions together with independent legislative and judicial bodies, which are based on the rule of law principle and, Third: a vigorous civil society and independent press that oblige government to act honest, attract the attention of community and ensure the continuity of reforms" (Condoleezza Rice, Supporting Human Rights and Democracy: U.S.A 2006 Registry). In the common discourse of populism, it is described that there is an entity, which strengthens and mobilize its own group of supporters by marginalising or making enemies, and popularizes its political arguments.

Structural Authority of the Representative Liberal Democracy

Whereas, the representative liberal democracy acknowledges human beings as the most fundamental entity, and defends that society is comprised of free and equal citizens and behaviours must be based on wisdom and knowledge. One of the precursors of liberalism is that every person would perform reasoned actions. An individual would evaluate his options and make the most rational choice. The institution called state regulates community through authority. Such decisions must be obeyed by social groups and individuals. In other words, authority is formed with rules and their implementation as well as determining the behaviours and do's and don'ts of community members. Gencay Saylan clarifies; for example, the binding rules for society are called law and legislation means the process reflecting the ways and performer of such rules. The implementation of law reflects the use of authority. Types of activities expressed by enforcement and judiciary include making decisions on laws and associated such decisions. The indicative characteristic of authority is its recognition as reasonable and legal by the members of the public. That's how the decision-making process on its nature and content, the scope and boundaries caused by decisions and the regulations on authority users constitute political regime. Within this framework, representative liberal democracy is a type of political regime. Hence, representative liberal democracy is mainly within a domain determined by the term of politics. In other words, the

type of regime named as representative liberal democracy is first of all a political phenomenon (Saylan, 2008: 12).

The issue that what masses of people expect from the state and politics under the representative liberal democracy as a type of political regime should be explained. Since Aristoteles, people give the same answer that they expect better and easier living environment from the state and politicians that use authority with state power. Populism realized within a democratic political regime upon the request of masses of the public, people competing to obtain political power show an effort to convince voters that they are the best option. Considering everything, it would be appropriate to express that a democratic political regime is inevitably populist as well. The highest priority in every political party is to maximize votes. In other words, making promises with unlimited emotions is in the nature of democracy.

Political regimes defined as representative liberal democracy function within socio-economic system called capitalism. Hence, the reasons in the rise of representative liberal democracy to populist authoritarianism should be assessed in relation with crises. As widely known, the reconstructions that cover economic, political and social domains are used to overcome the crises that occur within capitalism, which is a world system. Consequently, it is widely considered that there is an organic bond between capitalism being a world system, and representative liberal democracy; since a political regime as a system is a sub-system of capitalism, which is the social system. Hence, representative liberal democracy, a type of political regime, generally shows itself in the communities where capitalism is available.

Welfare State Capitalism

Historically, when we associate capitalist transformation with crises in the world, we see that various new political regimes and discourses have come forward based on periodical conjecture. For instance; in 1929, millions of stocks had suffered from excessive depreciation up to 60-70% at the Wall Street in America, which is one of the finance centres in the world. Stocks started to unexpectedly decline while financial institutions and banks approached to intensive purchases hoping that the problem would be eliminated within the market itself. However, "the invisible hand" which can be considered as the main initial in liberal economy theory didn't work, and the stock prices continued to drop. Finance and interwoven industrial institutions started to go bankrupt, and the great crisis first surrounded the country and then showed its impact everywhere. Rapidly increasing unemployment and recession are the indicators of system crisis. This crisis is considered to be the biggest that capitalism has ever encountered. At the world scale, this crisis, also known as the Great Depression, inevitably caused humanitarian plights as well as political and social conflicts. Undoubtedly, the

biggest outcome of crisis has been the disappearance and questioning of capitalism, market mechanism and invisible hand.

Within this framework, state was required to interfere in the invisible hand to solve the crisis. In order to ensure the regeneration of capitalism as social lifestyle and order, state sometimes has to solve social tensions and conflicts forcefully and sometimes in a smooth way. It is possible to define this as the reason for capitalist state's being. In capitalism analysis, Marx stated that self-interests in capitalism (maximum confiscation of surplus value) may cause capitalist collective interest in public. The interest of individual capitalist is the maximum interest, and in order to reach this, he/she must pay the lowest wage to his/her labour force and make a work day as long as possible. This is against the collective or systematic interests of capitalist; since social conflict would become stronger and order would be questioned. Hence, the solution is given to be only via state so that capitalist would be regenerated. At this point; Rosa Luxemburg, Henry Ford and John Maynard Keynes had common views yet with different terminologies, they emphasized the intervention to invisible hand from outside.

System crises may be overcome with restructuring that cover economic, political and cultural domains. In other words, this can be interpreted as capitalism's which is considered as a world system entering into a new phase and transformation. Similar to the restructuring and transformation of capitalism into welfare state capitalism with the policies that comply with the Keynesian approach interpreting liberal theory in a new and different manner in order to find a way out from the world-wide crisis of 1929. In a nutshell, Keynes, who was a liberal economist, considered that the invisible hand lost its function and efficiency in the advanced capitalism, and argued that there must be an intervention on the economy from outside to regenerate the order. Therefore, he identified nation-state as the only entity that would intervene to the economy.

It would not be wrong to say that the depression was eliminated with a number of economic policies that based on Keynes, and capitalism, as a world system, enter into a new phase as the welfare state capitalism. Additionally; in the early 1930s, welfare state capitalism is considered to bring major political power to the President Roosevelt, who was one of the pioneers on that matter. The depression was overcome with welfare state policies, and as a whole, capitalism showed an unprecedented growth and development.

In the phase of welfare state capitalism, the significant increase in the political power of social democratic parties and movement particularly in Germany and Great Britain revealed that system crises may bring change in the political arena.

Consequently, unlike civil rights and freedoms, the state would intervene to the social order and serve to provide the right to live humanely for each individual by ensuring that non-privileged individuals would enjoy their rights and freedoms. The means, which are defined as social and economic rights under public law

literature, would be provided by the state itself. In other words; the rights on health, education, housing and social security are one of the first state duties regarding the realization of more fair and equalitarian order. With regard to the work like, there are a number of regulations such as unionisation, collective agreement or right to strike. The *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* dated 1949, which is considered as the founding document of the United Nations also covers the aforementioned issues.

The desired fact is the definitions and practices regarding the democratic political regime that arise in the era of welfare state capitalism. In other words, the influence with the dominance of Keynesian paradigms on the political system identified as democracy was analysed and discussed. Moreover, the aim was to clarify how state and politicians using their political powers intervene to market, private ownership and distribution and try to assert such intervention as legitimate and rational. The related situation shows that capitalism is related with democratic political regime in this unique and historic phase, and from an ontological perspective, it forms its basis. The obvious validity of pluralist politics and pluralist democracy paradigm in the era of welfare state capitalism supports the related opinion. Capitalism, which was restructured as a world system, established an appropriate framework for "pluralist democracy discourse" developed by American political scientists in the 20th century. Consequently, the political system defined as "advanced democracy" emerged accordingly.

The most important and common criticism against liberal discourse was that financial inequalities, autonomous and free individual hypothesis would be null and void. This would be also applicable for pluralist democracy too. Pursuant to Charles Lindblom, one of the crucial representatives of critical pluralistic approach, big businesses have significantly dominant power on governments in capitalist communities that pluralist democracy can only function within the framework of structural commitment (Lindblom, 1977). Pluralistic discourse argues that every segment of society should compete for political power in a complete freedom to ensure the maximisation of interests. Lindblom discusses that each segment of society is not equal; hence, pluralist democracy can function in a structural commitment.

The economy policies of Keynes were applied until the end of 1970, and the status and function of state in economy have grown in many countries. As indicators of new crisis, new problems arising with the growth of state can be listed as chronic budget deficits, high taxes and inflation, collapse of Bretton Woods system, rapid increase in structural unemployment problem, oil shocks in 1973 and 1978 and creation of big funds.

Global capitalism and Neo-Liberalism

All of these motivated the economists to find a new solution. *The Trilateral Commission*, which is one of the American high-level corporate discussion groups, asked the working group that comprised of three distinguished social scientists (Samuel Huntington, Michel Crozier, Jojo Watanaki) to conduct a study to analyse the existing problems and propose solutions. This study concluded that welfare state practices do not only cause economic deadlock but also legitimization problem for political regimes. Within the operability of democratic political regimes, the legislative and organisation function of state weakens and economy is put in bottleneck condition. Therefore, the advanced pluralist democracies increasingly become ungovernable. Within the scope of this study, the most interesting part of report is that it underlines the necessity of social reconciliation, which reinterprets democratic political regime concept to overcome crisis. As emphasized under this study, system crises may be eliminated with restructuring processes that cover economic, political and cultural domains, whih is supported by the related report and all samples.

While the solutions against crisis emphasized the return to free market, state was asked to exclude the requests for redistribution of revenue and wealth outside the politics. Consequently, the answer to question 'what was mainly affected the world system crisis in1970s?' can be that state's share on economic resources gradually increased due to the almost perfect operability of pluralist democracy which eventually caused market shrinkage, regression or decline in rates of profit. Keynasian approach, which highlights effective intervention by state on market and economy, naturally led all social layers one way or another request something from the state. It is impossible for political parties not to see such demands within effective democracy functionality. In order to overcome crisis, the requirement to restructure process constricting or liquidating welfare state space is indicated respectively. Since 1980s, the liquidation of welfare process has launched with privatisation policies that are described as obligatory in theory and practice, yet accepted without criticism. The concept called globalisation, which is the transformation of whole world into a single market, is considered as one of the main components of the related restructuring. In other words, welfare state capitalism restructured and evolved to global capitalism phase. Neo-liberalism, which was only deemed as an intellectual movement, has obtained its position in political domain through becoming dominant in political thought and action.

Today, neo-liberal idea or interpretation is mainly limited with economic domain. To emphasize this remark, we can say that there is a consolidation between liberalism and conservatism. Neo-liberal ideas and policies are radically implemented via conservative governments, which have significant political powers. The regulations and proposals mainly have shifted to economic field. Neo-liberal interpretation is considered to first emerge in the studies of philosophers and theorists conducted in 1947 in Mont Pelerin, Switzerland. Mont Pelerin

Society deemed as a milestone in neo-liberalism was introduced as a response against welfare state capitalism and socialism, which was trying to become a world system. Friedrich A. Hayek was the pioneer of Mont Pelerin society and organized the movement.

Neo-liberal philosophers and theorists discuss the necessity of a state ensuring the full security of market. Nozick (Nozick 1974), as one of the prominent neo-liberal philosophers, argues that a *night-watchman* state would be sufficient and invisible hand of market would solve all kinds of social problems. Pursuant to neo-liberals, goods and services required for individual needs are only produced by "a group of businessmen". In other words, the rights and freedoms based on the positive definition of freedom are avoided since they would be generated through the intervention of state on economic domain. Moreover, neo-liberal discourse or market fundamentalism is not effective in political domain; however, Mont Pelerin and other civil organisations as well as academia or intellectuals, who are members of such movements, get significant financial contributions from major capital institutions. For example, California Contemporary Studies Institute, a civil society organization founded by neo-liberal American academics, was supported by generous financial contributions of major corporations like ExxonMobil, Shell, Ford Chase Manhattan, General Motors (MacLean, 2017: 122).

Neo-liberal ideology and practice is unquestionable discourse of globalised capitalism that cannot be criticized. While the related hegemony has over thirty-year background, it is possible to observe that world capitalist system has not reached a steady momentum; yet social inequality and injustice has become deeper. Such situation must also have affected the political domain. The tendency of political regimes defined with populism towards universal authoritarianism can be considered as the most important development occurred in political domain.

Albright's book *Fascism* from 2018 also supported that populism and authoritarianism do not overlap but considered as a negativity element showing resemblance with fascism from 1920s and 1930s, and underlined the necessity to take the problem seriously. The concept called globalisation, which is the transformation of whole world into a single market, is considered as one of the main components of the related restructuring. In other words, welfare state capitalism restructured and evolved to global capitalism phase. Neo-liberalism, which was only deemed as an intellectual movement, has obtained its position in political domain through becoming dominant in political thought and action (Carothers, 2006). It is also clarified that within this period, neo-liberal discourse elevated its academic prestige with *Nobel Prizes for Economy* in 1970s and 1980s. Since 1980s, neo-liberal theory and ideology has a hegemonic status guiding political practice in global capitalist system.

Post –Truth and Social Sciences

The deterioration of inequality and injustice cause various reactions of great masses, which allow political regimes to use such situation in becoming authoritarian. Such reactions may be regarding extraordinary increase of crime rates, mafia, religious extremism and violence. The most common reaction is in the way of looking for a rescuer; the masses then "place their rescuer a charisma" based on their most known reference reality; hence populist political leaders obtain universal scale power. At that point, rationalism is no longer on the table for the masses, and the social reality is established by the populist leader. This situation, which is the substitution of reality with *post-truth*, is not only applicable for today. In 1930s, Germany, which was the top country in the world in terms of science and culture, dismissed making rational choices and allowed *Führer* that they put charisma on to set the reality for them. It should be reiterated that the Minister of Propaganda was at the second highest person in Nazi Germany. Erich Fromm, one of the Frankfurt School members, analysed this phenomenon in his book called *the Fear of Freedom*. The available technology (electronic revolution), televisions, social media etc. together with processes create very appropriate environment for *post-truth* era (Hannan,2018).

At this point, *the third order of simulacra* analysis by Jean Baudrillard stands forwards accordingly. How come technological revolution can establish reality against neo-liberal hegemony during capitalism? Baudrillard, who discusses this topic under *Political Healing,* started with the finding of Bourdieu and noted, "The essence of power relations is to try to be like power relations while getting the whole power from such secrecy". And based on this explanation, he added, "An immoral and unjust capital can only exist by hiding behind an ethical utopia". From this framework, he underlined that everybody working to resurrect public ethics (through disclosure or indignation etc.) works for the capitalist order (Baudrillard, 2002, 31).

Baudrillard, who underlined the problem by institutionalising the existing modern life criticism, indicated that reality does not express itself as reality, and simulacrum are the reality. Baudrillard conducted a situation analysis and identification on the current era through his "simulation universe" theory, and noted that all facts as simulated penetrated into our lives in this order where our eyes only look to the screens. The most popular problem of political science is the liberal democracy crisis. The increasing intensity of post-truth concept takes away the meaning of the leadership of representative liberal democracy. *Post-truth* is a crisis for social sciences. Social sciences have two pillars. Each science domain has a subject (i.e. economic structure of political science; production, alteration, consumption, distribution relation of economy, administration function of public administration, state institutions). Each domain of science generates information on its subject and theory is the explanatory information of subject. First pillar answers the question of *what and how* while the second pillar explains *how it*

should be. Such dual structure is also applicable for natural sciences where people do science to tackle the problems that they encounter. However, this dual structure is more common in social sciences. The first pillar, which is the evaluation, means the information on the authenticity of the related subject, correct theory. Post-truth extorts the bond between the first and second pillar since the concern of information on truth is no longer available. Post-truth is not only a variable in the process that political regimes become authoritarian but also a development triggering a crisis in social sciences.

Methodology

In the research, political methodology that studies the quantitative and qualitative methods has been used.. First of all, contractualism, was conducted to assess the different views. The Idelogical Analysis technique, which iinvestigates embedded values, beliefs, biases, and assumptions within a specific text, in some domain of discourse, or in social practices within a particular cultural context, and of the motivations and power relations underlying these, has been used. Secondly, for the qualitative analysis, a questionnaire (*Table 1*), developed by the researcher, as a data collection tool has been used. The sample of the study consists of academics working as lecturers in universities in Northern Cyprus. A total of 115 academics participated in the study and their answers to the questionnaire questions were analysed by using SPSS. Random sampling method used among volunteer academics to ask semi-structured questions. A total of 7 statements were included in the 5 scale likert questionnaire, together with demographic questions. Survey questions were given at *Table 1* below.

Table 1. Survey Questions

Question No.	Survey Questions
Q1	Do you know about representative libral democracy?
Q2	Do you know about popülist authoritarianism?
Q3	Do you know about post truth politics?
Q4	Do you think liberal democracy has caused a major crisis?
Q5	Do you think political scientists has the authorianism tendency?
Q6	Do you think authoritaritarianism can be defined as populism?
Q7	Do you think global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis?

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 24.0 statistical program was used for the analysis of the data obtained. In the analyses, first of all, distribution statistics were given according to the demographic characteristics of the academics. Since the data do not show normal distribution, the non-parametric hypothesis tests, the independent sample test Mann-Whitney U Test, was used in the analysis of the data. In addition, Spearman's correlation test was used to examine the correlation between the responses of the participants to the survey questions. As it has always been difficult to asses credibility (Appelman & Sundar, 2016), collecting views of academics was used to support the literature review.

Participants

The quantitative results of the study has been given below. First of all, demographic characteristics of the participants were analysed.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

	N	(%
Gender		
Female	52	45
Male	63	55
Education		
PhD. Graduated	65	57
Non-PhD. Graduated	50	43

Results

According to the *Table 2*, 45% of the academics participating in the research are women and 55% are men. %57 of the academician's have PhD. and 43% academics have not PhD. Degree. Volunteer academics participation distribution was convenient for data collection in order to provide credibility and reliability. Below *Table 3* show us the results of knowing representative liberal democracy, populist authoritarianism and post truth politics of the academics according to gender.

In order to assess the question 1, 2 and 3, the Mann-Whitney U test was used, and the results were given at Table-3. According to the results, it can be seen that there is a difference between male and female participant's responses to the knowing representative liberal democracy, know about populist authoritarianism and knowing post truth politics. Liberal democracy knowing by female participants more than male participants, however, this situation is vice-versa for knowing populist authoritarianism. In knowing post truth politics again female participants

more than male participants. It is a known fact that post-truth politics have become a common topic for the ones who are interested in politics (Suiter, 2016b).

Table 3. Mann-Whitney U Test Statistics According to Gender

Survey Questions p-Values[*]	Decision
Do you know about representative liberal democracy? (P=.61)	Retain the null hypothesis
Do you know about populist authoritarianism? (P=.51)	Retain the null hypothesis
Do you know about post truth politics? (P=.55)	Retain the null hypothesis

* Significance level .05

The concept of post-truth was firstly discussed and defined by Steve Tesich at Watergate Syndrome and correlated the syndrome with post-truth. The Watergate Scandal is known as the event where the President of the United States of America of that time Richard Nixon was involved to illegal wiretap of the opponent Democratic Party headquarters at Watergate Hotel. Tesich emphasized that such victory had a dark side within and claimed that American society started to escape for real after the scandal revealed itself. We came to equate truth with bad news and we didn't want bad news anymore, no matter how true or vital to our health as a nation. We looked to our government to protect us from the truth (Tesich, 1992:12). Post-truth as a word, statement or concept has become widely used. It can be seen in table 3 that some media outlets guided and informed these lecturers about democracy, authoritarianism and politics. Their knowledge was not surprising. According to a research, agenda-setting theory by Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw reflects that the choices of editors, editorial departments and publishers have major influence in determining political truth (McCombs & Shaw, 1997:176). In other words, the obstacle between true information and information consumers claimed to be the media monopolized by the government.

Below Table-4 show us the results of knowing representative liberal democracy, populist authoritarianism and post truth politics of the academics according to education.

Table 4. Mann-Whitney U Test Statistics According to Education

Survey Questions p-Values	Decision
Do you know about representative liberal democracy? (P=.71)	Retain the null hypothesis
Do you know about populist authoritarianism? (P=.49)	Retain the null hypothesis
Do you know about post truth politics? (P=.58)	Retain the null hypothesis

* Significance level .05

In order to assess the question 1, 2 and 3, the Mann-Whitney U test was used again, and the results were given at Table-4. According to the results, it can be seen that there is a difference between PhD owners and non-PhD owners participant's responses to the knowing representative liberal democracy, know about populist authoritarianism and knowing post truth politics. According to the results obtained those academics who have PhD degree better knowing liberal democracy, populist authoritarianism and post truth politics than those who do not have PhD degree. This has been discussed in some articles and has become a truth regarding the ones discussing post truth as a result of social media (Hoffman, 2018).

In consideration with common characteristics of populist politicians, they determine irrational policies like religious or ethnical or xenophobia, show the tendency to come to power with the support of desperate masses by reflecting them crises and problems occurred due to the others over us/them discrimination. The principle of the state of law is abandoned through reflecting all of these as if we are in an ordinary vital struggle with them, who would destroy us with their offsets among us, and suspending fundamental human rights and freedoms. Explained as populist, this system is executed by a charismatic leader, who is attributed with extraordinary characteristics. This populist development coincides with post-truth politics. In other words, it is possible to mention a symbiotic correlation between increasing authoritarianism in political regimes and popularity of post-truth. Populism and authoritarianism, both of which have been discussed by political scientists, are deemed as negative elements resembling the concept of fascism in 1920s and 1930s rather than representative liberal democracy (Wolff, 2015).

In order to assess the correlation among research question 4 and 7, the Spearman test was used to examine the results and to check the existence of any relationship between liberal democracies has caused a major crisis and global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis. Results of the Spearman test were given in *Table 5*.

Table 5. Spearman Correlation Matrix

Survey Questions		Do you think liberal democracy has caused a major crisis?	Do you think global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis?
Do you think liberal democracy has caused a major crisis?	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.202[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.001
	N	115	115

Do you think global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis?	Correlation Coefficient	.202**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.
	N	115	115

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to the results, the existence of the real relationship between both roles gathered. This means that, there is a relationship between the liberal democracies has caused a major crisis and global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis.

Madeline Albright, who considers current discourse on populism as a transformation to fascism, explains the problem as the universal rise of populist politicians. Albright noted down that representative liberal democracy had a major downfall all around the world and there is a potential fascism threat available (Albright, 2018). Chantal Mouffe and other political scientists, who had worries about crises and underlined the necessity of re-functionality in democracy, reflected that representative democracy should undergo a transformation defined as radical democracy or cosmopolitan democracy or good governance (Mouffe, 2008).

Further the political scientist, Christoph Stefes, related regime is a number of systems that is not legitimized through elections, yet gaining its power from violence and oppression. Stefes stated that authoritarian regimes are everything that is not democratic, and he clarified the type of state structure considered as authoritarian regime. Stefes says, we can list absolute monarchies, military regimes and all kinds of single party systems as authoritarian regimes. However, multi-party systems in which the winner is already decided before the election also fall into this category. Christoph Stefes argued that authoritarian regimes had three pillars sustaining them as legitimation, repression and co-optation. He states that dictators allow citizens to be a part of regime and benefit from it, which create solidarity among people and ensure a significant pillar in the regime accordingly. Stefes emphasized that the strongest pillar of authoritarian leader or anti-democratic system is legitimation where governments are legitimated through elections in democracies while in dictatorship; the ruler must create his own form of legitimation (Stefes, 2013).

On the other hand, Galston reflected populism as a challenge against liberal democracy, which needs to reinvent itself to comply with new social and economic world order, and argued that reasonable nationalism is the antidote for populism (Galston, 2018). At the same time, Condoleezza Rice said that there is not only one single formula to ensure the progress in personal and democratic freedoms,

and correlated the effective implementation and protection of human rights in an active democracy with three main elements.

In order to assess the correlation among research questions the Spearman test was used to examine the results and to check the existence of any relationship between the political scientists' authoritarianism tendency and authoritaritarianism defined as populism. Results of the Spearman test were given in *Table 6*.

Table 6. Spearman Correlation Matrix

Survey Questions		Do you think political scientists has the authoritarianism tendency?	Do you think authoritaritarianism can be defined as populism?
Do you think political scientists have authoritarianism tendency?	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.404[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.001
	N	115	115
Do you think authoritaritarianism can be defined as populism?	Correlation Coefficient	.404[**]	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.
	N	115	115

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

According to the results, the existence of the real relationship between both roles gathered. This means that, there is a relationship between the political scientists' authoritarianism tendency and authoritaritarianism defined as populism.

Neo-liberal philosophers and theorists discuss the necessity of a state ensuring the full security of market. Nozick (1974), argues that a night-watchman state would be sufficient and invisible hand of market would solve all kinds of social problems. Pursuant to neo-liberals, goods and services required for individual needs are only produced by a group of businessmen. In other words, the rights and freedoms based on the positive definition of freedom are avoided since they would be generated through the intervention of state on economic domain. Moreover, neo-liberal discourse or market fundamentalism is not effective in political domain; however, Mont Pelerin and other civil organisations as well as academia or intellectuals, who are members of such movements, get significant financial contributions from major capital institutions. For example, California Contemporary Studies Institute, a civil society organization founded by neo-liberal American academics, was supported by generous financial contributions of major corporations like ExxonMobil, Shell, Ford Chase Manhattan, General Motors (MacLean, 2017: 122).Germany, which was the top country in the world

in terms of science and culture, dismissed making rational choices and allowed Führer that they put charisma on to set the reality for them. Erich Fromm, analyzed this phenomenon the available technology (electronic revolution), televisions, social media etc. together with processes create very appropriate environment for post-truth era (Hannan, 2018). All these show that political scientists have authoritarianism tendency, and some can be defined as polulism.

In order to assess the correlation among research questions the Spearman test was used to examine the results and to check the existence of any relationship between the liberal democracy role over the major crisis and role of global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis. Results of the Spearman test were given in *Table 7*.

Table 7. Spearman Correlation Matrix

Survey Questions		Do you think liberal democracy has caused a major crisis?	Do you think global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis?
Do you think liberal democracy has caused a major crisis?	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.109**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.001
	N	115	115
Do you think global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis?	Correlation Coefficient	.109**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.
	N	115	115

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to the results, the existence of the real relationship between both roles gathered. This means that, there is a relationship between liberal democracy role over the major crisis and role of global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis. The third order of simulacra analysis by Jean Baudrillard stands forwards accordingly. An immoral and unjust capital can only exist by hiding behind an ethical utopia. From this framework, he underlined that everybody working to resurrect public ethics (through disclosure or indignation etc.) works for the capitalist order (Baudrillard, 2002: 31). Particularly, capitalism can be explained as a transformation changing economic and social order as well and human and social life respectively. As a result of such historic findings, the related capitalist change also brought significant change on the institutionalisation process of legitimisation understanding in political order. Moreover, representative

liberal democracy, a type of political regime, should be considered as an output of this change. Although liberal philosophers acknowledge capitalism as the most suitable order in human nature with an organic bond between capitalism and democracy, the relation of capitalism with authoritarian political regimes i.e. fascism should not be avoided.

Discussion

The concept of post-truth was firstly discussed and defined by Steve Tesich at Watergate Syndrome and correlated the syndrome with post-truth. Such victory had a dark side within and claimed that American society started to escape for real after the scandal revealed itself. Some media outlets defined as having Marxist tendency do not talk about disinformation activities of media. The obstacle between true information and information consumers claimed to be the media monopolized by the government. Common characteristics of populist politicians determine irrational policies like religious or ethnical or xenophobia, show the tendency to come to power with the support of desperate masses by reflecting them crises and problems occurred due to the others over us/them discrimination. The principle of the state of law is abandoned through reflecting all of these as if we were in an ordinary vital struggle with them, who would destroy us with their offsets among us, and suspending fundamental human rights and freedoms. Acxording to the results, it is possible to mention a symbiotic correlation between increasing authoritarianism in political regimes and popularity of post-truth. Populism and authoritarianism, both of which have been discussed by political scientists, are deemed as negative elements resembling the concept of fascism rather than representative liberal democracy.

Populism as a transformation to fascism, explains the problem as the universal rise of populist politicians. Representative liberal democracy had a major downfall all around the world and there is a potential fascism threat available and need re-functionality in democracy. At the same time, the Authoritarian regimes are everything that is not democratic, and the type of state structure considered as authoritarian regime. However, multi-party systems in which the winner is already decided before the election also fall into this category. Authoritarian regimes had three pillars sustaining them as legitimation, repression and co-optation. Dictators allow citizens to be a part of regime and benefit from it, which create solidarity among people and ensure a significant pillar in the regime accordingly. The strongest pillar of authoritarian leader or anti-democratic system is legitimation where governments are legitimated through elections in democracies while in dictatorship; the ruler must create his own form of legitimation.

Populism as a challenge against liberal democracy, which needs to reinvent itself to comply with new social and economic world order, and argued that reasonable nationalism is the antidote for populism. It is clear that there is not only

one single formula to ensure the progress in personal and democratic freedoms, and correlated the effective implementation and protection of human rights in an active democracy with three main elements.

Besides all, Neo-liberal philosophers and theorists discuss the necessity of a state ensuring the full security of market. The night-watchman state would be sufficient and invisible hand of market would solve all kinds of social problems. Pursuant to neo-liberals, goods and services required for individual needs are only produced by a group of businessmen. In other words, the rights and freedoms based on the positive definition of freedom are avoided since they would be generated through the intervention of state on economic domain. Moreover, neo-liberal discourse or market fundamentalism is not effective in political domain; however, civil organisations as well as academia or intellectuals, who are members of such movements, get significant financial contributions from major capital institutions. Germany, which was the top country in the world in terms of science and culture, dismissed making rational choices and allowed Führer that they put charisma on to set the reality for them. The available technology (electronic revolution), televisions, social media etc. together with processes create very appropriate environment for post-truth era. An immoral and unjust capital can only exist by hiding behind an ethical utopia. From this framework, everybody working to resurrect public ethics.

Besides all, the results of our study highlighted that, there is a difference between male and female participant's responses to the knowing representative liberal democracy, know about populist authoritarianism and knowing post truth politics. Liberal democracy knowing by female participants more than male participants, however, this situation is vice-versa for knowing populist authoritarianism. In knowing post truth politics again female participants more than male participants. It is a known fact that post-truth politics have become a common topic for the ones who are interested in politics. Furthermore, it can be seen that, there is a difference between PhD owners and non-PhD owner's participant's responses to the knowing representative liberal democracy, know about populist authoritarianism and knowing post truth politics. According to the results obtained those academics who have PhD degree better knowing liberal democracy, populist authoritarianism and post truth politics than those who do not have PhD degree. This has been discussed in some articles and has become a truth regarding the ones discussing post truth as a result of social media (Hoffman, 2018). On the other side, according to the findings we can observe that there is a relationship between the liberal democracies has caused a major crisis and global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis. At the same time, we can see that there is a relationship between the political scientists' authoritarianism tendency and authoritaritarianism defined as populism. Furthermore, we can conclude that there is a relationship between liberal democracy role over the major crisis and role of global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis.

Conclusion

The main theme of this study, which is the rise of representative liberal democracy to populist authoritarianism with post-truth politics from the political and administrative aspects, becomes clear through its hegemony in the domain of ideas and practice. It is also obvious that it has become functional within the global capitalism, a world system, which is analysed and given as an example through its historic dimension. In other words, the different phases of capitalism designated the functionality of representative liberal democracy, i.e. welfare state capitalism, global capitalism. On the other hand, a democratic political regime is inevitably populist as well since Aristoteles. Every political party makes promises with unlimited emotions to maximize their votes and become the power. It is in the nature of democracy (Marres, 2018). However, the representative liberal democracy has showed a shift towards authoritarian administration defined as populism in the last 10-20 years. The populism mentioned here is significantly different than the populism under democracy. Democracy lost its functionality and relatively made a shift to populist and authoritarian administration via *post-truth* politics (Jasanoff & Simmet, 2017) .

This study analysed the tendency in developed countries with democratic background towards the authoritarian administrations, and it is identified that society gravitated to irrational statements regarding being in the power or making vital decisions. The victory of Donald Trump upon his election strategy over Hillary Clinton or post-truth politics in UK during the Brexit referendum and leaving the European Union can both be examples for such situation.

The common characteristics of populist authoritarian politicians stood forward with post-truth politics are that they determine irrational policies like religious or ethnical or xenophobia, show the tendency to come to power with the support of desperate masses by reflecting them crises and problems occurred due to "the others" over us/them discrimination. The principle of the state of law is abandoned through reflecting all of these as if we are in an ordinary vital struggle with them, who would destroy us with their offsets among us, and suspending fundamental human rights and freedoms. Explained as populist, this system is executed by a charismatic leader, who is attributed with extraordinary characteristics. This 'populist' development coincides with *post-truth* politics. In other words, it is possible to mention a symbiotic correlation between increasing authoritarianism in political regimes and popularity of *post-truth* (Lockie, 2017). Populism and authoritarianism, both of which have been discussed by political scientists, are deemed as negative elements resembling the concept of fascism in 1920s and 1930s rather than representative liberal democracy (Lynch, 2017). The establishment of contour-hegemony options (good governance, radical democracy) and making them a requirement shows the representative liberal democracy crisis. The discussion of such problems within this conjecture is promising for the future.

Liberal democracy were known by female participants more than male participants, however, this situation is vice-versa for populist authoritarianism. Regarding post truth politics again female participants were more than male participants. It is a known fact that post-truth politics have become a common topic for the ones who are interested in politics. Furthermore, academics who have PhD degree have a better knowledge about liberal democracy, populist authoritarianism and post truth politics than those who do not have PhD degree. On the other hand, we can conclude that there is a relationship between the liberal democracies has caused a major crisis and global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis. At the same time, there is a relationship between the political scientists' authoritarianism tendency and authoritaritarianism defined as populism. Furthermore, we can conclude that there is a relationship between liberal democracy role over the major crisis and role of global capitalism throws representative liberal democracy into major functionality crisis.

Recommendations

Since the quantitative research part of this study was carried out exclusively in Northern Cyprus, it will be useful to make the findings in different countries to compare the analysis of the findings. In addition, we believe that providing the study sample group with the views of stakeholders, such as politicians and columnists who write political articles, in addition to academics, will help to achieve even more comprehensive results.

References

Albright, M. (2018). *Fascism* United States: Habercollins.

Alterman, E. (2004). *When Presidents lie: A History of Official Deception and its Consequences.* New York: Penguin Group.

Appelman, A., & Sundar, S.S. (2016). Measuring message credibility: construction and validation of an exclusive scale. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *93*(1), 59-79. DOI: 10.1177/1077699015606057.

Arendt, H. (2005). Truth and politics. In: J. Medina & D. Wood (eds.). *Truth: Engagements Across Philosophical Traditions* (pp. 295-314). New York: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. DOI:10.1002/9780470776407.ch19.

Ball, J. (2007). *Post-Truth*. London: Biteback Publishing.

Baudrillard J. (2002). *Screened out*. New York : Verso.

Baudrillard, Jean (2003). *Simulakrlar and Simülasyon.* (translate. Oğuz Adanır). Ankara: East West Press.

BBC (2016)., *Word of the Year*. https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-37995600#:~:text=Oxford%20Dictionaries%20has%20declared%20%22post,public%20opinion%20than%20emotional%20appeals. (date of access: 8.02.2019).

Berling, T.V. & Bueger, C. (2017). Expertise in the age of post-factual politics: an outline of reflexive strategies. *Geoforum*, *84*, 332-341. DOI: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.05.008.

Bueger, C. (2015). Making things known: epistemic practices, the United Nations, and the translation of piracy. *International Political Sociology*, *9*(1), 1-18. DOI: 10.1111/ips.12073.

Carothers, T. (2006). The backlash against democracy promotion. *Foreign Affairs*, *85*(2), 55. DOI: 10.2307/20031911.

D'Ancona, M. (2017). *Post-Truth:The war on Truth and How to Fight Back*. London: Ebury Press.

Galston, A.W. (2018). *Anti Pluralism.* New Haven London: Yale University Press.

Güçdemir, D. (2016). *Facebook's role ın the USA election: Post truth politics, algorithms and fake news* (https://yenimedya.wordpress.com/2016/11/29/abd-secimlerinde-facebookun-rolu-post-truth-siyaset-algoritmalar-ve-sahte-haberler/ (date of access: 04.12.2019).

Hannan, J. (2018). Trolling ourselves to death? Social media and post-truth politics. *European Journal of Communication*, *33*(2), 214-226. DOI: 10.1177/0267323118760323.

Hoffman, S.G. (2018). The responsibilities and obligations of STS in a moment of post-truth demagoguery. *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society*, *4*, 444-452. DOI: 10.17351/ests2018.259.

Jasanoff, S. & Simmet, H.R. (2017). No funeral bells: public reason in a "post-truth age" age. *Social Studies of Science*, *47*(5), 751-770. DOI: 10.1177/0306312717731936.

Keyes, R. (2019). *The Post-truth Era.* (translate. Deniz Özçetin). Izmir: Tudem Press.

Lindblom, C. (1977). *Politics And Markets*. New York: Basick Books.

Lockie, S. (2017). Post-truth politics and the social sciences. *Environmental Sociology*, *3*(1), 1-5. DOI: 10.1080/23251042.2016.1273444.

Lynch, M. (2017). STS, symmetry and post-truth. *Social Studies of Science*, *47*(4), 593-599. DOI: 10.1177/0306312717720308.

Maclean, N. (2017). *Democracy in Chains*. New York: Viking Press.

Marres, N. (2018). Why we can't have our facts back. *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society*, *4*, 423-443. DOI: 10.17351/ests2018.188.

Mccombs, M., & Shaw, D. (1997). *Comunication and Democracy.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Ing Publishers.

Mouffe, C. (2008). *The Return of the Political* (translate. Fahri Bakırcı, Ali Çolak). Ankara: Epos Press.

Ottaway, M., & Chung, T. (1999). Debating democracy assistance: toward a new paradigm. *Journal of Democracy*, *10*(4), 99-113. DOI: 10.1353/jod.1999.0070.

Rabin-Havt, A. (2016). *Lies Incorporated the World of Post Truth Politics*. New York: Anchor Book Penguin Random House.

Rice, C. (2018). *Democracy in Decline*. United States: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rose, J. (2017). Brexit, trump, and post-truth politics. *Public Integrity*, *19*(6), 555-558. DOI: 10.1080/10999922.2017.1285540.

Saylan, G. (2008). *The Inevitable Crisis of Representative Liberal Democracy*. Istanbul: Imge Bookstore Press.

Stefes, **C.** (2013). https://t24.com.tr/haber/hangi-rejimlere-otoriter-denir,238690 (date of access:11.12.2019).

Suiter, J. (2016a). Post-truth?. *Social Studies of Science*, *47*(1), 3-6. DOI: 10.1177/0306312717692076.

Suiter, J. (2016b). Post-truth politics. *Political Insight*, *7*(3), 25-27. DOI: 10.1177/2041905816680417.

Tesich, S. (1992). *A Government of Lies.* Retrieved from *The Nation.*

Wolff, J. (2015). Power in democracy promotion. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, *40*(3-4), 219-236. DOI: 10.1177/0304375415612269.