



**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON, 2012**

**SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**DIVISION SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL RESEARCH**

An Analysis of the Development of Sociology in Turkey

**By**

**Ahmet Alp**

A dissertation submitted in partial

fulfilment of the requirements for

MSc (Social Sciences) in Sociology & Social Research

by instructional programme

## DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

I declare that this dissertation is my own work, and where material is obtained from published or unpublished works, this has been fully acknowledged in the text and references.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP .....	i
Abstract .....	iii
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Methodology.....	4
2.1 Research Questions .....	4
3. An analysis of the development of Sociology in Turkey.....	6
3.1. The Emergence of Sociology and Modernity in Europe and Turkey: A Historical Panorama Case of the 19th and 20th Centuries.....	6
3.2. The Characteristic of the First Period of Turkish Sociology from the Tanzimat Charter to 1908: The Salvation Idea of the Empire .....	10
3.3. The Second Period of Turkish Sociology from 1908 to 1923: Sociology Became the Assistance of the Committee of Union and Progress Party .....	11
3.4. The Third Period of Turkish Sociology, the Republic of Turkey (1923): Sociology Is the Advocate of the Ideology of the Nation-State.....	13
3.5. The Development of Turkish Sociology in the Third Period from 1939 to the 1960s: The Impact of the American Applied Sociology .....	15
3.6. The Development of Sociology in the Fourth Period from the 1960s to 2000s: from Eclectic Sociology Understanding to Distinctive Sociology Tradition .....	21
4. Main Problems of Turkish Sociology .....	28
4.1. A Critical Analysis of Turkish Sociology .....	28
4.2. Conceptual and Theoretical Problems of Turkish Sociology.....	30
4.3. Methodological Problems of Turkish Sociology .....	30
5. The Characteristics of the Distinctive Turkish Sociology for More Appropriate for Understanding Turkish Society.....	32
Conclusion .....	36
References.....	38

## TABLE

Table 1: The Periods of Turkish sociology's Development.....	5
--	---

## **Abstract**

*This study is a theoretical examination of the progress of Turkish sociology, since it was introduced to Turkish society from the last periods of the Ottoman Empire to 2000s. The studies of sociology have demonstrated so far that Turkish sociology was a dependent social science which was especially, western-oriented by 1970s. Even today, the situation of Turkish sociology is discussed in terms of its development and methodology regarding how it can be a free and specific social science in Turkey. In particular, Turkish sociologists have been researching the theories of western in terms of confirmation or falsification by implementing to Turkish society so far. Consequently, during the study, I will explore the reason why Turkish sociology has not developed originally, while other European sociologies have developed and presented social theories for the profits of their societies. Therefore, the focus of this study is to investigate the development of sociology and its conditions at first. Secondly, it will argue Turkish sociology In respect of methodology. Since methodology is the main factor of social sciences in terms of conducting a study. Hence, during the study, I will argue the previous sociologists' ideas and methodological understandings regarding sociological researches and the development of sociology so that It could be achieved a specific method and sociological knowledge which Turkish sociology can use in order to research and understand Turkish society.*

**Key words;** *Sociology, Turkish Society, Turkish Sociology, Development,*

## **1. Introduction**

This study examines the development of Turkish sociology since it was introduced in Turkey in terms of copying western sociology and using its ideas and theories without revising them for analysing Turkish society. Therefore, the main concern of this study is to analyse the development of Turkish sociology and its main problems. In doing so, it is aimed to state that Turkish sociology can be an independent-specific social science. Therefore, despite introducing the methodology of European or American applied sociology, Turkish sociology has to consider its specific methodology and produce social scientific knowledge for Turkish society. Furthermore, Turkish society has an ancient history which has had relationships with both the West and East intensively, by being different from other societies in this context. Thus, if Turkish sociology desires to have a specific sociology tradition, it is appropriate to think of its history, and try to produce social knowledge by considering its history. Put differently, Turkish sociology should be considered being a multi-disciplinary science (as the Annales school also offers this for social sciences in the 20<sup>th</sup> century), and having relationships with other social sciences (Sezer, 1979).

Hence, during the study, my argument is the analysis of the previous Turkish sociology and its characteristics from its foundation in Turkey to 2000s. Subsequently, I aim to evaluate the main problems of Turkish sociology which are mainly related not to be able to produce social scientific knowledge and thus, using western concepts and theories without revising them to Turkish society. It is clear that the main problem of Turkish sociology is not to be relating to Turkish society due to being based on western-oriented sociology tradition such as, French-German and American sociology traditions. Moreover, the methodological issues of Turkish sociology are also still problematic, the approaches which Turkish sociology has used to analyse Turkish society have not been useful to understand the society. For example, as soon as the philosophy of positivism and sociology emerged in Europe, it was introduced to Turkey. Nevertheless, its methodology and notions were used without considering the characteristics of Turkish society. Therefore, it can be asserted that Turkish sociology has not been able to investigate and understand Turkish society successfully because of this reason. As a result of this, it can be claimed that although Turkish sociology was presented to save the Ottoman Empire and manage modernization of Turkish society after the foundation of the Republic of Turkey, it failed in these both tasks (Alver, 2011). Consequently, I argue that Western sociology is not universal and the scientific knowledge which it has produced is not valid for all societies, either. Any society's sociology

understanding and attempts can produce knowledge as Connell (2007) indicated this issue in her “Southern Theory”. Therefore, Turkish sociology has to focus on its specific approach to Turkish society by being independent of European and American Sociology, as well as the dominant Turkish political ideologies. On the other hand, this study does not mean that Turkish sociology must be closed to western sociology entirely. Turkish sociology must benefit from universal sociological theories so as to understand the world’s societies, and create original concepts and theories which will help understand the Turkish society. In doing so, it will be possible to reveal that there is a specific Turkish sociology tradition like specific French or German sociology.

What is more, as indicated in the perspective of the relationships of history and sociology, the historical comparative methodology which has been suggested by many previous classical sociologists and social philosophers can be used to understand Turkish society. They used this method by depending on the history they researched. Furthermore, Turkish society has an ancient history. As Sezer (1988) contends that its history includes many sociological tools which can help Turkish sociology to understand and explore Turkish society. Accordingly, in order that we can talk about a specific Turkish sociology, at first, we need to have a special research methodology which is the most appropriate for Turkish sociology. In social sciences, methodology is the key point to collect knowledge regarding any social issue and understand it. By considering this issue, I can claim that since sociology was introduced to Turkey, Turkish sociologists have used sociological methods which were western-oriented, but not explanatory for Turkish society. As a consequence of this, it might be contended that there is not an original Turkish sociology, but western-oriented Turkish sociology. Consequently, the aim of this study is to examine the previous Turkish sociological traditions, mention their weakness, and at least, present comparative historical methodology which has been discussed recently for Turkish sociology to reach an original understanding of Turkish sociology.

Prior to this study, some researches have been conducted regarding the history of Turkish sociology so far. For example, H. Bayram Kacmazoglu (1988, 2001, and 2010) and Emre Kongar (1988) have produced some valuable studies about the history of Turkish sociology. However, their studies were only about presenting the products of Turkish sociologists and the development and progress of Turkish sociology. They mentioned that Turkish sociology was western-oriented and copying from Europe, and during its development, Turkish sociology was affected by western theories. Nevertheless, although

they revealed the situation of Turkish sociology, they did not suggest any solution or offer in terms of methodology and the independence of Turkish sociology.

Consequently, this study will be divided into four main parts. In the first chapter, the emergence of sociology and modernity will be manifested, and their impacts on both European and Turkish societies in terms of the growing of sociology as a social science. After that, it will deal with the development of Turkish sociology from the Tanzimat Chapter (1839) to 2000s. The second part of the study will be a critical analysis of Turkish sociology in terms of producing knowledge, theoretical, conceptual and methodological problems of Turkish sociology. As for the last part, it will be focused on how to achieve a distinctive Turkish sociology which can produce social scientific knowledge, understand and solve the social problems of Turkish society.

## **2. Methodology**

This study will use comparative historical method, which “is the analysis of a field of research characterized by the use of systematic comparison and analysis of processes over time to explain large-scale outcomes such as revolutions, political regimes, and welfare states” (Mahoney, 2003: 135). In social sciences, methodology is one of the key points in terms of approaching a social issue and solving it. In other words, methodology determines the way of the research. So far, some methods have been beneficial for social science research as quantitative and qualitative. Especially positivists have understood social sciences like natural sciences and therefore, they have preferred to apply statistical methods for researching social issues. However, nowadays, this aspect is not accepted as the unique method (Bryman, 2012). This research will use the comparative historical method as a part of Qualitative methodology because the development of Turkish sociology is a process in history. Therefore, in order to point out the development of Turkish sociology, and present what kind of growth it needs, it is highly necessary to compare and find out similarities and differences of Turkish sociology from other societies’ sociologies by which Turkish society has been influenced, as well as comparing it with the previous periods of Turkish sociology. In doing so, it will be possible to work out why Turkish sociology has not responded to the problems of Turkish society, and it will try to find some ways regarding how Turkish sociology can develop specific methods in terms of understanding Turkish society. Therefore, throughout the research, Turkish society in the Ottoman Empire period and the Republic of Turkey, and the development of Turkish sociology during these periods will be investigated. In doing so, it will be benefited from the previous studies regarding Turkish sociology, and by comparing it with the previous characteristics of Turkish sociology, the development of today’s Turkish sociology will be pointed out. Hence, briefly, in order to collect data, it will be focused on collecting data from journals and publications which are about Turkish sociology and its analysis.

### **2.1 Research Questions**

- Although sociology emerged at the same time with Europe, why has sociology developed less than European sociology?
- What has Turkish sociology contributed to Turkish society in order to understand and solve social, economic and political problems?
- Why has Turkish sociology developed under the impacts of the American and Western Sociology?

- While Connell (2007) indicates that there is not universal social knowledge which is only produced by “Northern” in her “Southern theory”, and she asserts that “Southern societies” or developing societies can produce social scientific knowledge, too. But why does not Turkish sociology produce social scientific knowledge like western sociology?
- Can Turkish sociology be beneficial to understand and solve the problems of Turkish society by considering its distinctive characteristics? In this term, can Turkish sociology build a specific sociology tradition for Turkish society?

**Table 1: the Periods of Turkish sociology’s Development**

<b>The Periods of Turkish sociology’s Development</b>			
<b>Periods</b>	<b>The Task of Sociology</b>	<b>Important sociologists</b>	<b>Influential sociology schools</b>
<b>1.</b> The Tanzimat Charter 1839	Salvation of the Ottoman Empire	The young Turks (introduced sociology under the impact of Positivism to Turkey)	French Sociology
<b>2.</b> the Declaration of the Second Constitutionalism (1908)	Save the Empire from collapse	Union and Progress, Ziya Gökalp vs. Prens Sabahattin in terms of sociological approaches	French Sociology (Durkheim and Le Play’s sociology schools)
<b>3.</b> the Republic of Turkey (1923)	Support Westernisation, and Spread the nationalist Ideology of the State	Ziya Gökalp, Prens Sabahattin, and German social scientists,	French and German Sociology
<b>4.</b> Ankara School 1939-1960s	Support Westernisation and Use the Method of American Applied Sociology	Niyazi Berkes, Behice Boran, F. Ziya Fındıkoğlu	American applied sociology, Marxist ideas (western Marxists rather than the USSR Marxists)
<b>5.</b> 1960s to 2000s	Arguments about the task and the method of sociology, and towards a distinctive sociology understanding	Baykan Sezer, Sencer Divitçioğlu, Nilüfer Göle	Marxist ideas, Multi-disciplinary approaches

**References:** Boran, 1943, Kacmazoglu, 2003, Ulken, 1992

### **3. An analysis of the development of Sociology in Turkey**

#### **3.1. The Emergence of Sociology and Modernity in Europe and Turkey: A Historical Panorama Case of the 19th and 20th Centuries**

Modernity and sociology are related phenomena and it might be quite hard to distinguish them in terms of their history. Therefore, it is fairly difficult to say which one existed initially. Hence, many thinkers consider this issue from two aspects, and they assert that if sociology is pointed out as a social thought, it is clear that sociology existed before modernity due to the fact that there has been social thought since the early years of mankind. Furthermore, this may also be indicated through studying of the philosophers in the age of ancient Greece (Swingewood, 2000). On the other hand, sociology, as a modern social science, started to emerge in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in order to help to enhance the thoughts of modernity as a result of the Enlightenment in Europe. Consequently, it depends on the approaches to modernity and sociology about which came first (Ray, 1999). When modernity is considered, many thinkers understand it as a project which has various forms such as, social, cultural, economic and political. In this respect, modernity may be marked as a new paradigm that emerged as a challenge to Aristotelian thought in the 17<sup>th</sup> century (Hall and Gieben, 1993). During this period, the enlightenment had the most significant impact on the emergence of modernity because modern societies and social sciences were established in this age. As a consequence of this, the thinkers of this period manifested the thought of modernity as a project which primarily began in western societies against the church. Hall (2006) reveals this challenge that modernity was the creation of a new paradigm or aspect of ideas regarding mankind, society, and nature which encountered existing conceptions rooted in a traditional world perspective, dominated by Christian religion and ideas. According to him, the main domain in which Enlightenment thinkers encountered the clergy, who supported the existing conceptions of the world. As a consequence of this challenge, new ideas were announced and had an impact on their varied cultural innovations in writing, printing, painting, music, sculpture and arts etc. Thus, in this period, thinkers began to consider researching the world empirically in order to gain a practical aim to create a “better”, more rational world for humankind. Consequently, the Enlightenment philosophers managed to reject beliefs in traditional authority. Hence, when they assessed traditional values and institutions, they found this irrational and running counter to human nature and posing a dilemma of human development (Ritzer, 1996). As a result of these evaluations, modernity has begun to be dominant in western societies since the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Moreover, with the project of modernity, scientists and philosophers could have freedom of thought, and

it led them to think of using the methods of sciences and developing them. Such as, sociology developed in this period as a scientific study of societies. In other words, mainly, the Enlightenment, the French and industrial revolutions prepared the birth conditions of sociology in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, accordingly, it can be asserted that sociology, in this period, found an opportunity to develop in order to respond to the demands of Western societies which industrialized, urbanized and became more complicated (Bayramoğlu, 2010).

Undoubtedly, when societies develop or pass a new stage as classical sociologists expressed, then the existing paradigm cannot respond to the demands of a society, and it strains. Thus, a new stage demands a new paradigm to respond to the needs of the society (Kuhn, 1962). By referring to T. Kuhn, it may be examined that the results of the developments in Western societies such as, the enlightenment, the industrial and French revolutions, new colonial attempts and the problems which modernity brought created new demands by societies and the existing paradigm was unable to respond adequately to those needs. Therefore, especially, western societies in the 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century demanded new paradigms in order to understand and solve their social problems and economic, cultural problems. Consequently, in this period, they started to tend to develop social sciences, and particularly sociology in order to solve their own problems and respond to the wishes of societies. In other words, the 19<sup>th</sup> century is the period of varieties of social changes and “*the great transformation*” (Polanyi, (1944), 2001). Enormous social problems and depressions in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, caused societies to seek new solutions so as to understand and eliminate those chaotic problems in the western world. Thus, the intellectuals of these societies applied social sciences, and remarkably, sociology was considered so as to solve the enormously chaotic situation. Since, in order to provide a functional and comfortable social world, it is necessary to work out solutions to conceive and after that to theorise it (Kızılcılık, 2001). Therefore, the aim of sociology in the 19<sup>th</sup> century can be remarked that it was seeking to find out how western societies could be recovered from the chaotic situation as a result of the industrial and French revolutions because in this period, western societies faced with two points. Firstly, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, western societies in general obtained enormous wealth and the domination of the world, and secondly, they sometime encountered with their internal contradictions which almost destroyed themselves such as, the French and industrial revolutions, the labour movements. Accordingly, the existing paradigm which supported feudal scientific understanding could not be used to respond these problems. Thus, these two

points forced societies to create a new science in order to respond the problems of newly transformed western societies (Bayramoğlu, 2010).

When we look at the issues of sociology in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, this goal can be pointed out from the ideas of the dominant sociologists such as, Comte, Durkheim, and even Marx in spite of the fact that they had different perspectives and methodologies. For example, Comte built his sociological theory by being based upon positivist sociology, “statics” because he wished to design sociology “as a special science dedicated to unrevealing the essential laws governing the societal phenomena and human social relationship with primary interest in analysing the problems and societies of the modern western world” (Doda, 2005:3). In the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, many social innovations occurred, and these led to immense social problems for societies. Since western societies began to change in this period structurally in terms of social, economic, cultural, political and religious dimensions. Therefore, Comte established sociology as a social science in order to work out the huge problems of the modern societies due to challenging the previous structures of western societies and new occurred revolutions during the modernisation period (Hall, 2006). As a result, Comte and his followers highlighted sociology as a static modern science for the progress of societies. Hence, it is asserted that the most common thinkers supported sociology in order to provide social order in western societies during the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries’ modernity, except Karl Marx (1818-1883) 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 (Halfpenny , 1994).

While European societies were dealing with these social problems, how was Turkish society in the 19<sup>th</sup> century? In fact, Turkish society had many social and economic problems like European societies. However, in specifically, the social problems of Turkish Society were different. For example, whilst in Europe, the problems emerged as the consequences of “rapid social changes”, “progress”, “evolution” and “revolution”, the situation of the Ottoman Empire in the 19<sup>th</sup> century was different. For the Empire which had lost economic and political independence, power and sovereignty against European countries tried to survive by profiting from the balance of power policy among European countries. By considering such conditions, it could be asked “why did Turkish Society rapidly transfer sociology which emerged in Europe in order to solve the social problems?” The main answer of this question is to consider what Europe and Turkish society expected from sociology

because they had different social problems and therefore, their expectations from sociology were different from each other. However, the managers of the Ottoman Empire, the Ideologists and intellectuals thought of sociology as a magic power in order to save the Ottoman Empire from being destroyed (Kacmazoglu, 2010).

In other words, it could be asserted that while sociology was built in Europe due to social, economic, politic and cultural reasons, it emerged in Turkish society because of political concerns as Lewis (1970) indicated this by revealing some questions of the Ottoman intellectuals such as, what was the problem with the Ottoman Empire? Why had it failed to keep up with its rivals? What might be done to rescue the Empire? It was not only 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. Consequently, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, modernisation or more specifically, westernisation movements started in the Ottoman Empire through the young Turks who were sent to European countries (particularly, France, Germany and England). Nevertheless, as Mardin (1983) pointed out, the main characteristic of the young Turks who were being educated by the western education system was estranged from the traditional Turkish education system and Turkish society. Thus, when they returned Turkish society, they were alienated to their society and solutions which they offered were not appropriate for understanding Turkish society. Particularly, they believed that it was possible to save the Empire from the worsening situation by obtaining western technology and ideas. Therefore, they considered recovering the Ottoman Empire by bringing these new ideologies to Turkish society such as nationalism and freedom. As a result of these effects, “the Tanzimat Charter” (1839) was announced by Mustapha Rashid Pasha, who had good relationships with Comte, and wanted to introduce his positivist philosophy to Turkish society.

The Tanzimat Charter had very significant impacts on the Ottoman Empire in this term. By announcing this charter, the Empire thought of taking French and England’s support because the Ottoman Empire lost the war 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. However, the Empire could not protect itself without the backing of European countries. As a result of these, the young Turks offered to Sultan Abdulmecit I to announce the Tanzimat Charter which European countries demanded in 1839. Some basic principles of the Charter were that everybody would be equal, and their certain rights would

be protected by the government; European style courts would be established for the judgement of public cases with this charter, the Sultan limited his own political authority (Goodwin, 2006).

As for Turkish society, the importance of the Charter can be asserted that the Ottoman Empire turned its face to Europe, and westernisation efforts started in social, cultural and politics areas intensively because by the announce of the charter, the Empire had only considered taking the technology of western countries for its army. Namely, with the period of the Tanzimat Charter, Turkish society entered the process of modernisation-westernisation. Thus, new ideologies and social sciences could have the opportunity to be introduced to Turkish society more intensively than before the Tanzimat charter (Berkes, 1964). Moreover, Kadioğlu (1996) stated the goal of this charter was to create a new society which could be seen as modern and civilized from the view point of European society. As a result of this, the young Turks who studied in Europe were affected intensively by new ideologies and social movements. After that, when they returned, they attempted to implement those ideologies on Turkish society.

### **3.2. The Characteristic of the First Period of Turkish Sociology from the Tanzimat Charter to 1908: The Salvation Idea of the Empire**

After entering to the Tanzimat period, many young students were sent to Europe in order to learn modern education and European system. However, these young students dealt with political affairs, and sought new solutions in order to save the Empire. Towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, they began to unite around “the Committee of Union and Progress”, which was the first political party against Abdulhamit II, who was the sultan of the Ottoman Empire in that period. Most of them were affected by different theories during their education, but their common aim was to recover the Empire. However, it was very problematic for the Empire because when they returned, they copied the ideologies, technologies, life styles and belief systems of the west to Turkey without analysing and revising them. Especially, the theory of Comte which is “order and progress” and “social Darwinism” was dealt with by the committee of Union and progress. Additionally, in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, Social Darwinism was very effective on the young Turks because the Empire was called “the sick man of Europe”, and the consequences of social Darwinism led them to think of the Empire as a body. In doing so, they considered improving the Empire by using the tool of this theory. However, it was understood that not only did social Darwinism not

understand and solve the problems of Turkish society but it did not also have any compatible element for living with Turkish society because it was quite different from Western societies (Kacmazoglu, 2010). Nevertheless, it was continued to bring European ideas to the Ottoman Empire in the late of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In this period, the ideas of Comte which Durkheim made systematic entered Turkey through Ziya Gökalp, who is the founder of Sociology in Turkey, and opened sociology department in the University of Istanbul in 1914. The Young Turks, markedly, Z. Gökalp attempted to benefit from the ideas which were about “order” and “progress”. However, as mentioned above, Turkish sociology was imported from Europe and it was not authentic to the society. While western (particularly French sociology) sociology dealt with the social structures turned upside down, the aim of Turkish sociology was not to solve social or cultural problems of Turkish society. Ziya Gökalp and his friends completely brought sociology to Turkey for political concerns, and they employed sociology to seek new ways to rescue the state and reshape Turkish society (Yılmaz, 2010).

### **3.3. The Second Period of Turkish Sociology from 1908 to 1923: Sociology Became the Assistance of the Committee of Union and Progress Party**

When it is investigated the general history of sociology and its history in Turkey, at first glance, it might be pointed out that as soon as sociology, which is in its origins a western knowledge, emerged in Europe, was introduced to Turkey at the same time as well. The reason why Turkish society was quite dynamic to keep up social changes in Europe was related to the characteristics of the society in this period because sociology was established in the west due to a response to its social problems, and despite being different in contents; Turkish society had many challenges too. Therefore, Turkish intellectuals were simultaneously, interested in sociology so as to find solutions to social problems. As Giddens (1997) 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. Therefore, the young Turks united around the committee of Union and Progress seized power, and issued a new constitution in 1908. Nonetheless, it was not enough effort to save the Empire, thus, they began to think of “Nationalism” instead of “Ottomanism”, as a larger ideology, and the idea of “Westernism” developed. Nevertheless, it needed a science that could help them to clarify and support the

new social transformation, so, they considered sociology satisfying nationalism and westernisation (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, 1992).

When the development of sociology is considered from the 1910s until the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, sociology was employed to serve the official ideology of the old regime as similar to the west. However, the tasks of sociology changed when the Ottoman Empire collapsed. While sociology was the science which had been hoped serve to save the Empire from collapse, after the 1920s, the task of sociology was to help to continue the new regime's existence, and to spread its messages to the public. Therefore, 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.

After the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, the understanding of Ziya Gökalp' sociology became more influential on Turkish politicians and Turkish society more than the previous periods. Thus, sociology lessons were started to be given in high schools in the middle of the 1920s, as well as universities. Nevertheless, 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).

### **3.4. The Third Period of Turkish Sociology, the Republic of Turkey (1923): Sociology Is the Advocate of the Ideology of the Nation-State**

After WW1 and the independent war of Turkey, a new age started for Turkish society because the Ottoman Empire, which consisted of various nations, and religious rules were destroyed, and a new secular-modern and less diverse country was established. However, this young state needed to follow an ideology by depending on the position of the world. Additionally, nationalism was the common ideology of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and inevitably, the Republic of Turkey was influenced by this idea deeply. Thus, nationalism became one of the most important guides of the state during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Moreover, the managers of the state, namely, M. Kemal and his friends, were influenced by Ziya Gökalp's ideas regarding nationalism, modernisation and secularism. Moreover, they tried to modernize Turkey by following European countries. Therefore, in this term, sociology was employed for this task. Ziya Gökalp was accepted as the ideologist of the state in this period. With the modern Turkish State, many revolutions mainly, republicanism, populism, revolutionism, secularism, statism, nationalism were attempted to be performed (Aksin, 1999). For example, secularism was accepted by removing the effects of the Islamic religion, the public were forced to live like European societies, and many western cultural or technical products were introduced to Turkish society under the name of the Turkish revolution. However, while social movements and revolutions emerged in Europe as a result of the demands of publics against the Church and the ruling classes, in Turkey, there was not such a demand from the public of Turkey. Since the Islamic religion did not oppress the public, even the society believed that they were in trouble because of moving away from the religion. However, as mentioned above, the young Turks who were educated in Europe were quite dominant in the Turkish State. 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. Hence, they had to fulfil revolutions in spite of the fact that the public did not demand then. Consequently, Kemalist revolutions were started. Those revolutions were mainly regarding westernisation and admitted the superiority of western societies. The task of sociology was to support those revolutions, and make them understandable and acceptable to the public. That is, the task of sociology was to adapt the society for the revolutions which were imported from Europe (Kadioğlu, 1996).

Therefore, after 1923, the ideas of Ziya Gökalp were the most influential on Turkish politicians. Moreover, another important sociologist was Prens Sabahattin (1878-1948), who was accepted as the second significant sociologist in Turkey. The common aim of Prens Sabahattin and Ziya Gökalp were similar to save the Empire from collapse rather than consider radical solutions for Turkish society. Although both of them were influenced by French sociology, Ziya Gökalp supported the Durkheimian sociology tradition while Prens Sabahattin was influenced by another French sociologist Le Play (Kaçmazoğlu, 2010). However, after 1923, the ideas of Prens Sabahattin were not considered because of two reasons. First, he was a member of the Ottoman dynasty, and the whole family of the Ottomans were exiled from Turkey. The second point is that he considered the problems of Turkish society in terms of structural issues, and he endeavoured 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. Therefore, the ideas of Prens Sabahattin could not be as effective as Ziya Gökalp's thought in Turkey. On the other hand, Gökalp considered the sociology of Durkheim by adapting it to Turkey, and, he 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. When this idea is considered politically in terms of the relationships with M. Kemal and his friends, the idea of Gökalp was worth thinking because it supported the same ideology for the development of Turkey. Thus, in this period, he became the theorist of the modern-secular-positivist Kemalist state understanding by sharing the idea which was "populism in spite of the public"<sup>1</sup> (İrem, 2004). Moreover, as politically, the ideas of Ziya Gökalp were adopted intensively by M. Kemal and his friends. Therefore, western-oriented (mainly French-oriented) sociology school of Gökalp became dominant in Turkey, and it started to lead to the politics of the Republic of Turkey. Hence, sociology became the defender of the dominant ideology of the state (Kadıoğlu, 1996).

Following Gökalp, M. İzzet (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. İzzet, who interpreted Turkism in a line close to his teacher

---

<sup>1</sup> Turkish society did not demand from sociology to solve social problems, this require came from the managers of the state, therefore, in order to keep up western societies in terms of technological developments and social transformations, the state demanded these demands in the contrary of Europe

Gökalp and affirmed as a “new cooperation connection”, asserted the idea that the nationality opinion was above all an ideal and criticised racist theories. However, the sociological understanding of Izzet was very similar to Gökalp’s sociology because of being influenced by him. Hence, it can only be asserted that he was a follower of Gökalp’s sociology because he did not establish a different understanding of sociology (Kaçmazoğlu, 2010).

In 1933, a university reform was performed by the government in Turkey. Especially, the aim of the government was to pressure social scientists in order to control them. Thus, this impact caused Turkish sociology to be more dependent on the dominant ideology. On the other hand, in the 1930s, many German professors who sought refuge from the oppression of Hitler as a result of the “Nazi” movements in Germany took sanctuary in Turkey. Therefore, German sociology school became more important and effective than French Sociology on the development of Turkish sociology. Many Turkish sociologists were affected by German professors, and new sociological study fields were dealt with. Consequently, Turkish sociology acquired dynamism thanks to German sociological understanding, and new methodologies were considered with new fields. For example, in literature, law and economy faculties, sociology lessons were started to be given by Z. F. Findıkoğlu, who was a student of Izzet. Therefore, in this period, it can be seen that literature, law and economy sociology emerged. Particularly, the sociology of economy sought to suggest a national economy to the government. Accordingly, 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 (Sahin, Undated).

### **3.5. The Development of Turkish Sociology in the Third Period from 1939 to the 1960s: The Impact of the American Applied Sociology**

Turkey, in respect of its geopolitical position, has always needed to keep up with developments which have occurred in the world because any change or development tends to affect Turkey and accordingly, those effects may be seen on Turkish sociology intensively as well. For example, Turkish society was influenced by the French revolution, and it developed in the perspectives of French sociology. On the other hand, when it reached the 1940s, America started being the dominant power in the world, and it had good relationships with Turkey in politics. In 1939, the second sociology school which was in Ankara was established in Turkey, the first being the Istanbul sociology school. The school of Ankara aimed to represent American sociology in Turkey in the late of 1930s; it was created by

Behice Boran, Niyazi Berkes, and Mediha Berkes. Those sociologists were educated in America, and during their education, they challenged Marxism and they were also influenced by Marxist ideas. However, the politics of the Republic of Turkey were completely against Marxist ideas because of their political relationships with America. Therefore, the school of Ankara encounter with proceedings, and the lectures were dismissed in 1948. However, even if they performed their studies in a short period, the school of Ankara introduced many new ideas and research methods to Turkish society (Kasapoğlu, 1991).

When the ideas of Ankara school are considered, it might be pointed out that it was independent from the school of Istanbul in terms of bringing new ideas, using methodologies and new fields regarding sociological researches. If it is looked at as the school of Ankara, firstly, it can be stated that the roots of this school were based on applied American sociology because the founders of the Ankara school were educated in America, and they were influenced intentionally by applied sociology. Indeed, even if American sociology is quite different in respect of field studies and methodologies, the roots of American applied sociology were from continental Europe, but the school of Ankara evaluated American and European sociologies as two different sociologies. The reason for this distinction originated in its position. The theoretical source of the school of Istanbul was European sociology, while the Ankara school came from America. Therefore, founders of Ankara school had to prove their presence against criticism from the Istanbul school and knowing European sociology. In doing so, they attempted to contend that they had more sociological knowledge than the Istanbul school, because, contrary to the school of Istanbul, they also knew American applied sociology as well as European theoretical sociology (Kacmazoglu, 2010).

Turkish sociology in the 1940s, passed into a new period as a result of the development of the Ankara school. By being different from the Istanbul school, they brought new fields to sociology. Firstly, the school critiqued the theories of racism because in this period, the consequences of development of racist theories in Europe (especially in Germany, the period of Hitler) affected Turkey as well. Racist politics were enhanced by the government 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. Therefore, the Ankara school attested that the theories of racism were completely unfamiliar to Turkish society because according to them, Turkish society had never exhibited racism by the Republic of Turkey (1923), but over nationalist theories were imposed by European sources under the ideology of modernisation/westernisation in Turkey.

Hence, Mediha Berkes (1943) critiqued Turkish sociology regarding its relationships with the theory of nationalism, and argued that the world civilisation 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 examined both dominant Turkish sociology and European sociology. They claimed that sociology could not be performed due to two reasons. The first point, sociology was carried out by proposing dogmatic doctrines and only producing ideologies for politicians. Another point was that the lessons of sociology were given to students as prepared formulations without investigating and analysing the relationships among occasions but in order to establish a scientific sociology in Turkey, the most important point was to examine a critical analysis of the doctrines or schools which came to Turkey (Berkes, 1940).

As for the critique of European sociology, they claimed that French sociologists only endeavoured to write general sociology books, and they did not consider the basis of sociology as a science, which was research. 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, because of its social conditions, obtained an important position in universities and colleges, and it was established as an independent discipline from philosophy. Hence, sociology, in America, was researching social events by using a scientific method (Boran, 1943). Even though the Ankara school examined European sociology so intensively, they considered American society as part of Europe. Although they criticized Western sociology, when we look at their subsequent studies, they were influenced by European sociology so deeply that it might be said that in fact, their aim was to create a unity with Europe because they believed that Turkish society did not have to be kept separate from Europe; otherwise, it would be a big loss for the development of Turkish society. Consequently, they argued that as a whole society, Turkey had to completely adopt all characteristics of western civilisation as much as possible because only the idea of bringing its technology was not enough for the development of Turkish society, as the first period Turkish sociologists promoted (Berkes, 1941).

As mentioned, the school of Ankara brought new study fields for Turkish sociology such as, urbanisation, industry, the sociology of rural life, literature, art etc. When the viewpoints of the Ankara school were looked at, they used monograph methods during their rural research in spite of the fact that they were affected by European sociologists. 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. Moreover, in their rural sociology studies, the impacts of Durkheim have been observed. Particularly, they presented that if Turkish society desired to develop, firstly, it had to collect the population in urban centres, 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 industrialisation of Turkey would grow (Berkes, 1941).

As for the school of Istanbul in 1940s, H. Z. Ülken, Ziya Fahreddin Fındıkoğlu and Nurettin Sazi Kösemihal represented this school. It was French origin sociology and philosophy oriented. In this period, despite the fact that they introduced some new fields in Turkish sociology, their main aim was to sustain the tradition of the first period sociology understanding. In fact, as Kaçmazoglu (2010) examined that they did not deal with the interests of public, the reality of the society and the sociological dimensions of practical problems. The School of Istanbul, which was completely under the impact of western-oriented, evaluated all sociological events in the perspective of westernization. The theories which they studied about were not related to Turkish society. On the other hand, as it has been indicated, although German sociology had an impact on the Istanbul school, 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. As it can be seen, the understanding of the Istanbul school was not original; their sociology was dependent a western-oriented sociology. 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 (Kaçmazoglu, 2010).

The Ankara and Istanbul schools, in spite of having many differences in terms of methodologies and fields, also had some common points. Especially, regarding the issue of Westernisation, the Ankara and Istanbul schools had very similar aspects. Both schools considered that Western and Universality were equal. According to them, there was one civilisation, and it was western civilisation. Therefore, Turkish society had to attain this civilisation as soon as possible. Moreover, they supported the “*statism*” instead of “*liberalism*” so that Turkish society could develop fast, and become westernized (Sener, 2005). Prominently, after World War II, Turkish sociologists recognized the superiority of Europe and America because they were the victors of the war, and they became more

powerful after it. Therefore, Turkish sociologists considered the line of Westernism more than the previous periods in terms of development. Moreover, after the WWII, modernisation theories rose, and they influenced Turkish sociologists intensively. According to modernisation theories, there is only one development; this is the development line of western countries. If a society aims to develop, the society has to follow the development line of western countries. Then, it can be asked what the criterion of this development is? For this question, modernisation theories suggest “economic development”. Therefore, modernisation 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 (Šafářová, 2010). Especially, Lerner (1964, (1958)), supported that modernisation was a sum of social change associated with economic development. Furthermore, McClelland (1961) connected economic growth with cultural values of nations. According to him, if a country tried to develop, then 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, modernisation theories attempted to prove that development was modernisation-westernisation in the perspective of culture and economic growth because western countries are industrialized countries which should be followed for the development. Consequently, after WWII, Turkish sociologists started to deal with modernisation theories, and by the 1980s, Turkish sociologists aimed to use their ideas regarding development of Turkey. Thus, after WWII, the attempts of Turkish government started to join the European Union as a result of the impact of modernisation theories.

Even though Turkish sociology was very creative in 1940s, when it reached the 1950s and 1960s, it can be observed, there was a recession regarding sociological research. Since if this period is compared with the previous or subsequent ages, sociological studies were very insufficient. As it has been pointed out that, Turkish sociology had developed by being based on the dominant ideologies and politics. Therefore, in this term, many sociologists who were from the school of Ankara were dismissed from the university, and some lecturers were forced to leave Turkey. For example, Behice Boran and Niyazi Berkes, who were the founders of the Ankara school, could not even write one essay between 1950 and 1960 in Turkey. Because 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, approaching Marxist theories was a reason to be arrested. Moreover, whilst the school of Ankara was closed because of its radical studies, there were some Marxist lecturers in the school of Istanbul as well. Yet they did not express their Marxist ideas like the Ankara school. Furthermore, in 1950s, while the Ankara school was closed, the Istanbul school thought of this as a warning from the state, and in this period, they lost their creativity. For example, H. Z. Ülken 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 (Zürcher, 2005).

On the other hand, as the impact of the dominant ideology 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. Moreover, in this term, the Democrat Party (DP) was ruling Turkey, and they had very good relationships with America. Therefore, the government did not let the Marxist ideas coming from the Soviet Union roots 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 westernisation. Consequently, the sociologists who were close to the government studied on the ideas of Gökalp while other sociologists who were in favour 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 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, 2010).

Briefly, it could be highlighted that in 1950-60s, almost all sociologists were either interested in empirical sociology or in favour of it. It was a golden age for the sociology of rural life as well as the sociology of industry although 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 the main issue of Turkish sociology was westernization, and in this period, sociologists sought to find new ways to become westernized. Secondly, creating the individualist characteristics features of a social structure, and thirdly, developing a hostile stance towards Communism and socialism. Furthermore, sociologists endeavoured to create a Turkish class society and Bourgeois in order to become westernized. On the other hand, even though new sociology understandings and ideas were introduced to Turkey such as, American applied sociology, Marxism etc., in this period, eclectic Turkish sociology understanding continued, because this time, Turkish sociologists used the methods of American applied sociology as well as European sociology methods. Therefore, still we cannot mention about a specific Turkish sociology (Kaçmazoglu, 2010).

### **3.6. The Development of Sociology in the Fourth Period from the 1960s to 2000s: from Eclectic Sociology Understanding to Distinctive Sociology Tradition**

Sociology, owing to being interested in relationships with society, both has affected Turkish society and has been affected by social, economics, politics and cultural aspects of Turkish society. Therefore, in the 1960s, Turkey was very active in respect of social, economic and political transformations. Put differently, Turkey passed a new age in terms of politics and ideologies. Since Turkey adopted democracy in 1945. Until the 1960s, there were two political parties and social scientists relatively, had more freedom than the one party state (from 1923 to 1946). In this period, sociology was reshaped by being based upon the dominant ideology of political party. Furthermore, especially, after demolishing the school of Ankara, the impact of American applied sociology decreased after 1950s and 60s compared to 1940s (Kaçmazoglu, 2010). Moreover, the Republican Party (CHP), which was the founder of the Republic of Turkey, used to deny the history of Turkish society before the republic (1923) as an ideology of the state. Therefore, it was problematic for sociologists to deal with the relationships of sociology and history analytically, but it does not mean there was not any historical study; few studies were conducted by considering the history in this period. For instance, Gökalp and Prens Sabahattin used historical sources for their society's analysis in order to mention the modernity stage of Turkey. As a political ideology of the state, Turkey had to become westernized, and for this, the Turkish State had to either avoid or criticize its history, which was under the impact of Islam religion. Since, according to the first and second generations of sociologists by depending on the dominant ideology of the state, Turkish society could have developed by fulfilling reformations regarding religion and traditional social life as modern western countries performed in the previous century

(Erdemir, 2007). Nevertheless, after passing pluralist democracy, the understanding of Turkish sociology started to be pluralist as well. In doing so, new ideas and fields were begun to be dealt with and researched more intensively than before. Moreover, in the 1960s, not only did sociologists start to be interested in history but economists and political scientists also dealt with the social aspect of history. Therefore, it could be asserted that social sciences united around history in order to understand the problems of Turkish society effectively (Çağan, 2007).

In fact, as indicated above, Kacmazoglu (2010) stated that before the 1960s, there were many studies which were in favour of association of sociology and history. This interest was as old as the history of sociology. In this perspective, the dominant European sociologists, even if wrong or right attributed to history their sociological systems, social evolution understanding and social change theories in order to present the development of the West. For Turkish sociology, Ziya Gökalp and Prens Sabahattin who were influenced by western sociologists benefited from historical data when they attempted to point out the structure of the Ottoman and Turkish societies. Nonetheless, as it has been mentioned, as a consequence of the dominant ideology of the politicians, historical studies were not regarded very highly except in some fields, and Prens Sabahattin' ideas were not effective like the ideas of Ziya Gökalp because his ideas were not supported by the governments in the first period. The impact of American applied sociology caused Turkish sociologists to avoid considering historical data in their sociological studies. Since American society did not have an old history, and therefore, in 1940s, the relationships of history and sociology receded as American sociology tradition became dominant with the sociologists who represented American applied sociology in Turkey. However, Turkish society had a very ancient history. Therefore, American sociology could not influence Turkish sociology entirely in terms of considering and interpreting social issues. For instance, it was revealed that Prof Sabri Ülgener who represented Weberian sociology and H. Ziya Ülken who had an eclectic sociological understanding benefited from the historical aspect in their studies (Kaçmazoglu, 2010).

As it has been pointed out, the 1960s were very active both for Turkey and the world, because in this decade, many developments and social movements occurred. For example, the increase of socialism among Arab countries, the third world movement for independence against colonist western countries, youth movements in the western world as well as the dynamics of internal structure caused many social and political movements in Turkey.

Marxist ideas and theories developed in Turkey in contrast to the 1950s when Marxists were oppressed by the government. Along with these movements, Turkish sociologists were also not satisfied the position of Turkey because it has not been able to become westernized in spite of attempting to develop since the Tanzimat Charter (1839) (Zürcher, 2005). Furthermore, Turkey was faced with a coup in 1960. Thus, the government was reduced and a new Turkish constitution was revealed. Although it was a coup against democracy, comparatively, it was more libertarian than the previous governments (DP: Democrat Party, and CHP: the Republic Public Party) in Turkey. Furthermore, sociology was institutionalized in 1961 by being an independent social science philosophy, and it also acquired a pluralist identity by considering many new fields with the previous studies. For example, Socialism, Marxism, American applied and European sociology understanding, the relationships of history and sociology, new sociological methods, and many new sociological issues were dealt with in this period (Kasapoğlu, 1991). However, still the main issue of Turkish sociologists was to consider the questions regarding the position of Turkey in the world in terms of development and modernisation. The key questions of the 1960s were “why has not Turkish society been able to gain the level which Western societies had already reached, and what are the obstacles against this development in Turkish society? Is the state, society or the imperialism of the West was an impediment against the modernisation of Turkey? (Kacmazoglu, 2010, p: 304). Turkish sociologists endeavoured to compare historical characteristics of Turkey with European history. During this time, it was struggled pointing out the similarities and differences of Turkish history from the western history, and the history of Turkish society was evaluated in the perspective of the differences of manufacturing types. However, those new schools also thought of the development of Turkey as westernization and the evolution of Turkish history was considered the ideas which were capitalism and socialism. Especially, in the 1960s, Turkish sociologists continued applying western theories in order to research and understand rather than produce specific theories which could have solved the problems of Turkish society. On the other hand, in this term, sociologists performed many historical studies regarding the Ottoman and Turkish society’s history, and evaluated them in the perspectives of new approaches such as historical or ethnographic approaches, and this led to the growth of new perspectives among Turkish sociologists, economists and political scientists (Kaçmazoglu, 2010).

Furthermore, in the 1960s, Turkish sociologists dealt with Marxist theories intensively. Since, they believed that Turkey was the first country which gained

independence among the countries that were attacked by Western nations, and aimed to become a modern country. However, Turkey had not become westernized, so, in order to achieve this, it was a necessity to fulfil the plans of development as quickly as possible. As the consequences of the impact of Marxist theories, Turkish sociologists attempted to prove the Marxist theories which mentioned the historical schema of western and non-western society (Lipovsky, 1992). Hence, it could be asserted that in the 1960s, while it struggled understanding the existing problems of the society through intensive historical discussions, it was also developed new different sociological models regarding the relations of production, the structure of Ottoman society and historical evolutionary process.

In short, the 1960s might be pointed out that the ideology of sociologists, social economists and political scientists was shaped around socialist movements and the theories of Marx regarding “*dialectic*” and their opponents. Therefore, social scientists began to be interested in history and politics, and they researched the structure of the Ottoman Empire and Turkish society in that period. Accordingly, it could be highlighted that the interests of Turkish sociology were combined around two areas in this decade. First, the studies which considered socio-economic characteristic of the Ottoman and Turkish society without dealing with political concerns. The second was the studies which concerned the Ottoman and Turkish society by benefiting existing models as Marxists supported. Moreover, it was a significant recovery that not only did Turkish sociologists deal with the structure and history of the Ottoman period but they also performed many important studies which considered social, political, religious, economics of the Ottoman and the Republic of Turkey, the movements of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Constitutionalism thought and revolutions (Mardin, 1964). Despite the fact that they considered different models and methodologies, the common goal of both side was to work out the way which would direct Turkey to become westernized.

Turkish sociology is quite dynamic and always tends to change by depending on the position of the world. Therefore, when it reached the 1970s, the interests of Turkish sociology altered too, because the Cold War between the USA and the Soviet Union passed a new level, and this affected Turkish society. Moreover, since the 1960s, Turkish society has been faced with a coup in every 10 years, and these coups have caused the study interests of Turkish sociology. As indicated, Turkish society was very dynamic, and opened to social changes and transformations. For example, in the 1970s, the speed of historical-orientation sociology which was full of prejudice, ideological and was argued in terms of scientific method and positioned Turkish society into existing western-oriented schemas finished.

Sociological studies which dealt with the structure of Ottoman society and its relations of production, but less ideological and more realistic studies replaced then. In the 1970s, new sociological study fields appeared. Turkish sociology started to examine its development and contributions to Turkish society; the previous theories were critiqued intensively. Particularly, admitting of the superiority of the Western civilisation was investigated by a new generation sociologists. Muzaffer Sencer, Baykan Sezer and Sencer Divitçioğlu were significant thinkers of this period for a new sociological tradition. Especially, in this term, sociological studies were generally contended around the Ottoman society and its differences from Western societies' structures. Therefore, it is quite possible to combine the main topics of sociology in three sub headings. First, rejecting the sociological assumptions of Marxists supported Turkish society in the line of Western development, and presenting that Turkish society was different from those of western features, and had specific characteristics which led it to develop in a special line. Second, they dealt with nomadic societies and Central Asia nomadic societies. Third, Feudalism and ATUT (Asiatic mode of production, which was contented by Marx, at first, in order to explain the eastern societies) were argued because if the Ottoman society's structures were determined, then, it would be understood why Turkish society could not have developed. Therefore, in order to present the difference of Turkish society from European societies, the thesis of ATUT was manifested by some sociologists and historians as Turkish sociologists supported that the Ottoman society was not feudal, and therefore, it was useless to follow the development line of Western emulatively (Sencer, 1969). However, particularly, Baykan Sezer (1979) and Ş. Mardin (1973) argued that the Ottoman society was neither Feudal nor ATUT; it had specific characteristics which were not similar to those systems.

After introducing new topics and methods to Turkish sociology, Turkish sociology began to specialize by researching and arguing new issues in the department of sociology. Moreover, in 1980, a coup occurred in Turkey, and many sociologists were put in prisons or dismissed, especially, Marxists sociologists were affected negatively by the coup. However, it did not have much bad impact on the development of Turkish sociology because after this term, many sociology departments were opened in Turkish universities, and many sociological studies acquired diversity. Many sociology journals published sociological studies in this period (Coskun, 1991). On the other hand, Turkey started attempting to join the European Union more intensively than before. Thus, the development of sociological studies and their teaching encouraged mostly because of Turkey's strong motivation and intention to

enter the European Union. Since the last 30 years, Turkey has sought to attend the European Union (EU) and, during this period, the Europeans have promised to consider the matter favourably, at a future point in time. As a result of the impact of the EU politics, particularly, after 1990 there was relatively more democratisation in every field including sociology. As a consequence of this, a group of academics founded the Sociological Association in Turkey in 1990. Since the original association, which was founded in 1950, was closed a year later, this new one was a very important initiative for Turkey and its sociologists who had always felt themselves under political control and subordinate to the state. This was the first civically organised movement for Turkish sociologists. The first step towards the foundation of the association was established by Ankara University professors who had suffered from the previous political intervention as it has been mentioned above that Ankara school was demolished in 1947. However, until the 1990s, approximately 10 sociology meetings were performed, but they were not special for sociologists, other social scientists attended those congresses as well. On the other hand, after the 1990s, 7 national sociology congresses has been carried out so far, and each congress has considered various topics that were thought significant for the existing issues of Turkish society at the time. Some topics are “Contemporary Developments in Turkey and the World” (1993) “Migration and Society” (1996), “Conflict, Integration and Differentiation in Turkey and the World” (2000) (Kasapoğlu, 2005), and “memory and culture” (2012, the seventh national sociology congress) Congresses are very significant in terms of decreasing compartmentalisation among sociologists who are not aware of others’ studies. Since the 1990s, many universities have published “sociology journals” each month or each year. Moreover, there are 103 state universities and 65 private universities, and there are over 130 sociology departments in Turkish universities totally. Moreover, since the last 20 years, 657 Master’s and PhD thesis have been studied and published (<http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/>, 2012). Today, each university holds sociology meetings in Turkey every year, and Turkish sociologists join international sociology congresses and meetings. Moreover, some of those meetings have been in developing countries which have more similar characteristics with turkey, as well as Western countries. For instance, in 2012, “1<sup>st</sup> international Middles East sociology congress” was performed; many sociologists joined this congress from the middles East countries. Moreover, many sociology congress, symposiums and meetings have been carried out in Istanbul recently. These developments have been very beneficial for Turkish sociologists to meet different sociology tradition, and this leads them to consider that there is a different sociology world except Western sociology. Especially, these countries are developing

countries which are more similar to Turkish society than the developed countries. Hence, those all developments have led Turkish sociologists to think about western sociological theories again. They have begun to consider that there is not a universal sociological theory, and such a theory would never exist as long as there are different societies and the relationships of interest. Thus, they have started to admit that it is useless to test western theories in respect of confirmation or falsification for understanding Turkish society. It could be asserted that this is a key development for Turkish sociology in terms of being free from European sociology schools and the dominant ideology of the state. On the other hand, it does not mean that Turkish sociology must be closed to western sociology. Especially, recent developments and attempts help Turkish sociology to have relationships with European sociology. How it is wrong to follow Eurocentric sociological theory without critiquing, it also makes Turkish sociology fail to ignore western sociology. Since, in doing so, Turkish sociologists can challenge different sociological theories, and they can compare those theories with their specific models in order to understand Turkish society and its characteristics (Turkish sociology institution, 2012).

## **4. Main Problems of Turkish Sociology**

### **4.1. A Critical Analysis of Turkish Sociology**

Turkish sociology, in the first three periods (from the Tanzimat Charter (1839) and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Constitute (1908) to the foundation of the Republic of Turkey (1923)), was imported from the West to Turkey without revising. Therefore, sociology brought many problems rather than solutions to Turkish society because Turkey had relationships with both the eastern and western due to having lands and mixed cultures from both sides. Accordingly, the social problems of Turkish society were neither similar to the East nor the West exactly because it was neither eastern nor western. In other words, Turkish society does not have to follow only western sociology and skip the East; it has to consider western sociology because of historical relationships but also perceiving its specific problems (Kasapoğlu et al., 2010). However, for the sake of westernisation, in the first two periods, Turkish sociology adopted western sociology universal, and instead of creating specific concepts and sociological theories, it preferred to use western theories. Hence, Turkish sociology clearly failed to understand Turkish society in the first two periods (Sezer, 1979). As for the fourth period, we met two pioneer sociology schools which were the French and German sociology oriented Istanbul school and the American applied sociology oriented Ankara school. Even though, there can be seen two sociological schools in Turkey, mainly, it can be contended that there were two representatives of Western sociology schools in Turkey because did neither the Istanbul school nor the Ankara school have specific Turkish sociological theory. Both of them saw western sociology as universal as well. Therefore, it was not possible to claim that there were specific sociological researches in Turkey in that period. Fundamentally, there were two reasons for this. The first one, Turkish sociologists used western theories in order to produce politics for the dominant ideology of the state. Second, sociology lessons were given to students as formulations without revising and critiquing. Moreover, still the main aim of sociology was to make Turkish society become westernized. Turkish sociology developed under the impact of western sociology by admitting its superiority as modernisation theories have claimed (Sezer, 1993).

In the last periods, from the 1960s to the 2000s, the characteristic of Turkish sociology tended to change slowly because in these decades, Marxist ideas started to be argued and new approaches emerged in Turkish sociology. Although in the 1960s, as a western notion and theory, Marxism was studied in Turkey, in the following years, it helped to critique Turkish sociology in terms of approaching western sociology. Especially, after the

1970s, in order to create a specific Turkish sociology, Turkish sociologists have started to argue about producing original concepts, theories and methods for Turkish sociology (Sezer 2011). Particularly, the ideas of Baykan Sezer regarding the relationships of history and sociology have been argued so far.

It has been indicated that Sociology emerged in the west in order to find out solutions for its social problems. On the other hand, in the Ottoman society, there were not the same social problems. Nevertheless, Turkish intellectuals introduced sociology for two reasons, to save the Ottoman Empire from collapse and make Turkish society resemble Western society. However, both of these ideas have failed so far. Moreover, the task of Turkish sociology has been controlled by the politics of the dominant ideology of the state even in the 2000s. Therefore, still we cannot mention about a specific Turkish sociology because of being dependent on the state and understanding western sociology's theories as universal. Nonetheless, recently, there have been some very significant developments regarding Turkish sociology in terms of criticising western sociology and attempting to be independent of the politics of the state. On the other hand, the independence of sociology from the dominant ideology, state and western sociology does not mean that sociology must be independent of the other social sciences. As mentioned above, sociology is a multi-disciplinary science, therefore, it has to have relationships with other social sciences, and also Turkish sociology specifically has to be open to other societies' sociologies in order to follow the world politics (Kızılcelik, 2001).

In short, it could be asserted that even though sociology and education of sociology has been introduced to Turkey for a hundred years, still we cannot refer to a national Turkish sociology tradition in Turkey. The functionality of social sciences is in parallel with their capacity to predict the tendencies of the future. Nowadays, as a social science, the characteristic of sociology is very significant about having estimates for the future. Nevertheless, the dilemma which Turkish sociology encounters does not allow it to perceive the problems of Turkish society holistically. Thus, it does not allow Turkish sociology to comprehend what hinders development and predict about the future of Turkish society. When we consider this problem, we can see three reasons why Turkish sociology has not had specific theories, schools of thought, and a specific Turkish sociology tradition. First, "compartmentalisation", namely, there is no connection among sociologists. Second, "eclecticism", "adaptation" or "imitation". Third, "discontinuity" or "transitoriness", that is, the absence of memory or broken refracted ideas of Turkish sociologists. If Turkish sociology

wishes to proclaim studies which present the dynamics of Turkish society, its historical development, strategic position, system of values and cultural characteristics, then, Turkish sociology should work out these three problems (Sahin, 2005).

#### **4.2. Conceptual and Theoretical Problems of Turkish Sociology**

Turkish sociology emerged in Turkey at the same time with Europe in order to seek solutions for the problems of Turkish society in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. However, there are some fundamental questions and critiques regarding Turkish sociology. Firstly, why does not Turkish sociology have a specific characteristic (in other words, why cannot we speak of a specific Turkish sociology like the German, French Sociology)? Secondly, why has not Turkish sociology developed like western sociology in Turkey? Or what were the obstacles of Turkish sociology in terms of suggesting solutions for Turkish society? It is believed that if Turkish sociologists responded those questions, then, Turkish sociology would have a specific characteristic, understand and solve the problems of Turkish society. Therefore, as Sezer (1979) argued that firstly, Turkish sociology has to face its challenges such as, its history, failures, concepts and theories as well as admitting the superiority of Western. In other words, when the history of the development of Turkish sociology is considered, it could be claimed that the main problem of Turkish sociology is not to be able to put forward specific concepts and reach specific social theories which might be helpful to understand the problems of Turkish society. Since Turkish sociology was established in Turkey, it has not produced any original concept and sociological theory for the society. It has used western theories and adopted Turkish society without considering whether they would be explanatory or not. Consequently, it is supported that if Turkish sociology wishes to produce appropriate concepts for understanding Turkish society, it has to face with its history because Turkish society has very deep relations with its history, and many social problems are related to its past. Therefore, Turkish sociology should attempt to find out its own distinctive concepts by considering its history (Sezer, 2011).

#### **4.3. Methodological Problems of Turkish Sociology**

Methodology determines a scientist's way to gather and interpret data. By being based upon the method, the results of social research change. Therefore, it can be asserted that methodology plays a central role in social sciences (May, 2001). Especially, Sociology has had very deep relationships with the methodology since it emerged. As known, sociology is

the science of society, and societies are very dynamic and change fast, so, as a science of society, sociology is dynamic too, and this causes sociology to use new methods by depending on the needs of societies. Put differently, by depending on a new paradigm, sociological method needs to grow or create new methods for the research of societies. Therefore, arguments, regarding sociological method, have not been finished so far, and it will not finish as long as societies and sociology are dynamic (Sezer, 1993). Hence, method is not an innocent way of collecting knowledge. The most important issue relates to how knowledge which is collected is used how, where and why? Method is determined by depending on our perceived relationship to objects, and this knowledge is not independent of our values and prejudices. Namely, any method cannot be value-free, as interpretivists contend (Bryman, 2012).

As for Turkish sociology, according to Sezer (1993), the problems of sociology would be solved through theoretical endeavours and having relationships with history because he believes that any sociological tool exists in history. A valid approach is the usage of theory and research together. In this respect, theory directs our research and in the end of the research, theory would be examined. By depending on the results either theory is accepted or denied. However, this is only a method in sociology to research societies as positivism suggests. Therefore, we need to benefit more from sociological methods in respect to understanding societies. Hence Sezer (1993) encouraged sociologists to argue methodological issues in sociology. He believed that the argument of sociological methods were the validity of sociology because of being a very dynamic social science. Briefly, if sociology wishes to develop and understand social problems, it has to use specific methods based on the social issues it deals with. Therefore, for the development of Turkish sociology, firstly, it has to think of the problems of Turkish society, and then, think of the methods which can be beneficial for understanding the society.

For a specific Turkish sociology, Sezer (1993) applied “the main factor” in his method argument. The main factor is the thing which leads us to have meaningful social relationships, and it is the product of the historical development. Therefore, it is related to social changes and affects them. Moreover, another important term is “the historical development process” in Turkish sociology for methodology, since he believes that it is important to research historical development process in order to understand the relationships of societies. In addition, Sezer (1993) put forwards that the task of sociology was to point out the main factor by researching the historical development process. In doing so, for today’s

social problems of Turkish society, Turkish sociology could have specific methods by looking at Turkish history and assert its distinctive characteristics in order to understand Turkish society.

### **5. The Characteristics of the Distinctive Turkish Sociology for More Appropriate for Understanding Turkish Society**

The main aim of Turkish sociology is to consider the profit of Turkish society. However, there are some central questions regarding this issue. How can Turkish sociology produce social knowledge and contribute solutions to Turkish society's social problems? And which sociological approaches can Turkish sociology use? During the study, it has been dealt with the problems of Turkish sociology in terms of concepts, theories and methods. Therefore, the analysis of this study exhibits that if Turkish sociology wants to develop and to be beneficial a social science in Turkey, it has to contribute solutions to the problems of Turkish society by creating specific concepts, theories and using specific approaches. Moreover, as Sezer (1993) indicated that Turkish sociology had to consider the comparative historical method in order to understand Turkish society because even today's social problems are related to the past of Turkey. Turkish sociologists need to deal with Turkish history, understand the social problems of the previous periods of Turkish history, and then to use specific methods in order to analyse today's social issues. Moreover, Turkish sociology has to consider the similar characteristics of Turkish society with other developing countries such as, Mexican, Brazil and the Middle East societies. Especially, a recent social theory which is "the Southern theory" is quite significant in terms of presenting periphery societies that can produce knowledge, as well as developed-western countries (Connell, 2007). Particularly, when it is thought of social problems of Turkey nowadays, we can see that those social problems are very similar to the developing countries which have been mentioned above. If Turkish sociology considers the Southern theory in respect of producing knowledge, Turkish sociology could think of its distinctive features, and by being based on this, it could seek how to contribute knowledge for Turkish society. Otherwise, Turkish sociology would continue to depend on western sociology in respect of producing its own theories.

As indicated, sociology is a science which leads societies to know themselves. Therefore, if we want to proclaim a specific Turkish sociology, the proposal of Baykan Sezer (1993) regarding the historical comparative method might be useful for Turkish sociology. Moreover, throughout the history, Turkish society has had clashes with the west and the east through its differences and similarities; also, Sezer (1993) claims this as the conflict of the

west and east by referring to K. Marx's theory regarding "history being the result of the class struggle" (Marx, (1848) 1985). Thus, he suggests that Turkish sociology has to deal with the problems of Turkish society and Turkish history specifically. Put more clearly, western sociology deemed the West as universal, and therefore, its notions are also universal and valid for all societies while this is just a viewpoint of European sociology as Connell (1997) rejects this theory, too. Consequently, instead of treating European sociology as universal, Turkish sociology has to seek original concepts and theories which are specific for Turkish society because western has used sociology and produced notions by being based on their profiles. Therefore, their social facts cannot be the same with Turkish society, and we can perceive that their viewpoint, regarding Turkish and other the non-western societies, is an orientalist approach. However, these notions and theories are not useful for Turkish society. Consequently, in order to gain a distinctive Turkish sociology, firstly, Turkish sociology must give up understanding western as universal. It has to perceive that Europe is just one civilisation in the world (Egribel and Ozcan, 2005).

Even though, it is not enough to point out the distinctive characteristics of Turkish sociology from western sociology, it is a vital development for Turkish sociology because after that it can start to consider the specific problems of Turkish society instead of trying to experiment western theories, and find out specific solutions for Turkish society. Currently, there are many social problems of Turkish society. Nowadays, the main issues of Turkish society are globalisation, the Kurdish Question and terrorism, urbanisation after the industrialisation, applying to join the European Union, income inequality, and violence against women. At first glance, those problems seem similar to the social problems of all societies in the world. However, the reason why they emerged, their impacts and results on Turkish society are quite different from developed societies while those problems are common for developing countries. Therefore, it can be asserted that although, these all problems are common for many societies in the world, specifically, in each society, their reason, and conditions are different. Hence, Turkish sociology should apply specific concepts and methods for those problems and it can also seek to have relationships with developing countries' sociologies for these social problems. In doing so, Turkish sociology can produce social scientific knowledge by having relationships with other developing countries' sociologies. This may lead them to disyoke from being periphery of the center or Western sociology (Kasapoğlu and at al, 2010). It can be given some examples for this issue. For instance, urbanisation is a general process all over the world. Urbanisation in general,

emerged as a result of industrialisation in the west; however, it occurred in Turkey as the consequences of psychological and political and security reasons, as well as economic reasons. Moreover, the urbanisation in Europe has been slow whilst the urbanisation of Turkey and other developing countries such as, Mexico, Brazil, chilli and other Latin American countries, have been very fast and started after the 20<sup>th</sup> century. As a result of rapid urbanisation in Turkey, unplanned settlements emerged around the big cities, and slums have been built (Ozer and at al., 2007).

Another example is the Kurdish Question and terrorism. Turkey has had the Kurdish question since the foundation of the Republic of Turkey, and has fought against PKK, which is a Kurdish separatist organisation, for about 30 years. This is the biggest challenge of Turkey and Turkish sociologists indeed. Since this is not only a political or militarist problem but a specific social problem of Turkey as well. Therefore, Turkish sociology has to understand and present some solutions for this problem. In order to contribute solutions, Turkish sociology must use a specific method which is special for Turkish society, and create new specific notions and theories. One more example is income and gender inequality. During the progress of globalisation, like many countries, Turkey has encountered many social, economic and political transforms. It is more likely to have impacts on Turkish society. Moreover, as a result of globalisation, the gap of income inequality has risen in Turkey since the 1980s. Furthermore, those problems are very important for other developing countries. Therefore, if Turkish sociology wishes to contribute solutions to those problems, firstly, it has to have relationships with other developing countries' sociologies and then, try to produce social scientific knowledge. Actually, today, "the southern theory" (Connell, 2007) suggests a very significant approach for developing societies' sociologies. Turkish sociology can also think of this theory and start to consider its specific characteristics and produce social knowledge for its social problems by having relationships with other sociologies, as well as western sociology. In doing so, Turkish sociology can face with the social problems.

As a result, after a wide analysis of Turkish sociology, we can see three approaches for Turkish sociology. First of all, Turkish sociology should only admit the superiority of Western sociology without understanding the specific facts of Turkish society as it preferred this approach by the 1960s. Secondly, Turkish sociology should understand western sociology's, methods, concepts and theories as universal, and try to understand and examine the specific facts of Turkish society by using them. Thirdly, Turkish sociology should

understand that Turkish society has specific problems which can only be solved through notions and theories which are special for Turkish society, and Turkish sociology should find out those concepts, theories and methods (Sezer, 1979). Moreover, while Turkish sociology put forward the problems of Turkish society, it has to produce knowledge by using specific methods for social problems. Consequently, Turkish sociology can contribute solutions to Turkish society. Therefore, there are two main tasks of Turkish sociology. Firstly, developing new explanatory theories for Turkish society. Secondly, thinking of the problems of Turkish society in a holistic manner, and interpret correctly through general social theories. If Turkish sociology starts to consider the problems of Turkish society in such a manner, then it could be claimed that it would be possible to talk about a specific Turkish sociology tradition. What is more, Turkish sociology has used the first two approaches so far, but since the last 20-30 years, Turkish sociology has tended to the third approach in order to become a specific sociology tradition, and contribute solutions to Turkish society. For this, it has tried to put forth the distinctiveness of Turkish society from other societies. Especially, if Turkish society consider the “southern theory” (Connell, 2007) in terms of producing social scientific knowledge, it will be useful for Turkish society, thus, it will be possible to refer to a Turkish sociology tradition.

## **Conclusion**

This study has attempted to present the development of Turkish sociology since it was introduced to Turkish society. However, it is not only an analysis of Turkish sociology, as well as presenting as a historical process. So far, many studies have been conducted about Turkish sociology and its development by identifying Turkish sociologists' names, and the development progress of Turkish sociology. On the other hand, this study has tried to analyse Turkish sociology in terms of challenging the social problems of Turkish society, and for those social problems, what kind of solutions can Turkish sociology find out, and how can it deals with those problems. Moreover, this study has been unique in developing an understanding regarding having relationships of Turkish sociology with other sociology traditions which has similar characteristics such as, developing countries' sociologies rather than western-developed countries' sociologies. Initially, one critique of this study has focused on the characteristics of eclectic Turkish sociology. As indicated, Turkish sociology was influenced by western sociology intensively, and all sociological ideas, concepts and theories were copied from the west, and attempted to adopt Turkish sociology to those theories to Turkish society even if they were not explanatory. However, this study presents that Turkish society has distinctive characteristics, and therefore, Turkish sociology must be an independent sociology tradition which can produce social knowledge as well as western sociology. For this, Turkish sociology can benefit from many sociological approaches which are useful for the social issues are studied.

During the study, it has been dealt with the main problems of Turkish sociology such as theoretical conceptual and methodological problems in order to work out these issues, and reach towards distinctive characteristics of Turkish sociology. According to this, if Turkish sociology wishes to be admitted as a specific sociology tradition in Turkey, it has to deal with the problems of Turkey by considering the characteristics of Turkish society instead of attempting to falsify or confirm western theories. Therefore, nowadays, there are some significant social problems of Turkey as mentioned above. If Turkish sociology desires to solve those problems, firstly, Turkish sociology has to deal with producing social scientific knowledge for these problems. As Connell (2007) revealed that developing countries can produce social knowledge, as well as western countries. Furthermore, when it is looked at the characteristics of developing countries, it can be seen that Turkish society is more similar to them than developed countries. For example, urbanisation, income inequality and violence against women have similar social problems of Turkey and those developing countries.

Hence, it can be better for Turkish sociology to develop a sociology understanding with those developing countries by having relationships with them and approach to western critically rather than copying their concepts and theories. Overall, as during the study mentioned that Turkish sociology has to consider the social problems of Turkey by producing specific concepts and theories which are more appropriate for the characteristics of Turkish society. Moreover, in order to be independent, it has to have relationships with other countries' sociologies in terms of being open to new developments regarding sociology. If Turkish sociology fulfils these requirements, it will be possible to declare a Turkish sociology tradition.

## References

**Akpolat, 2003**, Why Running to the West, Why Running from West, Matris Publishers, Istanbul

**Aksin, Sina, 1999**, “*The Nature of the Kemalist Revolution*”, <http://www.unaturkey.org/>

**Alver, Ahmet, 2011**, “*The Ideology of Westernisation and the Failure of the Turkish Intellectual in the March Twelfth Novels*”, the Journal of International Social Research, Volume: 4 Issue: 17

**Berkes, Mediha, 1943**, “*Race and Civilisation*”, the Journal of the Native Country and World (Yurt ve Dünya Dergisi), Vol: 36, Ankara

**Berkes, Niyazi, 1940**, “*Sociology: as a Science of Research*”, the Journal of Political Sciences, Vol: 107

**Berkes, Niyazi, 1941**, “*We and Western Civilisation*”, the Journal of the Native Country and World (Yurt ve Dünya Dergisi), Vol: 9, Ankara

**Berkes, Niyazi, 1941**, “*Coming Thoughts from The West*”, the Journal of Native Country and World (Yurt ve Dünya Dergisi), Vol: 9, Ankara

**Berkes, Niyazi, 1964**, the Development of Secularism in Turkey, Montreal: McGill University Press

**Boran, Behice, 1943**, “*Fluctuations in Sociology*”, the Journal of Human, Vol: 21-22, Istanbul

**Bryman, A., 2012**, Social research Methods, the 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Oxford Publishing, Oxford

**Cağan, Kenan, 2007**, “*Turkish Sociology and Baykan Sezer*”, Journal of social science, Vol. 4, No: 2

**Connell, Raewyn, 2007**, Southern Theory, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK

**Coskun, Ismail, 1991**, in the 75<sup>th</sup> year, Sociology in Turkey, Baglam Publishing, Istanbul

**Doda, Zerihun, 2005**, Introduction to Sociology, Published Lecture Notes, Ethiopia

**Egribel, E., and Ozcan, U., 2005**, “*East-West Conflict in History*”, Sociology Yearbook-Book 12, University Sociological Research Centre Work, Kızılelma Publishing, Istanbul,

**Erdemir, Halil, 2007**, Turkish Political History, Printed in Izmir-Turkey, By Manisa Ofset Publishing

- 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 and Gieben, 1993**, Formations of Modernity: Understanding Modern Societies an Introduction, John Wiley & Son, USA
- Hall, Stuart, 2006**, “*Formations of Modernity*”, Modernity, Edited By, Hall, S., Held, David. Hubert, D., Thompson, K., Blackwell Publishing, Second Edition, UK
- <http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/>, 2012
- <http://www.sosyolojidernegi.org.tr/?s=t%C3%BCrk+sosyolojisi>, 2012
- Irem, Nazim, 2004**, “*Jacobinism– Kemalist Radicalism in the Dilemma of Republicanism*”, Journal of Faculty of Business, Vol. 5, No. 2
- Kaçmazoglu, H., B., 2003**, the History of the Turk Sociology II, Ani Publishing, Ankara
- Kaçmazoglu, B., H., 2010**, the History of Turkish Sociology, Bookstore (kitavevi) Publishers, Istanbul
- Kaçmazoglu, H., B., 2010**, Researches on the History of Turkish Sociology, Kitavevi publications, Istanbul
- Kadiođlu, A. 1996**, “*The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of Official Identity.*” Middle Eastern Studies, 32
- Kasapođlu, A., 1991**, Problems of Sociology in Turkey, Journal of National Culture, 20,
- Kasapođlu, A., and at al., 2010**, “*The Center-Periphery Relationship between Turkish and Western Sociologies*”, Facing an Unequal World, Challenges for a Global sociology, Edited by: Michael Burawoy Vol: 2, p: 97-118
- Kıray, M., B., 1964**, Eređli: a Coastal Town before the Heavy Industry, Istanbul Connection Publishers, Istanbul
- Kızılçelik, S., 2001**, Globalisation and Social Sciences, Ani Publisher, Izmir
- Kongar, Emre, 1988**, Turkish Sociologists, Remzi Bookstore Vol. 1, Istanbul
- Kuhn, T., 1962**, the Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Publ. University of Chicago Press
- Larry J. Ray, 1999**, Theorizing Classical Sociology, Open University Press Buckingham · Philadelphia

**Lerner, D., 1964**, *the Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*, Toronto

**Lewis, B., 1970**, *the Birth of Modern Turkey*, Turkish Historical Society, Printing House, Ankara.

**Lipovsky, I. P., 1992**, *the Socialist Movement in Turkey 1960-1980*, Brill Academic Publishers

**Macionis, J. P., 1997**, *Sociology a Global Introduction*, Prentice Hall Publishers, London

**McClelland, David, C., 1961**, *Achieving Society*, the Macmillan Company Publishing, Ontario

**Mahoney, J., 2003**, “*Sociology Accumulation in Comparative Historical Research: The Case of Democracy and Authoritarianism*”, *Comparative Historical Analysis in Social Sciences*, Edited by L. Mahoney, Cambridge Univ. Press, p; 135

**Mardin, Serif, 1962 (2000)**, *Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse.

**Mardin, Serif, 1973**, “*A Key which Can Explain Turkish Politics: Centre-Periphery relationships*”, *Daedalus*, Kis, s.169-190.

**Mardin, Serif, 1983**, *the Politics Ideas of the Young Turks 1895-1908*, 2nd edition, Istanbul

**Marx, Karl, (1848) 1985**, *the Communist manifesto*, Penguin publishing, London

**May, Tim, 2001**, *Social Research Issues, Methods and Process*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Open University Press, Buckingham, Philadelphia

**Ozer and at al., 2007**, “*Unplanned Settlements within the context of Urbanization Process of Turkey*”, *Urban Development FIG Commission 3*, Athens, Greece

**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, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, Singapore

**Šafařová, K., 2010**, “*Turkey as a Candidate Country on the Way to Join the European Union*”, <http://projekter.aau.dk/projekter/files/33697829>

**Sahin, 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>

**Sencer, M., 1969**, the Structure of the Ottoman Society, 2<sup>nd</sup> edit. (1999), Vow Publishing, Istanbul

**Sener, Sefer, 2005**, “*Second Period Liberal Economic Policies in Turkey*”, Journal of Administration Sciences, Vol:3

**Sezer, Baykan, 1971**, the Sociological Characteristics Features of Settled and Nomadic Societies in the East, Sumer Bookstore Publishing, Istanbul

**Sezer, Baykan, 1979**, the Main Questions of Turkish Sociology, Sumer Bookstore Publishing, Istanbul

**Sezer, Baykan, 1993**, the Methodological Arguments in Sociology, Sumer Bookstore Publishing, Istanbul

**Sezer, 2011**, the Main Topics of Sociology, the Books of Baykan Sezer 1, Edited by Ertan Eğribel and Ufuk Ozcan, Sumer Bookstore Publishing, Istanbul

Swingewood, Alan, 2000, **a Short History of Sociological Thought, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition**, Palgrave MacMillan Publishers, London

**The 1<sup>st</sup> national sociology conference, 1994**, “*Sociological developments in Turkey and the World*”, the Association of Sociology Journal, Ankara

**TUNA, Korkut, 1991**, “*the Relationships of Turkish sociology with Western Sociology and its Results*”, Sociology in Turkey in the 75<sup>th</sup> year, Baglam Publications, Istanbul

**Ulken, Hilmi Ziya, 1992**, the History of Modern Thought in Turkey, Ulken Publishing, Istanbul

**Yasa, Ibrahim, 1968**, “*the Impacts of Internal Migrations to the Relationships of Business in Big Cities*”, AÜEF Journal, Vol.; 1, No: 1-4, Ankara

**Yılmaz, Ensar, 2010**, “*Ziya Gökalp’s Political Sociology*”, International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology Vol. 2(3), pp. 029-033,

**Zürcher, E., Z., 2005**, Turkey: A modern History, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Palgrave Macmillan, a division of St Martin Press, Canada,

