SSOAR

Open Access Repository
www.ssoar.info

Book review: Parlak, Bekir and Caner, Canturk: The Anatolian civilisations and the administrative history of Turkey: state and administration in Anatolian civilisations from early Hittite state to the Persian invasion

Aliu, Armando

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Rezension / review

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:
Aliu, A. (2014). *Book review: Parlak, Bekir and Caner, Canturk: The Anatolian civilisations and the administrative history of Turkey: state and administration in Anatolian civilisations from early Hittite state to the Persian invasion.*.
https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-368720

Nutzungsbedingungen:
Dieser Text wird unter einer Free Digital Peer Publishing Licence zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den DiPP-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
http://www.dipp.nrw.de/lizenzen/dppl/service/dppl/

Terms of use:
This document is made available under a Free Digital Peer Publishing Licence. For more Information see:
http://www.dipp.nrw.de/lizenzen/dppl/service/dppl/

gesis Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

From the SelectedWorks of Armando Aliu

January 2014

Parlak, Bekir and Caner, Canturk. "The Anatolian Civilisations and the Administrative History of Turkey: State and Administration in Anatolian Civilisations from Early Hittite State to the Persian Invasion." Ekin Publications, Bursa, Turkey, 2013, 271 pp., Price: 16 TL, ISBN: 978-605-5048-48-8.

Contact Author

Start Your Own SelectedWorks

Notify Me of New Work

Available at: http://works.bepress.com/armando_aliu/1

Book Review:

Parlak, Bekir and Caner, Canturk. *"The Anatolian Civilisations and the Administrative History of Turkey: State and Administration in Anatolian Civilisations from Early Hittite State to the Persian Invasion."* Ekin Publications, Bursa, Turkey, 2013, 271 pp., Price: 16 TL, ISBN: 978-605-5048-48-8.[1]

Recently, a striking well-written book has just come out. The book intends to fill in the gap of the missing knowledge of the administrative science formation and the genesis of state theory in the Ancient Anatolian Civilisations. The research has largely derived from the PhD thesis of Asst. Prof. Dr. Canturk Caner and extended to a book format with the great contribution of Prof. Dr. Bekir Parlak who is a pioneer in public administration and comparative public policy research in Turkey.

One of the main reasons that pushed me to an attempt of reviewing this book is the consciousness of the universal purpose and goal of the investigation. Moreover, I was impressed very much from Prof. Dr. Eleanor Robson's (University of Cambridge) seminar[2] that was held at the University of Heidelberg in Germany. Prof. Robson has successfully linked up the values, cultural heritages, kinships and emotional/mental similarities amongst the Anatolian-Mesopotamian civilisations and current existing civilisations. However, the destruction of cultural heritages in Iraq has done a tremendous impact on scientists who are devoting their life to the meaningfulness and preciousness of cultural heritages.

Precisely, I should like directly referring to Prof. Robson's expressions and thoughts. She stated that "the haemorrhaging of atrworks and antiquities across a state's borders is occasionally by the high profile recovery and return artefacts. Most fundamentally, the objects, buildings, texts (e.g. confidential inter-states' official correspondences) and landscapes – the creations of past inhabitants of the region – that help shape a sense of self, local identity, cultural property and/or tangible cultural heritage. Thus, decontextualised objects lose much of their meanings; the cultural whole is more than sum of its part."

Similarly, the destruction of heritage consists as much in people's loss of the ability to create and preserve as it does in the damage to things. But the social, economic and political entailments of cultural destruction extend far beyond professional livelihoods.

In the same manner, the book clarified all aspects of Anatolian and Mesopotamian civilisations; in particular, the enrichment and contextualisation of "*pure knowledge*" in ancient times asserted that the accumulation of natural and social science and information in classical forms were sources of ispiration for the latter civilisations and indeed current civilisations that are still alive. Therefore, the study seems very up-to-date because all of our knowledge has been generated by the classical scientific achievements of ancient civilisations.

The research can be considered as an interdisciplinary remarkable and innovative scientific investigation in the fields of history, administration and politics. The issues that are taken up and discussed throughout the study are briefly listed as follows: i) the general characteristics of Anatolia in the Age of Antiquity (3000 BC – 476 BC); ii) the origin of Anatolian Civilisations; iii) the political history of Anatolian Civilisations; iv) the insights of state and bureaucracy from the perspective of socio-economics and socio-politics; v) the state and public bureaucracy theory; vi) public system and organisation; vii) the functionality of bureaucracy and public officials involved in bureaucracy; and viii) the public law and public services.

The study aims to determine the role of bureaucracy in state administration, the state notion and dynamics of bureaucratic systems, the establishment process of states that have certain parameters in the framework of political, cultural and economic aspects in Anatolia in the Age of Antiquity.

The research argument claimed that the "state" notion (x_i) and bureaucratic mechanisms (x_{ii}) have significant influence on the beginning of settled-lifes (y_i) and the development of specialised division of labour (y_{ii}).

The study put forth the concept and system of state, the organisational structure of public bureaucracy, and public service functions, the organisations and public officials involved in bureaucracy, and the public legal order in Hittite, Urartu, Phrygian, Lydian and Ionian civilisations that had established in Anatolia in the Age of Antiquity.

Government and public bureaucracy are complex phenomena that have arised in connection with the first civilisational cultures of humanity. The need of social

[1] Original titel of the book is *"Anadolu Uygarlıkları ve Türkiye'nin Yönetim Tarihi: Anadolu Uygarlıklarında Devlet ve Yönetim – Erken Hitit Devleti'nden Pers İstilasına Kadar."*

[2] *"Neo-Assyrian Scholarship: A Geographical Analysis."* Prof.Dr. Eleanor Robson (University of Cambridge and University of Oxford, All Souls College), Neue Universität, Hörsaal 6, Grabengasse 3, Heidelberg / Deutschland, 10 January 2012.

organisation that began with the transition to the settled-lifes formed through the shift from hunter-gatherer and assimilative economy to the productive economy. Thus, this shift led to the emergence of the ideal state organisation. The position of state in social organisational culture was seen as an interventionist power and political authority which regulates social order and structural nexus.

Additionally, the study has focused on a system that contains the relationships amongst state and society and includes the factors that are listed as such: i) the source of government; ii) transparency; iii) social welfare; iv) democracy (demos-critea); and v) secularism. Furthermore, a state organisation that can ensure security and social welfare was evaluated as a crucial key element for the development of ideal society. Ensuring social welfare level is also associated with the creation of legaly binding regulations and justice system. In this context, the states established in Anatolia in the Age of Antiquity, set up state and government order based on law and legal regulations in order to create strong and practical mechanisms. These mechanisms were reinforced by organised and specialised powerful bureaucracy order.

A quite crucial task of government is to improve the socio-economic system. This task is the main key for sustaining social welfare and preserving the security and existence of state structures at the same time. Generally, the constructed political power in state's structure led to the enhancement of all aspects of a centralised administrative culture.

The more state mechanism become larger, the more the tasks and services of state increase, and in the same way the created-bureaucracy network for dealing with these issues is expanding as well.

The research has included two basic approaches (i.e. evolutionary and neo-evolutionary approach) in frame of state-administration nexus and the scope of bureaucracy.

The emergence of state and administration phenomena with an evolutionary perspective caused; i) the division of society into classes; ii) the creation of centralised administration under the control of distinguished elites; iii) the emergence of political and social government phenomenon ruled by elites; iv) the split of government superstructure into specialised structures; such as, the bureaucrats, the military and the religious communities; v) the creation of a politically integrated society model by means of law, regulations and the bureaucratic and organisational structure of government; vi) the spread of specialisation in work-life; and vii) the emergence of urban lifestyles in a more individualised/singularised society.

Neo-evolutionary approach adopts the role of urbanisation in formation of state authority and emphasise the role of economy in social life and the influence on state power. The most obvious distinction of neo-evolutionary approach from the evolutionary approach is that the neo-evolutionary approach is more related to the state power which influences the structure of bureaucracy and the development of social economy. The neo-evolutionary approach is not only investigating state and administration phenomena in settled societies but also taking into account the possibility that these phenomena might occur in settled or quasi-settled nomadic communities.

In the light of these considerations, the transition to a settled-life started by way of the development of an organised-social-life culture and the rise of production-consumption relations based on organised agriculture. The emergence of state structure as political authority in Anatolia in the Age of Antiquity is closely linked with the development of settled-life and the evolution of socio-cultural structure; especially, the rise of colonial cities that were established by Mesopotamian and Helenic civilisations.

As it is known, the initial political organisation which can be perceived as early state model had founded by the Sumerians in between 2200-2000 BC. Nevertheless, establishment of state structure was not an uncomplicated attempt. Sumerians had confronted with some challenges during the process of setting up a government because the Anatolian region had exposured by intense-continuous flows of migration.

Immediately after the Sumerians, many residential areas were sprung up and diversed to create political authorities and powers in 2000s BC. Actually, this diversity was encouraged by Assyrians. However, the "First Anatolian Migration" and the rise of Hittites as a great state power reshaped the legacy of the Assyrian Trade Colonies and the order of classical pre-colonialism.

Moreover, the "Second Great Anatolian Migration" was the latter step of the formation of state authority and social transformation. At the same time, the second migration flows broke down the Hittites and the Anatolia entered the Iron

Age. Within this period, the Urartu, Phrygian, Lydian and Ionian states cropped up in the Anatolian Peninsula. These states' common features were that they had the competence to create political organisation and improve politically, culturally and economically original values and sets of systems.

In other words, the reconstructurations of government and bureaucracy in the Anatolian Peninsula in the Age of Antiquity were able to be realised by the "First Anatolian Migration Flows" that occurred after the second half of the Bronze Period, and the "Second Anatolian Migration Flows" which commenced the Iron Age.

Unfortunately, the "Second Anatolian Migration Flows" had a negative effect on political and cultural structure in Anatolia. Approximately two hundred years following the fall of the Hittites, there is literally a time of chaos, diffusion and confusion that represents a dark period in Anatolia.

Migration appeared as a serious phenomenon in Anatolia during the Bronze Age. Migration flows reached the peak level in the middle of the Bronze Period. After the collapse of the Hittites and the transition to the Iron Age, Anatolia remained destabilised and this was a quite turbulent/eventful period. In fact, the Anatolian civilisations established via the great migration flows and thereafter these were demolished by Cimmerian Migration Flows and then replaced with the Persian invasion.

The study has two major limitations. Initially, from the axis of "time" limitation, the study investigated the period that begins with the Age of Antiquity and ends with the Persian Invasion in the 4th century BC. In addition, the civilisations established in the Anatolian Peninsula were examined in frame of thematic-regional limitation. Secondly, the other limitation is the structural forms of civilisations; such as, political structures, the insights of state mechanisms, civil and military bureaucratic organisations and so forth.

The study brought a universal contribution to public administration studies and presented an interdisciplinary approach to the Age of Antiquity. Likewise, the research drew a systematic and scientific framework for bureaucratic organisations and functions, and provided adequate clarifications for better understanding the theory of state and administration in the Age of Antiquity. The research sought to enhance the knowledge of the Historiography of Public Administration in a systematic and holistic manner.

The research examined the Cooper Age, the Bronze Age and the Iron Age respectively; and reflected crucial information concerning with the dialectics of settled communities and nomadic communities that lived within these three periods.

Settled communities accomplished enhancement of their socioeconomic and cultural structures, and enriched the contents of political powers and social transformations; whereas, the nomadic communities remained under-developed, scattered and sinewless. The nomadic communities had a very restricted means of production and they sustained their existence and social interactions by way of kinships and blood relationships.

Unfortunately, the increased level of prosperity and wealth in settled communities was not observed in nomadic communities. The rigid political culture and stringent power relations affected peaceful coexistence and trade relations with the settled communities. Thus, the poor and vying relations amongst the settled and nomadic communities caused the emergence of a new form of economic production and a new kind of political power relations that contain both 'war' and 'looting' culture, undoubtedly. This social chaotic order accumulated the costant growing needs and disorders-disobediences of the nomadic communities, and hence they organised looting attempts and erratic movements to settled communities. This new form of interaction initially satisfied the needs of nomadic communities; however, the settled communities arised the military class and bureaucracy in order to preserve themselves from any possible attack or looting. The instinct of security issues forced the settled communities seeking centralised-militarisation in the realm of classical deterrence theory.

The nomads benefited from the decline of the population rate of the settled communities and the nomads wreathed on many villages. Quite interestingly, after for a while, the nomads preferred to live together instead of looting or creating conflicts. Through wreathing, the nomads took place in the city government and defence, shaped state mechanism, met local elements and finally prepared the ground of the culture of a new engaged society.

Even though compared to settled communities, nomads had a dynamic political culture; they were very weak at economic production skills. As a result of this, both nomadic and settled communities reached the fusion of the two cultures

and that situation rised a new hybrid civilisation that acquired a specific integration process. At the end of this integration process, the created hybrid civilisation based on urban lifestyles, multivariate, cosmopolitan and dynamic multicultural forms and blurred structures.

The intense migration flows with wreathing and conquering purposes; on the one hand, accrued the number of settlement areas; on the other, the existing settlement areas changed the nature, attribute, and quality. The chaos caused by the increasing flows of migration in the existing settlements was tackled via the nationalisation of administrative power, significantly.

The explanation of the reason why Anatolian geography was transformed immediately into a zone of dense settlement is twofold: i) Geography/Region and ii) Transitivity. For instance, climatic conditions and geographical fertility made life suitable for being settled.

In the context of transitivity, the population movement and commercial transit routes appeared as a balance of relations with Assyrians and Babylonians in Anatolia.

Assyrian and Babylonian states preferred to avoid from nomadic communities; and therefore, they established buffer zones through using their political and economic power relations in the east and southeast of Anatolia. Whilst Assyrian and Babylonian states were protecting their sovereignties, they achieved an enormous level of richness from trading and embedded classical capitalism with new markets. In particular, Assyrians used the established small city colonies as a bank.

However, the sustainability of the embedded classical capitalistic forms and pre-colonialism did not reach a long-range steady function. In contrast to Assurian colonies, the Ionians resisted towards the Persian invasion and the most basic reason of their struggle is that they developed a powerful urban life culture. Their urban life culture constituted a source of inspiration for the civilisations coming afterwards; such as, the Helen, Macedonian and Roman civilisations.

The content of Ionian urban life culture found its meaning in the concept of "polis." In a general description of the "polis" notion based on non-agricultural economic activities and symbolised a lifestyle that appeared in the residential areas with a certain size of population. The "polis" was the most striking form of social welfare, freedom and full participation in the Age of Antiquity. The "polis" represented the fundamental rights and freedoms of individuals in their ideal society and ideal state model. The philosophy of "polis" acknowledged the Aristotelian motto – i.e. "a city rises on economic prosperity." This prosperity is not only the wealth of certain classes of society, but the level of richness that the entire city attains as a whole.

It can be put forward that the Anatolian Civilisations in the Age of Antiquity influenced the latter established states and indeed the current modern states in the issues that namely are listed as such: i) the philosophy and system of state; ii) the socio-economic and socio-cultural functions of administration; iii) the interactions of political authorities with economic actors; iv) the management of foreign affairs; and v) the diplomacy and management of urban areas.

Consequently, the formation process of political authorities, the governmental schemes and foundations, public bureaucracies and the structure of state order and function are useful criteria for considering the evolution of the world civilisations history in general, and the Anatolian civilisations in specific in the Age of Antiquity.

ARMANDO ALIU
University of Heidelberg
(GERMANY)
Aliu@stud.uni-heidelberg.de