

Chapter 8

Strategy of Good Software Governance: FLOSS in the State of Turkey

Hüseyin Tolu

Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Turkey

ABSTRACT

To chapter concerns emerging cybernetics, which is the school of “meaning to lead” and is particularly associated with the idea of dominations and controls. This chapter initially anatomizes the sociology of software cybernetics into two broad movements—free/libre and open source software (FLOSS) and proprietary close source software (PCSS)—to argue a good software governance approach. This chapter discusses (a) in what matters and (b) for what reasons software governance of Turkey has locked into the ecosystems of PCSS and, in particular, considers causes, effects, and potential outcomes of not utilizing FLOSS in the state of Turkey. The government has continuously stated that there are no compulsory national or international conventions(s) and settlement(s) with the ecosystems of PCSS and that there is no vendor lock-in concern. Nevertheless, the chapter principally argues that Turkey has taken a pragmatic decision-making process of software in the emerging cybernetics that leads and contributes to techno-social externality of PCSS hegemonic stability.

INTRODUCTION

“You never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete”; as B. Fuller (1895-1983), believed that in the system of monetary capitalism, it is practically meaningless to fight forces. So, smashing burgeoning technology for putting them out of their particular works is no longer the case of matter in the era of singularity. Nevertheless, this is not meant that the public ought not to have a particular criticism to technological singularity; or at least, no particular ethical concerns about its possible prospective and retrospective memory in the global (capitalist) system. The burgeoning technology is peculiar and mostly irregular, as W. Mossberg states that “why shouldn’t a PC work like a refrigerator or a toaster?” Or “I’m an enemy of what I call ‘computer

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-5314-4.ch008

Strategy of Good Software Governance

theology.’ There’s a class conflict out there. There’s a techno-elite that lives in a different world”. These quotations are what makes us concerned about cybernetics which is the school of ‘meaning to lead’, and particularly associated with the idea of dominations and controls, characteristically regarding criticism against doctrine of technological totalitarianism, existing mechanisms (machines and humans and their commissure), in which known and/or unknown one group control another. So, cybernetic is for the purpose of revealing its orchestrating mechanisms. “It is no longer a question of predicting the future, but of reproducing the present. It is no longer a question of static order, but of a dynamic self-organization” (Tiqqun, 2010, p.18). In this sense, cybernetics refers to an emergent governance of technology, policy and management, in which each element has actual persistence(s) of reality, but when they are merged together, multiplicities of reasonably complex interactions are arisen.

To study concerns of emerging cybernetics, interestingly enough, present software is escalating in order to sell hardware - e.g. present technology has no responsive meaning at all without software applications, such as Operating Systems (OSs) or the Internet. This makes software an interesting but sophisticated phenomenon. It is thereby initially essential to anatomize sociology of software cybernetics into two broad movements: Free/Libre and Open Source Software (FLOSS) and Proprietary Close Source Software (PCSS), to argue how our new technological revolution (e.g. innovations) exposures new concerns of our good governance approach in the capitalist democratic systems. This chapter broadly highlights why not to put technological movements into the same vein at all, because some of burgeoning technology should benefits public as a whole, in the prime imaginable way, as FLOSS movements seek. Then, this chapter compares the sociology of PCSS with those of FLOSS, highlighting their consequences as hegemonic totalitarianism with PCSS versus flexible emancipation with FLOSS. As the “control is as much an effect as a cause, and the idea that control is something you exert is a real handicap to progress” (Grand, 2003). So, it is actually essential to have the core knowledge of sociological of education and technology, in particular neither Utopian nor Luddite approach of Technorealism to conceptualise our new social goods, because

information is the vital element in a ‘new’ politics and economy that links space, knowledge and capital in networked practices. Freedom is an essential ingredient in this equation if these network practices develop or transform themselves into knowledge cultures. (Peters and Besley, 2008, p.186)

To comprehend these objects, the chapter is organized into seven sections. In the second and third sections, Actor Network Theory (ANT) and then the data collection method are introduced, to begin with, that there is an explicit good governance approach for the current software cybernetics, in particular sociology of education and technology, which crucially anatomizes the movements of FLOSS and PCSS. In this anatomization, the fourth and fifth sections inquire whether or not Turkey has locked-in into the ecosystems of PCSS. If Turkey has been, (a) in what matters and (b) in what reasons has software governance of Turkey locked-in into the ecosystems of PCSS, and in particular it considers causes, effects, potential outcomes for not utilizing FLOSS in the state of Turkey in order to reveal the cybernetics of Turkey. Therefore, the overall aim and contribution of the chapter is to increase an understanding of the underlying socio-political imperatives behind the cybernetics of Turkey in the specific context of PCSS. In the sixth section, it is argued that while the government has constantly stated that there are no compulsory national or international conventions(s) and settlement(s) with the ecosystems of PCSS and there are no vendor lock-in concerns, what does the data analysis principally indicate? Has Turkey actually taken pragmatic decision-making process of software (e.g. de-facto governance) in the emerging

22 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:
www.igi-global.com/chapter/strategy-of-good-software-governance/197111

Related Content

Open Scientific Entrepreneurship: How the Open Source Paradigm Can Foster Entrepreneurial Activities in Scientific Institutions

Harald von Kortzfleisch, Mario Schaarschmidt and Philipp Magin (2010). *International Journal of Open Source Software and Processes* (pp. 48-66).

www.irma-international.org/article/open-scientific-entrepreneurship/53877

"Memeration": Exploring Academic Authorship in Online Spaces

Rob Simon, Alisa Acosta and Eveline Houtman (2015). *Open Source Technology: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 41-56).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/memeration/120906

Evaluating Open Source Software through Prototyping

Ralf Carbon and Marcus Ciolkowski (2007). *Handbook of Research on Open Source Software: Technological, Economic, and Social Perspectives* (pp. 269-281).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/evaluating-open-source-software-through/21194

Search-Based Regression Testing Optimization

Nagwa R. Faisal, Abeer Hamdy and Essam A. Rashed (2021). *International Journal of Open Source Software and Processes* (pp. 1-20).

www.irma-international.org/article/search-based-regression-testing-optimization/280095

The Cultural and Institutional Barrier of Knowledge Exchanges in the Development of Open Source Software

Ikbal Maulana (2021). *Research Anthology on Usage and Development of Open Source Software* (pp. 167-185).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-cultural-and-institutional-barrier-of-knowledge-exchanges-in-the-development-of-open-source-software/286571