

DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY IN TURKEY FROM ITS EMERGENCE TO THE 1960S¹

Ahmet ALP²

Geliş: 31.01.2019 / Kabul: 04.04.2019

DOI: 10.29029/busbed.520060

Abstract

This study is a theoretical examination of the progress of Turkish sociology from its emergence to the 1950s and 60s. Many studies have been carried out for presenting the development of Turkish sociology and the stages that it has passed in terms of putting forward social knowledge for Turkish society. Although there is a rich literature about it, internationally and particularly, there is not much study in English. Therefore, the aim of this study is to present the development of Turkish sociology from its emergence in Turkey and its relationship with European sociology during its development to the 1960s in order to introduce Turkish sociology to other societies' sociologies.

Turkish sociology has a large literature, it is, therefore, quite difficult to exhibit in this study from its emergence to today. Consequently, during the study, it has been attempt to analyze the characteristics of Turkish sociology and its development periodically until the 1960s.

Keywords: *Sociology, Modernity, Turkish Sociology, Development of Sociology, Western Sociology.*

1 This study has been produced from the master's thesis of Ahmet Alp, which is An Analysis of the Development of Sociology in Turkey.

2 Research Assistant, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Bingol University,
ahmetalp1349@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8239-969X>.

ORTAYA ÇIKIŞINDAN 1960'LARA KADAR TÜRKİYE'DE SOSYOLOJİ'NİN GELİŞİMİ

Öz

Bu çalışma, Türk sosyolojisinin ortaya çıkışından 1960'lara kadar ki süreç içerisinde geçirmiş olduğu gelişimin bir incelemesidir. Günümüze kadar, Türk sosyolojisinin Türk toplumu için toplumsal bilginin ortaya konulması bağlamında geçirmiş olduğu aşamalar ve gelişimini ortaya koyan birçok çalışma yapılmıştır. Bu konuda zengin bir literatür olmasına karşın, Türk sosyolojisinin diğer toplumların sosyolojileriyle ilişki kurmasını sağlayacak, uluslararası anlamda ve özellikle İngilizcede kendisini tanıtacak çalışmalar çok azdır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın amacı Türk sosyolojisini diğer toplumların sosyolojilerine tanıtmak ve onun Türkiye'de ortaya çıkışından 1960'lı yıllara kadar ki gelişimi, karakteristik özellikleri ve Avrupa sosyolojisi ile ilişkileri ele incelemektir.

Türk sosyolojisinin zengin bir literatüre ve uzun bir geçmişe sahip olmasından dolayı, bu çalışma içerisinde onun ortaya çıkışından günümüze kadar ki dönemleri ele almak oldukça zordur. Bu yüzden, bu çalışma boyunca, Türk sosyolojisinin karakteristiği ve 1960'lı yıllara kadar ki gelişimi periyodik olarak analiz edilmeye çalışılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyoloji, Modernlik, Türk Sosyolojisi, Sosyolojinin Gelişimi, Batı Sosyolojisi.

Introduction

The development of Turkish sociology has had an oriented characteristic since it was introduced to Turkey in terms of copying western sociology and using its ideas and theories without revising them for analyzing Turkish society. Although Turkish sociology has such a characteristic, it has a century-long background, and hence, it has an impressive accumulation of knowledge in respect of analyzing and contributing knowledge for solving the problems of Turkish society.

The main argument of this study is to analyze Turkish sociology and its characteristics from its emergence (from the Tanzimat period which is known the declaration of the rescript of Gülhane) in Turkey to the 1960s. Subsequently, it is pointed out putting forward and evaluating the characteristics of Turkish sociology that are essentially in relation to produce social knowledge and use western notions and theories without revising them to Turkish society's characteristics. Turkish sociology developed based on western-oriented sociology tradition such as, French, German and American sociology etc... Its characteristics have been changed under the impacts of social changes and transformation of Turkish society. Therefore, it has different characteristics every period in Turkey. Even though

Turkish sociology has been affected by those sociology traditions, firstly Turkish sociology should focus on analyzing Turkish society and suggest solutions to the problems of the society.

Prior to this, many studies have been carried on regarding the history of Turkish sociology so far. For instance, Baykan Sezer (1979), Emre Kongar (1988), H. Bayram Kaçmazoğlu (2002, 2010 and 2011), and M. Çağatay Özdemir (2008) have produced some valuable studies about presenting the history of Turkish sociology. Nevertheless, when Turkish sociology and knowledge regarding it are considered internationally, it might be seen the lack of literature, and it is thought that this study will contribute knowledge about Turkish sociology to international literature.

This study has been divided some parts based upon this. Firstly, the emergence of Sociology in Europe and Turkey as well as its relationship with modernity, secondly, its development and the issues that it handled for Turkish society have been considered. Thirdly, after the great transformation of Turkey from empire to the republic and its impacts on the development of Turkish sociology have been handled while in the last part, the emergence of new schools (Ankara school as well as existed Istanbul school) and new study fields of Turkish sociology have been dealt with.

Sociology and Modernity in Europe and Turkey in the 19th and 20th Centuries

Sociology and modernity have significant relationships and it might be quite difficult to separate and see them as different phenomena from each other in terms of their history. Sociology, As a modern social science, started to emerge in the 19th century in order to help to develop the ideas of modernity, which appeared, as consequences of the impacts of the Enlightenment in Europe. The concept of modernity has been thought of consisting of various forms of economic social, political and cultural by many thinkers. Therefore, it may be considered modernity a new paradigm which evolved a challenge against Aristotelian thought in the 17th century (Hamilton, 1993: 51-58). The Enlightenment had the most important effects on the emergence of modernity during this period because social sciences and modern societies were established in this age in terms of social needs of societies. As a result of this, it could be asserted that the representatives of Enlightenment manifested the thought of modernity as a project that mainly started in western societies against the church. Hall and Gieben (1993) express this challenge that “modernity was the creation of a new paradigm or aspect of ideas regarding humankind, society, and nature, which encountered existing conceptions rooted in a traditional world perspective, dominated by Christian religion and ideas”

(Alp, 2012: 6). According to them, the main domain in which the Enlightenment thinkers encountered the clergy, who supported the existing conceptions of the world. As a consequence of this challenge, they announced new ideas and they had important effects on their varied cultural innovations in painting, printing, writing, arts, sculpture, music etc. Therefore, the Enlightenment thinkers started thinking of researching the world empirically so as to obtain a practical goal to create a “better”, more rational world for humankind in this period. As a Consequence of these efforts, the Enlightenment philosophers succeeded to reject the beliefs of traditional authority that had serious impact on western societies. Thus, the philosophers, who were representatives of the Enlightenment, found this irrational and running counter to human nature and posing a dilemma of human development when they assessed traditional values and institutions (Ritzer, 1996: 10). These all evaluations show that modernity has begun to be dominant as life style and ideologically in western societies since the 18th century. Furthermore, philosophers and scientists could have freedom of thought, and thanks to the project of modernity, it was led them to think of using the methods of sciences and developing. For example, sociology could have a development chance as a scientific study of societies in this period. Put differently, the birth conditions of sociology were mainly prepared in the 19th century by the Enlightenment, French and Industrial revolutions. Accordingly, it can be asserted that sociology gained an important role to respond to the demands of Western societies which became more complicated as a result of fast industrialization and urbanization movements in this period (Kaçmazoğlu, 2010: 1-8).

Although modernity brought new ideas and became dominant in western societies, it also created many social problems as indicated above. In other words, social life is always very dynamic and “when a society develop or pass a new stage as classical sociologists indicated, then the existing paradigm cannot respond to the demands of a society and it strains. Hence, a new stage requires a new paradigm to respond to the needs of the society (Kuhn, 1962: 62-66). By referring to T. Kuhn, it may be examined that the consequences of the developments in Western societies such as, the Enlightenment, Industrial and French revolutions, new colonial attempts and the social problems which were brought by modernity created new demands and the existing paradigm was unable to respond adequately to those needs” (Alp, 2012: 6). For that reason, in the 18th, 19th and 20th century, new paradigms were demanded by western societies so as to understand and solve their social, economic and cultural problems. As a result, “for solving their own problems and responding the wishes of societies in this period, they began to develop social sciences. In other words, the 19th century was the period of varieties of social changes and “*the great transformation*” (Polanyi, (1944), 2001). Enormous social problems and depressions in the 19th century caused societies

to seek new solutions so as to understand and eliminate those chaotic problems in the western world” (Alp, 2012: 6) and as a result of seeking such a solution, western intellectuals applied social sciences. For example, while they benefited from Anthropology and orientalist etc. for understanding non-western societies, sociology was remarkably, considered so as to solve the enormous chaotic situation of western world. Since, it is necessary to work out solutions to conceive and after that to theorize for providing a comfortable and functional social world (Kızılcelik, 2001: 77-79). For this reason, the aim of sociology can be remarked in the 19th century that it was seeking to find out how western societies could be recovered from the chaotic situation as the consequences of “the industrial and French revolutions because in this period, western societies faced with two points. Firstly, western societies in general gained enormous wealth and the domination of the world in the 19th century, and secondly, they sometime had a challenge with their internal contradictions which almost destroyed themselves such as the results of the French and Industrial revolutions, the Labour movements etc. Accordingly, the existing paradigm which supported feudal scientific understanding could not be beneficial to respond these problems. Hence, these two points forced societies to create a new social science so as to respond to the problems of newly transformed western societies” (Kaçmazoğlu, 2010a: 1-8, cited in Alp, 2012: 7).

When looked at the issues of sociology, this aim can be pointed out from the ideas of the dominant social scientists such as, A. Comte, E. Durkheim, and even K. Marx despite they had different perspectives and methodologies in the 19th century. For instance, Comte built his sociological theory by depending on positivist sociology, which is “statics”, because sociology had to be designed “as a special science dedicated to unrevealing the essential laws governing the societal phenomena and human social relationship with primary interest in analyzing the problems and societies of the modern western world” in Comte’ idea (Doda, 2005: 7-8). Many social innovations occurred, and these led to immense social problems for societies in the late 18th and 19th centuries. For western societies started to alter structurally in terms of social, economic, cultural, political and religious dimensions in the 19th century. Therefore, Comte considered establishing sociology as a social science for working out the chaotic situation of modern societies because of encountering to the previous structures of western societies and the new emerged revolutions during modernization movement in Europe (Hall, 2006: 1-16). As a result, sociology was highlighted as a static modern science for the progress of societies by Comte and his followers. Hence, it could be asserted that “the most common thinkers supported sociology in order to provide social order in western societies during the 18th and 19th centuries’ modernity, except Karl Marx because they believed that if any society wished to develop; it had to have a social order, so that the society could develop coherently. And for the purpose of this regular

growth, the task of sociology was to make people adjust to the new social order for the progress of modernity” (cf. Halfpenny , 1994, cited in Alp, 2012: 8).

What was the situation of Turkish society in the 19th century while European societies were dealing with these social problems? In fact, Turkish society faced with many social and economic problems as well as European societies but it had specific differences from western societies in terms of social problems. For instance, the problems appeared as the consequences of “rapid social changes”, “progress”, “evolution” and “revolution” whilst in Europe, the situation of the Ottoman Empire was more dramatically and it had to find out a solution for not being collapsed in the 19th century. Since the Empire which had lost political, economic independence, power and sovereignty against European countries tried to survive by profiting from the balance of power policy among European countries. If such conditions were considered, it could be asked “why did Turkish Society rapidly transfer sociology, which emerged in Europe in order to solve the social problems?” many answers can be given for those questions. But it can be seen that both European and Turkish societies dealt with sociology pragmatically. Although they had different social problems, the basic answer of this question is to consider what Europe and Turkish society expected from sociology. Therefore, it could be asserted that their expectations from sociology were quite different from each other. However, the Ottoman Empire was in a big trouble and it had to find a way to escape from collapse. Consequently, the administrators, e intellectuals and ideologists of the Empire considered sociology as a magic power so that saving the Ottoman Empire from the collapse (Kaçmazoğlu, 2010a: 8).

Put differently, while sociology developed in Europe for proposing solutions to economic, social, political and cultural problems, it was introduced to Turkish society due to political concerns as Lewis (1970: 28) indicated this by revealing some questions of the Ottoman intellectuals such as, “what was the problem with the Ottoman Empire? Why had the Ottomans failed to keep up the technical innovations and technology by comparing to its rivals? What might be done to save the Empire? Not only was it the technological superiority of the West that forced the Ottoman intellectuals to seek reform, but also the French Revolution that introduced the nation-state ideology and spread the ideas of freedom, equality and secularity throughout Europe as well. Hence, in the 19th century, modernization or more specifically, westernization movements started in the Ottoman Empire through the young Turks who were sent to European countries (particularly, France, Germany and England)” (Alp, 2012: 7). As Mardin (1983) pointed out, although they were sent to Europe in order to see and keep up the technological and other developments of Europe, they returned Turkey with different problems. For example, the essential characteristic of the young Turks who were being edu-

cated by the western education system was estranged from the traditional Turkish education system and Turkish society. Hence, when they came back to Turkish society, it was seen that they were alienated to their society. They had a serious orientalist view point and the solutions, therefore, which they suggested were not appropriate for understanding and solving the problems of Turkish society. Especially, according to their idea, obtaining western technology and ideas was a possible way to save the Empire from the worsening situation. Consequently, they thought about recovering the Ottoman Empire by introducing new ideologies as well as their technology to Turkish society such as nationalism, social equality and freedom etc. the effects of young Turks' ideas resulted "the Tanzimat Charter" which was announced by Mustapha Rashid Pasha, who had good relationships with A. Comte, and wanted to introduce his positivist philosophy to Turkish society in 1939.

The Tanzimat Charter had very important effects on the social structure of the Empire in the second half of the 19th century. The Empire considered receiving French and England's support by announcing this charter because the Ottoman Empire had a serious battle and lost it against Mehmed Ali Pasha, who was the governor of Egypt, and Russia was threatening the Empire with the claims of protecting the rights of Orthodox Christians. These all conditions showed that without the support of European countries, the Empire could not protect itself. The mentioned incidences forced Sultan Abdulmecit I to announce the Tanzimat Charter which European countries demanded in 1839 and the young Turks offered this insistently. At first glance, Charter had some basic principles that all people would be equal, and their certain rights would be protected by the government in the land of the Ottomans; moreover, the Sultan limited his own political authority and for the judgment of public, European style courts would be established for non-muslims (Goodwin, 2006: 17).

As for Turkish society, the importance of the Charter can be asserted that the Ottoman Empire gave up looking down Europe and it started to turn its face to Europe in order to keep up their technologies. Furthermore, westernization efforts began in social, cultural and politics areas intensively because the Empire only used to consider having the technology of western countries for its army by the time of announcing of the charter. In other words, Turkish society entered the process of modernization-westernization socially, culturally and politically as well as technological developments. Thus, it was an important opportunity for new ideologies and social sciences to be introduced to Turkish society more deeply than before the Tanzimat charter (Berkes, 1964: 117). Furthermore, as Kadioğlu (1996: 180-185) stated that the aim of this charter was to create a new modernized and civilized society like western societies. As a result of this, the young Turks

who studied in Europe were affected comprehensively by social movements and new ideologies. After that, they mainly tried to apply those ideologies on Turkish society when they came back to Turkey,

Birth of Sociology in Turkish Society: From the Tanzimat Charter (1839) To the Second Constitutionalist Period (1908)

Many young students were sent to Europe more intensively in order that they kept up with modern education and European development system after entering to the Tanzimat period. Nevertheless, they were firstly influenced by the new ideologies that occurred in Europe and therefore, they dealt with political affairs rather than dealing with their educational development knowledge. Maybe it was inescapable because the Ottoman Empire was in a big trouble and about to collapse. So they prefer to seek new solutions in order to save the Empire. The students started to unite around the Committee of Union and Progress”, which was the first political party in the Ottoman Empire towards the end of the 19th century and they had a strong political opposition against Abdulhamit II, who was the sultan of the Ottoman Empire in that period. Although their common idea was to recover the Empire from collapse, most of them were affected by different theories during their education in Europe. Nonetheless, it was very problematic for the Empire because when they came back to the country, they copied technologies, ideologies, belief systems and life styles of the west to Turkey without revising and analyzing them. Particularly, the theory of A. Comte, which was “the order and progress”, and “Social Darwinism” were dealt with by the committee of Union and progress. Additionally, the young Turks were under the influence of Social Darwinism in the late 19th century because the Empire was called “the sick man of Europe”, and the consequences of social Darwinism led them to consider the Empire as a sick body. In doing so, they focused on how to save the Empire from collapse by using the tool of this theory. Nevertheless, it was understood that social Darwinism neither understood, solved the problems of Turkish society nor had any compatible element for living with Turkish society because they were different societies and their social, cultural and economic dynamics were quite different from each other (Hanioglu, 1985: 346-347). However, they continued to bring European based ideologies to the Empire particularly in the late of the 19th century intensively. In this period, the ideas of Comte which Durkheim made systematic were introduced to Turkish society through Ziya Gökalp, who is the founder of Sociology in Turkey. He had an important effect on the committee of union and progress party and as a result of his attempt; sociology department was opened in the University of Istanbul (Dar-ul Funun) in 1914. The Young Turks, especially, Z. Gökalp was affected by the ideas which were about “order” and

“progress”. Nonetheless, Turkish sociology was imported from Europe without revising it based upon Turkish society’s dynamics and it was not, therefore, authentic to the society. While western (especially French sociology understanding) sociology dealt with the social structures turned upside down, Turkish sociology tried to work out about the political problems of Turkey rather than solving social or cultural problems of Turkish society. Since Sociology was introduced to Turkish society for political concerns by Ziya Gökalp and his friends, and they tried to benefit from sociology to seek new ways to rescue the state and reshape Turkish society (Yılmaz, 2010: 32).

Development of Turkish Sociology and Its Relationships with the Committee of Union and Progress Party

When general history of sociology investigated in Turkey, at first glance, it might be pointed out that sociology was introduced to Turkish society as soon as it emerged in Europe. The reason why Turkish society was quite dynamic and it had very close relationships with Europe. In this term, Europe faced with very fast and sharp social changes and they were related to the characteristics of the society. Therefore, Europe needed sociology to deal with its social problems. Moreover, Turkish society’s focus was on the direction of westernization; therefore, although it had different contents, Turkish society followed Europe for challenging its social problems. Hence, “Turkish intellectuals were simultaneously, interested in sociology in order to find out solutions to social problems. As Giddens (1997: 7) indicates that sociology was a product of the French and Industrial Revolutions which made western societies encounter new social conditions. As for Turkish society, sociology was imported from the west and constructed in order to work out many political and socio-economic problems which accelerated collapse of the Empire. In that period, the Ottoman intellectuals despaired of the political conjecture which was based on the ideology that Ottomanism would be a recipe for salvation of the Empire. For that reason, the young Turks united around the committee of Union and Progress seized power, and issued a new constitution in 1908” (Alp, 2012: 11). Nevertheless, the idea of Ottomanism or Islamism was not enough effort to save the Empire from collapse. Hence, they began to think of “Nationalism” instead of “Ottomanism” and the idea of “Westernism” developed as a larger ideology. Nonetheless, for spreading and imposing nationalism ideology upon the society, they needed a social science which could help them to clarify, support and spread these new ideas. So, sociology was considered satisfying nationalism and westernization ideas (cf. Kacmazoglu, 2003).

As it can be seen, “sociology had direct relationships with the project of salvation of the country and the dream of westernization. Therefore, Ziya Gökalp,

who was a member of the committee of Union and Progress, not only performed the establishment of sociology, to be the guider to the unionist regime in terms of having a nationalist identity through sociology in the line of the West, but also attempted to help define the ideologies of the West systematically. In other words, Ziya Gökalp built the understanding of sociology as nationalist-western-oriented and wished to establish sociology as a national science as well” (Ülken, 2000: 26, cited in Alp: 2012: 17).

Sociology is a dynamic social science and specifically, when it is dealt with in terms of Turkey, we can see that the sociology’s task was to serve the official ideology of the old regime as similar to the west for the salvation of the empire between 1908 and 1923. However, the tasks of sociology altered after the Empire collapsed. After founding the Republic of Turkey, the old regime was destroyed and relating to this, sociology’ task changed, too. After this, sociology, as a social science, started to help to continue the new regime’s existence, and spread its messages to the public. The similarity of western and Turkish sociology is seen in terms of their developments. For example, as Tuna (1991) argued that sociology, as a result of being the supporter of the official ideology, assisted the regime’s ideas of “order” as western sociology supported social order in the beginning.

The understanding of Ziya Gökalp’s (Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who was the founder of Turkey, saw him as his master mind) sociology began to be more influential on Turkish society and politicians more than the Ottoman times after the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923. As a result of these developments regarding sociology, not only were sociology’s lessons started to be given in high schools but also in universities as well in the middle of the 1920s. However, “Western-oriented sociology was still in the centre of the whole variations of Turkish sociology whichever sociological theory or ideology was supported. All accepted the transformation of Turkish society as westernization. Hence, this attitude brought a very strong loyalty to western sociology. As a consequence of this, sociological theories and models which were specific for western societies, tried to introduce changes into Turkish society by copying directly or adapting. At first glance, it was quite a beneficial way to obtain sociological knowledge. On the other hand, it led to ignorance of the social differences and specific characteristics of Turkish society in the first periods of sociology in Turkey” (Çağan, 2007: 85, cited in Alp, 2012: 12).

Turkish Sociology and the Republic of Turkey (1923): Sociology is the Advocate of the Ideology of Nation-State

The Ottoman Empire that consisted of various nations and religious rules were destroyed after the WW1 and a new age began for Turkish society. Republic of

Turkey which was a secular, modern and less diverse country was established after winning the independent war. Nevertheless, “the young state needed to follow an ideology by depending on the position of the world. Additionally, nationalism was the common ideology of the 20th century, and inevitably, the Republic of Turkey was influenced by this ideology deeply. Hence, nationalism became one of the most important guides of the state during the 20th century” (Alp, 2012: 13). Moreover, M. Kemal and his friends who were the leaders of the state were influenced by Ziya Gökalp’s ideas regarding secularism, nationalism and modernization. Accordingly, their aim was to modernize Turkey for development and this way was to follow European countries’ stages as modernization theories have claimed. Therefore, sociology was seen to be employed for supporting modernity and legitimating to public in this term. The task of sociology was determined around the ideas of Ziya Gökalp who was seen the ideologist of the state in this period. Some revolutions that sociology supported such as, populism, republicanism, secularism, revolutionism, nationalism and statism were aimed to be performed after founding the modern Turkish State (cf. Aksin, 1999). For instance, secularism was accepted by removing the effects of Islamic religion in public life, the public were motivated and in some places forced to live like European people and for this some laws were made (for example, hat law etc.), many western cultural or technical products were introduced to Turkish society under the name of the Turkish revolution. Although these all innovations are seen important for the development of Turkey, there was a serious social problem between the state and public. Since, the society did not pass the stages that European societies faced with. Therefore, they did not demand such revolutions from the leaders of state. For example, while Europe faced with social problems and revolutions as a result of the demands of publics against the Church and the ruling classes, in Islamic countries, there was not a serious social problem between Islam religion and public. For Islam and public had a different relationship and it never oppressed the social life of public against innovations so on. Therefore, Turkish society believed that they were in trouble because of moving away from the religion and its rules which were originated from its holy book. Nevertheless, “the young Turks educated in Europe were quite dominant in Turkish State and they were also influenced by European system and its development intensively. Therefore, they believed that in order to develop, they had to follow the theories of western, and which way western societies passed; Turkish society had to pass as well” (Alp, 2012: 13). Thus, they had to fulfill revolutions in spite of the fact that the public did not demand then, namely, they raised populism in spite of the public. Consequently, the revolutions called Kemalist started. They mainly focused on westernization and admitted the superiority of western societies. While politically such revolutions were performed, what was the task of sociology? Its mission was to support those

revolutions, and make them understandable and acceptable to the public. That is, sociology had to adapt the society for the revolutions which were imported from Europe (Kadıoğlu, 1996: 182).

Therefore, it is seen that although there were many ideas since the last period of Ottoman Empire, politically the ideas of Ziya Gökalp became influential on politicians after 1923. Furthermore, another sociologist who played an important role for Turkish sociology was Prens Sabahattin (1878-1948). The common goal of Ziya Gökalp and Prens Sabahattin were similar to each other. Both of them aimed to find out an answer about how to “save the Empire from collapse rather than think of radical solutions for Turkish society. Ziya Gökalp supported the Durkheimian sociology tradition while Prens Sabahattin was influenced by another French sociologist Le Play although both of them were influenced by French sociology” (Alp, 2012: 14). Nevertheless, the ideas of Prens Sabahattin were not paid attention because of two reasons. First, after the republic of Turkey was founded, the whole family of the Ottomans was exiled from Turkey and he was a member of the Ottoman dynasty so he could not have a chance to stay in Turkey and spread his ideas. The second point is that he endeavored to be the ideologist of the bourgeois class which was not in existence or at least did not have a significant role in Turkish society and also he thought of the problems of Turkish society in terms of structural issues. Therefore, the ideas of Prens Sabahattin were not accepted like Ziya Gökalp’s thought in Turkey. On the other hand, Ziya Gökalp claimed to move from the Islamic-nation which was from the middle age religion to the “nation” (this is the Turkish nation) by giving up being the ideologist of the committee of Union and Progress by considering the sociology of Durkheim and adapting it to Turkey. The idea of Gökalp was worth thinking because it supported the same ideology for the development of Turkey When this idea is considered with politically in terms of the relationships with M. Kemal Atatürk and his friends. Hence, he became the theorist of the modern-secular-positivist Kemalist state understanding in this term by sharing the idea which was “populism in spite of the public”³ (İrem, 2004: 15). Moreover, the ideas of Ziya Gökalp were adopted intensively by M. Kemal and his friends politically. Consequently, western-oriented (mainly French-oriented) sociology school of Gökalp started to lead to the politics of the Republic of Turkey after becoming dominant in Turkey. Thus, sociology’s task, as a social science, changed and it became the defender of the dominant ideology of the state (Kadıoğlu, 1996: 185).

3 Turkish public did not demand any solution for their social problems from sociology. This require came from the managers of the state so that they could keep up with western societies technologically and socially. For that reason, the state demanded these requests from sociology to introduce them to the society while western societies’ publics demanded social solutions from sociology.

Following Gökalp, “M. Izzet (1891-1930), who was considered as the second generation Turkish sociologist, attempted to unite the philosophy with the sociological thought under the intellectual influences of Goethe, Schelling and Fichte who were the leading representatives of the German idealist school, gave sociology lessons and lectures in Istanbul University in 1928” (alp, 2012: 14). M. Izzet, who interpreted Turkism in a line close to his teacher Gökalp and affirmed as a “new cooperation connection”, asserted the idea that the nationality opinion was above all an ideal and criticized racist theories. However, when the sociological understanding of Izzet is dealt with, it can be seen that it is very similar to Gökalp’s sociology because of being his student and influenced by him. Hence, it can be asserted that because of not establishing a different understanding of sociology, he could be only a follower of Gökalp’s sociology (Kaçmazoğlu, 2011: 93-94).

The university reform was carried on by the government in Turkey in 1933. Particularly, the aim of government was to pressure social scientists so as to keep them under control. Hence, this impact caused Turkish sociology to be more dependent on the dominant ideology. Moreover, while scientists were under the pressure of the state, there was a serious issue about scientists in the world as well. Particularly, Many German professors who sought refuge from the oppression of Hitler as a consequence of the “Nazi” movements in Germany took sanctuary in Turkey in the 1930s. Therefore, in this period, German sociology understanding started to affect and even it became more effective than French Sociology on the development of Turkish sociology because German sociologists began to perform many sociological studies and inevitably, they played a significant role on the development of Turkish sociology. Consequently, it could be claim that thanks to German sociological school, Turkish sociology acquired dynamism as well as new research methodologies with new fields. For instance, Z. F. Fındıkoğlu, who was a student of Izzet started to give sociology lessons in literature, economy and law faculties. Consequently, it can be seen that sociology of Literature, Economy and Law emerged in this period. Especially, the sociology of economy attempted to find out and offer a national economy to the government (Şahin, Undated: 2). Therefore, “sociologists considered the labour-oriented sociology as social policy information. Thus, it was a new field and method for Turkish sociology to seek solutions of the relations between the employer and the employee as well as the problems of work life in Turkey” (Alp, 2012: 15).

Development of Turkish Sociology between 1939 and the 1960: the Impact of the American Applied Sociology, New Sociology Schools and Field Studies

Turkey has always needed to keep up with developments which have occurred in the world in respect of its geopolitical position. Since any change or develop-

ment tends to affect Turkey and accordingly, those effects may be seen on Turkish sociology intensively as well. For instance, how the French Revolution influenced Turkish society, it also developed its sociology understanding based upon the perspectives of French sociology in the early 20th century. On the other hand, America started being the dominant power in the world after the 1940s, and it politically had close relationships with Turkey because both countries saw communism as their enemies and America wanted to support Turkey so that it did not join Communist bloc. As a result of these good relations in 1939, the second sociology school which was in Ankara was established in Turkey and it developed under the influence of American Sociology basically. In other words, the school of Ankara aimed to represent American sociology in Turkey in the late of the 1930s; it was established by Behice Boran, Niyazi Berkes, and Mediha Berkes who were educated in America. Although America was the center of Capitalism, those sociologists challenged Marxism and they were also influenced by Marxist ideas deeply during their education. However, the politics of the Republic of Turkey were not compatible with Marxist ideas because the Cold War started and America had good relationship with Turkey politically. Therefore, Turkey was seen as a satellite of capitalist America against communist countries. As a result of these, the government started to pressure on the representatives of Ankara school who were seen Marxists. Consequently, the school of Ankara challenged with prosecutions, and the lecture of School were dismissed in 1948. Although the representatives of Ankara school carried out their studies in a short period, the school could introduce many new ideas and research methods to Turkish society (Kasapoğlu and et. al., 2010: 103-104).

When we consider the ideas of Ankara, It might be pointed out that it was independent from the school of Istanbul. For Ankara school brought and introduced new ideas, methodologies and new fields regarding sociological researches. In case of thinking of the school of Ankara, at first glance, its founders were educated in America, and American applied sociology understanding had a critical influence on them. In other words, it can be highlighted that the roots of this school were rooted in applied American sociology. In fact, the roots of American applied sociology were from continental Europe even if American sociology was quite different in terms of field studies and methodologies. However, the school of Ankara evaluated American and European sociologies as two different sociologies because of political concerns as well as its position. While the roots of Ankara school were based on America applied sociology understanding, the theoretical source of Istanbul school that was seen its opponent had European oriented sociology understanding. Therefore, representatives of Ankara school had to prove their presence against criticism from the Istanbul school and knowing European sociology (Kacmazoğlu, 2010: 48-76).

Turkish sociology passed into a new period as a consequence of the development of the Ankara school in the 1940s. They brought new fields to sociology by being different from the Istanbul school. Firstly, the school had sharp criticism against racism theories because the consequences of development of racist theories in Europe in this period affected Turkey, too. Turkish government supported nationalist politics that were close to Racist politics in Turkey against non-Turkish nations by assimilating them in spite of the fact that neither did Turkish public demand nor supported the assimilation politics of the government. Thus, the Ankara school manifested that racist theories were completely unfamiliar to Turkish society. According to them, Turkish society had never exhibited racism by the Republic of Turkey (1923) but over nationalist theories was imposed by European sources under the ideology of modernization/westernization in Turkey. Thus, Mediha Berkes (1943), who was a prominent representative of Ankara school, criticized Turkish sociology about its relationships with nationalist theory, and argued that the world civilization had not been created by only one society. “It was the achievement which the whole humankind had created for thousands of years jointly. Secondly, they investigated both dominant Turkish and European sociology. They asserted that sociology could not be fulfilled because of two reasons. The first reason; sociology was carried out by proposing dogmatic doctrines and only producing ideologies for politicians. Another reason; the lessons of sociology which were given to students as prepared formulations without investigating and analyzing the relationships among occasions but in order to establish a scientific sociology in Turkey” (Alp, 2012: 17).

“As for the critique of European sociology, the Ankara school claimed that French sociologists only attempted to write general sociology books, and not consider the basis of sociology as a social science which should carried out some researches from fields etc. what is more, German sociology just dealt with historical research and philosophies; therefore, sociology could not have a chance to grow in Germany in terms of dealing with social events. On the other hand, the applied sociology of America was established as an independent discipline from philosophy because of its social conditions, obtained an important position in universities and colleges. Since American sociology could develop itself and research social events by using a different scientific method in America” (cf. Boran, 1943, cited in Alp, 2012: 17). Even though the Ankara school’s representatives thought of America as a part of Europe, they examined European sociology more intensive than American sociology. when it is looked at the school’s subsequent studies, it can be seen that they were influenced by European sociology ecole so deeply, and therefore, , their aim was to create a unity with Europe because they believed that Turkish society did not have to be kept separate from Europe although they criticized Western sociology; otherwise, it would be a big loss for the develop-

ment of Turkish society. Consequently, they argued that Turkey had to completely adopt all characteristics of western civilization as a whole society as much as possible because, as the first period Turkish sociologists promoted, only the idea of bringing its technology was not enough for the development of Turkish society (Berkes, 1943: 135-139).

The school of Ankara brought new study fields and understandings for Turkish sociology. For example, urbanization, industry, the sociology of literature, rural life, and art etc. study fields started to be considered thanks to Ankara school. Monograph methods were introduced to Turkish sociology understanding and they used this method for their rural research in spite of the fact that they were affected by European sociologists when the viewpoints of the Ankara school were looked at. For example, they asserted that “the main transformation of a society was economics as Marx pointed out. According to them, the line of development was to move from the eastern style society to western style society, from rural to urban, and from agricultural to industry” (Alp, 2012: 18). Moreover, the impacts of Durkheim have been observed in their rural sociology studies. Especially, they presented that if Turkish society desired to develop, firstly, it had to collect the population in urban centers, for this, people could move from rural areas, and then, they would start to grow the population in urban, and then, it would promote the division of the labour among the workers. In doing so, the school of Ankara attested that the industrialization of Turkey would grow (cf. Berkes, 1943).

In the 1940s, Istanbul Sociology School was under the effects of French origin sociology and philosophy. H. Z. Ülken, Ziya Fahreddin Fındıkoğlu and Nurettin Sazi Kösemihal were the important representatives of this school. In this period, their main aim was to sustain the tradition of the first period sociology understanding in spite of introducing some new fields in Turkish sociology. In fact, as Kaçmazoglu (2002: 48-76) examined, Istanbul School did not deal with the sociological dimensions of practical problems, the reality of society and the interests of public. The School of Istanbul considered all sociological events in the perspective of westernization because the theories which they studied about were related to western society’s characteristics rather than the characteristics of Turkish society. On the other hand, as indicated above, “French sociology was also very effective on the school, especially, Durkheim’s sociology understanding, and the method of the Le Play School in the 1940s although German sociology had an impact on the Istanbul school. As it can be seen, the understanding of the Istanbul school was not original; their sociology was dependent a western sociology understanding. Moreover, the idea of the Istanbul school was different from the school of Ankara due to being more theoretical and philosophical than the Ankara school because the sources by which they were influenced were different” (Alp, 2012: 18).

The Ankara and Istanbul schools had some common points in spite of having many differences in terms of methodologies and fields. In particular, the Ankara and Istanbul schools had very similar aspects regarding the issue of Westernization. Both schools dealt with Western and Universality as equal in their studies. According to them, there was one civilization, and it was western civilization. Wherefore, as soon as possible, Turkish society had to attain this civilization. Furthermore, they supported the “*statism*” instead of “*liberalism*” so that Turkish society could develop fast, and become westernized (Şener, 2005: 142). Prominently, America and Europe were the victors of the Second World War, they became more powerful, and this led Turkish sociologists to recognize the superiority of Europe and America in any dimension as well as sociology. Therefore, Turkish sociologists considered the line of Westernism more than the previous periods in terms of development. Moreover, after the WWII, modernization theories spread around the world more intensively and they also influenced Turkish sociologists in this term. Modernization theories claimed that there was only one development; it was the development line of western countries. If a society aimed to develop, the society had to follow the development line of western countries. However, the, it can be asked about what the criterion of this development is? For this question, modernization theories offer “economic development”. As modernization theories highlight that a country can grow by considering capitalist/industrialized/modern countries as models for development because they have already developed in this line (Šafařová, 2010: 9). Especially, Lerner (1964, (1958)), supported that modernization was a sum of social change associated with economic development. Moreover, McClelland (1961) “connected economic growth with cultural values of nations. According to him, if a country tried to develop, the country firstly had to create an entrepreneurship culture which would direct economic growth (actually, this theory is very similar to the theory of Weber which is “the Protestant ethic and the spirit of Capitalism). Briefly, he aimed to present that there was a general relationship between the value of nations and economic growth. Thus, modernization theories attempted to prove that development was modernization-westernization in the perspective of culture and economic growth because western countries are industrialized countries which should be followed for the development. Consequently, after the WWII, Turkish sociologists started to deal with modernization theories, and Turkish sociologists aimed to use their ideas regarding development of Turkey by the 1980s” (Alp, 2012: 19).

There was a recession regarding sociological research in the 1950s and 60s because in case of comparing this period with the previous or subsequent ages, it would be seen that sociological studies were very insufficient in that period although Turkish sociology was very creative in the 1940s. Turkish sociology had developed depending on the dominant ideologies and politics. Therefore, many

sociologists from the school of Ankara were dismissed from the university in this term, and some of them were forced to leave Turkey. For instance, it was not let Behice Boran and Niyazi Berkes, who were the founders of the Ankara school, to write even one essay between 1950 and 1960 in Turkey. The main reason of such pressures was related to politics direction of Turkish government. As mentioned, some of the Ankara school's lecturers were influenced by Marxist ideas, and they supported Marxism in Turkey while the existing government was close to America in politics. Therefore, in this term, approaching Marxist theories was a reason to be arrested or exile. Moreover, there were some Marxist lecturers in the school of Istanbul as well while the school of Ankara was closed because of its radical studies. But they did not face with such a harsh respond like the Ankara school because they did not express their Marxists ideas as radical as the Ankara school. Furthermore, while the Ankara school was closed, the Istanbul school thought of this as a warning from the state, they lost their creativity in the 1950s. For example, H. Z. Ulken who was interested in Marxism turned to dealing with philosophy rather than sociology. Nevertheless, as a consequence of dismissing those sociologists from universities, then, the teaching task of sociology was given to the lecturers that did not have a sociology background; it was also a key reason of recession in sociology in 1950-1960 (cf. Zürcher, 2005).

“On the other hand, as the impact of the dominant ideology was quite effective on sociology at that time, we can see among sociologists a return to Ziya Gökalp again because Marxist sociologists were pressured in Turkey, and they could not publish any article. What is more, in this term, the Democrat Party (DP) was ruling Turkey, and they had very good relationships with America. As a result of this, the government did not allow the Marxist ideas coming from the Soviet Union roots to grow and spread in Turkey although the USSR won the WW2, and became dominant in the world because the Soviet bloke was not democratic, and the direction of Turkey was to westernization” (Alp, 2012: 20). “Consequently, the sociologists who were close to the government studied on the ideas of Gökalp while other sociologists who were in favor of Marxism or Darwinism were repressed. Furthermore, as a result of dealing with the ideas of Ziya Gökalp, the ideas of Prens Sabahattin were considered as well because as indicated above, Prens Sabahattin was the most second effective sociologist, but his ideas were not considered in the previous periods of Turkish sociology. Particularly, after the World War II being resulted in the victory of the UK and the USA, this caused Turkey to have good relationships with these countries in terms of politics and military relation, but the USSR had a Marxist understanding, and because of the politics of Turkey, neither USSR nor Marxist ideas were effective in Turkey in 1950-60” (Kaçmazoglu, 2002: 115-124, cited in Alp, 20).

It could briefly be highlighted that in 1950-60s, either were all sociologists almost interested in empirical sociology or in favor of it. It was a golden age for the sociology of rural life as well as the sociology of industry despite the school of Ankara was eliminated; the studies of rural life were carried by other sociologists who were close to the government and foreign sociologists in Turkey such as, M. Belit Kıray (1964) “*Ereğli: a coastal town before the heavy industry*”, Ibrahim Yasa (1968): “*the impacts of internal migrations to the relationships of business in big cities*”. Still westernization was the basic issue of Turkish sociology and Turkish sociologists tried to find new ways to become westernized and in this period. Secondly, they aimed to create the individualist characteristics features of a social structure. Thirdly, they sought to develop a hostile stance towards Communism and socialism. Also, Prens Sabahattin’s ideas started to be considered and sociologists endeavored to create a Turkish class society and Bourgeois so as to become westernized. Even though Turkish sociology meet new sociology understandings such as, American applied sociology, Marxism etc. and ideas which were introduced to Turkey, eclectic Turkish sociology understanding continued because of the main problem of Turkish sociology understanding that is being eclectic. In other words, Turkish sociologists applied the methods of American applied sociology as well as European sociology methods without revising them depending on the needs and structural features of Turkish society. Therefore, still we cannot mention about a distinctive Turkish sociology tradition that can suggest specific solutions for the needs of society (cf. Kaçmazoglu, 2002).

Conclusion

This study has attempted to present the development of Turkish sociology since it was introduced to Turkish society towards the 1960s. Nonetheless, “not only is it an analysis of Turkish sociology but it also presents a historical process of Turkish sociology. Many studies have been conducted regarding it and its development by identifying Turkish sociologists’ names and the development progress of Turkish sociology so far. On the other hand, this study has tried to analyze Turkish sociology in terms of challenging the social problems of Turkish society since the last period of Ottomans to the 1960s, and for those social problems, what kind of solutions can Turkish sociology find out, and how can it deals with those problems” (Alp, 2012: 36). Moreover, there have not been much studies regarding Turkish sociology in literature although it has over one century history. Therefore, this study has been considered contributing knowledge to literature about the development history of Turkish sociology.

When Turkish sociology’s development characteristics are considered until the 1960s, at first glance, it might be seen that it was mainly affected by various

Western sociology traditions. In spite of the fact that Turkish sociology had an eclectic characteristics, it was quite dynamic and according to the transformation of Turkish society, it changed and for solving social problems, it dealt with new field studies. For example, in the first period, while introducing new state's ideology was the main issue of Turkish sociology, after decades, it started to deal with the problems of rural and urban areas. In the process of time, Turkish sociology dealt with the problems of Turkish society more intensively and it developed through new schools and their various study fields.

REFERENCES

- AKŞİN, Sina (1998), "The Nature of the Kemalist Revolution", Ataturk and Modern Turkey, International Conference, Ankara University Faculty of Political Science, no: 582.
- ALP, A. (2012), An Analysis of the Development of Sociology in Turkey, University Of Southampton, Social Sciences, Unpublished Master's Degree Dissertation.
- BERKES, Mediha (1943), "İrk ve medeniyet", Yurt ve Dünya Dergisi, Aralık, Vol: 36, Ankara.
- BERKES, Niyazi (1943), "Garpten Gelen Düşünceler", Yurt ve Dünya Dergisi, Vol: 9, Ankara.
- ÇAĞAN, Kenan (2007, "Türk Sosyolojisi ve Baykan Sezer", Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Vol. 4, No: 2, ss. 69-86.
- DODA, Zerihun (2005), Introduction to Sociology, Published Lecture Notes, Ethiopia.
- GOODWIN, Kevin (2006), "the Tanzimat and the Problem of Political Authority in the Ottoman Empire: 1839-1876", Honors Projects Overview, Paper 5.
- GIDDENS, Anthony (1997), Sociology, Polity Press, Third Edition, UK.
- HALFPENNY, P. (1994), Positivist Sociology and Its Critics, Edited by Peter McMylor , University of Manchester.
- HALL, Stuart and Gieben, Bram, (1993), Formations of Modernity: Understanding Modern Societies an Introduction Book I, John Wiley & Son.
- HALL, Stuart (2006), "Formations of Modernity", Modernity, Edited By, Hall, S., Held, David. Hubert, D., Thompson, K., Blackwell Publishing, Second Edition, UK.
- HAMILTON, Peter (1993), "the Enlightenment and the Birth of Social Science", Formations of Modernity, Ed. by Stuart Hall and Bram Gieben, Blackwell Publishing, Second Edition, UK.
- HANİOĞLU, Şükrü (1985), "Bilim ve Osmanlı Düşüncesi," Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi (Cilt 2), İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, S. 346-347.
- İREM, Nazım (2004), "Jacobinism–Kemalist Radicalism in the Dilemma of Republicanism", Journal of Faculty of Business, Vol. 5. No. 2.
- KAÇMAZOĞLU, H., B. (2002), Türk Sosyoloji Tarihi Üzerine Araştırmalar: Öncüleri ve

- Temelleri Çerçevesinde Yaklaşımlar, Birey Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- KAÇMAZOĞLU, B., H. (2010), Türk Sosyoloji Tarihi I: Ön Koşullar, Kitabevi Yayıncılık, İstanbul
- KAÇMAZOĞLU, H., B. (2011), Türk Sosyoloji Tarihi III: Yeni Türkiye’de Sosyolojinin Düşünsel ve Kurumsal Temelleri, Kitabevi Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- KADIOĞLU, A. (1996), “The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of Official Identity,” *Middle Eastern Studies*, 32/2, April 1996, pp. 177-194.
- KASAPÖĞLU, A., at. al. (1991), “The Center-Periphery Relationship between Turkish and Western Sociologies”, *Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for A Global Sociology*, Editors: Michael Burawoy, Mau-kuei Chang, and Michelle Fei-yu Hsieh, Vol. 2.
- KIRAY, Mübeccel B. (1982), Ereğli: Ağır Sanayiden Önce Bir Sahil Kasabası, İletişim Yayınları, Ankara.
- KIZILÇELİK, Sezgin (2001), Küreselleşme ve Sosyal Bilimler, Anı Yayıncılık, İzmir.
- KONGAR, Emre (1982), Türk Toplum Bilimcileri, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul.
- KUHN, Thomas (1962), *the Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Publ. University of Chicago Press.
- LERNER, D., (1964), *the Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*, Toronto.
- LEWIS, B. (1970), *the Emergence of Modern Turkey*, Turkish Historical Society, Printing House, Ankara.
- ÖZDEMİR, Mustafa, Ç. (2008), Türkiye’de Sosyoloji I-II (İsimler ve Eserler), Phoenix Yayınevi, Ankara.
- POLANYI, K. (1944) (2001), *the Great Transformation: the Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Beacon Press, Boston.
- RITZER, George (1996), *Sociological Theory*, McGraw Hill Companies, INC, 4th Edition, Singapore.
- ŠAFÁŘOVÁ, K. (2010), “Turkey as a Candidate Country on the Way to Join the European Union”, <http://projekter.aau.dk/projekter/files/33697829>.
- SEZER, Baykan (1979), Türk Sosyolojisinin Ana Sorunları, Sumer Kitabevi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- ŞAHİN, M., C. (undated), “Sociology Training in Higher Education in the Context of Epistemological and Ontological Problems in Turkish Sociology”, <http://www.acikarsiv.gazi.edu.tr/dosya/SociologyTrainig.pdf>.
- ŞENER, Sefer (2005), “Türkiye Ekonomisinde İkinci Dönem Liberal İktisat Politikaları”, *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Cilt: 3 Sayı: 1.
- TUNA, Korkut (1991), “Türk Sosyolojisinin Batı Sosyolojisiyle İlişkileri ve Sonuçları”, 75. Yılında Türkiye’de Sosyoloji, Bağlam Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Ülken, H. Z. (1942), (2000), *Ziya Gökalp, Yunus Koç (Yay. Haz.)*, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, İstanbul.

- YASA, İbrahim (1968), İç Göçlerin Büyük Şehirlerin İş-Güç Çeşitlerindeki Etkileri, Eğitim Fakültesi Der., Cilt 1, Sayı 1-4, ss. 175-193, Ankara.
- YILMAZ, Ensar (2010), “Ziya Gökalp’te Siyaset-Toplum İlişkisi”, e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy 2010, Volume: 5, Number: 3, Article Number: 3C0043.
- ZÜRCHER, E., Z. (2005), Turkey: A modern History, 3rd Edition, Palgrave Macmillan, a division of St Martin Press, Canada.