

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TURKISH SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

PAUL J. MAGNARELLA
Prof. Dr. ORHAN TÜRKDOĞAN

by PAUL J. MAGNARELLA and ORHAN TÜRKDOĞAN
Department of Anthropology, University of Vermont, Burlington,
Vt. 05401, U.S.A.; İşletme Fakültesi, Atatürk University, Erzurum,
Turkey. 20 VII 75

This report traces the development of social anthropology in Turkey from its intellectual foundations to about 1972-73. The report has a number of limitations which we would like to point out at the start.

1. It deals almost exclusively with "Turkish social anthropology"; that is, it mainly covers studies conducted in Turkey by Turkish social scientists who have examined social, economic, political, educational, and/or religious institutions and the socio-cultural values, norms, and roles which structure the relations of participants in these institutions. In preparing the report, we have been particularly interested in the work of social scientists who have resided in their research sites for an extended period and have employed the characteristic anthropological research technique of participant observation. We have treated any studies conforming to the above topical and research criteria as "social anthropological" studies, even though their authors may describe themselves by other labels, such as sociologists or rural sociologists.

2. Our treatment of the subject is neither bibliographical nor fully biographical. We only highlight the important works and persons marking the various stages of development of social anthropology in Turkey. A thorough treatment of the topic would have required a book rather than a short report. Excellent bibliographies by Beeley (1969) and Tezcan (1969) are available, but unfortunately biographical accounts of many important Turkish social scientists do not exist. We hope that some of Turkey's many promising young scholars will soon undertake the task of providing them.

3. Except in rare cases, we have not included foreign research in our discussion. Readers wishing information on foreign social research in Turkey are referred to Kolars (1962) and Weiker (1969).

4. Our information is often uneven. For instance, we give much more information on some authors than on others. This can largely be attributed to differential response or lack of response by Turkish scholars to our requests for information.

HISTORICAL AND INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND

Social science in Turkey developed largely in response to social, economic, and political problems in the late Ottoman and early Turkish Republican periods.¹ At the end of the 18th and the beginning of 19th century, Ottoman intellectuals were debating the causes of their Empire's decline and possible remedies for it. They wondered why the deterioration of conditions in the Islamic East coincided with advances in the Christian West. While conservatives or "Pan-Islamists" preached an Islamic revitalization as the solution, "Westernists" advocated the adoption of successful European social, legal, educational, and governmental institutions.

The military represented an important channel for cultural transmission from West to East. As a consequence of Turkey's adverse contacts with modern Europe's military might, most Ottoman leaders agreed that the Empire's decline was at least partly attributable to their own armies' antiquated tactics and equipment. Hence, they established new schools in which Western military subjects, along with the modern mathematical and physical sciences, were taught. For example, in 1828 a new medical school with European instructors was opened in Istanbul to train doctors for the "new" Ottoman army. Physicians for the civilian population still studied the syllabus based on the writings of Galen and Avicenna (Lewis 1961: 82 - 83).

Diplomatic contacts with Europe represented another important channel of Western influence into the Empire. Mustafa Reşit Pasha (1800-58), considered by many the real architect of the 19th-century Ottoman reforms, was sent to Paris as Ambassador in 1834. He mastered French and exchanged ideas with such important French intellectuals as the Orientalist Silvestre de Sacy and the social philosop-

1 The best English-language sources for these periods are Ahmad (1969), Berkes (1964), Davison (1963), Lewis (1961), Mardin (1962), and Ramsaur (1957).
Vol. 17, No. 2, June 1976

her Auguste Comte. His communications with Comte concerning methods of improving Ottoman government and society may very well represent the first direct contact of an Ottoman leader with Western sociological thought. After Paris, Reşit was sent to London, where he was favorably impressed by the British political system. The reforms he largely initiated and designed, collectively known as the **Tanzimat**, "the reorganization", contained such principles as the following (Lewis 1961 : 105) : the security of life, honour, and property of the subject, the abolition of tax-farming and all the abuses associated with it, regular and orderly recruitment into the armed forces, fair and public trial of persons accused of crimes, and equality of persons of all religions in the application of these laws. It was this last that represented the most radical breach with ancient Islamic tradition, and was therefore most shocking to Muslim principles and good taste.

Favorable European contact intensified during the Crimean War (1853-56), in which France, England, and Sardinia joined forces with the Ottomans against Russia. Large numbers of English, French, and Italian officials, merchants, journalists, soldiers, and travelers were present in Istanbul and other parts of the Empire disseminating European ideas and money. For many wealthy Ottoman families, a European education for their sons became the fashion; students went to Paris, Geneva, London, and other university centers to become exposed to Western culture and political thought.

During the period following the **Tanzimat**, a new Turkish literature developed, differing in form and content from classical Ottoman writings. This literary movement, which accelerated the spread of Western social and political thought in Turkey, was pioneered largely by three men : Ibrahim Şinasi (1828-71), Ziya Pasha (1825-80), and Namik Kemal (1840-88).

Ibrahim Şinasi, the son of an artillery officer, learned French as a boy from a French renegade in the Ottoman service. Later, thanks to Mustafa Reşit Pasha, he joined a Turkish student mission in Paris, where he reportedly took part in the revolution of 1848 and became acquainted with the poet-statesman Lamartine, whose writings greatly influenced him. After five years abroad, he returned to Turkey and was appointed to the Ministry of Public Instruction. He resigned, however, in 1859 and began to publish his own journal, through which he hoped to assimilate Turkish intellectual life to that of the West (Lewis 1961 : 133-34).

Ziya Pasha also studied French as a boy, and with the help of Mustafa Reşit Pasha he was appointed third secretary to the Sultan. Later he fell out of favor with the Ottoman rulers and fled to Europe, living successively in Paris, London, and Geneva. He translated Rousseau's *Emile* into Turkish and wrote vigorous criticisms of the Ottoman regime. In his book *The Dream*, written in London in 1869, he argued for the reorganization of the Ottoman Empire on the basis of French and English governmental principles (Emin 1934).

Namik Kemal, the youngest and most famous of these three innovators, was born to an aristocratic family and educated by private tutors. At seventeen he secured a position in the Translation Office of the Sublime Porte-Turkey's open window to the West. He came under the influence of Şinasi and collaborated with him on his critical essays on Ottoman affairs set the authorities against him, and he fled to Europe with Ziya in 1867. For the next three years he lived in London, Paris, and Vienna, where he translated a number of French works into Turkish while studying law and economics. He returned to Turkey to continue his political writings, only to be exiled by Sultan Abdulaziz. In a long series of plays, novels, essays, and poems, Kemal attempted to reconcile two basic ideas of the French revolution—freedom and fatherland—with Muslim traditions. He had been deeply impressed by the French and English parliamentary systems, and his political thought was heavily influenced by Rousseau and Montesquieu, whose *Esprit des Lois* he began publishing in translation in 1863 (Lewis 1961 : 137-43).

Although these and other Western thinkers in the Ottoman Empire were persecuted and often exiled by the authorities, their writings and activities contributed to the creation of a group of intellectuals known as the Young Turks, who believed that the Ottoman Empire could be saved only by the adoption of Western political and social institutions. The Young Turks entered into a political struggle with the Ottoman Sultan Abdulhamid, their primary objective being the restoration of constitutional rule and of the Parliament which had been suspended and prorogued since 1878. (They achieved this goal in 1908).

As the Westernists attempted to formulate a Europeanization process for the Empire, they came to realize the difficulty of superimposing Western institutions on an incompatible cultural base. Hence, they tried to systematize their thinking by studying the foundations of Western civilization and the evolution of Turkish culture (Berkes 1936 : 241).

One of the Young Turks who tried to utilize Western social scientific ideas in his conceptualization of a reformed Ottoman Empire was Ahmet Rıza (1859-1930). Son of an Austrian mother and an Anglophile Turkish father, Rıza studied in France and learned French fluently. Initially he tried to reform the Empire by working within the system, first in the Ministry of Agriculture, then in the Ministry of Education. However, he resigned from government service in disgust and went to Paris in 1889, where he joined a colony of Young Turks. There he met Pierre Lafitte a disciple of Comte, who instructed him in the positivist philosophy that was to dominate his thinking. Rıza became a familiar figure in Parisian positivist circles as well as an occasional contributor to the **Revue Occidentale**, the French positivist journal. Comte's concepts of "order" and "progress" were the keystones of Rıza's political writings, which he published in the Young Turk fortnightly journal **Meşveret** (Consultation). Although he did not produce any systematic sociological treatises, he was responsible for spreading Comte's philosophy to Turkey, where it subsequently influenced many Turkish sociologists (Berkes 1936 : 241).

Prince Sabahaddin (1877-1948), son of Sultan Abdulhamid's sister, escaped to France with his father and younger brother in 1899 to avoid political persecution. While there he met Edmond Demolins, a disciple of Frédéric Le Play, and adopted the Le Play school of social thought, a rival of the Comte school being expounded by Rıza, Sabahaddin founded a society of Young Turks in exile called **Ligue de décentralisation administrative et d'initiative privée** and published the paper **Terakki** (Progress) as its organ. He shared Le Play's great admiration for the English system of local self-government especially as expounded by Demolins in his 1897 work **A qui tient la supériorité des anglo-saxons**.

Sabahaddin was probably the first Ottoman to offer a complete social diagnosis of the underlying causes of Ottoman deterioration. He saw the Sultan's tyranny as the product of a particular sociocultural system, which had to be changed to reform the Empire. Following Demolins, he argued that societies were based on either **formation communautaire** or **formation particulariste**. The first category is typified by Eastern societies, among them the Ottoman, in which there is a tendency for people to rely on the community, family, tribe, clan, or public powers. In societies of the second category, there is a tendency for individuals to rely on the self. England was seen as the best example of this type (Berkes 1964 : (310-12). Following the reasoning of Le Play, Sabahaddin (1965) ar-

gued that Western individualism, private ownership, and governmental decentralization were responsible for the success of modern European states, and he advocated Westernization of this kind for Turkey. Sabahaddin and his disciple Mehmet Şevki (1968) popularized the ideas of Le Play in Turkey.

The major theoretical and methodological contributions Le Play was to make to Turkish social anthropology were his emphasis on the family as the basic unit of society and the use of the case-study method and the analysis of family budgets. Le Play maintained that each family functions primarily to earn subsistence for its members through work. The family's geographical location strongly influences the nature of its work and the character of its subsistence. This "place-work-family" triad became the focus of a number of social anthropological studies in Turkey, among the village studies of Salahaddin Demirkan (1941a, b).

Probably the most important personality in the development of both sociology and social anthropology in Turkey is Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924). The son of a government employee, he grew up in the rather remote Southeast Anatolian city of Diyarbakır. He studied French in lycée and became familiar with the writing of Namık Kemal, Ziya Pasha, and others in the modernist movement. In 1908 he joined a group of Young Turks in Salonika and discussed ways of modernizing Turkey. He became familiar with the major schools of 19th-century European sociology and found Emile Durkheim's concepts, theories, and methods most applicable to the Turkish situation.

Like Sabahaddin, Gökalp believed that political change in Turkey had to be accompanied by general sociocultural change to have any meaning. Hence, he employed Durkheimian sociology in a systematic investigation of Turkey's social and cultural problems. His prolific writings in Turkish journals addressed the question of how the Turks should integrate Western civilization with their Turkish and Islamic legacies. Among Gökalp's major contributions was his distinction between "civilization" and "culture." For him, "civilization" represented the shared creativity of many different peoples; it consisted primarily of mankind's intellectual and scientific achievements. By contrast, "culture" was comprised of one nation's unique sociocultural values, originality, subjective views, and expressions. To reform society, Gökalp contended, one must first understand and appreciate its unique culture and then adapt to it those aspects of international civilization that will induce harmonious change. His

sociocultural philosophy offered a solution to the controversy reigning in Turkey between the Pan-Islamists and Westernists. Unlike the members of these two camps, Gökalp argued that Turkification, Islamization, and modernization could be harmoniously combined to achieve national development (Emin 1931; Gökalp 1959, 1968; Heyd 1950).

Gökalp has been called the intellectual father of the Turkish Revolution (Webster 1939 : 138). The first Turkish Chair of Sociology was established for him at Istanbul University in 1915. He founded a research institute of sociocultural studies and started a short-lived journal of sociology (**İctimaiyat Mecmuası**) in 1917. Under his influence, many important works by Durkheim, Lévy-Bruhl, Fauconnet, and Mauss were translated into Turkish. Gökalp also encouraged the introduction of sociology into the normal schools. In 1924 this was achieved by copying the program the French Ministry of Education had prepared for the French normal schools. The first sociology textbook was a translation of the French textbook by Hess and Gleyze. In 1927 two of Gökalp's former students-Mehmet İzzet and Ali Kami-prepared Turkish textbooks, which were also based on French models. Hence, pre-World War II sociology in Turkey was dominated by the influence of Gökalp and Durkheim (Berkes 1936).

A common feature of all the various schools of social thought developed during the late Ottoman and early Republican periods was "their tendency to treat sociology as a kind of philosophy, even of religion, and as a source of quasi-revealed authority on moral, social, political, and even religious problems" (Lewis 1961 : 227).

The Young Turks dedicated themselves to the credo of Ottomanism-the establishment of a modernized Ottoman Empire with liberal institutions in which peoples of all races and religions could feel a common identity and enjoy common citizenship. However, the development of Arab nationalism and the Balkan Wars of the early 1900s, in which the Albanians and Slavs won their independence from the Ottoman Empire, combined to render Ottomanism impractical.

Towards the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, Pan-Turkism, a new political ideology proposing the union of all Turkic peoples in Asia in one nation-state, emerged and received impetus from various sources : the example of European nationalism; the development of Turcology-the study of Turkic language, history, and culture-in Turkey and Europe; and the immigration to Turkey of

educated "Russian Turks" (Muslim Tatars and Turks from the Volga, Central Asia, the Crimea, and Azerbaijan), who were familiar with Russian Pan-Slavism.

One of the first organized expressions of this new ideology was the establishment of the Turkish Society (**Türk Derneği**) in Istanbul in 1908, with the objectives of studying "the ancient remains, history, languages, literatures, ethnography and ethnology, social conditions and present civilizations of the Turks, and the ancient and modern geography of the Turkish lands" (Lewis 1961 : 343). In 1912 Ziya Gökalp joined the editorial board of the society's organ, **Türk Yurdu** (Turkish Homeland), and became the chief theoretician of the Turkist movement. Many cultural and political articles on Turkism were published under his direction.

Associated with **Türk Yurdu** was a club called **Türk Ocağı** (Turkish Hearth), established in 1912 in Istanbul and expanded to other cities, with the stated aim of advancing the social, scientific, and economic levels of the Turks and striving for the betterment of the Turkish race and language (Lewis 1961 : 344). By 1930, there were 255 branches of this club in Turkey (Karpat 1963 : 56).

The defeat of the Ottoman Empire in World War I and the subsequent establishment of the Turkish Republic under the dynamic leadership of Kemal Atatürk combined to eliminate Pan-Islamism, Ottomanism, and Pan-Turkism as viable ideologies. Atatürk wanted to transform Turkey into a modern Western nation-state. His foreign policy was based on the rejection of all expansionist dreams. Atatürk's task was to inculcate in the people the idea of the territorial state of Turkey, the fatherland of a nation called Turks, divorced of religious and dynastic loyalties.

The theory propounded by Kemal and his disciples was, briefly, that the Turks were a white, Aryan people, originating in Central Asia, the cradle of all human civilization. Owing to the progressive desiccation of this area, the Turks had migrated in waves to various parts of Asia and Africa, carrying the arts of civilization with them. Chinese, Indian, and Middle Eastern civilization had all been founded in this way, the pioneers in the last named being the Sumerians and Hittites, who were both Turkic peoples. Anatolia had thus been a Turkish land since antiquity. This mixture of truth, half-truth, and error was proclaimed as official doctrine, and teams of researchers set to work to "prove" its various propositions. [Lewis 1961 : 353]

Anatolia was to become the cradle of the new Turkish nationalism. Archaeology, anthropology and history were to be extensively utilized to prove the continuity of Anatolian culture through the Turkish period, as well as its relation to the West, of which Turkey was striving to become a part. [Karpat 1963 : 56]

Because Pan-Turkism-the ideological foundation of the **Türk Ocağı**-conflicted with his own national ideology, Atatürk had the club disbanded and replaced by new educational-cultural institutions called People's Houses (**Halk Evleri**), which were under the control of his own Republic People's Party. From 1932, the date of their establishment, until 1950, the date of their demise, the number of their establishment, until 1950, the date of their demise, the number of People's Houses expanded steadily to 478, distributed among cities, towns, and villages throughout Turkey. "Their purpose was to bridge the gap between the intelligentsia and people by teaching the first of these the national culture which lay among the Anatolian masses and, the second, the rudiments of civilization, and an indoctrination of the nationalist secular ideas of the Republic regime" (Karpat 1963 : 55).

In order to teach the intelligentsia the culture of the common folk, the People's Houses encouraged and financed the publication of numerous linguistic, ethnographic, and folkloric studies in many of the provincial capitals throughout the 1930s and 1940s. Although these works are of uneven quality, some of them are outstanding. Among the important ethnographic contributions are those of Hamit Zübeyr Koşay (1944), Abdülkadir Inan (1968), and Mehmet Halit Bayri (1939, 1947).

As part of this general nationalistic policy, the Institute of Turcology was established at the University of Istanbul in 1924. Its publication, **Türkiyat Mecmuası**, (Journal of Turcology) contained many historical, philological, and folkloric articles.

THE DEVELOPMENTAL PERIOD

Social anthropology in Turkey initially developed within this atmosphere of nationalistic purpose. The Anthropology Institute (**Antropoloji Enstitüsü**), also known as the Center for Anthropological Research in Turkey (**Türkiye Antropoloji Tetkikat Merkezi**), was established in 1925 in the Faculty of Medicine of Istanbul University. Most of its research dealt with physical anthropological topics,

though it did publish some folkloric studies by George Dumezil (1928), who was Professor of the History of Religions at Istanbul from 1925 to 1931, and a socio-statistical study of suicide in Istanbul by Max Bonnafous (1928), who taught sociology at Istanbul University at about the same time. The first real social anthropological work to emanate from the Institute was Kemal Güngör's **Ethno-anthropological Study of the South Anatolian Yuruks** (1940-41).

Şevket Aziz Kansu (b. 1909) qualifies as the first professional Turkish anthropologist. In 1927, as an Assistant in the Faculty of Medicine of Istanbul University, he was sent to France to study at the *École d'Anthropologie de Paris* and under Georges Papillaut of the *Laboratoire d'Anthropologie, École Pratique des Hautes Études*. In 1929 Kansu successfully defended his thesis, "*L'Étude morphologique des crânes néocaledoniens et des nègres africains*," and received "*le diplôme des sciences anthropologiques*" (Kansu 1940 : 37). He returned to Turkey in the same year to teach physical anthropology in Istanbul University's Medical Faculty and to edit the Anthropology Institute's **Revue Turque d'Anthropologie**. In 1933, President Atatürk invited Kansu to Ankara to direct an archaeological excavation. In 1935, Kansu was instrumental in having the Anthropology Institute moved from Istanbul to the newly established Faculty of Language, Literature, and Geography in Ankara, where he began teaching physical anthropology, ethnology, and prehistory. Although he produced numerous textbooks, Kansu is best known for his research on prehistory and physical anthropology in Turkey. He became Chairman and Professor Ordinarius of the Department of Anthropology and Ethnology, and in 1946 he was named the first President (**Recteur**) of Ankara University (Kansu 1946, 1955).

The Institute's primary objective was to contribute to the development of the Kemalist thesis of history to research the cultural origins, historical development, and physical characteristics of the Turkish people. For example, in 1937, by the order of Atatürk, anthropology professors, students, doctors, and health officials throughout Turkey participated in the cephalic measurement of 64,000 Turkish men and women, completing the task in only four months (Kansu 1940 : 20-23).

As part of his plan to Westernize Turkey, Atatürk reorganized Istanbul University in 1933 and established several faculties in Ankara during the 1930s. Lacking a large indigenous elite to fill all the faculty positions created, he capitalized on Turkey's long-standing relationship with Germany and readily accepted more than 100 Ger-

man professors who had found Hitler's policies intolerable. Among those who went to Ankara in the 1930s were composer Paul Hindemith, who helped reorganize Turkish musical education; opera director Carl Ebert, who founded and directed Turkey's State Conservatory of Music and Performing Arts; Hittitologist Hans Güterbock (now at the University of Chicago); and Sinologist-sociologist Wolfram Eberhard (now at the University of California, Berkeley) (Fermi 1971 : 67-70, 352-53). Eberhard was invited to Ankara University in 1937 to teach Classical Chinese language and history because the Turks hoped to be able to reconstruct their earliest history from Chinese sources. During his 11 years there, he trained many Turkish scholars in Chinese as well as in folklore. One of his students, Bahaddin Ögel, published an impressive work on the history of pre-Islamic Turkish culture (1962).

Turkish social anthropological research developed significantly from 1940 to 1960. The full-length village studies, based on fieldwork, produced during this period have strongly influenced both the course of social anthropology in Turkey and foreign understanding of Turkish rural life. In our estimation, five scholars especially stand out.

The first is Niyazi Berkes, who studied sociology at the universities of Istanbul and Ankara and in 1935 went to the University of Chicago on a research fellowship in sociology. He contributed a series of articles on American sociology (Berkes 1938-40) to the Turkish journal *Ülkü* (Ideal) and returned to Turkey in 1939 to become Assistant Professor (**Doçent**) of Sociology at Ankara University. In 1940 he began field research in a group of villages near Ankara, investigating such topics as population, economic life, work organization, material culture, kinship, and social organization (Berkes 1942). In 1952 he went to Canada's McGill University, where he rose to the rank of Professor in the Institute of Islamic Studies. His most noted publication is **The Development of Secularism in Turkey** (1964).

The second scholar, Behice Boran, studied sociology at Columbia University and held the rank of Assistant Professor of Sociology in the Philosophy Branch of Ankara University's Faculty of Language, History, and Geography. In her major work (Boran 1945) she investigates the comparative interrelationships between social structure and ecology in a group of mountain and lowland villages near Manisa in western Turkey. In her opening chapter she discusses a series of structural concepts, such as "social institution," "integration," and "differentiation." She also stresses the importance of field methodology, which she criticizes Durkheimian sociology (then do-

minant in Turkey) for belittling. In succeeding chapters she organizes her research materials under the headings of demography, economics, social stratification, external relations, family, and urbanization. Boran became a political activist and left the University in 1946. Eventually she became chairman of the Turkish Labor Party, a Marxist organization which was banned by the military in 1972 but was reorganized with Boran as chairman in 1975.

The period's most thorough study was conducted by the sociologist İbrahim Yasa in the village of Hasanoğlan near Ankara. Yasa was born in 1917 in Bergama; he received his B.A. (1933) and M.A. (1937) in sociology from the University of Missouri and his Ph. D. (1941) in sociology from Cornell University. In 1942 he was appointed Instructor of Sociology at the Village Institute near Hasanoğlan, and in 1944 he and his students began to study social, cultural, and economic life in that village, focusing attention on change over the preceding 30 years, during which "the propinquity of the railway saved the village from economic and social isolation and changed from a closed to an open village" (Yasa 1957 : iii). The pages of his detailed study (published in Turkish in 1955 and in English in 1957) reveal the intimate knowledge he acquired of village life during his several years' residence in the community. He divides his monograph into the following sections : research methods, village history and natural environment, travel and communications, demography, economics, kinship, education administration, religion, and social change.

In the introduction to the English edition of this work A.T.J. Matthews, who was then associated with the Polish Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East wrote (pp. v-vi) :

From the time of Ziya Gökalp the first prominent Turkish sociologist until very recently, the discipline has tended to follow the French school. Consequently, its orientation has been dominantly philosophical rather than scientific; it has been more interested in questions concerning what should be the ideal Turkish society than in what Turkish society actually was. Unfortunately for the discipline, some of the Turkish scholars gave considerable attention to securing and interpreting data for the purpose of justifying their own personal ideological beliefs, and as a result they came into conflict with political leaders. Thus, the particular orientation of the discipline and its consequences in action tended in the end to retard acceptance of sociological studies. It is important to note that this monograph is representative of the new scientific orientation which is emerging in Turkish sociology.

In 1949 Yasa became Assistant Professor of Sociology at Istanbul University, and in the summer of 1950 he conducted field research in the village of Sindel, in western Turkey. He was especially interested in the influence that urban contact had had on the community's social organization, economics, religious beliefs, and family structure (Yasa 1960). Both of these works, but especially the Hasanoğlan study, have become models for subsequent village research in Turkey. In 1959 Yasa moved to Ankara University, where he occupies the Chair of Sociology in the Faculty of Political Sciences.

The fourth scholar of this period, Nermin Erdentuğ, was born in Malta in 1919. She studied in Ankara University's Anthropology Institute, receiving her Licence in 1940 and completing her doctorate in 1942. She was successively promoted to the positions of Assistant (1940), Assistant Professor (1944), and Professor (1959) in the Institute. Her field studies in the villages of Hal (Erdentuğ 1956) and Sün (Erdentuğ 1959) represent the first book-length ethnographies of isolated rural communities in Turkey's underdeveloped eastern hinterland. In both studies she organizes her materials under the headings of economic life, social life, religious life, and life-cycle rituals. (A number of interesting shorter village studies were also published during this period, many of them appearing in *Sosyoloji Dergisi* [Sociology Journal], edited by Hilmi Ziya Ülken.)

The last of the five outstanding social scientists selected from this period is Mümtaz Turhan (1908-69). Turhan was born in the eastern Anatolian city of Erzurum, where his father was employed as a government official. He received his elementary-school education in Kayseri and his lycée education in Bursa and Ankara. Thereafter he studied at the universities of Berlin and Frankfurt, receiving a doctorate in psychology from the Psychology in Istanbul University's Faculty of Letters in 1935 and was promoted to Assistant Professor in 1939 (Gülensoy 1969 : 244). Shortly thereafter he traveled to England to study under Sir Frederic C. Bartlett, Professor of experimental Psychology, and to earn a second doctorate from Cambridge University in 1944. He then resumed his position at Istanbul University and in 1952 was selected to head the Chair of Psychology there.

Through his teaching, research, and writing, Turhan has contributed importantly to the development of psychological anthropology in Turkey. Like Gökalp, whom he succeeded as intellectual leader of Turkey's social scientific community, Turhan was vitally concerned with Turkey's acculturation to the West. He wrote prolifically

on village development and educational reform. In his first and most important social scientific work **Kültür Değişmeleri : Sosyal Psikoloji bakımından bir Tetkik** (Culture Change : A Social Psychological Investigation) (1951)-he reviewed the various anthropological theories of culture offered by Rivers, Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, Wissler, Redfield, Linton, Lowie, Kroeber, and others. He then examined cultural and attitudinal change in five eastern Anatolian villages where he had personally conducted fieldwork. This was followed by a discussion of psychocultural change during the last centuries of the Ottoman Empire. Throughout his analysis, he drew heavily on the theories and concepts of Western social scientists, especially those of his mentor Bartlett (1923, 1946). Following Bartlett, Turhan analyzed culture in terms of "hard" and "soft" features (cf. Bartlett 1946), the former consisting of those elements which give each culture its uniqueness.

In a 1957 article entitled "Some Thoughts on Village Research Methods," Turhan stressed the importance of understanding the villagers' attitudes towards the outside and their general mental frame of reference. Throughout his writings he argued, as did Gökalp, that harmonious Westernization in Turkey requires an understanding of both cultures (Turkish and European) and a deep appreciation for the values and attitudes of the recipient peoples. As an expression of these views, he drew the following analogy (Turhan 1950 : 67-68) :

An important condition for the success of an imposed change is that those who direct and control the change should be like a good translator. Just as a good translation needs somebody well versed in both languages involved, so it is incumbent upon those controlling an directing cultural change to be familiar with each of the two cultures and at least to be able to foresee and understand the implications of the social and psychological phenomena which will occur during the changes.

From the above it is apparent that professional social anthropological research in Turkey was initially conducted mainly by Turkish sociologists (e.g., Berkes, Boran, Yasa) who had received advanced training in the United States. By the 1950s, however, anthropology at Ankara University had achieved strong academic status. As the Turkish anthropologist Şenyürek (1953 : 79) wrote at that time :

In Turkey, there is a well-organized and extensive Department of Anthropology in the University of Ankara. The Department of Anthropology and Ethnology is a part of the Faculty of Language, History

and Geography, founded in 1936, which is one of the eight faculties of the University of Ankara, established in 1946. In the Department of Anthropology and Ethnology a total of forty-two courses are given in physical anthropology, prehistory (Paleolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic periods), human paleontology, ethnography, ethnology, social anthropology, and the history of the various branches of anthropology and ethnology. The Department, which gives both the Licence and Doctor of Literature degrees in anthropology and ethnology, has at present two professors, two docents (assistant professors) and three assistants in its cadre. Since 1940 this Department has given twenty-eight Licence degrees and five Doctor of Literature degrees in anthropology and ethnology. At present (1952), the Department has fourteen students enrolled of whom six are from other departments of the Faculty, mostly from the Department of Geography, taking a certificate in the Department of Anthropology and Ethnology. The Department of Anthropology and Ethnology has a well-equipped laboratory of physical anthropology, an independent library and a museum with exhibits on prehistory, physical anthropology and ethnology.

During this period a series of Turkish novels about village life contributed to the creation of a broad popular interest in peasant conditions that paralleled the development of the social sciences. Most of the novelists were progressive thinkers who regarded villagers as the ignored and exploited segment of Turkish society. Among them were Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu (1899-1974), whose *Yaban* (Stranger) is regarded as the first village novel of the Turkish Republican period; Sabahattin Ali (1907-48); Kemal Tahir (b. 1910); Orhan Kemal (1914-71); and Mahmut Makal (b. 1931), whose *Bizim Köy* (Our Village) created a literary and political explosion. (Rathbun 1972 and Stone 1973 offer excellent discussions in English of this literary development.)

The international legal and social scientific community also had a special interest in Turkey, because of its unique status as an Islamic country whose leaders had voluntarily embarked on a vigorous program of Westernization. For instance, during the 1950s an international group of lawyers and social scientists, including Turks-Timur, Fındıkoğlu, Velidedeoğlu, Belgesay, and Postacioğlu-gathered to assess the reception of Swiss family law in Turkey (for a report on this conference, see *International Social Science Bulletin* 1957; for a more recent assessment, see Magnarella 1973).

Lewis has described Turkish scholarship during this developmental period as follows (1961 : 432) :

With encouragement and support from successive governments, Turkish universities and learned societies have sponsored a truly impressive output of research and publication, notably in history, archaeology, language and literature, the general aim of which is to recover and illuminate the Turkish past. Great progress has also been made in the social sciences. Not all the work is of equal value, and some, notably in the 1930's, was directed to political rather than scholarly ends. Turkish scholars have, however, shown a growing regard for the standards and an increasing familiarity with the methods of critical scholarship, and in so doing have acquired a significance that is more than purely local.

THE RECENT PERIOD

During the 1960s and early 1970s, both the amount of social scientific activity and the number of research directions increased greatly. Hence, our discussion must again limit itself to the highlights. Among the trends characterizing this period are (1) greater use of quantitative techniques of data collection (surveys, questionnaires, censuses) by both social anthropologists and sociologists; (2) greater application of social scientific studies to Turkey's social problems; (3) the beginning of the social scientific study of urban life; (4) the development of social anthropology and sociology in centers other than Ankara and Istanbul; (5) a renewed interest in the systematic study of Turkish folklore; and (6) increased activity on the part of government agencies specifically established to deal with rural and urban social problems.

One of the most noted scholars of this period is the sociologist-anthropologist Mübeccel Kiray. Born in Izmir in 1923, she completed her undergraduate and graduate studies at Ankara University, receiving her doctorate in sociology in 1944. Subsequently, she studied cultural anthropology at North-western University, receiving a Ph.D. in 1950. She returned to Turkey to teach at Middle East Technical University, Ankara, where she was promoted to the ranks of Assistant Professor in 1960 and Professor in 1965. She recently headed the Social Sciences Division at that university.

Kiray conducted one of the first important studies of this period on Ereğli, a Black Sea coastal town just west of Zonguldak (Kiray

1964; for an English-language discussion of this work, see Magnarella 1970). The study is important for two reasons. First, it focused on a small town which had been scheduled to become an industrial center. A systematic study of the town's preindustrial character could later be compared with the results of a postindustrial restudy. Second, it relied heavily on quantitative data collected by administering a lengthy interview schedule to a large, systematic sample of townsmen. Subjects dealt with include demography, socioeconomic life, standards of living, family structure, education, recreation, communication, religion, world view, and town-village ties. The study stimulated interest in urban social research and in the collection of quantitative data. Like Yasa's village studies, Kiray's was an important model for subsequent research.

In 1966 Ibrahim Yasa published his research on the social and economic life of families living in Ankara's **gecekondu** or shantytown district (Yasa 1966a). The research, which was sponsored by the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, relied primarily on data gathered by a comprehensive interview schedule administered to a sample of 1916 households. Other research in the city of Ankara is being conducted by members of Ankara University's Institute of Urban Affairs, e.g., Director Fehmi Yavuz (1962, 1966), Cevat Geray (1966), and Ruşen Keleş (1966, 1972).

A group of social scientists (nonanthropologists) at Istanbul University (such as C.O. Tütengil, Z.F. Fındıkoğlu, M. Eröz, and A. Kurtkan) also turned their attention to the study of urbanization by joining forces with the Sakarya Research Center and investigating social, physical, and educational problems in the city of Adapazarı (published in **Sosyoloji Konferansları** 1966-67).

Another major urban research project has been conducted in Izmir by members of the Turkish Social Science Association: Şerif Mardin, Ruşen Keleş, Cevat Geray, Deniz Baykal, Ergün Özbudun (political science); Mübecceci Kiray, Oğuz Arı (sociology); Orhan Türkay (economics); Cigdem Kagitçibaşı (psychology); Şefik Uysal (education); and Emre Kongar (social work). Interview schedules have been administered to several population samples, and each research member is analyzing data pertinent to problems of his discipline: kinship, politics, occupational choice, religious values, attitudes, etc. Arı (1972), Kiray (1972), and Kongar (1972) have already published their findings. Unfortunately, this important study, which is financed by a Ford Foundation grant, does not include the work of a social

anthropologist. Although many of the data were gathered without the benefit of the researchers' long-term, intimate residence among the people being studied, the investigations and their findings will contribute significantly to the knowledge of urban life in Turkey's large cities.

The only ethnographic study of an urban community was conducted by the sociologist Fatma Mansur (1972) in Bodrum, a small town on the Aegean coast.

Several Turkish ministries, especially the Ministry of Reconstruction and Redevelopment (**İmar ve İskan Bakanlığı**), have been making important contributions to urban research. (See the numerous references to the writings of Ayda and Turhan Yörükán in Tezcan 1969.)

The study of rural communities also progressed during this period. The political scientist Cevat Geray (1967) directed a community development study of Bünyan, a village near Kayseri. Yasa's (1969) restudy of Hasanoğlan, which had been elevated to municipal status in 1954, describes many social, economic, and cultural changes. In the following years, two graduates of Ankara University, who had been trained by Yasa and other social scientists there, published interesting comparative village studies. The first one, by Özer Ozankaya (1971), an Assistant Professor of Sociology in Ankara University's Political Science Faculty, compares the political culture of two remote, underdeveloped villages in northeastern Anatolia with that of two exposed, developed villages in central Anatolia. The second, by Erdoğan Güçbilmez (1972), compares the socioeconomic changes of two villages in Ankara Province. Another of Yasa's students, İsmail Beşikçi, published the first modern social study of a nomadic Kurdish tribal group (1969). Mahmut Tezcan, a sociologist in Ankara University's Education Faculty, published a study of the blood feud (Tezcan 1972), and M. Kiray collaborated with geographer Jan Hinderink to produce a comparative geographic and socioeconomic study of four villages in south-central Turkey (Hinderink and Kiray 1970). Interesting village social surveys dealing primarily with family life have been directed by Rezan Şahinkaya (1966, 1970), an Assistant Professor of Home Economics in Ankara University's Agricultural Faculty.

All of these village studies rely heavily on the use of questionnaires and interview schedules for the collection of data. All of them could have been significantly strengthened if the researchers had also employed the social anthropological techniques associated with

long-term residence in the subject communities. An exception is the study of a Black Sea coastal village by Vedia Emiroğlu (1972), a former student of Erdentuğ. In addition to offering a detailed ethnography of village culture, she focuses on the problem of cultural change, especially the impact of new agricultural technology on traditional practices and attitudes. In her introductory chapter she discusses some of the ideas about cultural change expounded by Western anthropologists, such as Malinowski, Mead, Herskovits, Redfield, and Foster, as well as the theories of Ziya Gökalp and Mümtaz Turhan.

During this period, also, Nermin Erdentuğ published two of the very few cross-cultural studies. In one (Erdentuğ 1972a) she examines rural society in Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan; in the other (Erdentuğ 1972b) she notes similarities between Turkish and Japanese culture.

Although social scientific research continues to be dominated by scholars from universities in Ankara and Istanbul, social scientists in outlying areas have recently begun to make important contributions. The work of rural sociologist Orhan Türkdoğan of the comparatively new Atatürk University in Erzurum is a notable example. Born in Malatya in 1928, Türkdoğan later studied sociology and anthropology at Ankara University, graduating in 1955 from the Sociology Department. In 1959 he became an Assistant in the Faculty of Science and Letters of Atatürk University. During the ensuing years he conducted field research of a social anthropological nature in three Molokan (Russian Christian) villages in eastern Turkey. His 1962 doctoral dissertation (published in 1971) represents the first social scientific study of a non-Muslim people in modern Turkey. From 1962 to 1964 Türkdoğan studied anthropology in the United States, at the universities of Missouri and Nebraska. He then returned to Atatürk University, where he became Assistant Professor in 1967 and Professor in 1971. His numerous publications demonstrate the scope and depth of his problem-oriented, applied social scientific interests: community health and medical sociology (1972), community development (1969), comparative social structure (1965), rural sociology (1970a), and urban problems (1974). Türkdoğan is representative of a new group of Turkish social scientists who are teaching and researching in the more remote areas of Turkey and thereby contributing importantly to a broader understanding of the country's social, cultural, and economic problems.

tablished is being capably carried on by his former assistant Dr. Nephân Saran. Her major publication is a statistical study of juvenile delinquency in Istanbul (Saran 1968). In 1971 the Department had Assistant Professor (Dr. Saran), two Assistants, and 250 thesis students (Saran 1971 : 3). In the same year it issued the first volume of its annual journal-**Journal of the Department of Social Anthropology and Ethnology (Sosyal Antropoloji ve Ethnoloji Bölümü Dergisi)**.

Anthropology courses are offered at several other Turkish universities. Recently, anthropological instruction in Turkey has been aided immensely by the publication of Bozkurt Güvenç's Turkish-language general anthropology text (1972). Güvenç, who teaches anthropology at Hacettepe University in Ankara, has prepared a first-rate presentation of the historical development and major areas of anthropology. His use of Turkish data as well as cross-cultural examples to illustrate points makes the text especially appropriate for its Turkish audience.

ASSESSMENTS

The growing number of competent Turkish social scientists makes one optimistic about the future of social research in Turkey. The Turks have shown serious concern for the development of social science in their country. In 1970, leading Turkish social scientists devoted a conference to just that topic (**Türkiye'de sosyal araştırmaların gelişmesi** 1971). Conference participant Bozkurt Güvenç (1971) presented a set of criticisms of Turkish social anthropology that we believe still holds true today. He finds Turkish sociologists-anthropologists too limited in their selection of research topics and in their application of concepts. Among the topical areas that have not been researched he includes studies of child socialization, culture and personality, and regional markets. His list of unutilized or insufficiently applied concepts includes the Great Tradition-Little Tradition, alliance and descent, and role and status. (We would add the emic-etic dichotomy as well.) He also laments the problems arising from the absence of a generally agreed-upon social science vocabulary (a problem shared by many Third World countries in which scholars are attempting to develop a social science literature in the vernacular) and criticizes researchers for their lack of fully developed research methodologies.

With respect to this last criticism, we have noted that recently many Turkish sociologists social-anthropologists have been relying

almost exclusively on social survey methods in their research. Although questionnaires and interview schedules accumulate important data, we feel they do not produce the degree of empathy, understanding, and appreciation of a community's life and problems that is possible through successful participant observation and long-term residence in the subject community. In their attempt to be quantitative and statistically analytical, social scientists run the risk of separating themselves from the people they are trying to understand. By using questionnaires and interviews exclusively, social scientists directing research projects fail even to see or talk with most of the people whose behavior and attitudes they will later try to explain. Greater personal involvement of a social anthropological nature could correct this tendency.

In addition, Güvenç criticizes Turkish social scientists for not having developed or adhered to any particular theoretical school and for not having taken full advantage of the theoretical and conceptual developments in their field. Although French social theory historically influenced Turkish social scientific thought, this trend has not continued into present. For instance, Claude Lévi-Strauss has had no impact on Turkish anthropology.

Güvenç also recommends that the various social science chairs, departments, and institutes in Turkish universities cease their squabbles and establish close cooperative ties.

The major general recommendation of the conference was that problems of social and economic development be given top priority for social scientific research and that the Turkish government support such research and utilize its findings in the decision-making process. As in any developing country, cooperation and coordination between government agencies and social scientists are necessary so that limited research funds can be applied to projects most beneficial to the nation.

ABSTRACT

The report traces the development of Turkish social anthropology from its intellectual foundations in the 19th-century Ottoman Empire to its near maturation in the early 1970s of the Turkish Republic. Rather than offering a bibliographical or a fully biographical account, the report focuses on important Turkish scientists and publications highlighting the various stages of social anthropological development. It begins by relating the various responses of Ottoman

intellectuals to the declining status of their empire vis-à-vis Europe and illustrates how Western social scientific thought was diffused to Turkey at this time. Moving to the post-World War I period, the report discusses the impact of modern Turkish nationalism on the organization and nature of early anthropological research. Finally, it describes the current status of social anthropological research and anthropological instruction in Turkish universities.

RÉSUMÉ

Le rapport retrace le développement de l'anthropologie sociale turque depuis ses fondations intellectuelles durant l'Empire Ottoman du 19^{ème} siècle jusqu'à sa presque maturité sous la République Turque du début des années 1970. Plutôt que d'offrir un compte-rendu bibliographique ou biographique complet, le rapport est centré sur les savants et publications turques, ce qui met en valeur les diverses étapes du développement de l'anthropologie sociale. Il commence par relater les diverses réactions des intellectuels ottomans devant le déclin de leur empire en face de l'Europe, et illustre comment la pensée socio-scientifique occidentale a été diffusée en Turquie à cette époque. Passant à la période d'après la première guerre mondiale, le rapport discute de l'impact du nationalisme turc moderne sur l'organisation et la nature de la recherche anthropologique. Finalement, il décrit le statut actuel de la recherche socio-anthropologique et de l'instruction anthropologique dans les universités turques.

RESUMEN

La crónica remonta el desarrollo de la antropología social en Turquía, desde su nacimiento intelectual en el Imperio Otomano del siglo dieinueve hasta su casi madurez a principios de los años 1970 de la República Turca. Mejor que ofrecer una relación bibliográfica o enteramente biográfica, la reseña enfoca importantes científicos y publicaciones turcas que destacan las varias etapas del desarrollo antropológico social. Empieza relatando las diversas respuestas de los intelectuales otomanos al estado de decadencia de su imperio frente a Europa y esclarece cómo el pensamiento científico social del Occidente se difundió en Turquía ese tiempo. Cambiando al período de la post-guerra mundial primera, la reseña discute el impacto del nacionalismo turco moderno en la organización y naturaleza de las primeras investigaciones antropológicas. Finalmente describe

la situación generalizada de la invción y la instrucción antropológica en las universidades.

by NADIA ABU ZAHRA

**Department of Anthropology, University of British Co Vancouver,
B.C., Canada V6T 1W5. 17 x 75**

The subject of this study is fascinating the development anthropological studies in Turkey from the late 18th o until today. For the early period, the authors rely mai Lewis's **The Emergence of Modern Turkey** and the **Enoyolof the Social Scienes**. To collect their data on contem anthropology in Turkey, they sent questionnaires to the social scientist there. Thus their study does not give insight into how the various stages of the development social anthropology were affected by the prevailing intellectual and the social and political conditions of the time the authors cared to give us an account of the content various works of the Turkish thinkers, they might hav some light on the social problems prevalent then. For instance what was the content of Ibrahim Sinasi's 1859 journal the criticism of the government which led to Namik K. flight from the country in 1867? What were the social of Ahmet Riza's "disgust" with the Ministry of Education According to the authors, Gökalp "employed Durkheim sociology in a systematic investigation of Turkey's socicultural problems." but nowhere are we told how he Durkheimian sociology or what cultural and social ther treated in his writings. The data on contemporary Turkish social scientists do not go beyond the information one finds in a curriculum vitae. No account is given of the conditions and the intellectual atmosphere which migh affected their studies. We are only told, for example Behice Boran of Ankara University became' a political activist and left the university in 1946. Eventually shebe chairman of the Turkish aLbor Party, a Marxist organization which was banned by the military in 1972 but was reorganized with Boran as chairman in 1975."

The authors conclude that the anthropological studies that have been accomplished in Turkey are deficient in the use of anthropological methods of fieldwork and participant observation and in certain areas of study, such as culture and personality, regional markets, etc. I would add that studies on politics, ritual, symbolism, and religion seem to be lacking in Turkey as well as in other Near Eastern countries. It is ironic, however, that the author's methods, like those of the anthropologists they criticize, lack a sound anthropological approach. They enumerate the works of social scientists,

their degrees, etc., as if these scholars were isolated from the rest of the Turkish society and not affected by their society and its current problems. Like the work on which they comment, their study is deficient in certain "areas," namely, reference to social and economic problems and to the particular social moods in which these social scientists live and work.

WOLFRAM EBERHARD

Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, Calif. 94720, U.S.A. 7 x 75

This is an article which certainly will many colleagues who are unable to read Turkish and yet want to know what is being done in Turkey in their field.

As in many countries, anthropology and sociology in Turkey are influenced by political attitudes, and it is difficult to remain totally impartial. Nevertheless, I think the authors have presented us with a well-balanced study.

I miss some scholars who seem to me to have had an impact, though none of them can officially be called a «social anthropologist.» The late Fuad Köprülü might be called the first to have studied folk narratives and epics from a sociological and literary viewpoint. His work was continued by Pertev Naili Boratav (now in Paris) with his social analysis of Turkish folk narratives and narrators (a German translation (Boratav 1975) which has just been published) and by Boratav's pupil İlhan Başgöz (now at the University of Indiana, Bloomington), who published the largest collection of Turkish riddles (Başgöz 1968) and has also studied Turkish rain prayers. A second line represented by Nermin Abadan, whose study of Turkish workers in Germany (Abadan 1964) was one of the earliest studies of foreign workers in Europe.

The role of the Halk Evleri could perhaps have been underlined more strongly, although I agree with the authors that such of the published work consists of data and not analysis. Will, a man like Ali Rıza Yalçın, with his work on the nomadic Yürük of southern Turkey (Yalçın 1959), might have been mentioned; he has informally influenced numerous others.

NERMIN ERDENTUĞ

Antropoloji Enstitüsü, Dil-Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara, Turkey. 30 x 75

This report is a successful attempt at meeting a long-neglected de-

mand with is up-to-date biblio-biographical account studies carried out by Turkish social scientists in Turkey. We greatly indebted to the authors for their endeavour. Nevertheless, there are some points to be stressed with relation my own work.

At the outset of my career, I spent about three years (1948-51) in British universities, and this experience was influential in my adherence to the British functionalist school despite my later academic studies in the United States. I was the first Turkish anthropologist to use fieldwork techniques (mainly participant observation) in Turkey. I established sociocultural anthropology (ethnology) as an independent chair at Ankara University in 1960. Since then, my colleagues and I have developed various ethnographic and folkloric studies. I have always given priority to sociocultural change in Turkish peasant studies in the M.A. and Ph. D. studies carried out under my supervision (see Erdentuğ 1969, Emiroğlu 1972, Ilbars 1974). I also initiated applied anthropological researches at the M.A. and Ph. D. levels at the Academy of Social Work, Ankara (1961), the Faculty of Education, Ankara University (1968), and the Faculty of Medicine (Department of Community Health), Diyarbakır (1970). These researches are closely related to community development from the standpoint of health and, especially, education (Erdentuğ 1972c, 1975). In fact, I was the initiator of a Ph. D. research project in community health development carried out among the Zazas and Kurdish societies of southern Turkey (Gençler 1974).

by BOZKURT GUVENÇ

Department of Anthropology, Hacettepe University, Beytepe, Ankara, Turkey. 15 x 75

I should perhaps address myself to antecedents or developmental questions, since my stand on current issues is amply described and fully credited by the authors.

That social science develops in response to social change, a phenomenon observed time and again elsewhere, is sustained by the Turkish experience; hence the relevance of the "historical" introduction provided by Magnarella and Türkdoğan. They lean, however, heavily on the political rather than on the sociocultural history of the land—yet to be undertaken.

The Young Turks, as well as some early Republicans, tried to reform the state without due regard to its socioeconomic infrastruc-

We studied the available literature and presented a preliminary version of our ideas to a group of Turkish scholars attending the Seminar on Turkey's Social and Economic Problems held in Erzurum, Turkey, in October of 1973. We profited greatly from their comments, criticisms, and recommendations.

If our purpose had been to "shed some light on contemporary social problems" in Republican Turkey, we would have found an examination of current national and international economic, political, and demographic factors much more productive than Abu Zahra's recommended exposition of a 19th-century criticism of the Ottoman Sultan.

Finally, Abu Zahra's claim that Turkey lacks studies of politics and religion is grossly uninformed. Politics is probably the single **most** studied Turkish social scientific subject. Tezcan's (1969) bibliography of Turkish sociology, which covers many but far from all of the Turkish-language books and articles published from 1928 to 1968, lists more than 1,000 works on Turkish politics. Under the heading of religious sociology, Tezcan has 200 references. Excellent studies in both these areas also exist in European languages, and many additional studies have appeared since 1968.

KAYNAKLAR

- ABADAN, NERMİN. 1964. **Batı Almanya'daki Türk işçileri ve sorunları** (Turkish workers in West Germany and their problems). Ankara : Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı Yayını [WE]
- ACIPAYAMLI, ORHAN. 1961. **Türkiye'de doğumla ilgili adet ve inanmaların etnolojik etüdü** (An ethnologic study of customs and beliefs associated with birth in Turkey). Atatürk Üniversitesi Yayınları 15.
- . 1962. **Anadoluda nazarla ilgili bazı adet ve inanmalar** (Some customs and beliefs associated with the evil eye in Anatolia). **Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi** 20 : 1-42.
- . 1963. **Türkiye'de yağmur duası** (The rain prayer in Turkey). **Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi** 21 : 1-40.
- AHMAD, FERÖZ. 1969. **The Young Turks**. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
- ARI, OĞUZ. 1972. **İzmir'de kitle haberleşmesi** (Mass communication in İzmir). Sosyal Bilimler Derneği Yayınları A-2.
- BARTLETT, F. C. 1923. **Psychology and primitive culture**. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- . 1946. **Psychological methods for the study of "hard" and "soft" features of culture**. **Africa** 16 : 145-55.
- BAŞGÖZ, İLHAN. 1968. **Türk halk edebiyatı** (Turkish folk literature). İstanbul : Ararat Yayınevi. [WE]
- BATES, DANIEL G. 1973. **Nomads and farmers : A study of the Yörük of southeastern Turkey**. University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology Papers 52.
- BAYRI, MEHMET HALİT. 1939. **Halk adetleri ve inanmaları** (Folk practices and beliefs). Eminönü Halkevi Neşriyatı 11.
- . 1947. **İstanbul folkloru**. İstanbul : Türkiye Basımevi.
- BEELEY, BRIAN W. 1969. **Rural Turkey : A bibliographic introduction**. Ankara : Hacettepe University Publications.
- BENEDICT, PETER. 1974. **Ula : An Anatolian town**. Leiden : Brill.
- BERKES, NİYAZİ. 1936. **Sociology in Turkey**. **American Journal of Sociology** 42 : 238-46.
- . 1938-40. **Birleşik Amerika Devletlerinde sosyoloji** (Sociology in the United States). **Ülkü** 11-14.
- . 1942. **Bazı Ankara köyleri üzerinde bir araştırma** (Research on some Ankara villages). **Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Felsefe Enstitüsü Neşriyatı Sosyoloji Serisi** 2.
- . 1964. **The development of secularism in Turkey**. Montreal : McGill University Press.
- BEŞİKÇİ, İSMAIL. 1969. **Doğuda değişim ve yapısal sorunlar** (Questions concerning change and social structure in the East). Ankara : Doğan Yayınevi.

- BONNAFOUS, MAX. 1928. Le cuicide à Stamboul : Étude statistique et aussi d'interprétation sociologique. *Revue Turque d'Anthropologie* 5 : 22-40.
- BORAN, BEHİCE SADIK. 1945. **Toplumsal yapı araştırmaları** (Studies of social structure). Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Enstitüsü Sosyoloji Serisi 3.
- BORATAV, PERTEV NAILİ. 1975. **Türkische Volkserzählungen und die Erzählerkunst**. Taipei : Orient Cultural Service. [WE]
- DAVISON, RODERIC H. 1963. **Reform in the Ottoman Empire 1856-1876**. Princeton : Princeton University Press.
- DEMİRKAN, SALAHADDİN. 1941 a. **Küçük Çekmece köyü** (Küçük Çekmece village). İstanbul : Kültür Basımevi.
- . 1941 b. **Celaliye Köyü** (Celaliye village). İstanbul : Burhaneddin Basımevi.
- DE PLANHOL, XAVIER. 1958. **De la plaine Pamphylie aux Lacs Pisidens : Nomadisme et vie paysanne**. Paris : Adrien-Maisonneuve (Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique de l'Institut Français de'Archéologie d'Istanbul).
- DUMEZIL, GEORGE. 1928. Une survivance du Manichéisme dans le folklore sibérien. *Revue Turque d'Anthropologie* 5 : 15-21.
- EMİN, AHMET. 1931. "Gökalp, Ziya" in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 6, pp. 687-88.
- . 1932. "Kamal Mahmad Namuk," in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 7, pp. 535-36.
- EMİROĞLU, VEDİA. 1972. **Edilli köyünün (Akçakoca) kültür değişmesi bakımından incelenmesi** (A study of culture change in Edilli village [Akçakoca]). Ankara : Varol Matbaası.
- ERDENTUĞ, NERMİN. 1956. **Hal köyü'nün etnolojik tetkiki** (An ethnological study of Hal village). Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 109.
- . 1959. **Sün köyü'nün etnolojik tetkiki** (An ethnological study of Sün village). Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 132.
- . 1969. **Cultural change in Turkish traditional society**. Vienna : International Committee on Urgent Anthropological and Ethnological Research. [NE]
- . 1972 a. "Türkiye, Pakistan ve İranköykir toplumlarının karşılaştırmalı etnolojik incelemesi (A comparative ethnological study of rural society in Turkey, Pakistan, and Iran)," in **Türkiye Türk toplumlarında kültürel antropolojik (ethnolojik) incelemeler** (Cultural anthropological (ethnological) studies of Turkish societies). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları 29.
- . 1926 b. "Türk ve Japon kültürleri arasında bazı benzerlikler (Some similarities between Turkish and Japanese culture)," in **Türkiye Türk toplumlarında kültürel antropolojik (ethnolojik) incelemeler** (Cultural anthropological (ethnological) studies of Turkish societies). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları 29.
- . 1972 a. The basic points to be taken into consideration in the efforts to modernize. *Annales de l'Université d'Ankara* 12. [NE]
- . 1975. **Türk köylerinde öğretmen-imam ve muhtar ilişkilerinin eğitim açısından değerlendirilmesi** (An evaluation of teacher-imam-headman relations from the standpoint of education). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 1 (1-4). [NE]

- ERMI, LAURA. 1971. 2d revised edition. **Illustrious immigrants**. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- GENÇLER, AHMET. 1974. Diyarbakır ve çevresinde sosyalleştirilmiş sağlık hizmetlerini etkileyen toplumsal ve kültürel faktörler, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.
- ERAY, CEVAT. 1966. Şehirselsel toplum kalkınması (Urban social development). **Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi** 21.
- . 1967. **Toplum kalkınması deneme çalışmaları Bunyan örneği** (Test activities in community development : The Bunyan case). Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları 228-210.
- GÖKALP, ZİYA. 1959 (1911-23). **Turkish nationalism and Western civilization : Selected essays**. Translated and edited by Niyazi Berkes. New York : Columbia University Press.
- . 1968 (1920) **The principles of Turkism**. Translated and annotated by Robert Devereux. Leiden : Brill.
- HİÇBİLMEZ, ERDOĞAN. 1972. **Yenimahalle ve Kayadibi karşılaştırmalı bir köy araştırması** (A comparative village study of Yenimahalle and Kayadibi). Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları 327.
- GELENSOY, TUNCER. 1969. Prof. Dr. Mümtaz Turhan. **Türk Kültürü** 75 : 244.
- GÜNGÖR, KEMAL. 1940-41. **Cenubi Anadolu Yörüklerinin etno-antropolojik tetkiki** (Ethno-anthropological study of the South Anatolian Yuruks). Ankara : Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları.
- GÜVENÇ, BOZKURT. 1971. "Etnolojik ve sosyal (kültürel) antropolojik araştırmalar (Ethnological and social [cultural] anthropological research)," in **Türkiye'de sosyal araştırmaların gelişmesi** The development of social research in Turkey). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları D-11.
- . 1972. **İnsan ve kültür : Antropolojiye giriş** (Mankind and culture : An introduction to anthropology). Ankara : Sosyal Bilimler Derneği Yayınları.
- KONGAR, EMRE. 1972. **İzmir'de kentsel aile** (Urban family in İzmir). **Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği Yayınları** A-3.
- KOŞAY, HAMİT Z. 1944. **Türkiye türk düğünleri üzerine mukayeseli malzeme** (Comparative materials on Turkish weddings). Eski Eserler ve Müzeler Umum Müdürlüğü Yayınlarından 2(4).
- LEWIS, BERNARD. 1961. **The emergence of modern Turkey**. London : Oxford University Press.
- MAGNARELLA, PAUL J. 1970. From villager to townsman in Turkey. **Middle East Journal** 24 : 229-40.
- . 1973. The reception of Swiss family law in Turkey. **Anthropological Quarterly** 46 : 100-16.
- . 1974. **Tradition and change in a Turkish town**. Cambridge : Schenkman/Wiley.
- MANSUR, FATMA. 1972. **Bodrum, a town in the Aegean**. Leiden : Brill.
- MARDİN, ŞERİF A. 1962. **The genesis of young Ottoman thought**. Princeton : Princeton University Press.
- MORRISON, JOHN A. 1939. **Alışar : A unit of land occupance in the Konak Su Basin of central Anatolia**. Chicago : University of Chicago Libraries (private publication).

- OZANKAYA, IZER. 1971. **Köyde toplumsal yapı ve siyasal kültür** (Social structure and political culture in the village). Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları 322.
- ÖGEL, BAHAEDDİN. 1962. **İslamiyetten önce Türk kültür tarihi** (Pre-Islamic Turkish culture). Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- ÖRNEK, SEDAT VEYİS. 1966. **Sivas ve çevresinde hayatın çeşitli safhalarıyla ilgili batıl inançların ve büyüsel işlemlerin etnolojik tetkiki** (An ethnological study of superstitions and sorcery associated with various stages of the life cycle in Sivas and its environs). Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 174.
- . 1971 a. **Anadolu folklorunda ölüm** (Death in Anatolian folklore). Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 218.
- . 1971 b. **Etnoloji sözlüğü** (Ethnologic dictionary). Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 200.
- RAMSAUR, ERNEST E. 1957. **The Young Turks : Prelude to the Revolution of 1908**. Princeton : Princeton University Press.
- RATHBURN, CAROLE. 1972. **The village in the Turkish novel and short story, 1920 to 1955**. The Hague : Mouton.
- SABAHADDIN, PRENS. 1965. **Türkiye nasıl kurtarılabilir** (How can Turkey be saved?). İstanbul : Elif.
- SARAN, NEPHAN. 1968. **İstanbul şehrinde polisle ilgili olan onsekiz yaşından küçük çocukların sosyo-kültürel özellikleri hakkında bir araştırma** (Research on the socio-cultural characteristics of children under eighteen years of age with İstanbul police records). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Antropoloji ve Etnoloji Bölümü Yayını 1.
- . 1971. "İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Antropoloji Bölümü araştırma faaliyeti (Social research activities of the Social Anthropology Division of İstanbul University's Literature Faculty)." **Türkiye'de sosyal araştırmaların gelişmesi** (The development of social research in Turkey). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları D-11.
- STIRLING, PAUL. 1965. **Turkish village**. New York : Wiley. [IY]
- STONE, FRANK A. 1973. **The rub of cultures in modern Turkey**. Bloomington : Indiana University Press.
- ŞAHİNKAYA, REZAN. 1966. **Orta Anadolu köylerinde aile strüktürü** (Family structure in central Anatolian villages). Ankara Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Yayınları 255.
- . 1970. **Hatay bölgesinde köy ve şehirde aile mutluluğu ve çocuk ölümü** (Family happiness and child mortality in the villages and city of the Hatay region). Ankara Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Yayınları 425.
- ŞENYÜREK, MUZAFFER SÜLEYMAN. 1953. "Southwest Asia," in **International directory of anthropological institutions**. Edited by W. L. Thomas and A. M. Pikelis. New York : Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.
- ŞEVKİ, MEHMET ALİ. 1968. **Osmanlı tarihinin sosyal bilimle açıklanması ve öteki makaleleri** (An explanation of Ottoman history through social science, and other articles). Translated into modern Turkish by Muzaffer Sencer. İstanbul : Elif.

- SZYLIOWICZ, JOSEPH S. 1966. *Political change in rural Turkey*. The Hague : Mouton.
- TEZCAN, MAHMUT. 1969. *Türk sosyoloji bibliyografyası 1928-1968*. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları 6.
- . 1972. *Kan gütmeye olayları sosyolojisi* (The sociology of blood feud events). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları 24.
- TURHAN, MÜMTAZ. 1950. Analysis of the cultural changes. *Sosyoloji Dergisi* 6 : 57-68
- . 1951. *Kültür değişimleri : Sosyal psikoloji bakımından bir tetkik* (Culture change : A socio psychological investigation). İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınlarından 479.
- . 1957. Köy tetkiklerinde kullanılacak metodlar hakkında bazı düşünceler (Some thoughts on village research methods). *Sosyoloji Dergisi* 12 : 98-103.
- TÜRKDOĞAN, ORHAN. 1965. *Erzurum ve çevresinde sosyal araştırmalar* (Social research in Erzurum and its environs). Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları 40.
- . 1969. *Toplum kalkınması* (Community development). Atatürk Üniversitesi Yayınları 68.
- . 1970 a. *Türkiye'de köy sosyolojisinin temel sorunları* (Basic questions on rural sociology in Turkey). Atatürk Üniversitesi Yayınları 76.
- . 1970 b. *Ziya Gökalp sosyolojisinde bazı kavramların değerlendirilmesi* (An evaluation of some concepts in Ziya Gökalp's sociology). Erzurum : Atatürk Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları.
- . 1971. *Malankarlar'ın toplumsal yapısı* (The Malokans' social structure). Atatürk Üniversitesi Yayınları 137.
- . 1972. *Doğu Anadolu'da sağlık-hastalık sisteminin toplumsal araştırması* (A community health system study in East Anatolia). Atatürk Üniversitesi Yayınları 161.
- . 1974 *Yoksulluk kültürü* (Culture of poverty). Atatürk Üniversitesi Yayınları 336.
- Türkiye'de sosyal araştırmaların gelişmesi* (The development of social research in Turkey). 1971. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları D-11.
- WEBSTER, DONALD E. 1939. *The Turkey of Atatürk*. Philadelphia : American Academy of Political and Social Science.
- WEIKER, WALTER F. 1969. Modern Turkish studies. *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin* 3(3) : 1-16.
- YASA, İBRAHİM. 1955. *Hasanoğlan köyü'nün içtimai-iktisadi yapısı* (The socio-economic structure of Hasanoğlan village). Ankara : Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü.
- . 1957. *Hasanoğlan : Socio-economic structure of a Turkish village*. Ankara : Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü.
- . 1959 a. Köylerin sosyolojik bakımdan incelenmesinde bazı esaslar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi* 14 (1). [IY]
- . 1959 b. Örnekolay araştırmalarında gözlem ve mülakat metodlarının önemi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi* 15(2). [IY]
- . 1960. *Sindel Köyü* (Sindel village). Ankara : Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü.