

A CRITICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF ZAFER
TOPRAK’S HISTORICAL STUDIES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
THE MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

TÜLAY YILMAZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

SEPTEMBER 2017

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tlin Genz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. mer Turan
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Ferdan Ergut
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nesim Őeker	(METU, HIST)	_____
Prof. Dr. Ferdan Ergut	(METU, HIST)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cenk Saraođlu	(Ankara ni., GZT)	_____



I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Tülay Yılmaz

Signature :

ABSTRACT

A CRITICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF ZAFER TOPRAK'S HISTORICAL STUDIES

Yılmaz, Tülay

MA., Department of History

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ferdan Ergut

September 2017, 287 pages

The main goal of this study is to examine Zafer Toprak's methodological approach to historical studies. Toprak's work has influenced many areas of academic disciplines such as economic and social history writing. His studies focused especially on the modernization era and the Republican period of Turkey. He stands apart from historians who came before him in respect to his approach toward social and economic life of the late Ottoman era and the early Republican period. His studies on the period of CUP (Committee of Union and Progress) demonstrate clearly how Turkish politics and society began to be shaped in a modern sense. For this thesis, first his studies on the economic history of Turkey will be reviewed in detail, with emphasis on his arguments and contribution to that field. Then, his studies on populism, feminism and anthropology will be presented in summary. In this context, his methodological perspective on historiography will be examined through the lens of his extensive historical studies. In addition, his shortcomings and contributions to these fields will be analyzed.

Keywords: Historiography, Zafer Toprak, Economic History, Social History, Assessment of a Historian

ÖZ

ZAFER TOPRAK TARİHÇİLİĞİNİN ELEŞTİREL VE METODOLOJİK BİR DEĞERLENDİRMESİ

Yılmaz, Tülay

Yüksek Lisans, Tarih Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Ferdan Ergut

Eylül 2017, 287 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, Zafer Toprak'ın tarih çalışmaları üzerinden metodolojik yaklaşımını incelemektir. Toprak'ın tarihle ilgili çalışmaları, ekonomik ve sosyal tarih alanı içerisinde birçok farklı alana yayılmıştır. Toprak'ın çalışmaları özellikle modernleşme ve Cumhuriyet dönemi Türkiye'si üzerine yoğunlaşmaktadır. Geç Osmanlı ve erken Cumhuriyet döneminin sosyal ve ekonomik hayatına olan yaklaşımı açısından kendisinden önceki tarihçilerden ayrılmaktadır. Toprak'ın çalışmaları, özellikle *İTC* (İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti) ve Cumhuriyet dönemi Türk siyasetinin ve toplumunun modern anlamda nasıl şekillendiğini açıkça gösteren bir örnektir. İlk olarak, ekonomi tarihi alanındaki çalışmaları, bu konudaki argümanları ve çalışmalarının ışığında detaylı bir şekilde incelenecektir ve Türkiye ekonomi tarihi alanına katkıları vurgulanacaktır. Daha sonra, popülizm, feminizm ve antropoloji çalışmaları argümanlarının bir özeti olarak sunulacaktır. Bu bağlamda, Toprak'ın tarihi çalışmalar üzerindeki metodolojik tavrı, geniş kapsamlı tarihî çalışmaları ışığında incelenecektir. Ayrıca, bu alanlardaki eksiklikleri ve katkıları analiz edilecektir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Tarih Yazımı, Zafer Toprak, Ekonomi Tarihi, Sosyal Tarih, Bir Tarihçinin Değerlendirmesi



To my love

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Prof. Dr. Ferdan Ergut, for his guidance, advices, criticism, encouragement and the opportunity of benefiting from his immense knowledge.

Besides my supervisor, I would like to send my deepest love to Tuncer Evci, for never letting me feel alone in this challenging process. His love and support gave me strength and courage while conducting this work.

I also feel obliged to serve my kindest appreciation to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Deniz Taner Kılınçoğlu for his constructive suggestions, and comments.

I also thank my brother Latif Yılmaz for his comments and guidance throughout my thesis process.

Finally, I would like to express my greatest gratitude to the people who have helped and supported me throughout my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. BIOGRAPHY.....	7
2.1. TOPRAK’S EARLY ACADEMIC CAREER	7
2.2. TOPRAK’S STUDIES AFTER THE 1990s	14
2.3. TOPRAK’S PUBLICATION AND ACADEMIC LIFE.....	19
3. ECONOMIC HISTORY	27
3.1. A SHORT LOOK AT THE HISTORICAL APPROACHES AND DEBATES ON ECONOMIC HISTORY IN TURKEY	27
3.1.1. Debates on Economic History in Turkey	32
3.2. ECONOMIC THOUGHT.....	43
3.2.1. Corporatism	49
3.3. NATIONAL ECONOMY	51
3.3.1. Foreign Exchange in the Ottoman Empire	64
3.4. BANKING SYSTEM	66
3.5. LABOR.....	72
3.5.1. The Development of Workers’ Consciousness and Strikes.....	76
3.5.2. Regulation of Law for Workers.....	83
3.5.3. Trade Union Organizations	85
3.5.4. Debate about Ta’til-i Eşgal Law.....	87
3.5.5. The Attempt of Industrial Journal to Develop Worker’s Awareness (Sanay-i Dergisi).....	88
3.5.6. Toprak’s View on Labor.....	89
4. SOCIAL HISTORY	91

4.1. POPULISM	91
4.1.1. The Effect Of Narodnik Movement Of Russia In Turkish Populism.....	93
4.1.2. Sociology, Journalism and Ideology	98
4.1.3. Women's Roles in Populism	108
4.1.4. Populism and Solidarism.....	109
4.2. FEMINISM	114
4.2.1. Debates about Equality of Women.....	116
4.2.2. Women's and Child's Rights in the Field of Labor.....	120
4.2.3. Modernization in Education and Clothes	121
4.2.4. Women and Family	125
4.2.5. Social Change and Its Effects on Magazines	126
4.2.6. Marxist Approach on Feminism.....	129
4.2.7. Women Studies In Turkey.....	131
4.3. ANTHROPOLOGY	140
4.3.1. Mustafa Kemal's Approach to History and Anthropology	143
4.3.2. Anthropological Studies of the Period	147
4.3.3. The Push for Quantification in the Republican Era.....	155
4.3.4. Anthropological Discrimination Against Women.....	156
4.3.5. Darwinist Curriculum in Schools	158
4.3.6. The Sun-Language Theory	160
4.3.7. Critiques of the Approach of Toprak on Anthropological Studies.....	161
4.3.8. Kurdish Ethnicity in Border of Turkey	165
4.3.9. Critique of the Approach of Toprak on Kurdish Question.....	169
5. THE METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW OF TOPRAK'S STUDIES	175
5.1. HISTORIOGRAPHY	175
5.1.1. Toprak's Studies on Economic History.....	179
5.1.2. Toprak's Studies on Social History	181
5.1.3. Toprak's Attack on Official Historiography	183
5.1.4. Modernization Approach in Toprak's Studies	184
5.1.5. The Influence of Annales School On Toprak's Studies	192
5.1.6. Narrative	199
5.1.7. Comparison	201
5.1.8. Causality	206
5.1.9. Facts.....	213
5.1.10. Quantitative Studies in History	216

5.1.11. Intellectual History, History of Ideas and Mentality	218
5.1.12. Cultural History	224
6. CONCLUSION	228
BIBLIOGRAPHY	233
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET	275
APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	287



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AKP	Justice And Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi)
AMP	Asiatic Mode of Production (Asya Tipi Üretim Tarzı)
CHF	Republican People's Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası)
CHP	Republican People's Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi)
CUP	Committee of Union and Progress (İttihat ve Terakki)
DİSK	Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey (Türkiye Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu)
İTC	Committee of Union and Progress (İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti)
KA-DER	Association for Supporting Women Candidates (Kadın Adayları Destekleme Derneği)
SBF	Faculty of Political Science-Ankara University (Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Ankara Üniversitesi)
TİP	Turkey Labor Party (Türkiye İşçi Partisi)
TÜMÖD	Association of Academic Staff (Tüm Öğretim Elemanları Derneği)
YÖK	Council of Higher Education (Yükseköğretim Kurulu)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

E. H Carr says that history is a work of interpretation and that historical interpretation is the process of 'becoming', according to social, political and cultural events and time.¹ He underlines that the task of the historian is not to just tell of events in a chronological order, but to interpret any historical facts that h/she is presented with. He points out that historians may not be as objective as possible in doing this,² and that we should first identify and familiarize ourselves with various historians in order to better understand historical events or phenomena, since the historian is, him/herself, a product of the history of the given era in which they live.³ According to Carr, when a historian interprets a historical fact, s/he expresses her/his own historical judgement, and that judgement is expressed under the influence of his/her past experiences, values, beliefs and ideology, meaning s/he will most probably look at events from a biased perspective.⁴ Just as when a scientist is experimenting and observing an event, s/he cannot act independently of knowledge, experience, and value judgments of his own, the historian will also add something of themselves when interpreting a historical fact.⁵ For this reason, in order to better understand historical events and phenomenon, we should first

¹ Edward Hallett Carr, *What is History?*, (London: New York: Victoria: Toronto: Auckland, Penguin Books, 1987), 137.

² Ibid., 38.

³ Ibid., 26.

⁴ Ibid., 135.

⁵ Ibid., 47.

familiarize ourselves with the historian who studies a given subject. That means, before examining a historical fact presented to us by a historian, we should learn more about him/her to understand under what conditions and from which perspective it was written.

The practical requirements of each historical judgment give the unique characteristics of ongoing 'contemporary history' to all historical studies. According to Croce, all history is “contemporary history”, which means that history consists primarily of seeing the past through the eyes of the present. In the light of this problem, the main task of the historian is not to record, but to evaluate.⁶ All history is the history of thought⁷, and history consists of the mind of the thinker who re-thinks the events and phenomenon critically. The “facts of history” never come to us as "pure" and transparent, since they do not and cannot exist in a pure and explicit form. They are always reflections of the mind of the record holder. The conclusion we must follow, then, is that if one is to read a historical work, s/he must first have knowledge about the historian, not simply the facts within his/her works. Collingwood says that “history is what the historian makes”.⁸ The facts of history are nothing, interpretation is everything.⁹ “Take a look at the historian before examining the event”, Collingwood says.¹⁰

This study, therefore, will be an overview and a methodological critique of Zafer Toprak’s historical works. He is one of the key Turkish historians to examine the Tanzimat and the early Republican periods on the basis of economic and social developments. His life, his works, his understanding of history and the new perspectives which he contributed to the Turkish historiography will form the scope

⁶ Ibid., 26.

⁷ R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), 215.

⁸ Ibid. 204.

⁹ Carr, *What is History*, 27.

¹⁰ Ibid., 27.

of this thesis. The first prominent element in Toprak's work, especially in his economic and anthropological studies, is to provide a reevaluation of the Tanzimat economic state and of the anthropological studies undertaken in the early Republican period, without prejudice. He believed that the Tanzimat period had to be rewritten and investigated and he is one of the important representatives of the understanding of history which is described as economic and social history in Turkey.

Toprak's studies cover a wide range of subjects and his works, which range from women's history to populist and intellectual currents, from economic history to anthropology, make him a remarkable historian worthy of consideration. It can be said that he is one of the scientists who are highly productive in the field of academics in Turkey. At the time of writing, he continues to study and his most recent work planned is in the field of the history of childhood, although it has not yet been published.

In the second chapter, "Biography", Toprak's biographical information throughout his academic career will be touched upon, as a researcher's life story is critical to understanding his activities and works. In this regard, his educational life, academic career and academic production will be emphasized. An outline will be given covering which subjects Toprak worked on in which period, and which major project books were prepared by Toprak in addition to his academic studies.

In the third chapter, "Economic History", Toprak's studies will be examined under the headings of debates on economic history in Turkey, economic thought of the period, banking system, national economy and labor studies. First of all, the debates on economic history, such as dependency, imperialism and Asiatic mode of production, will be presented to make clear under which conditions (or which intellectual context) Toprak's work on economy came into being. These debates are crucial to understanding Toprak's objectives in studying this period from such a different perspective, because most other studies approached Ottoman economic systems from the standpoint of colony, periphery, semi-periphery or sui-generis. His fellow historians did not see the Ottoman Empire's and the early Republican

period's economic systems as independent from the Western suppression. They claimed that the Ottoman economic system was destroyed by the liberal policies promoted by Western countries, which were promoted until the end of Ottoman Empire. However, Toprak claims that liberal policies were still in place in the Tanzimat period and the efforts to establish a nation-state and a national economy had begun at that time. That is, although Ottoman state was partly dependent on the West, the government in the Tanzimat era fought to end the nation's economic dependence on the West. The intellectuals of the Tanzimat period started to suggest the abandonment of liberal policies and the transition to statist policies in order to save the country from the economic exploitation of the West. Although some of them were still advocating that the best path toward the economic development of the country was to retain these liberal policies, most of intellectuals and bureaucrats believed that statist policies would be the best option for the Ottoman Empire. Accordingly, his study *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918* (National Economy in Turkey 1908-1918) will be presented as a summary of his arguments. All of these developments enabled Ottoman bureaucrats and intellectuals to discuss the establishment of a national economy, which was a requirement for the founding of a nation-state. The first step to establish a national economy was to found a banking system to provide capital for Turkish-Muslim entities – a necessary step to obtain economic independence. Toprak's studies on labor, in which he asserts that the mentality and consciousness of the working class in the Ottoman Empire started to develop in parallel to modernization efforts thanks to the environment created by the 1908 Revolution, will be discussed in the context of his arguments. In his labor studies, Toprak tries to keep track of the effects of modernization on the working class and claims that, in parallel with economic and industrial development, the working class in a modern sense was formed and shaped during this period. This development also addresses the formation of other classes in Turkey.

In the fourth chapter, "Social History", his studies on social history, populism, feminism and anthropology, will be touched upon in a summation of his arguments and claims. In the case of populism, he examines the populist discourses and applications of the state and intellectuals of the period. He differentiates the populist

discourse of the early Republican period from the discourse after the 1950s, until the present. He saw the populist tendency of the Republican era as an ideology that tried to unify the whole of Turkish society, and it included the features of a social state. Accordingly, it is essential to differentiate populism in the early Republican era from today's version of populism. Furthermore, his examination of feminist movements within the Ottoman Empire and the early Republican period did not take a different approach than his other studies. He investigates the feminist tendencies among academics and the society at large by looking at newspapers, journals, and even the changes in popular clothing styles and labor practices of women in industry. For him, as a result of the modernization and the environment created by the First World War, women started to modernize and participate more in the public life, and new templates for being women in the Ottoman Empire were formed during this time of modernization. The discourses of the intellectuals of the period on the equality of women and men were very close to their European counterparts. Like the development of consciousness of the workers, economic thought, and populist activities of the period in a modern sense, women's political actions took shape simultaneously. At the end of this chapter, a short literature review on the women's movement in Turkey will be presented in order to grasp Toprak's position on women's studies literature in Turkey. Lastly, his research on the anthropological studies pioneered by Mustafa Kemal in the early Republican period will be presented in a summation of his arguments. According to him, the anthropological studies conducted by Mustafa Kemal did not have a discriminative content. On the contrary, with this study, Mustafa Kemal aimed to gather all of the ethnicities living in the Turkish borderlands under a comprehensive, inclusive, identity (Turkishness). Whatever their ethnicity was, they were called Turks, since all ethnic groups living on the borders of Turkey came from the same place and the same ancestors, according to Mustafa Kemal and his followers. As a result, Mustafa Kemal intended to assemble all of these ethnic groups under the same roof and aimed to change the position of the Turks in the eyes of European countries who classified Turks as an inferior race. At the end of this chapter, the critiques on his anthropology studies and the Kurdish question will be presented in order to examine the depth of these studies and determine their position in the literature.

In the fifth chapter, which is a methodological overview of Toprak's studies, his methodological base will be criticized in light of the studies mentioned above. His theoretical approach of highlighting the direction of modernization, Enlightenment and the Annales School will be handled in terms of his relationship with these social currents. As a follower of modernist theory and Enlightenment, he considers the period which he studies as the renaissance of the Ottoman Empire. Rationalization spread all over the country at that time, from economic structures to daily life, from greater society down to individuals. Then, his methodological overview in regards to his relationship with causal explanation, narrative, comparison, quantitative historical research, facts, intellectual history and history of mentality and cultural study will be questioned in light of his studies covering a very large area in the historical sciences. Toprak's attitude towards the official understanding of historiography, and how much he puts distance between the understanding of the official historiography and his own history writing, will also be discussed on the basis of his arguments and works. In addition, the shortcomings and contributions to the subjects and approaches that he addresses in his studies will be examined.

In the conclusion section, an overview of the discussions of the thesis and a reevaluation of the basic conclusions of each chapter by way of a general overview of their arguments will be provided.

To conclude, as quoted above, it is important to familiarize oneself with historians before delving into historical facts. This approach reveals to us how impartial those who are writing about historical facts and phenomenon really are, and how thoroughly a historical event was studied and presented to us. Methodological and biographical works are essential in order to examine historians before reading, however, such studies on Turkish historiography in general are not common. Therefore, an increase in the number of such review texts will provide a significant improvement in the writing of history in Turkey.

CHAPTER 2

BIOGRAPHY

Zafer Toprak is an economic historian whose research focuses on the late Ottoman Empire and the early Republican period of Turkey. A scientist, he was elected to the Turkish Academy of Sciences and received an honorary doctorate in the United States. He was also given an outstanding academic achievement award by “Boğaziçi University”. He has published about twenty books in the fields of economic, social and political history and has received many awards for these publications. He taught at Boğaziçi University for many years and retired in 2013 with the status of professor emeritus. In 1972, he was a lecturer at the University of London and he was once a visiting lecturer at Minnesota State and Paris Universities. Prof. Dr. Toprak is still a regular member of the Academy of Sciences and continues to lecture at Atatürk Institute of Boğaziçi University as a historian. He also gives history lectures at Koç University where he worked as part time professor for many years, before being appointed a permanent professor.¹¹

2.1. TOPRAK’S EARLY ACADEMIC CAREER

Toprak spent a part of his childhood in “Heybeliada” where he completed junior school. He continued his high school education in St. Joseph school, which was known as Frerler at that time. His grandfather was a religious man who taught in religious schools (medrese) and so they lived in “Fatih Çarşamba”, which was a very conservative district in İstanbul. Therefore, when Toprak started high school,

¹¹ Zafer Toprak, “Tarih Yazımında Bilimsellik,” interviewed by Fevziye Özberk. *Bilim ve Ütopya*, no. 262, April 2016, 76-85.

his family needed to leave “Heybeliada” and settled down in “Çarşamba”. He asserts that the area was too conservative to allow him freedom to study. Toprak was amongst the most successful students at St. Joseph school. Although he was already a student in the field of the positive sciences at that time, Toprak had great interest in social sciences and he went on to improve himself in this field. He started to follow the leftist journal “Yön Dergisi” when he was still in high school and he met the publication’s writers such as Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus in those years.

It is possible to explain the interest of Toprak to the field of social sciences with the political situation of the time. When the 1960 military coup took place, Toprak was only fourteen years old. The 1961 constitution guaranteed people freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of work and entrepreneurship. This revolution changed the political structure of Turkey in an important way. Citizens had more freedom, universities were autonomous, and workers had some rights. And in this environment the Turkish Labor Party (Türkiye İşçi Partisi) was founded by some intellectuals of the period.¹² The politics of 1960s had distinct characteristic features from the past. There was now a more liberal political environment and a socialist movement gained ground. University students could establish their own groups, the left literature began to enter the country and attracts great interest from young people.¹³ Socialist literature began to develop in the field of social sciences and analyzes were made about the economic situation of the Ottoman Empire. The high school years of Toprak had just passed in this environment. Therefore, shifting to the field of social sciences was a very predictable situation for him.

Meanwhile, he began to politicize himself, in keeping with the energy of the period. His natural orientation towards the social sciences and his interest in politics led

¹² Feroz Ahmad, “Politics and Political Parties in Republican Turkey.” in *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Vol. IV: Turkey in the Modern World*, edited by Reşat Kasaba, 226-265. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). 241.

¹³ Ibid., 243.

him to apply to the department of Political Sciences in Ankara University. Here too, he successfully demonstrated his qualifications and entered the school as a student of highest ranking. As a member of the ‘1968 Generation’, when the polarization in the political context was very intense, leftist tendencies were most influential upon him. Similarly, most of the professors in the school either had an active position in *CHP* (Republican People Party) or in *TIP* (Turkey Labor Party). In that period, he took courses from Mehmet Selik who translated Marx’s *Das Kapital* into Turkish and the book was used as required reading in the school.

Toprak says that three books of that time; *Elementary Principles of Philosophy* by Georges Politzer, *The Fundamentals of Political Economy* by P. I Nikitin, and *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* by Vladimir Lenin, were enough to be able to understand the world of the “Mülkiye” (the Faculty of Political Science at Ankara University). The problem of underdevelopment in Turkey was being discussed by students and professors in nearly every class in the faculty of political science at Ankara University, and the reasons for that underdevelopment were sought from the past. History seemed like a broad-reaching science to uncover cause and effect. After completing his undergraduate study with a certificate of outstanding achievement, he went to London to study for his Master of Arts degree. He says that when he went to London, he took a very important book, *Turkey’s Order* by Doğan Avcıoğlu. According to him, this book was touted as having all of the information to understand and solve the problems of Turkey at that time. While he worked on his Master’s dissertation, he also benefited from the British archives to develop his thesis.

By the time he was writing his master's thesis on the subject of the 1838 Ottoman-British Trade Agreement, he had chosen his particular area of professional interest. He chose to delve into economic history, and more specifically into the Turkish Revolution. He felt he should write academic articles and his first was a critique of an article by Asaf Savaş Akat which had been published by the journal “Birikim”. The name of article was *Geçiş Dönemi Toplamları için Teorik bir Çerçeve I* (a Theoretical Framework for Transitional Societies - 1). In the meantime, Toprak started his PhD studies at the department of the Faculty of Economics at İstanbul

University. Idris Küçükömer wanted Toprak to proceed in the field of economic theory, but Toprak did not agree. He was more interested in the historical aspects of economics than its theoretical practices.

Towards the end of the 1960s and the early of 1970 were very complicated years for Turkey. The relatively libertarian environment of the 1960's left itself to a chaos and dissociated society. The concept of rightist and leftist has entered the Turkish literature during these years. The Menderes government supported US cold war policies without question and took side with US before the 1960's coup. Likewise, İsmet İnönü and the junta government maintained the same policies. Then America's relations with Turkey had disrupted society and anti-American actions were increasing day by day by the university students in Turkey. Especially *Fikir Kulüpleri* (Idea Clubs) established in universities, started to discuss Turkish-American politics. These clubs were discussing the situation of underdeveloped societies that imperialism caused. Then some people in these groups joined *TIP*. However, as time progress, anti-Americanism turned into a different situation rather than a foreign policy. The country was divided into two groups, right and left.¹⁴ It was likely that this political environment had great influence on the formation of his ideological perspective and subjects he studied in that time.

After his graduation, the military declared a memorandum at March 12 in 1971, and an authoritarian regime took hold in Turkey. Returning home was unthinkable for Toprak after that, but he did return to Turkey right after the 1973 elections. He wanted to become an assistant at the Ankara University and at the time, Gündüz Ökçün who was dean of the *SBF* (Faculty of Political Science), went to great lengths to make it happen. However, there had no open position for *SBF* faculty.

As parallel his range of studies, the year 1977 was an important one for Ottoman historiography in Turkey. The Ottoman Social and Economic History Congresses,

¹⁴ Ibid., 239-245.

which would later become an annual tradition, gathered in Ankara.¹⁵ Ottoman and Turkish history began to develop in this period and these academic fields of study expanded from social to political life. Again, the influence of the Annales school and positivist history was seen in Turkish historiography. For instance, it can be shown through the work of such names Suraiya Faroqhi in the Annales stream, and Enver Ziya Karal or Tarık Zafer Tunaya on the positivist enlightenment side.¹⁶ Zafer Toprak, who would begin to be active later on, can be placed between these two wings. Toprak's writing was influenced by both the enlightenment and Annales School.

With the end of the 1970s, the military thought that the spread of the rightist and leftist ideologies, the workers' strikes, the spread of socialist ideology within the society, executions, and the ever-worsening politics in the 1970s required immediate action. Also all necessitated a change in economic policies, and politics based on class should be eliminated, so they would start to apply neoliberal politics to change this situation. Consequently, 1980 military coup put neoliberal policies into practice in Turkey¹⁷. Neoliberalism is viewed as a class strategy of the bourgeoisie; it is not a mere bundle of economic policies, but a coherent political attack on the collective nature of the working class.¹⁸ For this reason, neoliberalism aims to eliminate politics and political institutions from class contradictions and challenges, that is, to suppress class-based politics. Neoliberalism cultivates authoritarian state forms and authoritarian political projects because of this fundamental feature. At the same time, neoliberal capitalism has brought about the narrowing of the political sphere all over the world, the restriction of the

¹⁵ Oktay Özel, Gökhan Çetinsaya, "Türkiye'de Osmanlı tarihçiliğinin son çeyrek yüzyılı: Bir bilanço denemesi," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 91, (2001): 8.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁷ Haldun Gülalp, "Modernization Policies and Islamist Policies in Turkey" in *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, eds. Sibel Bozdoğan, Reşat Kasaba, (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1997), 56.

¹⁸ Cenk Özbay, Maral Erol, Aysecan Terzioğlu and Z. Umut Turem, eds., *The Making of Neoliberal Turkey*. (Surrey: Ashgate-Routledge, 2016). 4.

possibilities of political democracy and the institutionalization of appropriate forms of state. In this framework, relations between state apparatuses are reorganized to isolate the political and institutional practices of the state from social and political struggles.¹⁹ In order to overcome the political and economic crisis of the 1970s, it was necessary to end social and political polarization, to restrict the search for rights of the laborers, to discipline the working class, to suppress the youth movements and to prevent the left socialist rise i.e. “ensuring national integrity”.²⁰ In this environment where neoliberal politics has started to be applied as state economy policies, many academicians who stand against the neoliberalism like Toprak have begun to produce in the field of economic history by emphasizing class, macro-structures and working class. Due to the neoliberal and postmodernist discourses which brought cultural, ethnic and individualistic solutions to the social explanations of the period, Toprak also gave more importance to the structural analysis, the concept of working class and class.

As a legacy of the 1970s, there would be great momentum behind the economic history of Turkey in the 1980s and many academic candidates made their career choices in favor of economic history. In accordance with the prevailing orientation of the period, Toprak also decided to pursue the field of economic history in his doctoral study. Despite his busy life at Boğaziçi University, within four years Toprak defended his doctoral thesis; *İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti'nin Milli Ekonomi Politikası* (National Economy Policy of the Committee of Union and Progress). After being read by the jury of the Faculty of Economics, it was appreciated, but the true value of it appeared over time. This work was published in 1982 by Yurt Yayınları under the name *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918* (National Economy in Turkey, 1908-1918). Until the publication of *National Economy* in Turkey, there was not much work being done on the economic structure of the Constitutional Era.

¹⁹ Haldun Gülalp, “Modernization Policies and Islamist Policies in Turkey,” 56.

²⁰ Melahat Kutun Gorgen, “Neoliberal Politikalar Uzerinde Kimlik Politikalarının İdeolojik İşlevi: Ana-Akım Soylemin Elestirel Bir Değerlendirmesi,” *Toplum ve Demokrasi* no.13-14, (January-December 2012): 5.

Zafer Toprak's *National Economy* opened a new window into the understanding of the period.²¹ Generally, the 1923 Izmir economic congress was seen as the starting point of twentieth century Turkish economic history. Prior to that, the 1838 Treaty of the Ottoman-British Trade and the "1881 Duyun-i Umumiye" were regarded as critical points. According to Toprak, *National Economy* reconciled Constitutional Monarchy with Republican Turkey. He emphasized continuity in the context of economic policies between the two periods. In *National Economy*, he tied early twentieth century Turkish economic history to the 1908 Young Turks Revolution and showed the statist policies of the government. Toprak then continually tried to develop this thesis and add details that had previously been overlooked. Tarık Zafer Tunaya influenced him and he made a great contribution to the academic historiography with his *National Economy*.²² National economy emphasizes class structure and it may be counted as an objection against the neoliberal politics of the era. He believes that society can be only explained with macro rather than micro-structures, ethnicity, subjective realities or cultural context.

In the 1980s, the late Ottoman and early Republican periods constituted the main themes of history writing in Turkey.²³ Toprak's early studies were also in harmony with these topics. However, despite all the pressures of the era, he kept away himself from work that would magnify the Kemalist period in the annals of the national economy. Although he was following an Enlightenment line, he never became a proponent of the regime. On the contrary, he argued that the roots of the economic policies of the Kemalist period extended to the Constitutional Era. In this regard, he held an opposing stance against the common views of that period.

²¹ Deniz Taner Kılınçoğlu, Book Review: A History of Ottoman Economic Thought: Developments Before the Nineteenth Century, *Ekonomik Yaklaşım* 24, no. 87 (2014): 85-91.

²² Özel, Çetinsaya, "Türkiye'de Osmanlı tarihçiliğinin son çeyrek yüzyılı: Bir bilanço denemesi," 18.

²³ Ibid., 18.

2.2. TOPRAK'S STUDIES AFTER THE 1990s

The neoliberal period, which started its first steps after 1980 and began to become more evident in social consequences after 1990, was very different from 1960-1980 as an accumulation strategy. In this period, the economy was based more on imports, foreign direct investment and financial resource inflows rather than national investments, on the basis of a liberalized international market integration.²⁴ Neoliberalism assumes that the state will be extinguished, that the private sector and civil entrepreneurship will take its place, and therefore politics must have been carried out in society.²⁵ In 1990s, social distinction, identity politics, and the “other” in society have begun to become more apparent. As a result, social sciences have also been influenced by this situation.

In the 1990s (as a continuation of the revitalization that started in the 1980s), political, administrative and intellectual history studies on the Tanzimat, Abdulhamid and Constitutional eras began to multiply. The 1990s were also a time of immense work on immigration and population studies, covering various aspects of social history including work on children and women.²⁶ In this vein, Toprak paid particular attention to labor and gender history. He gathered all of the articles about gender issues into a book known as *Türkiye’de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm 1908-1935* (Feminism and Women’s Freedom in Turkey 1908-1935). It is necessary to say here that the book lacks cohesion because it is a collection of articles written at different times and in different subjects. According to Toprak, he focused on the dates between 1908 and 1935 because this coincided with the first wave of women’s liberation and modernization. Toprak also states that women's freedom began in this period and that women were visible through the years of the

²⁴ Cenk Saraçoğlu, *Şehir, Orta Sınıf ve Kürtler İnkar’dan “Tanıyarak Dışlama”ya*. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2011). 86.

²⁵ Zeynep Gambetti, “Linç Girişimleri, Neoliberalizm ve Güvenlik Devleti,” *Toplum ve Bilim* No. 109, (Summer 2007): 21.

²⁶ Özel, Çetinsaya, “Türkiye’de Osmanlı tarihçiliğinin son çeyrek yüzyılı: Bir bilanço denemesi,” 26.

Constitutional Monarchy. In addition, he went on to publish many articles about demography and many different subjects.

When coming to the 2000s, the neoliberal restructuring strategies in Turkey which was gradually applied since 1980 aimed to accelerate the capital accumulation process and to prevent a possible economic crisis.²⁷ The elections in 2002 was a crucial point in terms of both the transformation of the Islamic movement in Turkey, the effects on Turkey's internal and external politics, as well as regional developments.²⁸ Neo-liberalism, which started in 1980 and has been pushed to the top by “Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi”'s (Justice and Development Party) policies, has removed the concept of class and has made the society heterogeneous by its policies. AKP implements the "Strong Economic Transition Program" has accelerated the expansion and centralization of capital accumulation while completing the neoliberal structural adjustment process with economic policies. However, it did not go beyond strengthening the role of Turkey in the international division of labor of the world capitalism. This situation has rapidly impoverished the workers, civil servants, and peasants, has further increased the injustice in the distribution of income and has enlarged the unemployment.²⁹ In the neoliberal society model, the main purpose of the political process, or the limitation of the role of the state, is to strengthen the market against the state.³⁰ The concept of "conservative democracy", which the AK Party has identified as an ideological identity, is based on the reaction of traditionalism against the project of

²⁷ Özbay, Erol, Terzioğlu and Turem, *The Making of Neoliberal Turkey*, 4-5.

²⁸ Haldun Gülalp, *Kimlikler Siyaseti Türkiye’de Siyasal İslamın Temelleri*, (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003), 181.

²⁹ Metin Altıok, “Neoliberal Yapısal Uyum Sürecinde Son Evre: AKP Hükümeti” 2007, “*Toplum ve Demokrasi*, No.1 (1), (September-December, 2007), 70.

³⁰ Vedat Koç, “Ak Parti’nin Siyasal Sosyolojisi,” in *Yeni Sağ, Küreselleşme ve Türkiye, Türkiye’nin AK Parti’li Yılları*, edited by Nafiz Tok, Mehmet Özel, Vedat Koç, 19-128. (Ankara: Orion Kitabevi, 2014), 31.

Westernization and Kemalist modernization.³¹ It created a kind of Islamic modernization which went hand in hand with neoliberalism.

Toprak's books, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji* (Republic and Anthropology from Darwin to Dersim) and *Türkiye'de Popülizm 1908-1923* (Populism in Turkey 1908-1923), was probably published against the discourse of AKP on Kemalism and its populist discourse to take support of the lower classes. In these two books, Toprak brings to the agenda the continuity and the breaks between the Republic, past and present. *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji* presents the breaking points in Turkish history. With World War I, as in the rest of the world, fundamental changes were observed in Turkey. Mustafa Kemal made great contributions in this period in terms of these fundamental changes. In the 1930s, a cultural revolution took place that can be observed in very few countries outside of Turkey. Toprak indicates that this book became the story of these fundamental changes in society and cultural anthropology was the backbone of this process. However, after 1938, the anthropological studies and discourses on ethnicities turned into racism because the fundamental goal of these studies carried out by Mustafa Kemal was to raise the value of Turkish race without discrimination and includes different ethnic groups in Turkey. In addition, these studies enabled to develop of the scientific studies in the field of social science in Turkey. Like anthropological studies, the populism has a more distinct identity from the populist current in contemporary Turkey. It had an ideological aspect and tried to gather all of the segment within the society without any discrimination.

Besides neoliberal politics, postmodernism constituting the social aspect of neoliberalism claims that the concept of social class is no longer valid in terms of producing meaning and fixing identities.³² The Marxist narrative which emphasizes the worker class and the class struggles as the driving force of history should be

³¹ Metin Altıok, "Neoliberal Yapısal Uyum Sürecinde Son Evre: AKP Hükümeti," 73.

³² Haldun Gülalp, *Kimlikler Siyaseti Türkiye'de Siyasal İslamın Temelleri*, (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003), 123.

abandoned. Postmodernism tries to find partial solution to every partial social problem. No any structure or society is homogeneous so it is futile to seek solutions that will respond to the whole. Since the class existence has no effective presence and meaning, and the criticism of class struggles has also disappeared.³³ After 1980, neo-liberalism has directed the economy while postmodernism has driven social transformation.

After 1980, the ideology of post-modernization that supported the formation of civil society organization rose in the discourse of state-market contradiction. As a result, the rise of postmodern identity politics has increased, the ideology of state-centered modernization has begun to be criticized in Turkey, and the alternative modernization, the post-modernization discourse, has become widespread. In this liberal model, individuals are treated as independent autonomous structures. Because of individual autonomy and differences, the inequalities between individuals were now emphasized rather than the inequalities between class layers. Individualization led to the emergence of subjective identities based on diversity instead of their common economic-material position within society.³⁴

Postmodernism emphasizes "differences" in the context of categories such as gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality. According to this approach, the characteristic of today's society consists of increasing fragmentation, diversification of social relations and experiences, multiplicity of life forms and increasing personal identities. In other words, diversity and differences in society in post-modern world have melted all the old certainties and universality. Postmodernism expresses the end of the ideology as both the mode of thought and the means of organizing social life and rejects metanarrative arguments as universal theories of history.³⁵ Thus, post-modernism declares the end of "macro politics". Macro politics leaves its place

³³ Özbay, Erol, Terzioğlu and Turem, *The Making of Neoliberal Turkey*, 3-5.

³⁴ Melahat Kutun Gürgeç, "Neoliberal Politikalar Üzerinde Kimlik Politikalarının İdeolojik İşlevi: Ana-Akım Söylemin Eleştirel Bir Değerlendirmesi," 5.

³⁵ Oya Çitçi, "Yeni Siyaset: Neoliberalizm Ve Postmodernizmin Siyasal Projesi," *Journal of Social Sciences* 1, no.2 (2008): 6.

to pluralism of short-run “micro politics”. In this context, it rejects the modern political contexts of the modernity, embodied in political parties and trade unions.³⁶ Also postmodernism created a radical break in Kemalist modernism.

In the meantime, according to Toprak, historiography had been undergoing radical transformations, shifting from modernity to post-modernity as a consequence of neoliberal thinking and globalization. Economic content was replaced with a cultural content. A structural understanding of history was replaced with a discourse based on memorizing, oral history and storytelling. Finally, macro historiography lost its value while micro historiography gained favor. However, with a new edition of *National Economy in Turkey*, it still maintained its macro quality. Toprak criticizes the neoliberal period’s approach to historiography and advocates for maintaining a structural understanding. He thinks that an accurate conceptualization of history independent of economic influences and structures is not possible. Moreover, a relativistic history which is far from scientific cannot be supported. In essence, “*National Economy*” remained loyal to modernist paradigm to a large extent.

In short, if it is necessary to categorize the works of Toprak, it can be said that until the end of the 1990s he concentrated on the economy, labor and ideas, but after the 2000s he gave more importance to feminist movements and anthropology. His study on anthropology is based on a state-focused perspective and although his book *Türkiye’de Popülizm 1908-1923* was published in 2013, it is a summation of all his articles on intellectual and ideological movements written before the 2000s, so it is not a new work. Toprak published very few articles on the history of ideas and labor after the 2000s. His work also shows a visible decline in the field of economic history since that time. If all of Toprak’s work on history has to be

³⁶ Melahat Kutun Gorgen, “Neoliberal Politikalar Uzerinde Kimlik Politikalarının İdeolojik İşlevi: Ana-Akım Soylemin Elestirel Bir Değerlendirmesi,” 7.

separated into two periods, it is possible to say that the themes of the first period were the history of labor, economics, and ideas, while the themes of the second period consisted of anthropology, feminism, the Kurdish question, and the Balkan and Gallipoli wars from a state-centered approach. Significantly, his studies on anthropology and Kurdish question are substantially open to critique, as I will try to demonstrate at the end of the chapter “Anthropology”. At this point, it may be meaningful to refer to AKP’s politics to understand the causes of such a great transformation in Toprak’s studies’ subjects and approach after 2000s. The AKP regime tried to suppress the secular life style, put neoliberal policies under the name of modern Islam and corrupt society. It tried to destroy the secular life by fostering enmity against the early republican period. All created a great reaction in the secular segment of society against AKP’s regime and the discourse of modern Islam.

2.3. TOPRAK’S PUBLICATION AND ACADEMIC LIFE

He started his publication career with the “Yurt ve Dünya”, the scientific publication branch of the Labor party (İşçi Partisi) and with the journal “Toplum ve Bilim” that he, Sencer Divitçioğlu and Savaş Akat founded. He was also among the founders of the journal “Toplum ve Bilim” and a publisher for “Yurt Yayınları”. As a result of the 1980 coup, academicians were only able to publish inside a limited framework. Many publishing houses were censored and closed down and only a few of them survived. One of them was “Toplum ve Bilim” magazine, whose distribution was interrupted from time to time. There was no other magazine or publishing organization that was so objective and distant from the ideology that the state imposed in the 1980s. Some journals and publishers were close to Kemalist ideology while the others were Islamist. This period caused the revival of the official history theses of the Republican Era. However, “Toplum ve Bilim” never left its objectivity and scientific approach, despite many government attempts at censorship and repressive policies.

In 1977, he got an offer from the department of Humanities of Boğaziçi University to become a lecturer. For that reason, he says that he needed to publish his articles under a pseudonym. His first articles; *1908 İşçi Hareketleri ve Jön Türkler*,

Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı ve Tarihte 1 Mayıslar (1906-1925) (1908 Worker’s Movements and Young Turks, Worker Class in Turkey and May 1 in History (1906-1925)) were published by the journal “Yurt ve Dünya”. He states that he used original sources for both and so these studies have been key references for many years in historical research. The journal “Toplum ve Bilim”, in particular, was good workshop for him to develop his research and studies. He published both his own articles and translations of work from Ottoman Turkish into the new Turkish Latin lettering in “Toplum ve Bilim”. In the first issue of “Toplum ve Bilim”, he published an article *İkinci Meşrutiyet ve Solidarist Düşünce; Halkçılık* (Second Constitutional Monarchy and Solidarist Thought; Populism) and a translation *Türkiye Sosyalist Fırkasının bir Risalesi; Sosyalistlik Nedir?* (A Booklet of the Socialist Party of Turkey; What is socialism?). In the same year, his article *Halkçılık İdeolojisinin Oluşumu* (The Formation of Populist Ideology) was published in the book *Atatürk Döneminin Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Sorunları* (Economic and Social Problems in the Period of Atatürk).

Although Boğaziçi University did not employ staff without doctorate degrees, Toprak was the only exception here and he started to give courses before his PhD was granted. From his beginnings with Boğaziçi University as a young academician, he indicates that he began to follow an Anglo-Saxon path, moving away from the socialist and oppositional stance of Ankara. Unlike the *SBF* in Ankara University, Boğaziçi University was a very harmonious university, and the staff were new hires as it was a brand-new faculty. The Faculty of Humanities was a very new interdisciplinary department in which litterateurs, historians and philosophers were involved.

There is no doubt that September 12, 1980 is one of the most important turning points in Turkey's recent political and social history. A coup d’état meant that civil politics became inactive, and politicians and large sections of society were no longer the defining actors of political life. The military regime that was established began to impose repressive policies upon the whole of society through new state institutions. In addition to politics, the fields of science, literature and art were put under strict pressure and control in the name of “survival of the state” and “national

unity and solidarity”. Kemalism was imposed as an official ideology, and left and right felt movements and intellectual activities were forbidden, either explicitly or indirectly and the concept of Turkish-Islamic synthesis entered The Turkish literature. A state-centered discourse, which was forcibly imposed on the axis of Kemalism, followed a pragmatic path. While this discourse emphasized “modern civilization” and “Kemalist nationalism”, it also stressed spiritual-religious values. Some scientists and intellectuals within certain sections of society supported this discourse.³⁷ Both the conservative nationalist segment and secular positivist (Enlightenment) segments of society supported the efforts to form this official ideology that would continue throughout the first half of the 1980s.³⁸ After the September 12 coup, and as a result of the state policies, the works of academicians were censored and they were removed from their positions in universities.³⁹

The coup also resulted in academia falling under state control. Academics who defended state ideology were the ones appointed to universities, so the academic environment outside of the state-centered approach was very limited.⁴⁰ It is necessary to include Toprak among the names that are far from this situation.

In this repressive environment, Toprak was interrogated twice in Selimiye in the first half of the 1980s due to his activities in the *Barış Derneği* ve *Tümöd*. He was taken into custody over a speech he had made on fascism and Nazım Hikmet which was recorded on *Disk*. Toprak intended to defuse the situation by claiming that he had nothing to do with the politics of Nazım Hikmet during his interrogation. While the academicians in Boğaziçi University after the 1980 coup were not greatly influenced by the dismissal of teaching staff, they could not go abroad without permission of the government. Toprak received an invitation from France, however,

³⁷ Özel, Çetinsaya, “Türkiye’de Osmanlı tarihçiliğinin son çeyrek yüzyılı: Bir bilanço denemesi,” 11.

³⁸ Ibid., 11.

³⁹ Ibid., 13.

⁴⁰ Salih Özbaran, *Tarih ve Öğretimi*, (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1992), 33-49.

and went abroad without permission. This decision created a problem when he returned back and he was not appointed to the university, even though he had been an associate professor for five years. He protested and was eventually granted a role associate professor in 1987 and immediately applied for full professorship. Finally, in 1989 he became a professor.

In the 1980s, the humanities department was removed from Boğaziçi University and the Western languages and literature, philosophy and history departments were founded. The History department opened master's and doctoral programs within a short time. After being rector of Boğaziçi University in 1992, Üstün Ergüder tried to improve academic quality of Atatürk Institute, which was partly at arms' length from Boğaziçi University. Ergüder assigned Toprak as director of the institute. Atatürk Institutes generally focused on national struggle and the early Republican period, and were established in six universities in Turkey at the time of the YÖK (Council of Higher Education) laws. They were, to a certain extent, an adaptation of the Atatürk Institute of Ankara University which aimed to protect of identity of the Republic in the intensive ideological environment of 1930s. Atatürk's Principles and Revolutionary History Institutes were established in universities in keeping with the social aims of the new government. Their goal was to establish these institutions as places to raise a Kemalist generation who would take first place under the founding laws of YÖK. Another goal was to institutionalize scientific research in these fields and to train a large number of specialists.⁴¹ However, Toprak believed that this historical background of the Institute should be changed in the direction of the historical studies in the current world and that it was a necessity to go beyond the concerns of the era and put it in a more scientific framework. While the Atatürk Institutes, founded in Turkey, started the history of modern Turkey as May 19, 1919, and ended it in 1938, Toprak initiated it from Tanzimat period and brought it up to today. In addition, the name of Institute has been changed as *Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History* in English. After that, the Atatürk Institute

⁴¹ Özel, Çetinsaya, "Türkiye'de Osmanlı tarihçiliğinin son çeyrek yüzyılı: Bir bilanço denemesi," 11-12.

was going to be an institution that has become a more modern and scientific institution following the world literature and that is generally oriented towards modernization of Turkey starting with Tanzimat period rather than an institution that promotes the principles and revolutions of Mustafa Kemal.

For this reason, he emphasizes that he was aiming to create an institute that was a focal point for a wide interdisciplinary scope. Indeed, the Atatürk Institute was only formed in its present context as a result of Toprak's efforts and it remains, today, as one of the most distinguished interdisciplinary institute in Turkey.

In addition to his initiative in Atatürk Institute, he was one of the founders of "Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı" (Economic and Social History Foundation) which made the biggest contribution to the academic and popular history of Turkey in the 1990s. It was established as a non-governmental organization in 1991 and with the rapid expansion of its operational framework it quickly gained influence on cultural and social life in the country.⁴² The Foundation has shifted the axis of historical research, from the central state and its institutions, to the history of local and ordinary people, civic institutions and organizations, and mass or marginalized social movements. Another important development of the 1980s and 1990s was the publication of the Journal of "Tarih ve Toplum" (History and Society) which was a pioneer of popular history magazines.⁴³ The journal "Tarih ve Toplum" appeared as an alternative to the biased historiography dating back from the 1950s to the 1980s. When it was first published in 1983, it brought a very different perspective to history writing in Turkey. Unlike the past, it emphasized that everything claimed by researchers should be backed up with

⁴² Özel, Çetinsaya, "Türkiye'de Osmanlı tarihçiliğinin son çeyrek yüzyılı: Bir bilanço denemesi," 27.

⁴³ Ibid., 15.

evidence. Moreover, it demonstrated that history can be popularized without compromising its scientific aspects⁴⁴.

Most of Toprak's works was developed in the "Tarih ve Toplum" and "Toplumsal Tarih", which are primarily a workshop for him. The articles he published in these journals were written in a very modest language that addressed both the common people and professions. Moreover, it can also be said that he has contributed to the popularization of history in Turkey by his articles in these journals. He has published about 20 books and more than 200 articles throughout his academic life. His articles were first published in Turkish, then in French, English, German and Italian. He usually tried to write in the "empty spaces" of historiography.

Toprak did not limit himself to the academic field; he also prepared many books and exhibitions for institutions and entered publishing life. During the 1980s, he became the general director of the history section of the "Yurt Ansiklopedisi" (Yurt Encyclopedia), which was preparing an eleven-volume encyclopedia. Soon, he started projects in other areas, too. Firstly, he prepared a book for publication marking the 50th anniversary of "Şişecam". Then, he prepared project books for institutions such as "İstanbul Menkul Kıymetler Borsası, Sümerbank, Akbank, Milli Reasürans, Anadolu Sigorta, Darüşşafaka, and Borusan", in the latter half of the 1980s. At the same time, he worked as a curator for exhibitions in financial institutions such as İş Bankası, "Yapı Kredi Bankası" and "Garanti Bankası". He prepared the 75th anniversary exhibition of the Foundation of Republic for "Yapı Kredi Bankası". Moreover, the work entitled *Bir Yurttaş Yaratmak- Muasır bir Medeniyet için Seferberlik Bilgileri* (Creating a Citizen - Mobilization Information for a Contemporary Civilization) was published at this time. Meanwhile, he was involved in the foundation of two museums; "the Finans Museum of İş Bankası" and "Asım Kocabıyık Borusan Museum".

⁴⁴ Tarih ve Toplum, *Hakkımızda*, <http://www.tarihtoplum.com/public/sayfa.aspx?id=749> (accessed Aug. 27, 2017).

He also took part in the editorial boards of “Toplumsal Tarih”, “Tarih ve Toplum”, “İstanbul Dergisi”, and” Boğaziçi University Press” and “Yurt Yayınları”. He was the director of the “Avrupa Bilim Vakfı”’s projects and he organized many symposiums. He prepared an exhibition known as “Lozan’dan Cumhuriyet’e İsmet İnönü Sergisi” which was shown all around Turkey. His last exhibition “Entellektüel Tarihimizde Kırılma Noktası; Nazım Hikmet’in Açlık Grevi” was mounted in Boğaziçi University.

In summary, Toprak witnessed two different military coups as part of the 1968 Generation. Despite the pressures and censorship that followed the military coups, he never lost his passion for science, and continued to research and study without interruption. He published his first academic article in journal “Birikim” in 1975. Immediately after this, the journals "Yurt ve Dünya" and "Toplum ve Bilim" published many of his other articles. Because of his passion for reading and research, he claims to have one of the most extensive libraries, with a reported 130000 books.

At the beginning of his career, Toprak focused on labor movements, economics and the history of ideas as being against the neoliberalist effect on academia. Later on, he delved into the fields of feminism and anthropology. In recent years, particularly, almost none of his work has been related to labor and trade union developments. As we have seen previously, Toprak’s writing topics are affected by the common discourses of the period. He took a stand against the Kemalist and ideological approach of the 1980s and published the “National Economy” against the state discourse.

It can perhaps be claimed that he published his books *Darwin’den Dersim’e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji* and *Türkiye’de Popülizm 1908-1923* and his many related articles, as a reaction against AKP’s discourse on Kemalism and the early Republican period of Turkey. The dominant discourse of this period was developed within the mindset of an enmity against Kemalism and Mustafa Kemal. Toprak, on the other hand, examines the Kemalist period and Mustafa Kemal from a

functionalist point of view and claims that the Kemalist regime did not impose a false ideology, despite its negative aspects.



CHAPTER 3

ECONOMIC HISTORY

3.1. A SHORT LOOK AT THE HISTORICAL APPROACHES AND DEBATES ON ECONOMIC HISTORY IN TURKEY

To better understand how Toprak's studies on economy, especially "National Economy", have come to light as a new approach to late Ottoman economic history, I will first of all give an overview of other historical approaches in Turkey and debates on its economic history. Before the conceptualization of the "National Economy" by Toprak, most academic studies of the era have tied the modernization of the Turkish economy to the Republican period. This was due to the fact that the Second Constitutional period was seen as a scapegoat for economic deterioration after the First World War. Toprak, however, opposes allegations that the Unionists carried out a completely liberal economic policy and deteriorated the economic structure of the Ottoman Empire. Most economic history studies claimed that it was the Republican era that conducted a protectionist economic policy to prevent economic dependence, while it can be seen that the Unionists gradually tried to protect the Ottoman economy against exploitation by the West with statist policies and they gradually abandoned their liberal policies.

Chronological history writing in the Ottoman era dominated the historiography in Turkey for years. After the establishment of the Republic, Mustafa Kemal pioneered the institutionalization of historical science in Turkey. Even though he pursued an ethnic discriminative aim, history science has been institutionalized in Turkey thanks to his emphasis on anthropological and historical studies. According to Berktaş, the National War of Independence and the establishment of the new Turkish state played a determining role in the settlement of History as a branch of

science in our country.⁴⁵ The bourgeois-democratic revolution known as the “Kemalist Revolution” has been a key influence in the development of this field. Berktaş claims that the adherents who support a more advanced methodology for history will not be able to overcome that history without thoroughly digesting the historical legacy of the Republicans.⁴⁶ One of the main reasons for the development of history science in Turkey was a reaction against Europeans who placed the country in a third-class position. Until the first half of the 20th century, European historical literature reduced world history to the history of the West, i.e. the “center” of the capitalist world system. All the accomplishments of civilization were attributed to European whites. The West portrayed the regions, countries and the peoples in the periphery of the system as if they were in an absolute stagnation, or it claimed that any countries that started to modernize were still only following the West, and lagging behind. Berktaş states that modern historical studies in Turkey show a definite parallelism with Westernization or modernization.⁴⁷ However, like the examples in the Western world, the nationalist point of view was dominant in the historiography in Turkey at that time, in order to create a nation-state. Along with the end of the single-party period, a wide variety of studies began to appear in the area of historiography, as with other fields.

Hobsbawm says that there was most likely an impact of Marxism from the beginning, something which was exceptionally significant in the historiography.⁴⁸ Of course, the effect of Marxism was seen especially in the economic and social historiography of Turkey. According to Faroqhi, not only Marxists studied social and economic history, but this area attracted the broader attention of socialists,

⁴⁵ Halil Berktaş, *Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü*, (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 1983), 13.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 14.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 26.

⁴⁸ Eric Hobsbawm, “Karl Marx’s Contribution to Historiography,” *Diogenes* 16, no. 64, (1968): 40.

social democrats and left leaning liberals in Turkey.⁴⁹ Yet, Turkish historians have not produced any usable paradigms.⁵⁰ Despite the fact that most of historians and social scientists used Marxist concepts to understand and explain Ottoman and Turkish economic and social structures, Ortaylı states that researchers may use the terminology of Marxist historiography, but in their analysis of society they certainly ignore the basic concept of Marxist historiography, i.e., the modes of production.⁵¹ Accordingly, for Hobsbawm, most historians who call them Marxists tend to use the tools of positivism, even though they are not aware of it.⁵² The historiography in Turkey can be summarized from what Hobsbawm has said. Although many historians position themselves in the Marxist, or the Annales tradition, in practice we cannot see that it has been put into practice effectively.

In the 1980s, European historians and sociologists opposed framing the history of the previous twenty years as a period in which economic and social history prevailed. Instead, they focused on the effect of the state on that history.⁵³ Ottoman historians have begun to be interested in this new stream of historiography; however, Faroqhi states that this is a somewhat paradoxical situation since the Ottoman historiography has always been very state-centric. On one hand, the "traditional" state-centered approach was based on the new style of Marxist historiography, but on the other hand, the new one was based on the theories of non-Marxist state organization. Researchers with a comparative approach, such as Perry Anderson, insisted that the arena in which the decisive class struggle emerged has always been at the state level. One of the most important issues for the Ottoman

⁴⁹ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı Tarihi Nasıl İncelenir? Kaynaklara Giriş* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999)121, 4.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 11.

⁵¹ Halil Berktaş, *Kabilelerden Feodalizme* (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 1983), 36.

⁵² Hobsbawm, "Karl Marx's Contribution to Historiography," 38.

⁵³ Faroqhi, *Osmanlı Tarihi Nasıl İncelenir? Kaynaklara Giriş*, 12. To learn about this account see: Theda Skocpol, Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Bringing the State Back in*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1985).

historians who pursued Anderson and dealt with the question of state structure from the perspective of Marx was to find an answer to the question of how state bureaucracy acted independently from the society which surrounded it.⁵⁴

Besides Marxist tradition in Turkish historiography, Charles Tilly's work has always been important for Ottoman historians who are interested in the formation of the state, but who are outside the Marxist tradition. For specialists who are trying to understand the role of war in Ottoman politics with a new approach, Tilly's capital accumulation, as well as the fact that wars are centralized in the theory of state formation, is an important advantage.⁵⁵ Tilly's "nation-state" is an organization with a relative independence from the community that controls and governs various regions and cities, and it has a strong bureaucratic system.⁵⁶

Faroghi claims that it is very difficult to examine a continuing theoretical approach because the outlines of a paradigm usually become visible when it loses its validity. For instance, The Asiatic Mode of Production was a popular approach amongst Ottoman social scientists in the 1960s. At the same time, another political intellectual group was exploring the possibilities of the concept of "feudalism". A group of Ottoman economic historians using AMP as a framework for their research have, however, embraced the paradigm of "world systems" put forward by Wallerstein and his school.⁵⁷ Although the debate on feudalism was not a suitable theoretical framework for the Ottoman Empire, it has enabled Ottoman historians to produce a viable comparative history.⁵⁸ In recent years, in many areas of history, the idea of linear progress as a positive approach has been abandoned.⁵⁹ That is to

⁵⁴ Ibid., 12.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 14.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 15.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 17.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 18.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 278.

say for Faroqhi, when discussion on AMP in Turkish historiography was continuing, but its outcome was not visible in that time. Whether or not a paradigm is suitable to examine a society is tested only after it has been applied and after the paradigm has been refuted.

According to Toprak, the dissolution of colonialism after the Second World War led to a radical transformation in historiography. The end of colonialism, the deterioration of European powers, and the rise of new great powers became the factors which determined this transformation. The role of Europe in world history was re-evaluated and the Euro-centric approach was questioned. The collapse of Europe as much as its rise came to the forefront of the agenda of historians. In those days, the Dutch historian Jan Romein declared the end of the European age and the beginning of the Asian Century. Political and ideological reasons, as well as the development of inter-disciplinarity among social sciences, became a factor in this new quest to find an alternative explanation for current world systems as historians sought a new analytical approach. The post-war period saw the dawn of social and economic history. The interest in political and military history decreased and material civilization, mentality, daily life, and common man were emphasized. Evolution was replaced with structure, and continuity gained importance as change. As a result, the polarity between Europe as a symbol of change and Asia as a symbol of continuity lost its significance.⁶⁰ The distinction between center and colonies also weakened and the new approach included factors such as town, region, and social groups. At this stage, historical writings were affected by US historians and the issues of Asia and Africa gained priority. At the same time, interest in the Near East, the Far East, etc., grew rapidly in the US.

Toprak remarks that while the former colonies which gained their independence established their own history departments, historical studies were still dominated by Western historians for a while because Europeans were better educated and they

⁶⁰ Zafer Toprak, "Türkiye'de Tarih Yazımının Evrimi ve Yarının Tarihi," *TÜBA Günce*, no. 37 (2007): 28-30.

had easier access to archive resources.⁶¹ Asian and African young academicians went to Europe to study history and there they encountered Western archives, learned Western concepts and studied historical events. Toprak contends that they could not make much reference to their own civilizations and their own national sources. While national historians were taking an anti-Western stance, European historians also began to question overseas histories which have been done with a European-centered approach. Then, the colonialism and anti-colonialism approach was replaced with a left-right opposition. The neo-Marxist critique of colonialism has since been influential in the Western world. Naturally, this situation also affected Turkish historians.

3.1.1. Debates on Economic History in Turkey

Berktaş states that economic history cannot be reduced to a history of technology, or any other specific topic. While examining the development of the material bases of human society, economic history has to include the technical direction of production, the social direction of production, and productive relations with productive forces.⁶² Economic history constitutes an area that examines the material bases of societies and the development of these bases within the understanding of history as a whole. Moreover, it examines both the relationship between man and nature in relation to nature.⁶³ In other words, economic history deals with economies in both technical and social dimensions. As economic developments influence social and political developments over the course of history, social, political and ideological structures can also be influential, or even determinative, on the economy.

⁶¹ Zafer Toprak, *Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum, Milli İktisat, Milli Burjuvazi* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995), VIII.

⁶² Berktaş, *Kabilelerden Feodalizme*, 36.

⁶³ Şevket Pamuk, *Osmanlı-Türkiye İktisadî Tarihi 1500-1914* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları: 2007), 14.

In hindsight, Toprak's studies on economy originated from the questioning of imperialism and dependency theories that dominated the studies of his period, in order to clarify the economic structure of the late Ottoman Empire. Concepts such as underdevelopment, colony, semi-colony, comprador bourgeoisie, sovereignty, national bourgeoisie, and accumulation of capital were the leading concepts at that time. According to Toprak, his studies, (such as *Economy and Society in Turkey (1908-1950)*, *National Economy*, *National Bourgeoisie*) aimed to investigate the structural problems brought into question by delayed nation building in Turkey.⁶⁴ He looked at the formation of the new social strata and sought to shed light on the radical transformations observed on the eve of the Republic in the Ottoman Empire.

It is vital to look at the academic discussions of the period to understand the significance of the Toprak's studies on economic history. In this sense, the debates about Imperialism and Dependency will be examined to explain how Toprak's studies on national economy in Turkey came into being. Although the term Imperialism has been in use since the 1860s, it only entered into the literature as a historical concept later, with the book of J.A Hobson "Imperialism: A study (1902). According to Hobson, Imperialism was the result of low consumption inside English markets. That is, he defines imperialism as "the endeavor of the great controllers of industry to broaden the channel for the flow of their surplus wealth by seeking foreign markets and foreign investments to take off the goods and capital they cannot sell or use at home".⁶⁵ Therefore, for Hobson, the most significant factor in the economics of imperialism is foreign investments. The large banking institutions are the main elements that promote imperialistic policies and try to find the most profitable markets for their investments. These financial institutions use the means of the state for private business purposes to carry out their policies. According to him, Imperialism is not simply a choice, it is a requirement. Markets need to be obtained for growing manufacturers and new areas must be found for the

⁶⁴ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum, Milli İktisat, Milli Burjuvazi*, V.

⁶⁵ John A. Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study* (New York: James Pott & Company, 1902), 1.

investment of surplus capital. These large and growing powers of production need to expand and such expansion is a requirement for an industrial power. Hobson contends that the natural outcome of economic pressures, (those resulting from the sudden surge of capitalism which cannot find a place to present its own product), is the necessity to find foreign markets for goods and investment. When nations were more industrialized, the growth of production goes beyond the growth in consumption. That is, more goods are manufactured than needed, and more capital comes into being than there is room for remunerative investment.

Manufacturers, merchants and financiers never want to dispose of their economic resources; therefore, they bring pressure on the government to secure their interests. Hobson asserts that it is not industrial advance which demands the opening up of new markets and areas for investment, but it is the mal-distribution of consuming power that hinders the absorption of commodities and capital into the country. The economic root of imperialism is, at its core, an issue of over-saving. This over-saving includes rents, monopoly profits, and other unearned or excessive factors of income that are not earned by labor. These types of incomes do not have any relation to the productive process, nor do they increase consumption, because they do not hold a proper place in the natural economy of production and consumption.⁶⁶

To conclude, Britain was no longer able to sell its domestic product inside its own borders, because demand was less than production. Britain then went searching for new markets to sell its product and accumulate capital and, thus, the theory of capitalist imperialism was born. Hobson's theory of imperialism was later taken over by Marxist intellectuals, especially by Kari Hilferding and Rosa Luxemburg, and was then adapted and developed.⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Daniel H. Kruger, "Hobson, Lenin, and Schumpeter on Imperialism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 16, no. 2 (1955): 254.

⁶⁷ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum, Milli İktisat, Milli Burjuvazi*, V.

Meanwhile, Marxists brought imperialism to its inevitable historical position. In 1916, Lenin described imperialism as the "last stage of capitalism" and imperialism gained a new dimension that was to be adopted in Marxist theory and practice for many years. Debates on imperialism were starting to stagnate during both the Second World War and in the following decade. The fall of Germany at the hands of the liberal world then created a hopeful atmosphere for the future. Again, the claim of imperialism gained strength in the 1960s.⁶⁸ Of course, the independence gained by colonies and American economic empire played a major role in this opinion. Although many ideas and different views have been put forward about imperialism, the generally agreed upon point was that the real effects of imperialism on overseas territories were seen after the Industrial Revolution. The colonial powers were organized in the direction of their interests, which meant that communities in the colonies had to carry out different responsibilities. But, there was also the problem of de-industrialization to consider and the Indian textile industry was a concrete example of this dilemma.⁶⁹ Specialization in meta-products (cash crop) and specialization in monoculture and going towards monoculture were other features of this period.

The Argentinian economist Raúl Prebisch and Hans Singer introduced the theory of "dependency" in 1949. "Dependency" stemmed from the observation of the continuity of Latin American problems. Poverty, inequality, misery, external debt, foreign capital governance and dependency became perpetual issues in these countries. According to this theory, dependency stems from underdevelopment, but not technically from lack of development. This theory was later developed and included Latin America, as well as the Third World countries. The Third World countries which were on periphery of the global economic system pumped surplus to the West, and the West actively kept peripheral countries in this position to increase and accumulate its own capital. Thus, dependency was a process rather

⁶⁸ Ibid., VI.

⁶⁹ Ibid., VI.

than a state. That is to say, the Third World was not underdeveloped, but it was a world left behind by West. Andre Gunter Frank expressed it in his own way: "the development of underdevelopment".⁷⁰ The theory of dependency was applied to many nations of the Third World, especially to countries in Africa. While Neo-Marxists were embracing the theory of dependence, classical Marxists and anthropologists emphasize the autonomy of African history.⁷¹

Later on, dependency theory would gain a new dimension through Wallerstein who studied primarily the problems of colonialism in Africa and the end of colonial times, inspired by the theory of dependency and underdevelopment. Wallerstein believed that developmental problems can only be understood in a global context and within a historical perspective. He was close to Annales and especially to F. Braudel.⁷² The first edition of *The Modern World System*, which was planned as four volumes, was published in 1974 and included the analytic framework of his project. This study has been a source of inspiration for many researchers in Turkey and has opened up an interesting debate on European expansion and the origins of capitalism. Wallerstein asserts that the roots of today's world economy go back to the end of the 15th century, because the starting point of the increasingly mature world system took place in the 16th and 17th centuries. This world system completed its own development before the Industrial Revolution. "The "systemic turning point" was roughly the period between 1450-1550, which is the period of dissolving of feudalism".⁷³ According to Wallerstein, the main mechanisms of the capitalist world system gradually took the place of feudalism in the period between 1550 and 1650.

⁷⁰ Joseph L. Love, "Raul Prebisch and the Origins of the Doctrine of Unequal Exchange," *Latin American Research Review* 15, no. 3 (1980): 45-72. 45-47.

⁷¹ Love, "Raul Prebisch and the Origins of the Doctrine of Unequal Exchange," 48.

⁷² Stanley Aronowitz, "A Metatheoretical Critique of Immanuel Wallerstein's "The Modern World System"," *Theory and Society* 10, no. 4 (1981): 503-520, 510.

⁷³ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum, Milli İktisat, Milli Burjuvazi*, VIII.

Wallerstein further characterized the world system in terms of international economic order and the international division of labor. The world system consisted of the center, which was able to change its position, the periphery and semi-periphery. That is to say, the center might be periphery and the periphery might be center at different times. Contemporary history was the history of the integration of various parts of the world within the world system. This world system was based on the fact that the center was exploiting the periphery and thus had obtained surplus. This was seen in trade, where the gain of one side was a loss for the other side. For Wallerstein, the Industrial Revolution was the result of the accumulation of international trade and it consolidated existing unequal relations and the development of underdevelopment.⁷⁴

The position of historical studies in Turkey has been shaped and undulated by all of these debates. The pluralistic environment of the 1960s opened the country to outside influence. Turkey followed the developments of the West, and the Marxist community in particular has translated and published these developments regularly. Like the West, Turkey encountered many problems within the areas of economic and social history, and historical sociology. All of these debates provided an evolving conceptualization of history in the 1960s. In a particular sector in Turkey, historiography followed the conceptual dimensions in the West.

Imperialism and dependency theories and their interpretations have been used to seek for some questions on the history of Turkey's economy such as "how does Turkey avoid being an underdeveloped?" "how does it avoid being dependent to imperialist countries" and "how can it provide its own economic development?" These were the questions most discussed by the Turkish intellectuals after the 1960s. The ground of these discussions was based on the disappointment caused by both dependency on the Western countries and especially to USA in the sense of

⁷⁴ Tony Smith, "The Logic of Dependency Theory Revisited," *International Organization* 35, no. 4 (1981): 755-761.

economy and politics and that it could not still develop sufficiently.⁷⁵ Of course these were not the only reasons why these discussions were popular.

In the 1960s, there was a shift to left all around the world, and at the same time, Turkey had increasingly an antipathy against America because of the Cyprus issue. Therefore, the political and economic influence of the Western countries and USA was started to be questioned radically in Turkey. The most critical point of this questioning was economic dependency. Probably because of these reasons, the history of political economy and economics started rapidly to become popular fields.⁷⁶

From the framework of these discussions, and after the short-term experience of the Kadro movement, Hobson-Lenin's thesis left its mark on the historical studies of social science in Turkey in the 1960s.⁷⁷ Along with the literature of underdevelopment, this approach determined the direction of structural history. Doğan Avcıoğlu, İsmail Cem, Muzaffer Sencer, Idris Küçükömer, Sencer Divitcioğlu, Stefanos Yerasimos and many other academicians and writers have touched upon the imperialism problem from different disciplines.⁷⁸ For instance, in the late 1960's and the early 1970s, the debate on the nature of the Ottoman Empire in Turkey was initiated by Sencer Divitcioğlu. He argued that the Ottoman Empire was a clear example of the Asiatic Mode of Production.⁷⁹

Since the 1930s, structural problems have determined the understanding of history. The land reform that was on the agenda led Ömer Lütfi Barkan to follow the reform

⁷⁵ M. Asım Karaömerlioğlu, "Bağımlılık Kuramı, Dünya Sistemi Teorisi ve Osmanlı/Türkiye Çalışmaları", Winter 2002, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no 91: (2002):81

⁷⁶ Ibid., 82.

⁷⁷ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum, Milli İktisat, Milli Burjuvazi*, VI.

⁷⁸ Ibid., VI.

⁷⁹ Huri İslamoğlu and Çağlar Keyder, "Agenda for Ottoman History," *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 1, no. 1 (1977): 37. (end note).

efforts in the Balkans. Barkan defines himself as an Annales historian because he was strongly influenced by Annales historians, especially by Braudel and his methodological perspective. Sahillioğlu claims that Barkan studies historical facts through the eyes of ordinary people, not through the eyes of great men. He believes that history is not decided by power; instead we should look at the lives of the ordinary people, their cultural codes and sociological structures, as well as geography, demography and climate – an approach developed by the Annales School in France.⁸⁰ In the following years, Mustafa Akdag and Halil İnalcık looked at history from the standpoint of social and economic concerns. At the same time, İsmail Hüsrev Tökin, Şevket Süreyya, Hüseyin Avni Şanda were historians who looked at history in a similar way⁸¹.

Aside from these debates, some intellectuals tied the situation of economic underdevelopment of Turkey to the Asiatic Mode of Production. With the duality of state and subject (*reaya*), the Ottoman Empire could not form a middle class and, in a sense, it was deprived of a civil society element. In other words, the Ottoman Empire could not capitalize upon itself by reproducing itself. The Asiatic Mode of Production emphasized the specificity of the East and brought the vicious cycle and unresolvedness of the Ottoman Empire into agenda. After the second half of the seventies, Wallerstein influenced structural and conceptual history in Turkey. Intellectuals such as Çağlar Keyder, Huricihan İslamoğlu İnanc, Yahya Tezel, Şevket Pamuk, Reşat Kasaba etc. tended to see Ottoman Turkish history in the context of center-periphery.

According to Kasaba, the land was the primary source of income for the Ottoman Empire, from its rise to its decline. Until the 17th century, the Ottoman Empire implemented the *timar* system as their land policy, meaning that the land belongs in its entirety to the state, but the right of cultivation belonged to peasants, as long as they agree to raise *the timarli sipahis* with part of their income derived from that

⁸⁰ Halil Sahillioğlu, “Ömer Lütfi Barkan,” *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 41, no. 1-4 (1985): 4.

⁸¹ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Ekonomi ve Toplum, Milli İktisat, Milli Burjuvazi*, IX.

land. Then, in a similar mentality, the Ottoman Empire used the *iltizam system* as a land policy and later the *çiftlik system*, but this system eventually became defunct, too.⁸² The economic and social corruption of the Empire necessitated the expansion of commercial activities and investments in a free environment. In fact, in border areas especially, the circulation of goods and capital often escaped the reach of the central bureaucracy.⁸³ While the Balkan countries made commerce with European countries, the other regions of the Empire started at a much later time. The development of interstate relationships between the Ottoman Empire and Europe finally enabled merchants to enjoy commerce with European countries and Turkey was then incorporated into the World economic system.

On the other hand, Cizakça claims that incorporation of the Ottoman Empire into the World economy was not a single event and different regions were incorporated different periods in history. Two stages of the Ottoman incorporation are identified here: one is the early incorporation of the period 1550-1650, and the other is the full of incorporation of the period 1830-1900. He also contends that Ottoman industry was under pressure from European competition during the latter stage.⁸⁴ In addition, Pamuk points out that through capitulations and Tanzimat reforms, the Ottoman Empire became a peripheral country.⁸⁵ Çağlar Keyder examines the agricultural, industrial sectors and trade activities as a periphery economy to explain the integration of the Turkish economy into the world economic system. These sectors are considered as the main factors of integration into the world economy. He uses technological transformations in industry to measure the impact of

⁸² Reşat Kasaba, "Incorporation of the Ottoman Empire, 1750-1820," *Review* X, (1987): 811-816.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 811-816.

⁸⁴ Murat Cizakça, Incorporation of the Middle East into the European World Economy, *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* Vol. 8, No. 3 (Winter, 1985): 354.

⁸⁵ To learn more about Pamuk's claim, see also; *Osmanlı Ekonomisinde Bağımlılık ve Büyüme*, 1994, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları

capitalism on the country.⁸⁶ According to Keyder and İslamoğlu, Ottoman history has been approached with a crossbreed institutionalist-functionalist view on one side, and a rough modernization view on the other.⁸⁷ For them, the dominant mode of production in the Ottoman social establishment was AMP. But later, the contradictions that existed within AMP, and the contradictions that arose as a result of the articulation of AMP with social organizations, led to its dissolution.⁸⁸

Then, when general production turned into commodity production, and when these commodities began to impact the circulation of industrial capital, the position of the country as a peripheral area became stronger.⁸⁹ Thus, the situation enabled the Ottoman Empire to integrate into the World economy and eventually become a colonial state. With this transformation into a colonial state, the Ottoman system lost its specificity. The domination of the capitalist mode of production in an economic and political sense had transformed the system. Henceforth, the Ottoman Empire as a part of the capitalist system can be examined as an integral part of the new capitalist world order.⁹⁰

According to Toprak, two discrete periods in the historical studies can be observed in Turkey: the first is one of national history and the latter is one of structuralist history. The national history period was a result of an attitude against colonial history, as it took an opposite stand to the West's "civilization function".⁹¹ By contrast, the Kadro movement, inspired by Marx and Sombart, added structural

⁸⁶ Çağlar Keyder, *The Definition of a Peripheral Economy Turkey 1923-1929*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 4-5.

⁸⁷ Huri İslamoğlu and Çağlar Keyder, "Osmanlı Tarihi Nasıl Yazılmalı? Bir Öneri," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no.1 (1977): 55.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 63.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 73.

⁹⁰ Huri İslamoğlu and Çağlar Keyder, "Agenda for Ottoman History," *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 1, no. 1 (1977): 55.

⁹¹ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum, Milli İktisat, Milli Burjuvazi*, X.

elements to history, however, it remained as political and narrative history according to Toprak. Although structural historiography with its economic and social problematic content gained traction with Ömer Lütü Barkan, a conceptual totality arrived with the Second World War. The structural history in Turkey then took a Marxist turn in 1960s, and a neo-Marxist turn in 1970s. The Marxist version was derived from Hobson-Lenin, while the neo-Marxist version was derived from the Prebisch-Wallerstein concepts.

Almost all social scientists have tried to find an answer to the problem of development in Turkey. While reasons for underdevelopment were being questioned, it was also argued that development can take place by following different systems. The first examples of attitude towards Western economic models based on trade liberalism in Turkey were seen in the 19th century despite the fact that Namık Kemal, Ahmed Midhat and Musa Akyiğitzade were against the liberal model of economy and embraced the List's national economic concept. After the National Independence War, the discourse of "oppressed nations" was used widely by the Kadro Movement. Figures such as İsmail Hüsrev Tökin, Hüseyin Avni Şanda, and Şevket Süreyya discussed the thesis of "developed countries" and "dependent countries", inspired by Hobson-Lenin.⁹² Lastly, the debates on the Asiatic Mode of Production occupied a large section of Ottoman economic history.

In summary, the background of Toprak's studies on economic history lies in the historical perspective of the aforementioned debates of the 1960s and 1970s. His studies examine a latecomer nation-state structure in the case of Turkey. For this reason, he looks at the economic history of the late Ottoman Empire from a very different perspective than other analysts.

⁹² For detailed information about the debates on economic history by Toprak see: Zafer Toprak, "Tanzimat Ekonomisi ve 'Günah Keçisi'," *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 70 (1989): 21-22.

3.2. ECONOMIC THOUGHT

The Tanzimat period in the history of Turkey is generally defined as spanning the Young Ottomans Era to the present. While some think that it was the beginning of the establishment of modern Turkish society, others perceive Tanzimat as a period of imitation of the West, and interpret it as a break from, or dissociation from, more local values which were peculiar to Ottoman society. The Tanzimat is one of the problematic points when economics has intersected with history. For that reason, it became a starting threshold for academicians who study developmental, as well as political economy. The impressive accumulation of historical literature on the Tanzimat period is concrete proof of its significance within the social sciences. For the proponent of the Tanzimat, the ensuing transformation of Ottoman administrative, judicial and political structures is perceived as a phase in which the foundation of the modern nation-state is laid out, whereas its opponents interpret it as the beginning of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, mostly due to the Tanzimat administration's mismanagement which eventually undermined the system. These scholars emphasize how bureaucrats made the Ottoman Empire "the sick man" of the West as a result of unthinking attitudes. However, for Toprak, all discussions meet at a common point; the Tanzimat economy. From this vantage, the Western economy is seen to have completely taken over the Ottoman economy with external and public debts (Düyun-u Umumiye). According to the proponents of the theory of imperialism, the Ottoman Empire was effectively colonized. For the proponent of the dependency theory; the Empire was made periphery, or semi-periphery. During periods when nationalization was emphasized, the high cost of history was a bill issued to the bureaucrats of the Tanzimat.

Until now, the Tanzimat has been viewed critically in the literature, but Toprak takes a very different attitude towards this period. In a sense, he advocates for this era in his economic studies. His aim is to show that the Tanzimat period was an enlightening time in terms of its economy and modernization, from its administration to the nation's social life, and that the foundation of later modernity

efforts lies in this period.⁹³ He tries to approach this era holistically by embracing the content of the Tanzimat, from its administrative and judicial reforms to its economic and financial developments, and he tries to see the logical interconnections among its various developments. According to him, all other transformations brought on by the administrative, judicial, political, financial, and economic and Tanzimat to the agenda are a sensitive, critical pattern related to each other like the interdependent wheels of a clock.⁹⁴ For Toprak, those who judge the Tanzimat economy usually develop their thesis along two main axes, but both are essentially extensions of the "dependency" paradigm.⁹⁵ The first dimension is economic: the Ottoman Empire lost its industry with the onset of Tanzimat and was forced to buy finished products and sell raw materials as it was a periphery country subject to liberal foreign policies. The second dimension is fiscal; the Ottoman State borrowed foreign debt at the beginning of the Crimean War and it could not manage this debt. Thus, the Empire was dominated financially by the West, owing to various commercial agreements.⁹⁶ Both axes of the political economy approach have absorbed the theory of imperialism. Most scholars, from Namık Kemal, Ahmed Midhat, Yusuf Akçura, Parvus, and pioneers of the Kadro movement, to recent intellectuals who supported center-periphery approaches, adopted the view of imperialism. According to Toprak, there is a paradox whose essence has two distinct concerns.⁹⁷ The former is a fundamentalist view which emulated the past, and the latter is the mercantilist initiative brought by nationalized states, such as

⁹³ The concept of modern society includes a specific type of human being, a certain conception of the relationship between man and nature and between man and man, a system of certain economic relations and ultimately a political construction that is thought to have been built on the social and economic foundations created by these patterns. See Köker, *Modernleşme, Kemalizm ve Demokrasi*, 39.

⁹⁴ Zafer Toprak, "Tanzimat Ekonomisi ve 'Günah Keçisi'," *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 70 (1989): 21.

⁹⁵ Zafer Toprak, *İttihat-Terakki ve Cihan Harbi – Savaş Ekonomisi ve Türkiye’de Devletçilik 1914-1918*, (İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2003), 1-16.

⁹⁶ Toprak, "Tanzimat Ekonomisi ve 'Günah Keçisi'," 21.

⁹⁷ Zafer Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)*, (Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 1982), 21.

Germany or Prussia. Toprak claims that the dilemma of those who judged the Tanzimat economy is that they interpret the past with a neo-mercantilist approach, which is determined by daily concerns, and ignore structural integrity. That is, the Tanzimat economy is viewed from a fundamentalist perspective and the subsistence guild tradition is perceived as industry. While the land system is considered as ideal, developments in foreign trade are evaluated negatively. In a sense, modern economics are put to judgment. To summarize, for Toprak, the economic policies of the Tanzimat era were a transition from classical Ottoman economic structure to the contemporary economy.

The Tanzimat economy ended the past structure – that of a deconstructive, introverted, provisionist and fiscalist paradigm which continued for centuries - and initiated a new model that was dynamic, extroverted, sensitive to market motives and initiated the birth of a monetary framework.⁹⁸ The economic influence of the West in Ottoman literature came with the Tanzimat. Following free trade treaties, classical economic doctrine was constantly emphasized and a new liberalism which stood against provisionist Ottoman economic thought was adopted by the government. In the process, the barriers to trade, such as internal and external customs were removed, and market indicators were prioritized for the monetization of the economy. Similar developments were also observed in foreign economic relations. With new trade contracts, a free trade philosophy was adopted in foreign

⁹⁸ Ibid., 22. Collingwood says that looking at some periods of history as progress can lead to great illusions. Historians who look at some periods as a progress or stagnation, and collapse stigmatize some periods as affluent or golden age, while other as collapse and misery. For Collingwood, the well-known periods are the periods in which the historian entered into, either through the presence of abundant evidence, or because of his own mind's tendency to revive the experience. The so-called evil periods are the times when the evidences are relatively either inadequate or that historians cannot reestablish the connections due to the fact that the reasons come from their own life or from that age. Today, we are constantly being presented with a sense of history that consists of such good and bad times. A historical view, divided into periods of primitive or decadent is presented to us according to whether bad times precede or follow good times. This distinction between primitive periods and periods of glory and decadence is not historically correct. This tells us a lot about the historians who are examining the facts, but they do not say anything about the phenomena they examine. Collingwood claims that this light or dark pattern is an optical illusion arising from the disintegration of the knowledge and the ignorance of the historian. See Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, 379.

trade markets. Thus, in the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire's foreign trade capacity increased significantly.⁹⁹

When the Ottoman economy was close to collapse, the critics appeared. The intellectuals of the era took a stand against a liberal economy. Ahmed Midhat claimed that free trade policies could be only compatible with the concrete reality of the British economy: Britain had to provide foodstuffs from external sources, or else face famine. All British industrial units needed to get raw materials from foreign countries lest the factories be forced to terminate production. Therefore, free trade was inevitable for Britain and necessary for its survival.¹⁰⁰ But economic policies should have different prescriptions for each country. While there was not any alternative except trade for Britain due to the fact that it was industrialized and its trade activities were developed, it did not have land for agricultural activities. Mizancı Murad, one of the leaders of Young Turks, shared similar views with Ahmed Midhat, Namık Kemal and other members of that group.

The more academic critique of Ottoman economic thoughts against free trade came from Musa Mehmetcanoğlu Akyığıtzade, an immigrant from the Kazan region at the end of the 19th century. Friedrich List and his follower, Paul Cauwès, were the economists who influenced the views of Akyığıtzade. According to Musa Akyığıtzade, the only way forward for the Ottoman State was to be industrialized, but the first condition for industrialization was a protective foreign trade policy. Akyığıtzade supported the division of labor between men and women, and Toprak claims that he had a very advanced and enlightened view on gender division of labor.¹⁰¹ He believed that the division of labor between men and women would provide the impetus for economic development, as it had in Europe.

⁹⁹ Zafer Toprak, "II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İktisadi Düşünce", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. III (1985): 635.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 635.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 636.

The merchants who supported the “CUP” espoused liberal free trade. The essay “Chamber of Commerce and Agriculture and Industry” alleged that the protective foreign trade policy would result in rising costs, even with wage increases in the areas protected by customs walls. Prices in the country would rise faster than wages and thus the workers would not make any real gains. They claimed that a protective foreign trade policy would not be compatible with the interests of the country, so the only and the best solution was free trade. The economic minister of the period, Cavid Bey, was also against protective foreign trade policies.¹⁰² For him, this approach would cause the country and the workers to become increasingly impoverished. The owners of capital would find even more wealth after restrictions on foreign trade were lifted; there would remain a distorted, weak and less competitive economic policy behind the protective barrier of custom walls. However, by increasing yields in agriculture through scientific advancements, the country would be elevated to wealth and prosperity. Therefore, the Ottoman state must focus on agriculture, and foreign trade policy especially should focus on agricultural exports. Industry could only emerge "on its own" within this developmental process. Cavid Bey also attached more significance to railway, road, port and other public works initiatives that would enable the broadening of agriculture to commodity production and foreign markets, and he emphasized that domestic and foreign capital must be directed to these areas instead of industry.¹⁰³ That is to say, capital must set its own direction and determine its orientation in light of market indicators, without interference from the government.¹⁰⁴

Some members of CUP, however, opposed strictly free trade policies and claimed that even the most developed countries were ultimately forced to carry protective trade policies.¹⁰⁵ They claimed economic independence could only be actualized in

¹⁰² Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)*, 23.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 110.

¹⁰⁴ Toprak, “II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İktisadi Düşünce,” 637.

¹⁰⁵ One of them was Kirkor Zohrap Efendi who opposed the free trade policies.

this way and that European countries occupy the territories they want to capture through economic dependency. Then, with the conquests of war left behind, it was instead the economic battles that determine the characteristics of the era. In the early years of the Second Constitution, ideas moved away from classical liberal teaching and advocated the industrialization of the Ottoman Empire to develop in harmony with an emerging nationalism. Members of the CUP whose opinions were collected in the journals of “Turk Yurdu” emphasized the significance of industrialization for the Ottoman Empire. Yusuf Akçura and Parvus published writings criticizing free trade policies and they had growing public support. With the Second Constitution, Ottoman intelligentsia tended toward nationalism, inspired by German economic thought, and a "national economy" was adopted. Instead of Smith, Ricardo and Bastiat, the opinions of List, Rae, Cauwès, Carey, etc., who rebelled against classical economics became more popular.¹⁰⁶ Tekin Alp, who was the idealist of economics of the CUP, was a proponent of Friedrich List, the founder of the principles of German national economics. Alp’s position was that Turks should build a national economy as soon as possible and encourage national economists, in the manner proposed by List. For Gökalp, too, only if Turks embraced and implemented German economic models could they then create a successful nation state. Germany went through three stages of development; what they termed unity, economic unity and political unity. The Turkish Unionists (*İttihatçılar*) were advised to follow the same path to gain their sovereignty. Cultural unity was to be the first step of Turkism, and then the other stages must follow.

After that time, and in line with List’s view, members of the CUP focused on uncovering the true nation, something found between its collective humanity and the individual, and emphasized that the nation should seek to gain an organic integrity. They stated that economic independence could be realized through industrialization which would lead to this integrity. According to Toprak, the period of 1908-1918 were the years in which an industrialization consciousness arose in

¹⁰⁶ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)*, 86.

Turkey.¹⁰⁷ The problem of industrialization had come to the fore in newspapers and magazines. To more clearly identify the direction of industrial development for the country, the total number of industrial establishments was surveyed, competitions for industrial goods were organized and industrial exhibitions, expos and fairs were opened. Foreign specialists were brought in to establish industrial schools and workers and students were sent to Germany for technical education. For Toprak, the second constitutional monarchy was when the nation strived to become an industrial society, and when the overall conception of industrialization was born in Turkey.¹⁰⁸ As a result, reluctant Ottomans needed to find economic reasons for remaining an underdeveloped country.

3.2.1. Corporatism

Corporatism as a worldview flourished in the political, economic and social turmoil of the Second Constitutional Era in Turkey. While the national economy distinguished the Ottoman Empire from the cosmopolitan structure of the economy, solidarism strengthened social unity and corporatism ensured that small producers and the middle class relied on state.¹⁰⁹ According to Toprak, corporatism was the search for a solution to the social collapse of the Second Constitutional era, and a reaction to Ottoman liberalism which was inspired by classical economic theory. With the Second Constitutional Monarchy, traditional artisanship was subjected to radical transformations; guild organizations were removed and small producers were refocused on modernization. During this time, the CUP tried to harmonize with artisanal organizations in the direction of nationalization, For Toprak, however, the corporatist solution, which was interpreted as to be compatible with Turkey by Ziya Gökalp, was a philosophy that covered the entire cross-section of

¹⁰⁷ Toprak, “II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İktisadi Düşünce,” 639.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 639.

¹⁰⁹ Zafer Toprak, “Türkiye’de Korporatizmin Doğuşu,” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 12 (1980): 21.

society.¹¹⁰ Corporatism supported the protection of small producers and was inspired by ethical sociology since it was a moral crisis that led the Ottomans to collapse, particularly during World War I.¹¹¹ That is, the economic collapse caused by war, the extreme profits resulting from speculative initiatives and social poverty, as well as the emergence of “wealth obtained from war”, were all conditions that arose from the lack of morality according to Gökalp.¹¹² But according to Durkheim, corporations form the base of political organizations and they are the basic political units of the state. Durkheim claims that with the development of industrial society, the old political structure gradually lost its power and regional differences had lost their importance. The latter meant that individuals had lesser ties to those regional differences. The prescription to prevent this is that society must be transformed into a system of national corporations. The principles of representation of professionals, which was developed and introduced by Kır Ali İhsan during the National Struggle, were accepted and put into effect by the first parliament, in 1920.¹¹³ The initial draft suggests a mixed corporate structure; a parliament consisting of representatives from social and economic professions, alongside elected parliament with representatives from across society.

Yet, when the second parliament in Ankara was abolished, only the parliament consisting of professional representatives remained. This parliament was a symbol of the division of labor in society. A parliamentary committee was formed in which a total of nine professional groups were represented, including farmers and shepherds, merchants, mariners, miners, self-employed, artisans, civil servants and soldiers. According to Kır Ali İhsan, there were no stratified social classes in Turkey, while in the West, imperialism, capitalism and tyranny were based on nobility, clergy, great industry and bankers. He felt Western countries are governed

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 42. For related account see: Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)*, 32-35.

¹¹¹ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)*, 34.

¹¹² Toprak, “Türkiye’de Korporatizmin Doğuşu,” 43.

¹¹³ Ibid., 47.

in accordance with the interests and benefits of these classes. However, in Turkey, the absence of such crystallized class structures facilitates the solution to the class problem. Mustafa Kemal did not espouse this view, although professional representation was approved by the parliamentary committee. Ziya Gökalp elaborated his stance on corporation in his work entitled “Türkçülüğün Esasları” wherein he emphasized the necessity of corporate transformations, and offered “national guild system” instead of “artisans guilds”.¹¹⁴ In other words, corporations were, according to Toprak, an effort to reconcile Durkheim's spiritualism with the historical materialism of Marx. Toprak maintains that corporatism, populism, solidarism should be evaluated together in the history of Turkey. These three concepts are significant in the formation of the nation-state before the establishment of pluralist democracy in Turkey. He asserts that the development of nationalism in Turkey can be placed in a realistic position if evaluated in light of these three concepts.¹¹⁵ Turkey's problems with democracy can only be resolved by overcoming corporate expectations that are evident in the projections of these three concepts.

3.3. NATIONAL ECONOMY

“The National Economy 1908-1918” is the first book for Toprak¹¹⁶ who studied the economic development of the Ottoman Empire until the end of the World War

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 49.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 50. According to Köker, most of the studies that try to explain or interpret the social change processes in the Republic of Turkey in a theoretical framework are based on a paradigm which was constituted under the leadership of the social scientist in the USA after the World War II. The “paradigm” is, in terms of information theory, an empiricist-positivist, a structural-functionalist in terms of social theory and a progressivist in terms of historiography. According to modernists, democracy is the product of a series of economic and cultural evolutions in the West, beginning with the Renaissance. This process of evolution has also revealed the conditions for the settlement of a democratic political system. Therefore, in order to settle “democracy” in non-Western societies, both the level of economic development and cultural change are required. Democracy is a political system that can be requested or realized only after the fulfillment of these preconditions. See Levent Köker, *Modernleşme, Kemalizm ve Demokrasi*, 10th ed. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007), 12- 13.

¹¹⁶ His main arguments in the book “National Economy” was summarized in the article “Zafer Toprak, “Milli İktisat,” *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* vol. III (1985): 740-747.

I. His work, “National Economy” is a classic example in the genre and the economy was the primary area of interest for him. In his investigations, Toprak tries to keep track of the conditions under which the national economy was finally established. Until Toprak, most scholars presumed that the national economy was established after the foundation of the Republic, and so the Unionists were therefore supporters of the liberal economy. However, Toprak claims that even if the Ottomans carried out a liberal approach until the Second Constitutional years, after the World War I, the economic policies of the Ottoman had shifted from liberalism to statism. Because of the destruction brought on by war, they had to turn inward, toward statism, and it was their main tool in creating a national economy. Contrary to previous thought, then, the state economics of the Unionists in fact had started to clash with the neo-mercantilist policies which were based on statism. Toprak therefore defines the Tanzimat period as a transition from provisionalism to economic process and, as emphasized previously, he sees the Tanzimat period as an “enlightenment” process. This period is now considered the beginning of Turkey’s march towards modernization. Toprak claims that by the Young Turk Era (1908-1918), Ottoman finances and "economy were modern in every sense.”¹¹⁷ Moreover, he states that the “decay paradigm is a part of the historiography of the empires”.¹¹⁸ A considerable number of scholars have framed the demise of the Ottoman Empire as a time of decay but, on the contrary, Toprak offers a new view of the demise of the Ottoman Empire and the rise of the Turkish Republic in regards to its structural changes and economic development. He proposes that the Ottoman case might be better understood if it can be viewed in the context of a more dynamic process of change, rather than a process of decay.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷ Zafer Toprak, “Proto-Globalization and Economic Change in the Late Ottoman Empire: A Commentary,” *New Perspectives on Turkey* [Special Issue on Comparative Turkish and Japanese Modernities], no. 35 (2006): 133.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 129.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 129.

According to Toprak, the Young Turks who were against the Ottoman state tradition were faced with two options. Those who were seeking solutions to the problem with the help of the social sciences followed Le Play and embraced the ideas of “decentralization” and “free-enterprise”. On the other hand, Cavid Bey and his supporters argued that the state should be excluded from economic life and that economic obstacles of all kinds should be removed.¹²⁰ Toprak claims that both views, in fact, brought on the debate over individualism in the liberal age, despite their origins in different disciplines. Then, the second constitution brought a new dimension to the understanding of the Ottoman state. In the end, it was noted by the Unionists that intervention by the state in the economy with the goal of increasing state revenue would lead to some complications. They claimed that taxes such as “*aşar*”, and “*ağnam*” discouraged producers from making investments and the country was increasingly impoverished under this model. It was argued that the contemporary state had a definable national character and that governments should take care of the economic interests of the whole nation, instead of just the interests of the state bureaucracy. With the Second Constitutional Monarchy, an “economic” rather than “fiscalist” approach to state organization became more pronounced among the Unionists. The state would no longer intervene in economics in order to provide maximum income to the treasury. The basic function of the national government was to strengthen the economy, to encourage an enterprise environment for individuals, and to increase the taxpayer’s ability to pay indirect income to the state. Toprak asserts that in the first years of the revolution, the Unionists, thus, rejected the “*kapıkulu*” tradition and suggested that individualism was the basic philosophy of Turkish contemporary society. He also argued that the individual should be defended against the state. From now on, the individual would become the entrepreneur, and “free-enterprise” would constitute the Ottoman life philosophy.¹²¹

¹²⁰ Toprak, *Türkiye’de “Milli İktisat” (1908-1918)*, 23.

¹²¹ Ibid., 23.

While liberal thinking in the West was evolving with the process of nationalization, in the Ottoman Empire, liberalism could not go beyond an abstract concept that the involved intellectuals were inspired by the West. The longing to emulate the West was reflected in their way of thinking and liberalization was seen as a requirement to westernize. But liberalization of the economy had increased the importance and effectiveness of non-Muslims and foreigners in trade. Consequently, the Muslim craftsman was impoverished under free competition conditions. At the same time, with the Second Constitutional Monarchy, the removal of the guilds caused great damage to Muslim artisans, so in this environment, Turkish nationalism began to emerge. But leaving liberalism behind and turning towards nationalism also led to an increase in oppressive practices. The “1908 Ta’til-i Eşgal Law”¹²² which led to the closing of oppositional newspapers and journals, plus the attempts to intimidate the opposition by political assassinations, and finally the “1913 Bab-ı Ali” raid, were incidents that proved political power was completely taken over by Unionists.¹²³

Following the 1908 revolution, although the Young Turks wanted to establish a national state involving all Ottoman elements, the multiethnic nature of the Ottoman Empire was not amenable to this, and so the nationalist discourse could not go forward, except amongst a few bureaucrats. That is to say, Ottoman nationalism could not move forward from an isolated idea that was embraced by a few bureaucrats.¹²⁴ As a result, Ottoman nationalism was, as Toprak claims, not widely adopted and separatist groups became dominant. According to Toprak, German romanticism had an important contribution to the development of Turkish nationalism. At the beginning of the 19th century, Germany, which was economically far behind England and France, moved away from liberal economic

¹²² To look at the details about Ta’til-i Eşgal Law, see; Zafer Toprak, “1909 Tatil-Eşgal Kanunu Üzerine,” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 13 (1981): 141-156.

¹²³ Toprak, *Türkiye’de “Milli İktisat” (1908-1918)*, 20.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 19.

thought under the influence of thinkers such as Fichte, Gertz, Müller and List, and tried to integrate into a closed national economic structure. Toprak indicates that the national model of the Unionists was the closed foreign economic doctrine of Germany. That is to say, the economic dimension of Turkish nationalism was one inspired by the "German national economy" dating from Müller to Schmoller. In addition, German romanticism complied with the repressive tendency of the Unionists. The individual was, therefore, pushed into the second plan, and thus, they protected “the community” and “the state”.

During the First World War, the views of national economists such as List, Carey, Rae, and Cauwes were adopted, and a "national economy" policy was put into practice by recognizing the extraordinary environment of the war.¹²⁵ In this vein, the state directly participated in economic life and, “statism¹²⁶” or, "state economics" constituted the basis of the national economy. With the onset of war, capitulations were unilaterally abolished and a protective foreign trade policy was activated. Private tariffs were put into effect and foreign trade was directly undertaken by the state through the export delegation, and foreign exchange transactions were under the control of the “Kambiyo Muamelatı Merkez Komisyonu”. Similar developments were observed in domestic trade where the state increased its activities in almost every area of economic life. Some organizations such as “Heyeti Mahsusa-i Ticariyye”, “Merkez ve Taşra İaşe Heyetleri”, “İaşe Umum Müdürlüğü”, “Men-i İhtikar Heyeti”, “İaşe Meclisi”, “İktisaddiyat Meclisi”, and “İaşe Nezareti” constituted the guiding organizations of the state economy.¹²⁷ Henceforth, the Ottoman state would become an agricultural

¹²⁵ Ibid. p. 209

¹²⁶ Toprak explains the details of statism in the Ottoman Empire and its application in the article “Zafer Toprak, "I. Dünya Savaşı'ndan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye'de Devletçilik," *Teori*, no. 325, (2017): 10-15.

¹²⁷ Toprak, *Türkiye'de "Milli İktisat" (1908-1918)*, 21.

and industrial nation, in line with the principles of "national economy" which would be closed to the outside.¹²⁸

According to Gökalp, Ottoman society had a cosmopolitan flavor to its economy for many years. Even in the First World War years, the doctrine of Manchester Economics which depended on the principle of “*Laissez faire, laissez passer*” was still being taught in schools, although economic doctrines could no longer be cosmopolitan. Manchester economics is now recognized as not being related to cosmopolitanism; it was industrialized and opened up its gates for free trade for this reason. Therefore, it has become clear that it was the “national economy” of Britain, rather than a cosmopolitan economic approach, which was more influential. Gökalp claimed that this fact was first seen by Friedrich List and John Rae, and the idea increasingly adopted by all economists of the nations; however, Turks remained the slaves of the British economy.

In the 19th century, most of the companies operating in Ottoman lands were foreign ones. Corporations such as banking, insurance, railway, dockyard, mining, electricity, water, gas, tram, tunneling and so on, were usually managed from European capitals like London or Paris.¹²⁹ Until the Second Constitution, there were no joint-stock companies being established without the input of foreign capital, with the exception of “Şirket-i Hayriye” and “Ziraat Bankası”.¹³⁰ To the Unionists, the regime of Abdülhamid had interrupted, or even destroyed domestic trade and entrepreneurship in the country. Newspapers and magazines connected to the Unionists emphasized that Turkish Muslim components should be promoters of domestic trade and that domestic trade should be firmly established. Furthermore,

¹²⁸ He examines the industrialization attempts in the late Ottoman Empire in the articles “Zafer Toprak, “II. Meşrutiyet ve Osmanlı Sanayii”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. V (1986): 1348-1359. Also see; Zafer Toprak, “Osmanlı Devleti ve Sanayileşme Sorunu”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. V (1986): 1340-1344., and Zafer Toprak, “Tanzimat’ta Osmanlı Sanayii”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. V (1986):1345-1347.

¹²⁹ Toprak, *Türkiye’de “Milli İktisat” (1908-1918)*, 214.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 40.

according to the merchants, the years of despotism were the years when economic insecurity was widespread and when one could not claim rights in front of the justice system. If a country does not have an open justice system, or if the laws do not defend the rights of citizens, they said, trade and industry could not be expected to develop. The years of despotism were a period in which no one could make investments. Toprak states that the entrepreneur was faced with all kinds of difficulties, and until a warrant or a license was obtained, a significant part of his capital was invested in bribes and tips. The Union and Progress' newspapers claimed that with the second constitutional system, Ottoman citizens could be certain of their future, since no one would have to resort to methods such as bribery, and favoritism.¹³¹

During the war, the Unionists aimed to realize the nationalization of the market. At the same time, they projected that trade would be taken out of the hands of non-Muslims and be given Muslim Turkish elements. The provincial organizations of the Unionists formed credit and sales cooperatives in order to bring together producers and Muslim traders, whereas the trade unions who were in control of the market were faced with Turkish Muslim producers as the only sellers.¹³² Meanwhile, the Unionists wanted to establish a state bank to decrease the effectiveness of the "Osmanlı Bankası". In order to actualize this goal, they encouraged Turkish Muslim elements to establish a national bank. The members of the CUP who longed to establish an order that would benefit from the capital accumulation that the 1908 Revolution brought to the agenda, and to restrain the increasingly dependent economic structure of the country, constantly emphasized the ethnic dimension of the problem. Accordingly, they tried to create a new "middle class" consisting of Turkish Muslims and protected Turkish Muslims pitted against non-Muslim elements. It was proposed that Muslim elements should be interested in trade, should learn the artisanship, and should become entrepreneurs.

¹³¹ Ibid., 42.

¹³² Ibid., 213.

As a result, and by way of the "national economy" policy applied during the war years, Muslim Turkish elements and foreigners were liquidated from the market, and "national" joint-stock companies were established. The establishment of this national economy required innovations and entrepreneurship. In this sense, the Unionists provided some facilities for Turkish Muslim elements to grow their small companies. Despite the fact that the Second Constitutional period occurred during wartime, they prepared an environment for the important transformations for corporations. Toprak points out the significant increases in the number of companies in this period, and national capital to becoming dominant in the vast majority of the newly established companies.¹³³ Toprak states that;

In a few months, around 600 shops were opened in different districts of Istanbul, and Muslims were advised to purchase from their co-religious shopkeepers. Pamphlets were distributed in support of the campaign. A "patriotic" literature guided by Unionists appealed to the national feelings of the Ottoman Muslim people.¹³⁴

The Unionists believed in the necessity of securing capital together with the constitutional administration. In addition to discouraging methods of the despotic era, the worker's strikes that threaten capital accumulation after the 1908 Revolution were another obstacle for the Unionists to create a national economy. The Committee of Union and Progress posed a firm attitude against the strikes and the "Ta'til-i Eşgal Law" was secured to remove the obstacles that stood in the way of capital accumulation. The importance of trade was emphasized in magazines and newspapers whose number increased considerably, and these magazines and newspapers frequently published articles recommending the establishment of new companies.

With the Second Constitution, the efforts of the Unionists were not in vain and Turkish Muslim elements started to engage in trade. The Islamist view of Constitutionalism did not adopt common views, such that it was unnecessary to

¹³³ Ibid., 39.

¹³⁴ Zafer Toprak, "National Economy and Ethnic Relations in Modern Turkey," in *State Formation and Ethnic Relations in the Middle East*, Usuki Akira (ed.), Osaka; The Japan Center for area Studies, (2001): 190.

work for the mortal world, or that Constitutionalism caused poverty and unemployment for Muslims. They encouraged Muslims to adopt “hadiths”, or narratives, such as ‘poverty is something close to impiety; the winner is the love of God’. At the same time, Islamic journals published articles on trade and artisanship, and reinterpreted concepts such as profit and interest.¹³⁵ In the Second Constitutional years, the most effective publication directing Ottoman Muslims in economic affairs was “Islam Mecmuası”,¹³⁶ which was under the control of the Unionists. This magazine advocated for the national economy and had taken a definitive stance on the subject of national capital. With these influences, Ottoman Muslims started to engage in trade before the First World War.

Although the consciousness of the Muslim element had developed and they understood the importance of trade, and the Turkish Muslim had engaged in trade, it was still not a very effective system until the First War. But the war, itself, would provide the environment for the assembly of Turkish Muslim businessmen which were imagined by the CUP. In these years, the free market mechanism has been turned upside down by war and the state needed to intervene directly in the economy. In the name of national economy and economic awakening, the Turkish Muslim element was encouraged, and speculative gains that accelerated the accumulation of capital were tolerated by the government. Along with the war, the closed economy meant there were basic needs that could not be imported, and that domestic producers and traders had increased prices too much due to demand. These conditions caused the birth of the black market, profiteering and a group called “war profiteers”.¹³⁷ Again in the war years, political factors also played a part in which some fields of business were taken over by Turkish Muslim elements.

¹³⁵ Toprak, *Türkiye’de “Milli İktisat” (1908-1918)*, 53.

¹³⁶ To learn more about journalism on economy see the article “Zafer Toprak, “Sanayiden ve Emekten Yana Bir Dergi: Sanayi Mecmuası”, *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 253, (2015): 60-70. in which Toprak investigates the economic thought of the period and “Industrial Journal” which tried to develop the economic activities in Turkey with propagation of national economy.

¹³⁷ Toprak, *Türkiye’de “Milli İktisat” (1908-1918)*, 344.

Here, Muslim Turkish entrepreneurs filled the gaps created by Armenian deportation. During the struggle with speculation, the Unionists focused on the non-Muslim elements and this provided a great support to Turkish Muslim traders to eliminate their opponents. Although the years between 1914-18 were the years of war, Ottoman society exhibited a large increase in joint-stock corporations.¹³⁸

Whereas the number of joint-stock companies operating in Ottoman lands was only 86 until 1908, some 236 companies were established between 1908 and 1918. In the first five years of the constitutional liberalization period, the companies founded between 1908-1913 went into foreign non-Muslim element partnership and foreign capital maintained its weight in most of those companies. In the period of 1914-18, which was called the national economic period, the majority of joint-stock companies operating in the country were founded by Muslim Turks. Foreign capital was rarely seen in the businesses established during those years.¹³⁹

The Second Constitutional years were a time of seeking solutions to the problem of capital accumulation in a society that was in the process of nationalization. These years were very important ones for national corporations. Now that the Ottoman Muslim was being engaged in trade, the next step was setting up companies and exchanging money with interest. Unionists have played a great role in the entrepreneurship of Muslim Turkish elements. CUP provided facilities to establish national companies, organize the producers, tradesmen and traders in those companies, and prepare an environment for the birth of national commerce.¹⁴⁰ National trade has sometimes required methods that would not be compatible with free competitive liberal economic doctrine, and this had led to illegitimate gains. However, CUP believed in the inevitability of such illegitimate transactions during

¹³⁸Ibid., 57

¹³⁹ Ibid., 58.

¹⁴⁰ To look at the debates about commercialization and monetization activities in the Ottoman Empire; Zafer Toprak, "Monetization and Commercialization in the Tanzimat Period (1838-1876)", *The State and the Economy in the Ottoman and Republican Periods*, in, ed: Faruk Birttek, (İstanbul: 1988).

the national economic period and argued that the result would legitimize the methods.

Besides the inadequacy of capital accumulation and legal-administrative obstacles, the fact that foreign companies were privileged as the result of capitulations in Ottoman territory was another reason that the development of domestic companies was restricted. Ottoman governments attempted to make reforms during the Tanzimat period in order to facilitate an end to these capitulations; however, the capitulations constituted a reason for European countries to intervene in the internal affairs of the Ottoman state. In the Second Constitutional era, every government brought capitulations to the agenda and tried to persuade foreign countries to remove them. Bab-ı Ali was looking forward to the opportunity to remove the capitulations and, as a result, European countries entering the First World War mobilized the Ottoman government to unilaterally abolish them.¹⁴¹ The Said Halim Pasha cabinet announced on September 9, 1914 that all financial, economic, judicial and administrative privileges of foreigners living on Ottoman territory had been abolished, and that relations with foreigners would be regulated in light of the state's legal principles.¹⁴²

Immediately after the removal of the capitulations, changes were made to Ottoman Legislation with regard to the legal status of foreign companies. These companies were obliged to use the Turkish language and to recruit Turkish Muslims for their businesses. The basic purpose of making Turkish language compulsory was to ensure that Turkish Muslims would be employed.¹⁴³ It should be noted that, however, that the Ottoman capital which was held by foreigners had always included businesses that employed Turkish Muslims in unskilled jobs, simply because the available workforce did not know any foreign language or craft. In

¹⁴¹ Toprak, *Türkiye'de "Milli İktisat" (1908-1918)*, 70.

¹⁴² Ibid., 71.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 80.

order to change this, the Unionists encouraged Ottomans to engage more in trade and craft. In addition, they accelerated the opening of technical and professional schools for this purpose. In these institutes, the Muslim Turkish elements were trained with the goal of placing Ottoman citizens in positions where foreigners were traditionally employed.¹⁴⁴ To accomplish this, trade courses gained importance in the Ottoman education system following the 1908 Revolution. Evening schools were opened, evening courses were offered and special trade courses for women were organized. These schools were opened through the initiatives of the CUP's clubs and the courses offered were designed to serve those who want to study literacy, learn a foreign language, or specialize in a particular profession. Apprenticeship schools were also organized to provide evening education for working children.¹⁴⁵ According to Toprak, as a result of the decline of the labor force due to war and the widespread feminist movements, women were provided entrance to trade courses and were involved in business life.¹⁴⁶

At the same time, members of the CUP also touched upon the Ottoman capital problem. Although it was important that the capitulations had been abolished and the Turkish Muslim component had been shifted to trade and craft, they pointed to the necessity of capital to actualize industrialization and to create a national economy. They stressed that it was necessary to benefit from external sources for these economic goals to be met. Toprak states that, in the pre-War period, most of the Unionists who embraced the liberal economy, especially Cavid Bey, addressed the necessity of foreign capital. However, during the war, many of the Unionists were convinced of the necessity of national capital. In spite of the competing anti-foreign investment and pro-foreign investment ideas, the Unionists took the utmost care not to frighten allied countries during “national capital” initiatives. Toprak claims that they were emphasizing national capital, but that they also could not give

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 81.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 81.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 83.

up on foreign capital. They gave priority to domestic capital in smaller scale enterprises, but foreign and national capital partnerships were proposed for larger-scale projects.¹⁴⁷ According to Toprak, the attempt to build national capital was perceived as xenophobia by the West and the Unionists gave them the necessary response. Pundits such as Cavid Bey and Tekinalp expressed an opinion that there was nothing xenophobic about the construction of national economies. They claimed that this was a charge made only by countries that did not want to see development in Turkey. These pundits said that the country embraced all nations, contrary to foreign claims of xenophobia. They emphasized that the sole purpose was to establish national capital and national unity.

In addition, the Ottoman government's foreign trade policy before the Tanzimat was free, Toprak claimed. According liberal views, this freedom was further increased and influx of foreign money into the country's capital has been defended by liberal intellectuals during the Tanzimat period. However, with the Second Constitution, there was further enlightenment on this issue and the need for a protective foreign policy began to be addressed. Again, the importance of industrialization and agriculture was discussed. Figures such as Cavid Bey argued that the Ottoman economy was an agricultural one and thus the prioritization of agricultural development was required. As a result of this, industry would naturally develop. However, some Unionists emphasized that true industrialization should have priority. Cavid Bey stressed that weight should be given to agricultural progress and that heavy industrial branches should be left to foreigners. In this sense, he was opposed to a completely closed economic structure. Zohrap Efendi, however, stated that the most advanced states, even the nations that were supporters of the extreme trade liberty, eventually accepted a form of moderate protectionism: for example, the United States had been pursuing a protectionist foreign trade policy since 1866. Switzerland and Germany were also following similar policies. The Ottoman producers were weaker against foreign trade competition than producers in

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 89.

developed countries and he believed in the requirement of a moderate protection policy to preserve agricultural products and the very primitive Ottoman industry. He asserted that if such a foreign trade policy was not followed, the limited wealth of the county would be melted away and foreign capital would dominate it. Here, he was criticizing Cavid Bey's liberalism by saying the end goal of European countries was to invade the countries which would provide them the means to continue with a capitalist cycle. The military war had ended, but it was soon replaced with economic war. He pointed out that if necessary measures were not taken against the economic wars of foreigners, that if the economic defense lines of the country were to be somehow destroyed, the Ottoman lands could be considered completely conquered.¹⁴⁸

It is evident, then, that when World War I started, radical steps had to be taken by the Unionists to protect themselves from the destructive effects of war. Capitulations were unilaterally abolished by the government and repayment of national debts was postponed. They enacted new custom tariffs which provided protective measures for small industries and local products. Small merchants, consisting of Muslim elements, provided the accumulation of capital. Many new small-scale companies opened and a considerable number of companies and trading activities took shape. Toprak claims that there was a gradual reduction in national debt during this time and commerce expanded.¹⁴⁹

3.3.1. Foreign Exchange in the Ottoman Empire

While the state was interfering with exports, Bab-ı Ali was also adopting the paper money system. Moreover, it intervened in foreign exchange transactions with the goal of protecting the foreign value of the ottoman *lira* due to the lack of stability in the gold standard. On April 8, 1916, with the “Tevhid-i Meskukat Kanunu”,

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 112.

¹⁴⁹ Toprak, “Proto-Globalization and Economic Change in the Late Ottoman Empire: A Commentary,” 133.

Ottoman money entered into the gold standard system.¹⁵⁰ However, Ottoman currency was constantly depreciating against the currency of neutral countries. The basic reason behind the depreciation of the Ottoman lira in the period when foreign trade relations were very limited, was that those who wanted to secure their possessions during the war, or who were trying to protect themselves from the erosion of wartime inflation, were converting their depreciated money into Swiss Francs. “Bab-ı Ali” realized that if this continued, the Ottoman *lira* would lose its value against the German mark, even though trade relations with Switzerland were very limited. The increasing value of the German Mark would greatly influence Ottoman foreign trade, therefore, in the light of these developments, the Ottoman state needed to control foreign exchange transactions. With the establishment of the “Kambiyo Muamelatı Merkez Komisyonu” operation, the transfer of wealth was prevented, at least to some extent, according to Toprak. At this point, the Ottoman *lira* began to find stability in neutral country markets.¹⁵¹ Ottoman liberal intellectuals who stood against the absolutist Ottoman state tradition had adopted free market rules, but this was not long-lasting. Ottoman intellectuals, influenced by the nationalist trends that emerged on a global scale with the Second Constitutional Era, now adopted and implemented the German economic model.

To summarize, the Unionists terminated economic capitulations unilaterally when they had the opportunity during the First World War. Then, the Ottoman state passed from the “*ad valorem*” to specific tariffs. Toprak writes that this new custom tariff was an important step in the direction of economic independence. During the war, “Bab-ı Ali” adopted two new arrangements that were inspired by Germany, and that were guiding Ottoman external economic relations. Exports were linked to certificates by the export delegation, and some cereal crops and strategic items that could be consumed in the country during the war period were banned for export.

¹⁵⁰ Toprak, *Türkiye’de “Milli İktisat” (1908-1918)*, 123. Toprak examines the financial situation of the Ottoman Empire in the article: Zafer Toprak, “Osmanlı Devleti’nin Birinci Dünya Savaşı Finansmanı ve Para Politikası”, *ODTÜ Gelişme Dergisi*, (1979-1980) 205-238. Also see; Zafer Toprak, “Osmanlı Kambiyoları,” *Finans Dünyası*, (1990): 72-74.

¹⁵¹ Toprak, *Türkiye’de “Milli İktisat” (1908-1918)*, 124.

Meanwhile, the government, looking for solutions to foreign exchange problems caused by the paper money regime, established “Kambiyo Muamelatı Merkez Komisyonu”, prevented speculative money transfers, and placed the official exchange market under state control by identifying the commodities which were in demand.¹⁵²

3.4. BANKING SYSTEM

Toprak covers the earliest years of the Republican Era to today to explain the development and progress of the banking system in Turkey. The emergence and the development of the banking system is very important to modernize and rationalize an economic structure within a country, so he examines the development of the banking system to understand what/how steps were taken in establishing the nation’s modern economic system. To that end, Toprak tracks the development period from the Tanzimat to the present. He elaborates on this subject in his two books, *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)*, and *İttihat-Terakki ve Cihan Harbi – Savaş Ekonomisi ve Türkiye’de Devletçilik (1914-1918)*, and discusses the topic further in many other articles. In addition, his book, “*Bir Geleceğin Geçmişi / 1948’den 1998’e Akbank Tarihi*” examines the establishment and the progression of the “Akbank”.

The establishment of the banking system was a requirement of national economic policies and the establishment of a nation-state in the Second Constitutional Era. The national bank problem came to the agenda of Ottoman society with the Young Turk revolution. In the course of the 1908 revolution, Rıza Bey stated that national wealth should be protected by establishing national banks and he proposed a draft bill in the parliament that would accomplish the task.¹⁵³ At the same time, the Young Turks believed that the activity of foreign capital should be limited in this

¹⁵² Ibid., 12., To learn more about national economy and ethnic discrimination by the members of the CUP see the article: Toprak, “National Economy and Ethnic Relations in Modern Turkey,” 187-196.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 130.

area. Until the Tanzimat period, there was no so-called bank with its present meaning in Ottoman Empire, but with the Second Constitution, the Young Turks began to pay close attention to financial and economic issues.

The world economy has not always developed in parallel with the interests of individual countries. Each country typically had national credit institutions while The Ottoman Empire initially had assigned this duty to foreign countries. Therefore, it was necessary to build a national bank.¹⁵⁴ The intellectuals of the period published articles about the contributions of bank institutions to the national economy. The Second Constitutional years were a period of significant transformations in the field of banking. “Osmanlı İtibar-ı Milli Bankası”¹⁵⁵ as a state bank and “Ziraat Bankası”, a bank whose scope of activity had been expanded, as well as a number of credit institutions in the country and in the provinces, were then opened. According to the Young Turks, unless the country's economy has financial independence, it would never be rid of its dependency on foreign powers.

Toprak describes how banking institutions in its modern form and modern credit policies were both created during the administration of the Young Turks. National banks in the country came into existence in the modern sense during this period. Capital accumulation also began to capitalize, literally, at this time. During the Second Constitutional Era, the sphere of influence of the banking system over the non-Muslim citizen was limited and the Turkish-Muslim element had taken over. As a result, there was not only an attempt to establish a modern economic system, but also to create national capital by transferring Muslim participants into the economy, primarily by removing non-Muslims from economic activities. Although it was a requirement of the modern state structure, the goal was to generate a nation-state and create a society that exemplified the Turkish identity. In my point of view, while Toprak gives more emphasis to the modernization and capitalization efforts

¹⁵⁴ Toprak, *İttihat-Terakki ve Cihan Harbi – Savaş Ekonomisi ve Türkiye’de Devletçilik 1914-1918*, 57.

¹⁵⁵ Toprak, *Türkiye’de "Milli İktisat" (1908-1918)*, 142-149.

made by the Young Turks, the most important trigger element which enabled them to take these actions was nationalism.

Toprak addresses capital accumulation from the Ottomans to the Republic, and the evolution of the credit institutions within a period of one hundred years from 1850 to 1950 where he states that there are interruptive points on both dates. The 1850s are a meaningful stage for the Ottomans, while 1950 is a very important date for Turkey in terms of its turning point in a political context and its economic restructuring. Where most of historians blame the Crimean War for the Ottoman economic crisis, Toprak sees the Crimean War as an instrument that opened the Ottoman Empire to the outside world.¹⁵⁶ The Empire opened its doors to the outside world after 1838, and again after the 1844 monetary reforms imposed a financial structure similar to Western financial structure. During the Tanzimat years, at least until the years of the Great Depression, there were fundamental transformations in the Ottoman Empire. According to Toprak, the Ottoman economy changed its shell; it was transformed into a different structure and stripped of its traditional framework, both in a social and a financial sense. In addition to municipal services, a series of contemporary institutions emerged during this period. For Toprak, the most important issue in this whole process was monetization. However, it is necessary to take into consideration the banking system of the Republican Era from a different perspective than the previous periods because Republican Era Turkey developed out of a problematic period of the world economy.¹⁵⁷

Republican Era Turkey picked up the pieces left behind from the Ottoman Empire, which had been wracked by wars that lasted more than a decade. In this atmosphere, one of the main problems was to build a modern economic structure. The state was responsible for economic initiatives at a time when there was economic

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 134.

¹⁵⁷ Zafer Toprak, "Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyete Sermaye Birikimi ve Kredi Kurumlarının Evrimi 1850-1950," *Activity – Special addition of the Journal of Active*, November-December (2001): 2-5. Also see: Zafer Toprak, "Osmanlı Bankası ve Tarihten İzler," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 50 (1998): 15-22.

accumulation. The “Türkiye Sanayi ve Maadin Bankası” became sign of the active participation of Republican Turkey in the industrialization process. This bank would open industrial loans for the private sector and operate the factories which were in the possession of the Ottoman Empire by taking them over. Still, the most important banking organization of the 1920s was the “İş Bankası”, a bank established by the state itself as an investment bank. Another bank was the “İmar Bankası” that continued to operate until recent times in Turkey.

During the 1930s, the country's economy took a difficult turn due to the Depression and the market was lacking in stability. Countries were closing their doors to free market trade and foreign trade terms were developing against Turkey's market. On the other hand, the more liberal economies were deadlocked and Turkey had to take precautions to prevent that outcome. It was necessary for the state to engage in increasingly intensive production activity. The state would therefore enter a new organizational model known as statism. Toprak suggests that, with the Republic, Turkey experienced radical transformations and the economy entered the development phase. He indicates that infrastructure investments were mostly completed, and the level of education of the country increased to such an extent that it could not be compared with the 1920s. In the period extending to World War II, economic activities and the pace of growth reached an impressive level. However, this strong economy was interrupted due to the preparations for war. Towards the end of the conflict, banks such as “Yapı Kredi”, “Akbank” and “Garanti Bank” were established, together with more private enterprise in Turkey. During the period 1946-60, private capital accumulation was fed with new resources, which led to the rapid expansion of social and economic development. In this period, trade capital in particular, with the contribution of internal and external factors, saw more and more activity. According to Toprak, the Turkish economy ended its war phase and economic development was on the agenda of Turkey. The development of the Turkish economy showed signs of progress after the post war period. A remarkable revival in the economy was observed due to the rapid increase in investment after 1950. Mechanization in agriculture and the rapid expansion of planting areas as a result of that technology, plus successive years of good harvest and the

opportunities created by the Korean War were all factors in growth. With the rapid increase in investments, the improvements in transportation, the increase of capital in business, the growth of cities, the increase in the number of modern enterprises in the economy and the expansion of production for the market, all increased the needs for money and credit; thus, the investments in the banking sector have become more attractive.¹⁵⁸

Toprak remarks that the recent economic history of Turkey and the history of money lending and banking have been evaluated in light of political developments from that period until today. Politics determined the state's point of view towards economic problems, and direct causality relations between political developments and economic developments were sought. As a result, the collapse of the Ottoman state after six centuries of sovereignty and the birth of the republic of Turkey have been interpreted within a paradigm of economic collapse and recovery. However, it can be said that the last century of the Ottoman State had been the scene of significant transformations and the basis of a modern state was laid in this century. Attempts at economic development were also actualized in this period.

Toprak marks that our social scientists, especially our historians, have fallen into dilemmas constantly while evaluating the last century of the Ottoman Empire. Historians bring the origins of the modern Turkish state to the Tanzimat period, "Sened-i İttifak" or "Selim III", and they portray a "collapse story" and "sick man" in light of "dependency" relations that the close contact with the West brought to the agenda. The main discussion of dependency theory revolved around economic-financial relationships. The "1838 British Ottoman Trade Agreement", "Ottoman Bank", "Düyun-i Umumiye", "Tobacco Regi" and a series of legal and institutional developments were interpreted as the internal conquest to the Ottoman Empire. A colonial or semi-colonial discourse prevailed from primary school to post-graduate programs. According to Toprak, historiography in Turkey has always blamed the past to legitimize the Republic, and change has always been emphasized instead of

¹⁵⁸Zafer Toprak, "Cumhuriyet ve Bankacılık," *Toplumsal Tarih* 14, no. 80 (2000): 26-31.

the continuity. However, after consolidating the gains of the new social order, looking at the past in a more tolerant way and looking for continuity as well as change in the development of societies constitutes one of the main fields of study of history science. In other words, he contends that we should shift our interest from "state" to "society" in order to understand history and to arrive at more realistic solutions.¹⁵⁹

Thanks to Tanzimat, the Ottoman economy had been monetized, internal and foreign trade had expanded and the road to economic development had opened; thence, the Ottoman economy integrated with the world economy. Closed, stable, provisionist economic structures had dissolved and a dynamic, growing, an evolving economic structure was flourishing. With the advent of Tanzimat, there were radical transformations in the Ottoman currency, as well as its economy and banking system.¹⁶⁰ In summary, the period 1838-1908 represented a cautious but liberal time in the field of money-credit-banking. However, with the Second Constitutional Era, economic activities passed from a “fiscalist-provisionist” model to an interventionist structure that was oriented to place economic activities on a “rational” basis. The state had integrated itself into economic activities and this attitude continued in the first decades of the Republic. Thus, the history of the Turkish economy in 1908-1938 turned toward a neo-mercantilist economic approach.¹⁶¹ National banks, established in the provinces during the Second Constitutional Monarchy, proved that the increasingly powerful capital in Anatolia had entered an accumulation period.

¹⁵⁹ Zafer Toprak, “Osmanlı Bankası ve Tarihten İzler,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 50 (1998): 15.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 18. For more detailed information about banking structure see also; Zafer Toprak, “Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet’e Bankacılık Sektörü (1838-1991),” *Geçmişten Geleceği Türk Bankacılık Sektörü*, (Ankara: Bankacılık Düzenleme ve Denetleme Kurumu, 2010): 35-44.

¹⁶¹ Toprak, “Osmanlı Bankası ve Tarihten İzler,” 18.

The Committee of Union and Progress became the leader in establishing national banks. Following the path of the nationalist movement, it encouraged members to establish banking institutions and it further aimed to “nationalize” the Ottoman monetary system and credit facilities by providing material and immaterial facilitations during their development. These "national" banking activities, especially in Western Anatolian regions that had opened to the market economy, provided credit opportunities to the Ottoman producers. In conclusion, the modernization and monetization of the Ottoman economy started in 1838 and it has been an ongoing process ever since. Thus, we can infer that the economic history of Turkey is in a progressive structure for Toprak. The development of the Turkish economy has been continuing since 1838, with occasional interruptions, which means continuity is as important as change in historical studies.

3.5. LABOR

Toprak’s studies on labor date to the start of his academic career. His earliest articles of labor history were published by the “Yurt Yayınları”, in 1976. Then, in 1977, some of his labor studies were published in the famous monthly culture magazine “Yurt ve Dünya” under the pseudonyms Ahmet Seren and Hakkı Onur. Although Toprak’s main field of study is not the working class and its patterns of labor, he has reviewed countless articles about labor and workers over the years. In 2016, he collected most of his works on labor into a single book and expanded it further. The book, *Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946* (Worker Class in Turkey 1908-1946), begins with the workers’ strikes that broke out after 1908 Revolution and concludes with trade union¹⁶² organization in 1946, a year which Toprak says marked a turning point in Turkey’s labor history.

¹⁶²Toprak examines the trade union organization called “Amele Teali Cemiyeti” in the articles: Zafer Toprak, “Amele Teali Cemiyeti”, *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* vol. 1, (1993): 341-342., Zafer Toprak, “Tek Parti Döneminde Çalışma Yaşamı ve Amele Teali Cemiyeti,” *Düşün*, (June 1986): 20-24.

Toprak states that social and human sciences in Turkey developed in the 1960s and 1970s under a modern paradigm of enlightenment, and that the class concept was used during that period to analyze society and structure in Turkey and the rest of the world. While capitalism in the West was living its golden age, the welfare state had evolved to a certain extent, but it began to stumble at the beginning of the 1970s. Due to many negative factors, the social state was no longer able to carry its own burden. As a result, unemployment started to rise and prices reached an apex. Consequently, a new economic structure called neo-liberalism, whose basis was established by Friedrich Hayek, was born. Unfortunately, the manifesto of neo-liberalism was one that was removed workers in large measure. Eventually, developments in global economic systems, as a matter of course, affected the social sciences. Modernity was transformed into the “post-modernity” and the whole world, including Turkey, was influenced by the post-modern movement.¹⁶³ Within post-modernity, the “social” was transformed into the “cultural”. Hereafter, the concept of class was removed and replaced with “cultural codes”, while ethnic and religious divisions became fashionable.¹⁶⁴ This process fitted well with the interests of capital. After these changes, the workers lost their organizational power and traded their class consciousness for religious and ethnic identities. Toprak emphasizes that the main reason for his use of the class concept in his book is his belief in the philosophy of the Enlightenment and his desire to highlight the role that modernity played in the construction of contemporary Turkey.¹⁶⁵ He also states that he used the concept of "class" in the title of his book, “Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946” as a direct reaction to post-modernity.¹⁶⁶

Politically, Turkey was entering a very different stage, and therefore everything in the period would have a completely different character. On June 5, 1946, a law was

¹⁶³ Zafer Toprak, *Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2016), 11.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 12.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 11.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 11.

enacted that permitted the establishment of class-based organizations, trade unions, and parties. Thus, the legal basis for the workers to organize freely was created. In this period, the workers started to organize on a large scale with the support of socialist parties. However, the starting date for Toprak's studies on labor goes back to 1908. As was emphasized in his other works, the labor movements in the post-1908 period are the beginning of the quest for workers' rights in a modern sense, as seen in the European examples. Although labor movements and strikes occurred in the industrial sector during the time of Abdulhamid, they turned out to be short-lived and disconnected local movements. However, the worker's strikes and demands for rights after 1908 were a more long-term revolt against the exploitation of labor. In fact, the impetus for their demands was, according to Toprak, the discourse of newly emerging powers, reflections on developments in Europe, and the beginning of worker consciousness.¹⁶⁷

The concept of workers in the Ottoman Empire is not limited to the post 1908 period. Establishments that can be counted as factories had been seen in the Ottoman Empire since the Second Mahmud's era. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, there were attempts to encourage industrialization, even if they were limited to the Sublime Porte. In order to improve industrial efforts, the state undertook initiatives such as sending students to Europe for training.¹⁶⁸ Engineers and qualified staffs were also brought in and the state allocated additional support budgets. Factories expanded, and from time to time, workers made an attempt to strike in order to convey their demands. But according to Toprak, all of these were far from being mass movements. It was only after the achievement of the 1908 Revolution when workers' movements became organized *en masse* and walkouts that could be categorized as general strikes occurred. According to Toprak, the mass movements triggered by the 1908 revolution were concrete proof that the Ottoman

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 8.

¹⁶⁸ To learn the workers who migrated to Germany for working in the early republican period see: Zafer Toprak, "Almanya'ya İlk İşçi ve Öğrenci Göçü: 1916-1918," *Bilim ve Sanat*, no. 3 (1981): 26-27.

society had broken out of its traditional shell.¹⁶⁹ Naturally, the process of consciousness began at a time when employees were increasingly purified from the process of "alienation", and when the working people were actively concerned about their own future.¹⁷⁰ In other words, the period in which the class consciousness of the workers became evident began in 1908. Toprak claims this is when the modern concept of the "worker" entered the literature. The section of society consisting of *reaya* (meaning flock or subject), civil servants, tradesmen, and so on were only described as workers in modern sense after the 1908 Revolution.¹⁷¹

Toprak states that Turkey started 'its own century' with the 1908 Young Turks Revolution. The rebellion against Abdulhamid on July 23 resulted in the declaration of a constitutional monarchy and the absolute monarchy was ended. Thus, the 1908 Revolution brought a series of radical transformations. Some basic freedoms were put into practice, a relatively pluralistic political environment was created, and every kind of intellectual movement in society found an environment of free expression. According to Toprak, while liberal views in Europe affected a wide range of society, socialism also found its proponents in Ottoman lands. Different labor problems emerged at various stages of history and each had its own methods of struggle. But in the period when capital was dominant, labor rights took on a different dimension and had clearer demands than previously seen. By the nineteenth century, labor-capital relations became one of the main concerns of the social and human sciences.¹⁷²

The Second Constitution is known as one of the essential milestones of the Turkish labor movement and trade union history. Labor-capital relations in Turkey entered

¹⁶⁹ Toprak, *Türkiye'de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 7. Toprak investigates the worker's strikes in 1908 in the article: Onur Hakkı [Zafer Toprak], "1908 İşçi Hareketleri ve Jön Türkler," *Yurt ve Dünya*, no. 2 (1977): 277-295.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 8.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 8.

¹⁷² Ibid., 3.

a new stage at this time, with the Young Turk Revolution.¹⁷³ The workers' movements which appeared all over the country affected daily life considerably. However, Ta'til-i Eşgal law, which was enacted by the Young Turks, and the ensuing battles led to the stifling of workers' movements. A new chapter was opened for workers' demands due to the War of Independence in Turkey, but all opposition was controlled again under a law known as Takrir-i Sukun. The right to strike, which is the key right of the working class, was left out of the agenda for over forty years. Until the 1960s, strikes were considered illegal acts, but labor-capital relations in Turkey entered a new phase with the 1961 constitution. While the history of labor is as old as humanity, Toprak cites 1908 as the dawn of the working class in Turkey. There is labor everywhere where production exists, but Toprak's focal point is on labor history; that labor gains its class qualification in Turkey and reaches a certain level of consciousness, with 1908 as its starting point.

3.5.1. The Development of Workers' Consciousness and Strikes

The new labor regulations which were approved by The Young Turks regime did not solve all labor problems¹⁷⁴. In the aftermath of the 1908 Revolution, strikes began in İzmir. Further strikes of dock and port workers soon spread to other ports. The first strike in İstanbul was started by *Cibal-i Tobacco Regi* and it was followed by the *Paşabahçe* glass workers who demanded an increase in their wages, staged a work stoppage and then marched in the streets. On August 12th, the tramway workers of the *Beşiktaş* and *Aksaray* line refused to begin their shifts. On August 17th, the water companies *Kadıköy* and *Üsküdar* went on strike. After that, the Zonguldak mine workers, Ergani copper mine workers, Balya, Karaaydın, and Simli lead mine workers, the Istanbul oven workers and Salonika, Kavala, Samsun

¹⁷³ Ibid., 5.

¹⁷⁴ Donald Quataert, *Social Disintegration and Popular Resistance in the Ottoman Empire, 1881-1908, Reactions to European Economic Penetration*, (New York: New York University Press, 1983), 64.

tobacco workers, tramway workers, marine firms, and railway workers all staged strikes. On August 17th, the government began to arrest workers involved in these walkouts¹⁷⁵.

One of the industries where the strikes were most intensive in 1908 was the railway. For Toprak, the railway symbolized modernity for the Ottoman, and modernity was closely related to the birth of the working class. Notably, the railway had dissolved the traditional social texture and created a passion for secularism. The railway made the distances between traditional villages and the larger cities less onerous for workers and allowed the transmission of urban ideas into formerly isolated settlements. The railway represented contemporary values in many ways. As a result of this, the understanding of time and space was radically transformed in the Ottoman Empire.¹⁷⁶ While Islamic cities traditionally formed around the mosque, the railroad took over as the residential hub of the town. The density of cities or towns near the stations and their surrounding areas intensified. The economic market revolved around stations and was integrated with them. As the railway station became more central to trade, it also became a secularizing element in society. That is to say, the railway station created an alternative focal point to the mosque. The station was now its own community. The traditional concept of time, which perceived the day in accordance with *Ezani* Time, was pushed aside by railway schedules.¹⁷⁷ The modern railroad became one of the busiest corridors for business in the aftermath of the 1908 Revolution. According to Toprak, railways had a great influence on the development of working class consciousness because the railways were the symbol and the gateway to secularism. The railways were pioneers in the development of a working-class consciousness, as the symbols of

¹⁷⁵ Onur Hakkı [Zafer Toprak], “1908 İşçi Hareketleri ve Jön Türkler”, *Yurt ve Dünya*, no. 2 (1977): 278-81.

¹⁷⁶ Toprak, *Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 78.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 80.

modern civilization. With the 1908 revolution, railroads were the leading sector in the struggle for labor rights.

The 1908 strikes were not only limited to railway workers; the maritime, tobacco and tramway workers in the field of public transportation also went on strike. The tourism sector, which was part of the push for modernity, became one of the most important employment areas. Moreover, the service sector began to form one of the primary areas of employment in the Ottoman Empire. With the 1908 Revolution, the voices of workers on this field also began to be heard.¹⁷⁸ According to Toprak, indeed, the underlying reason for all of these strikes was that modernity had penetrated every area of Ottoman society, from daily life to industrial production, and as a consequence, it led to the enlightenment of the working class and the formation of Western-like demands. Modern life penetrated every field; from consumption patterns to advertising, from everyday life to the tourism sector, from the formation of public space to the development of worker consciousness. With modernity, workers now knew their own rights and were opponents of the exploitation of labor. For Toprak, although the Unionists were annoyed by these events, they were, in fact, the result of conditions the Unionists themselves had created through their discourses on liberty and modernity. In other words, modernization developed not only institutions, but also the people's consciousness.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 133.

¹⁷⁹ The Enlightenment believed the power of the human reason to transform the world. In this sense, intellectuals such as Voltaire, Hume and Adam Smith considered history as an unfinished condition of the material and moral improvement. They have sought to find out the shape of history by pursuing the growth of human society from primitive to civilization. See John Tosh and Seán Lang, *The Pursuit of History*, 19. Man was considered as a part of nature and the explanation of historical events can be sought in the facts of the natural world. Therefore, history was regarded as a sort of natural history of man or anthropology where institutions was determined not as an invention of human reason in the course of its development but as the required effects of natural causes. According to Condorcet, the tyrants and their slaves, priests and their dupes would have disappeared in near future during the French Revolution and for this Utopian future, people would behave rationally in the enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. For Enlightenment philosophers, the core point of history is the sunrise of the modern scientific spirit. Before this period, everything was fictitious and darkness, false and fraud. For this reason, there was certainly no need to historical research because everything is out of reason and so it was a futile effort to search for truth in the past i.e. the past was not worth to make research. Moreover, Rousseau realized

According to Toprak, the 1908 workers' movements constituted a turning point in terms of Turkey's working-class history. For nearly forty years before 1908, although the Turkish working class, who toiled in railways, shipyards, tobacco regi, or “Şirket-i Hayriye”¹⁸⁰, had walked out or started to organize trade unions because of the weakness of the country’s economy, the oppressive policies of the Abdulhamid Era, and similar objective and subjective reasons, these workers’ movements never attained wide scale popularity. Following the revolution of 1908, and under the relative freedom in which principles such as "liberty, equality, and fraternity were emphasized, the Turkish working class waged a struggle for their rights in almost all business sectors in a short period of two and a half months, and further began to organize trade unions all over the country. The Committee of Union and Progress initially tolerated the strikes in order to consolidate the counterrevolution and gain numbers against the Tyranny, but the strikes increasingly contradicted the ideological stance of the CUP, so Unionists began to change their attitudes towards strikes and workers. As a result, the workers’ right to strike was forbidden by the government decree.

The Young Turk Revolution as a bourgeois movement was completely different from the French Revolution. The bourgeois democratic revolution¹⁸¹ is a type of movement in which the exploited masses rebel under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. The Young Turk Revolution was a “top-down” movement, one that moved away from the masses according to Toprak, while Aykut Kansu supports the

that rulers could offer their people nothing except what the people themselves were ready to accept. Romanticists believed that the people would become enlightened with education. For Rousseau, the principle of history was a principle which could be implemented both the recent history of the civilized world and to the history of all races and all times. Furthermore, Rousseau emphasizes that we should look at the history sympathetically and try to find in history the expression of genuine and valuable human success unlike the approach of Enlightenment intellectuals on history. The conception of history is a progress and a development of human reason or the education of mankind. See Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, 78-88.

¹⁸⁰ Toprak gives the details about the trade union organization of Şirket-i Hayriye and their strikes in 1925 in the article: Zafer Toprak, “Şirket-i Hayriye Amele Cemiyeti ve 1925 Grevi,” *Toplumsal Tarih* 5, no. 30, (1996): 6-14.

¹⁸¹ Toprak, *Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 55.

opposing argument that the 1908 Revolution was not disconnected from society, which was exactly what made it a revolution.¹⁸² For Toprak, the democratic aspect of 1908 Revolution was, therefore, very weak. While the bourgeois democratic revolutions grew from the material basis of the industrial revolution, the 1908 Revolution, lacking such a base, was a revolution carried out in the name of the "bourgeoisie". According to Toprak, the powerless Ottoman economy could not go beyond creating a cooperative bourgeois class under the yoke of imperialism. The Young Turks, nourished by positivist thoughts, attempted to create the "national bourgeoisie" and were eager to import the capitalism of the West and bring a kind of state sponsored capitalism to Turkey by using the state apparatus as a tool for primitive capital accumulation. This trend, which can be defined as "bourgeois nationalism" at the ideological level, would gradually form the material basis of the Unionist Turkish-Islam bourgeoisie, with the motivation of Parvus and the impetus of nationalization.¹⁸³

During a two or three-month period in 1908, mass strikes appeared in almost all business sectors. Neither the new government nor pro-government newspapers and magazines were pleased with the situation. At the same time there was a big difference in salaries between domestic and foreign workers, and the journal of the İstanbul "Ticaret Odası" (Chamber of Commerce of İstanbul) found Ottoman workers were unjustly favored in the segregation of the domestic and foreign workers. The journal blamed Ottoman workers in its articles and touted the idea that domestic workers would never be at the level of their foreign counterparts.¹⁸⁴

The quick spread of workers' movements all over the country prompted the Unionists to take preventive measures. The Unionists thought that workers' desires and demands were unreasonable, so they insisted that these demands could not be fulfilled in any real way. According to them, the unreasonable demands of the

¹⁸² Aykut Kansu, *The Revolution of 1908 in Turkey*, (Boston: Brill Academic Pub., 1997).

¹⁸³ Toprak, *Türkiye'de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 34.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 35.

workers should only be addressed by establishing trade unions whose rules were designed in accordance with Unionist interests. They went on to specify the framework and context of the trade unions and indicated that “it was vital to avoid all kinds of socialist demands for trade unions”.¹⁸⁵ Although some Unionists supported trade union leaders like the liberal Cavid Bey, others opposed to the idea of establishing trade unions because such collectives represented the socialist view of labor. A law prohibiting the right to strike was put into force on October 8, 1908, in the form of a statutory decree without convening the assembly.¹⁸⁶

The outbreak of the 1908 workers' movements was described as the dawn of socialism by some. In particular, newspapers and magazines which favored foreign capital were annoyed by this situation and they wrote that these movements were the beginnings of widespread socialism in Ottoman society and would damage the capital and development of the country.¹⁸⁷ They claimed that Mehmed Cavid Bey was a socialist because he supported the rights of workers, like the right to establish trade unions.¹⁸⁸ In fact, Cavid Bey denied this rumor and claimed that some rights, such as establishing trade unions, should be given to the workers only within a liberal framework. On the one hand, he stated that this kind of insurrection of the workers was harming the economy and the prestige of the country, but on the other hand, he defended the workers' right to establish trade unions. Defending the right of the establish trade unions was enough for a person to be labeled as a socialist at that time, yet, in reality, the main reason to defend the unionization rights of workers was that workers were able to be kept under control when organized into these groups.

Toprak claims that the strikes after the 1908 Revolution showed that the Committee of Union and Progress took over as the *de facto* power, even though it had not taken

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 37.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 38.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 142.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 143.

a place in government in the early days of the Revolution. The various decisions made by revolutionist members were an indication that they could take charge of their administration, even if they were not in power. During the strikes, both employers and workers went to the Unionists, hoping for a solution from them. However, as soon as the strikes spread to all business sectors, the arrests began.¹⁸⁹

A proposal was enacted on August 9, 1909 that banned the right to strike in all institutions which were part of public service; in other words, strikes were forbidden in all workplaces where the number of workers was high such as in railways, sea transportation, tramway, ports, docks, power administration and water distribution. The trade unions established in these places were subsequently closed. According to Toprak, the *CUP* would rather choose the type of liberalism found in liberal-socialism for worker-employer relationships, and the characteristic class divisions supported by the *CUP* became set in stone with this law.¹⁹⁰ Toprak states that the Revolution of 1908 was a bourgeois revolution, although the Ottoman Empire had not had the same bourgeois class as was found in developed industrial countries.¹⁹¹ But since Tanzimat, developments and expectations peculiar to the bourgeois society became increasingly powerful. Though there was limited accumulation of capital in the Ottoman territories previously, after Tanzimat, a bourgeois class was formed both in mentality and as demonstrated by lifestyle. In fact, a bourgeois class peculiar to the Ottoman Empire emerged and developed in this period. The changes happening outside the country during the nineteenth century which connected every area of trade to each other were also manifested in the Ottoman Empire. In a sense, globalization changed many things from education and politics, to daily life and the changing mentalities in the Ottoman territories, just as was seen in other countries. Toprak notes that the closer contact with the West provided by Western literature, an increasingly secularized understanding of education, the flow

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 44.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 38.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 42.

of current information through new means of communication and the development of new means of transportation all caused a characteristic bourgeois culture, or “*sui generis*”, unique to the Ottomans. Young Turks and members of the *CUP* represented this emerging segment of the Ottoman Empire.¹⁹²

Toprak does not only deal with industrial workers in his labor studies, but also examines the post-republic working conditions of agricultural employees. In the chapter “Yüzyılın İlk Çeyreğinde Çukurova’da Emek ve Sermaye” (Labor and Capital in Çukurova in the First Quarter of the Century), he refers to the situation of the agricultural workers in Çukurova and the activities of the state in this area. Because of the lack of labor force in the region, agricultural production suffered while Turkish villagers only worked in their own small territories. However, while there was a shortage of labor in the field of agricultural production, Toprak does not speculate as to why the daily wage remained low. Theoretically, when there is a shortage of labor in a region, salaries are expected to be high. Landowners apparently would not raise the salaries of the workers, even at the expense of leaving their crops in the field. According to Toprak, it was very difficult to find a proletariat in Ottoman lands, both in industry and agriculture, before the time of the Republic¹⁹³ when one of the basic problems of the farmer was to find land-laborers. The loss of human power due to war further negatively influenced the agricultural sector.

3.5.2. Regulation of Law for Workers

Toprak does not only address the 1908 workers' strike, he also examines the labor of women and children in industry and the legislation which resulted from their

¹⁹² Ibid., 42.

¹⁹³ Toprak, *Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 207. To learn about the depression of worker in Adana in the early Republican period see; Zafer Toprak, “Cumhuriyet’in İlk Yıllarında Adana’da Amele Buhranı ve Amele Talimatnamesi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no 41 (1997): 7-13.

labor issues.¹⁹⁴ He further claims that the first studies on women's and child labor, and the understanding of related social policies or their demands, were first done at the time of the 1908 workers' movements. But in a real sense, to create a widely accepted social policy in Turkey became possible only after the First World War. According to social policy experts, measures to protect workers through social policy before the Republican era were too limited. But for Toprak, the "Dilaver Pasha Regulation" issued for the Ereğli Coal Basin of 1865 was a document that sought to increase production, and at the same time, convey the first movement towards social politics.¹⁹⁵ This legislation provided a rest area for workers, working time was set at ten hours per day, special privileges were attached to the fees they paid, and it stipulate that workers were to be informed early if the business would be closed to avoid miners being unemployed collectively. Although there were no precautions regarding work safety, if workers were ill they were to be examined by the mine doctor and sent to their homes if they were unable to continue work. According to Toprak, it is a matter of debate as to how much these rules were adequately put in practice, but they are certainly noteworthy measures for that day. The second important document in terms of social policy was "Maadin Regulation" dated 1869, according to Toprak. This regulation removed the obligation to work in unsafe mines, provided precautions against work accidents and necessitated the presence of doctors and medicine in the mines. It also provided compensation to accident victims and their families. However, it also brought a penalty of between 5 and 20 gold (Ottoman money) for accidents which were the worker's fault.¹⁹⁶ Social policy laws until 1920 were limited to those issues, but the strikes of 1908 brought to light worker demands which were previously not heard, from working

¹⁹⁴ Toprak gives the details of the attempts for laws for women and child labor in the article: Zafer Toprak, "Sosyal Politika Tarihimizin İlk Önlemler Paketi: "Müessesât-ı Sinaiyede Çocukların ve Kadınların Çalıştırılması (1910)," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no 27 (1984): 229-237.

¹⁹⁵ Toprak, *Türkiye'de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 172. To learn more about "Dilaver Pasha Regulation" in the working area see also: Zafer Toprak, "Türkiye'de İlk İş Kanunu Teklifi: Amelenin Suret-i İstihdamına Dair Kanun Teklifi (1911)," *Toplumsal Tarih* 6, no. 32, (1996): 6-10.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 173.

hours, holiday and salary increases to equal salary rates and more. Although these were put into effect, parliament discussed them and solutions were considered. Again, during the Second Constitutional period, Dr. Ömer Şevki Bey presented a proposal to parliament for the protection of women and children in the workplace. This proposal included the protection of women and children and other related measures inside industrial factories. It contained many precautions for girls and boys, from minimum working age to general working conditions in the factories. Toprak says that the social policy proposed by Şevki Bey was the first comprehensive package of preventive measures in Turkey's social policy history.¹⁹⁷ However, he states that the first legislation which was put into effect to regulate the working conditions of children was the 1921 Zonguldak and Ereğli Coal Mine Workers' Law. This legislation prohibited children from working in mines until they were 18 years old. Following this legislation, the 1930 General Health Law would provide comprehensive protection. This law banned the child labor under the age of 12 in any kind of industry, but did nothing to regulate conditions in other fields such as agriculture, commerce, transportation and employment at home. Regulations covering those issues would only come to the agenda with the 1936 Workers Act when children were banned from working at night. At the same time, laws regulating the working conditions of women were written into the General Health Act of 1930.¹⁹⁸

3.5.3. Trade Union Organizations

Toprak also addresses trade union organizations in his labor studies. He remarks that for some time during the Ottoman Empire, the vertical corporate organization and horizontal trade union organization advanced concurrently.¹⁹⁹ As mentioned above, the trade union organizations came into being for the first time in 1908.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 175.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 230.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 252.

Strikes were seen in almost all business sectors due to the open environment provided by "İlan-i Hürriyet" (the Declaration of Freedom). Workers from all over the country resisted corporate power with new, concrete demands. According to Toprak, even though there were mass strikes before 1908, these were short-lived and immediately negotiated movements, but the strikes in 1908 gained a quality that shook society and raised serious questions about its future.²⁰⁰ Nevertheless, because of the Ottoman guild tradition, trade union organization was not easily achieved and, as in every modernist movement of the Ottoman Empire, there was a duality here for a while, too. The Ottoman tradition of the guild was preserved until the mid-nineteenth century, but this organization later began to dissolve. The integration of the Ottoman economy with the West made market indicators clear and monetized the country for the first time. As a consequence, traditional organizational structures such as guilds lost their function.²⁰¹ The Ottomans began the process of integration with the world economy; they employed a vertical production system which consisted of master-foreman-apprentice, and as a result, gave rise to "transition organizations" which included the modern extensions of traditional structures.

For a while, the structures of the horizontal trade union and vertical corporate trade union organizations were operating simultaneously. According to Toprak, workers' organizations in Turkey were comprised of quite different elements than their Western counterparts. Although cooperation between artisans and workers in the West was observed in the early stages of industrialization, rapid industrialization process soon separated these segments. This process, however, took a very long time in Turkey because of late industrialization in the Ottoman Empire. All kinds of employees were often found in artisan organizations and despite the fact that the

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 252.

²⁰¹ Ibid., 254. Also, Toprak investigates the development of trade union organizations in details in the articles: Zafer Toprak, "Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet Türkiye'si'nde Sendikal Gelişmeler: İstanbul Umum Deniz ve Maden Kömürü Tahmil ve Tahliye Amele Cemiyeti", *Toplum ve Bilim*, no 40 (1988): 141-153., Zafer Toprak, "1946 Sendikacılığı: Sendika Gazetesi, İşçi Sendikaları, Birlikleri ve İşçi Kulüpleri," *Toplumsal Tarih* 6, no 31 (1996): 19-29.

guilds of the Ottoman Empire faced disintegration in the years following the Tanzimat period, the tradition continued to exist until the Republican years.

3.5.4. Debate about Ta'til-i Eşgal Law

A debate was started by social scientists in the journal “Toplum ve Bilim” (Society and Science) following the September 12, 1980, over the Ta'til-i Eşgal law. In light of its new labor regulations, Mesut Gülmez classified certain strikes rules which would cover the prohibition of strikes, the freedom to strike, and the right to strike. He asserted that these three classifications would suggest the 1908 Ta'til-i Eşgal did not bring a prohibition to the right of strike; on the contrary, he said this legislation opened the period of "freedom of strike".²⁰² The debate continued in the next issues of the journal “Toplum ve Bilim” and Mesut Gülmez argued his point in his latter works. Toprak expresses his thoughts on this subject in the chapter “Ta'til-i Eşgal Kanunu ve Grev Yasağı” from his book “1908-1946 İşçi Sınıfı”. According to Toprak, the reference point of for Mesut Gülmez and the defenders of this line of thinking stemmed from Article 6 of the law which indicates that “servants and workers are free to abandon their service”.²⁰³

Indeed, Article 6 permits the workers to leave their jobs when they could not agree with their employers. However, for Toprak, it is very difficult to deduce a right to strike from this Article and he asks; are the right to abandon work and the right to go on strike, in fact, synonymous? Or at least, were they used as synonymous words in that time? In the end, Toprak believes that these two words are not synonymous and the intended meaning of the words the “right to abandon the work” was that the worker had the right to give up his/her job when he/she could not agree with employer. Toprak contends that when all the data is taken into account, it is very difficult to argue that the 1908-1909 the law of Ta'til-i Eşgal legislated strikes and guaranteed one of the most fundamental rights of workers; the right to strike. In the

²⁰² Ibid., 154.

²⁰³ Ibid., 155.

same way, it is impossible to declare that the law outlined the methods to approach strike in Turkey. In short, the purpose of the term “the right to abandon the work” is to specify that the workers were free to sell their own labor individually in case of disagreement with management. The law Ta’til-i Eşgal did not grant the freedom to strike at public-service workplaces, either. On the contrary, this law banned any strikes at workplaces which served the public and defended the continuity of work in such places for the sake of public interests.

3.5.5. The Attempt of Industrial Journal to Develop Worker’s Awareness (Sanay-i Dergisi)

In summary, the foundation of the working class in Turkey was directly related to the development of industry. After the Second Constitution, most newspapers and journals had discussed the industrial problem, including one of the most prominent journals, Sanayi Dergisi (Industry Journal) which was published by Muslim Turkish entrepreneurs. This was a journal established to pave the way for the birth of an industrial mentality in the country, to increase industrial knowledge and power amongst Turkish-Muslim subjects, and to also encourage Turkish-Muslim entities to take national steps in the field of industry. According to Toprak, the journal was meant to develop the consciousness of the workers about industrial issues in the Second Constitutional years. At that time, a protectionist economic policy was adopted in the name of National Economy by moving away from the liberal economic thought of the nineteenth century. This magazine published articles about the working class and, at the same time, emphasized the importance of labor for the country's economy and development by glorifying the working class. The main goals of this magazine were to glorify those workers and laborers who were previously despised and ensure the development of industry. After the war, the term ‘Ottoman workers’ was replaced by ‘Turkish workers’, Millet-i Osmaniye (Ottoman nations) was replaced by Turkish nation, and domestic industrialization was encouraged. It further sought to prepare people for the awakening of industry, to give power to Turkish workers, to enlighten them, to improve their working conditions, to increase the knowledge and power of the industry in Turkey and to

encourage national advancements in Turkish industry. In short, the fashion of popularizing the peasantry was done here through the promotion of workers and industry. If the goal was to improve industry, the key component was naturally its work force. At the same time, this magazine supported the development of workers' rights by publishing articles that would enlighten the workers.²⁰⁴

3.5.6. Toprak's View on Labor

As we have seen above, Toprak examines the whole of these structures while considering workers' movements. His goal is not to show how the workers' movements are shaped or concluded, but to delineate the causes that led to those movements; what factors existed, what the workers' demands were, and which points were different from the issues of the past. Toprak's studies on labor especially concentrated on the 1908 strikes. In addition, there are many other topics such as trade unions, women's and child labor rules and legal regulations, the first labor holidays in Turkey and the influence of socialist thinkers on the working class. While strikes, demands for rights and trade union developments are more intensely debated in Toprak's early studies, his later work shows that legal arrangements and state-worker relations are his key matters of concern. Labor studies especially interested him at the beginning of his career and during his post-1980 studies. As he stressed in all his works, he looks at the worker-laborer consciousness, movements and strikes within a modernization paradigm. That is, he focuses on the effects of modernization on worker's consciousness and strikes.

During the Ottoman Empire, the modernization of certain apparatuses, such as the emergence of foreign capital, construction of industrial factories and the corresponding railways for meeting the needs of trains and steam ships, plus the growing interests of entrepreneurs in coal mines and other mines, all led to the mass worker actions. Poor labor relations deprived workers of their guild memberships and abused the workers with low salaries and hard-working conditions. Some

²⁰⁴ Ibid., 222-228.

worked fifteen-sixteen hours a day without breaks for a week at a time, yet they took home wages that were not enough to buy bread. They worked without social security and were deprived of health facilities. The number of women and children found in hard working conditions increased day by day. In this atmosphere, despite of the risk of hunger and a life of misery, they went on strike²⁰⁵. The severe and difficult working conditions triggered mass uprisings. Although the Unionists could have come to power with their claims of freedom and equality, these strikes showed that they were not the most powerful group when it came to Turkey's industrialization.



²⁰⁵ Dimitri Şımanov, *Türkiye işçi ve sosyalist hareketi*, 2nd Ed., (İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1990), 24. Toprak also makes research on May 1 labor day (1 Mayıs İşçi Bayramı) from the late Ottoman Empire to recent history of Turkey in the articles: Ahmet Seren [Zafer Toprak], "Türkiye İşçi Sınıfı ve Tarihte 1 Mayıslar (1906-1925)," *Yurt ve Dünya*, no. 3 (1977): 393-412., Zafer Toprak, "İstanbul'da Amele Bayramları: -II, Cumhuriyet'in ilk Yılları," *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 43 (1987): 44-47., Zafer Toprak, "İstanbul'da Amele Bayramları:-I- Cumhuriyet Öncesi," *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 41 (1987): 35-42. Also, to learn more about the attempt for establishing political party by workers and peasants see: Zafer Toprak, "Ahmed Cevat'ın Bir Risalesi: Amele ve Köylü Kitleleri Nasıl Fırka Teşkil Eder?," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 9-10 (1980): 103-121.

CHAPTER 4

SOCIAL HISTORY

4.1. POPULISM

Toprak's book, called "*Populism in Turkey in 1908-1923*", is a product of his articles and researches on the history of thought since 1977 in the late Ottoman Empire and early Republican period in Turkey. In this chapter, I will focus on the Toprak's studies on ideas and populist movement in the Turkish recent history.

According to Toprak, the Second Constitutional period was a period of enlightenment which was unique to the Ottomans. The positivism and social thought of the French Third Republic deeply influenced the Young Turks who had taken refuge in Paris. The Ottoman modernization model was initially inspired to a great extent by the French example, and Toprak states that the transition from the idea of community to society was one of the factors that influenced Ottoman intellectuals.²⁰⁶ 'People' and 'society' would be the key words after the Second Constitutional Monarchy, in 1908. The development towards a national identity which was first seen among the Muslim communities had also been observed in the Turkish-speaking segment of the population since the second half of the nineteenth century. The quest for a national identity that emerged initially in the field of language and literature later spread into Ottoman political and social life. The Turkish-speaking cognoscenti of the Ottoman Empire gradually began to define

²⁰⁶ Zafer Toprak, *Türkiye'de Popülizm 1908-1923*, (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2013), 15. Toprak gives the details about definition of populism and political and ideological populism in the article; Zafer Toprak, "Popülizm ve Türkiye'deki Boyutları," in *Tarih ve Demokrasi - Tarık Zafer Tunaya'ya Armağan*, (İstanbul; Cem Yayınları; Üniversite Öğretim Üyeleri Derneği, 1992): 41-65.

themselves as Turks. The main reference point for this understanding was the Western idea of the modern and they regarded themselves as "modern", although it was occasionally categorized as modern Islam. Toprak suggests that the understanding of progress which was the dominant approach in the nineteenth century also transformed Ottoman society.²⁰⁷

In the process, the West and the East were further diverged from each other, and political constructions and democratization processes in developing countries brought a complicated ideological tide to the agenda. According to him, as it had happened in many underdeveloped countries, nationalism-socialism, traditionalism-modernism and conservatism-fundamentalism coexisted in Turkey.²⁰⁸ Rapid social transformation, urbanization, modernization, the new-old conflict, and the relative poverty of the rural population stimulated the populist anticipations in Turkey. And as a result, in the first half of the twentieth century, while democracy in the West created disappointment in some circles, populism in developing nations that were seeking to embrace "modernity" took the place of democratic society's expectations. Toprak contends that while populism and democratization are two contradictory elements, populism constituted a different dimension of democratization in Turkey.²⁰⁹ In the Second Constitutional years, the search for national identity brought an integrated, solidaristic social model. In the absence of a strong middle class, the rejection of class struggle formed the main axis of such populist developments. Unlike the West, the Ottoman-Turkish populism was a result of it being late to develop, and its chaotic capitalist organization. It had become a worldview that integrated traditionalism with fundamentalism and modernization. Toprak indicates that nationalism and populism have the same meaning for Ottomans, so, populism was an idea and

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 16.

²⁰⁸ Zafer Toprak, "II. Meşrutiyet'te Popülizm: Falih Rıfkı ve Ziya Gökalp'in Halkçılık Anlayışları", in *Yakın Türkiye Tarihinden Sayfalar - Sina Akşin'e Armağan*, ed. Mehmet Ö. Alkan, (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2014), 2.

²⁰⁹ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 17.

application that marked the first stages of the Turkish Constitutional Era and Republican Turkey.²¹⁰

4.1.1. The Effect Of Narodnik Movement Of Russia In Turkish Populism

Populism in Ottoman territory was mostly influenced from Russia. The populist movement in Turkey was spread under the influence of the Muslims who were educated in Russia. The Russian Narodnik movement constituted an example for Turkey, which had been late to modernization.²¹¹ Despite the fact that Ottoman intellectuals were inclined towards Western teachings, they closely followed developments in Russia due to the fact that a large number of Muslims lived there and were in constant communication with the Ottomans. Toprak claims that the immigrant Muslim intellectuals who carried the ideas of Russia into the Ottoman territory were a considerable influence the Young Turks. Musa Akyiğitzade, Yusuf Akçura, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, and Hüseyinzade Ali were the most prominent among them. Thinkers such as Sadi Maksudi and Zeki Velidi had similar roles in the Republican years.²¹² Toprak asserts that the Narodnik, or populist approach, had a socialist dimension, as well as a nationalist one for the Ottomans. According to him, to ignore the socialist element that overlaps and dissociates with its analogue element in the West, and to perceive nationalism as a purely rightist ideology, independent from time, are a historical mistake. To consider the sympathy of the Unionists toward the Bolsheviks after the world war as pure opportunism also means to ignore the different dimension of the Young Turks.²¹³ Toprak states that

²¹⁰ Ibid., 17.

²¹¹ To learn more about Narodnik movement see; Zafer Toprak, “Osmanlı Narodnikleri: ‘Halka Doğru Gidenler’”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 24, (1984): 69-81. Also see: Zafer Toprak, “Türkiye’de ‘Narodnik’ Milliyetçiliği ve Halkçılık (1908-1918)”, in *Türkler* vol.14, eds. H.C. Güzel, K. Çiçek & S. Koca, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Stratejik Araştırma Merkezi Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002), 801-806.

²¹² Toprak, “II. Meşrutiyet’te Popülizm: Falih Rıfkı ve Ziya Gökalp’in Halkçılık Anlayışları,” 11.

²¹³ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 291

with the effect of solidarism, the ideas of the Second Constitutional thinkers who tried to reconcile liberalism with socialism included elements for the social state.²¹⁴

Populist thought constituted the backbone of transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey and the nation-state foundation.²¹⁵ Ottoman populism received a positive reaction in Salonica during its first phase. In this city, the Unionists who convened around the journals of “Yeni Felsefe Mecmuası and Genç Kalemler” discovered “the people” after the Second Constitution. Then, after the loss of Salonica, the populist discourse started to bloom in Istanbul. Journals such as “Halka Doğru”, “Türk Yurdu”, “Türk Sözü”, “Türk Duygusu”, “Büyük Duygu” and “Talebe Defteri” began to spread the discourse of “going toward people”.²¹⁶ The unequal income distribution seen in the Constitutional period, as well as various moral issues, led the Constitutional Monarchy and the Republic to embrace populism. Therefore, populism became one of the widespread ideological approaches of this period. Arguments about populism as an ideology came to the agenda through articles on immigrant Turkish intellectuals from Russia, in particular the articles of Yusuf Akçura in the journal “Halka Doğru”. In the Second Constitutional period, the “commons” and populism constituted an important dimension of Gökalp’s thought system. However, the notion of French Solidarism was dominant in Gökalp’s understanding of populism, instead of Russian Narodnik. According to Toprak, the Gökalp’s questioning of Western Capitalism also had a significant effect on the process of building the Republic, so his ideas constituted

²¹⁴ Ibid., 292. Many developing countries saw the Russia’s Narodnik movement as a path to follow (While the word ‘folk’ means both ‘nation’ and the citizen/folk in Russian, the latter two words were not used synonymously, especially during the Republican period in Turkey. That is, both of them were expressed instead by the word “narod” or ‘the people’ in Russia, therefore it was called the ‘narodnik’ movement.)

²¹⁴ Ibid., 23.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 23.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 45. For looking at the journals on ideas and thought in the Ottoman Empire see; Zafer Toprak, “Fikir Dergiciliğinin Yüz Yılı”, in *Türkiye’de Dergiler-Ansiklopediler (1849-1984)*, (İstanbul; Gelişim Yayınları, 1984), 13-54.

the dominant approaches in the Single Party Period. Toprak states that populism, in harmony with Gökalp's solidarism, was transformed into an ideology that was followed by the state during wartime, and he asserts that *CHF* was the product of this populist thought.²¹⁷ Moreover, he states that it was Ziya Gökalp who inspired Mustafa Kemal to form his views on populism.²¹⁸ Toprak claims that although Gökalp has a definite attitude towards socialism, his approach on solidarism can be construed as a secret socialist view in a sense.²¹⁹

Toprak, however, also argues that Ottoman society had begun to dissolve starting in the nineteenth century, so a different understanding of solidarity was required under these unstable conditions. It was Durkheim who would find a scientific solution to this, and with his work, constitutional positivism rose to the fore. Toprak maintains that “the concepts of Durkheim's solidarity and division of labor would lead to a new social organization and open up the gates of the nation-state”.²²⁰ Concordantly, this task was carried out by the intellectuals who discovered Durkheim in Salonica. Durkheim was, for the first time, analyzed in the scientific context in the “Yeni Felsefe Mecmuası”.²²¹ Gökalp investigated Durkheim and claimed that the “declaration of freedom” was a political revolution which must be followed by social revolution. This social revolution meant leaving old lifestyles behind and starting new ones, which in turn implied a new economic order, a new

²¹⁷ Ibid., 28.

²¹⁸ Ibid., 20.

²¹⁹ Ibid., 171. Along the same lines, Toprak claims that Yusuf Akçura also had socialist views in terms of defending equality, and distribution of income among the society. As an example, he states that Akçura addressed the difficulties that the poorer segments of society encountered under Ottoman rule. Also, the cultivated land of the villagers was inadequate and harvest was not enough to be able to meet their subsistence. Although they obtained high yields, they lacked railway, truck and other transportation facilities, so they could not integrate with the market. The people could only overcome these problems under the leadership of the cognoscenti. For this reason, the Turkish intellectuals must have turned to the people, integrated with them, and educated them according to Akçura. Ibid., 173.

²²⁰ Ibid., 146.

²²¹ Ibid., 146.

family structure, new art, new philosophy, new morality, new politics and new laws. And leaving traditional life behind could only be possible with innovations in these areas. Gökalp also supported the idea of the simplification of the language. In this area, his goal was to come closer to “people” and spread and popularize the idea of nation-state. Toprak indicates that Gökalp’s view on populism was clearly seen in his articles in the journals of “Genç Kalemler” and “Yeni Felsefe”. Also, Toprak claims that Gökalp was inspired by Tarde in his first period, then, by Foulillee and finally by Durkheim during his mature period.²²²

Toprak says that populism in Turkey can be thought of as a parallel to the peasantry movement. He indicates that it was inevitable for populism to protect the peasantry, which was the basis of the traditional culture and seen as its protector. He notes that the cognoscenti and the peasantry shared a similar fate in a sense, but because of the similarity of their socio-psychological positions, not because of their ideas, or their way of life.²²³ The common past, common values, and a shared uncertainty for the ideal future that had been lost during the transformation process led populists to identify with the peasantry. He underlines that although they identified themselves with peasantry, that identification was limited by ideological framework. The interaction between reality with the ideology revealed a complex structure. Despite their warm feelings towards the villagers, populist intellectuals were generally second or third generation urbanites. Despite the fact that they did not know the real village, or even know it superficially, nor did they want to come to know it, they still used the terms peasantry, peasant community, or peasant as strictly ideological symbols. Toprak asserts that populist intellectuals were trying to crystallize their own philosophical problems, and in doing so integrated the feelings of rebellion that were common amongst poor peasants.²²⁴

²²² Ibid., 147.

²²³ Ibid., 43.

²²⁴ Ibid., 43.

He further claims that the ideological world of the Ottomans simultaneously developed in the second half of the nineteenth century within the publishing world. The most important factor in the evolution of the thought was journalism.²²⁵ As in the first Ottoman magazines during the reform movements of “Tanzimat” period, there was a trend toward Western ideas. The intellectuals of the “Tanzimat” were interested in the science and techniques of the Western world, so they tried to introduce fields such as science and technical studies to the Ottomans. However, Toprak remarks that although the developments peculiar to the West were followed and introduced to the Ottoman society, it was a kind of encyclopedic information that had little true resonance in Turkey.²²⁶ The second constitutional period was a milestone in publishing circles. With the proclamation of liberty, or “hürriyet”, radical transformations were observed in the publishing business. At the same time, freedom was encouraged every aspect of this idealistic journalism. The first Islamist-Turkist publishing body that rebelled against Abdulhamid was “Sırat-i Mustakim”.²²⁷ Women's rights became an important position for this magazine. Concurrently, it touched upon the importance of the industry, the virtue of studying, how to acquire wealth and its necessity for the Turks. Many other magazines and newspapers appeared on the shelves, but it was Ziya Gökalp who carried Islamic modernization to its apex, according to Toprak, Gökalp addressed the evolutionary and Islamic-social problems in journals such as “Islam Mecmuası”, “Türk Yurdu”, “Yeni Mecmua”, “İçtimaiyyat Mecmuası”, Milli Tettebbular Mecmuası”. He was also on a quest to reconcile his beliefs without contradicting the masses.

According to the view of “new life”, Western civilization was collapsing because it inevitably *had* to collapse. The real civilization was Turkish society, which would start with the development of this “new life”. For Gökalp, the concept of the “superior man” as defined by Nietzsche referred to Turks, and the new life would

²²⁵ Ibid., 79.

²²⁶ Ibid., 79.

²²⁷ Ibid., 85.

be born from the Turks who were the source of all innovation. Toprak states that Gökalt took on a new personality when he went to Salonica for the congress of the CUP. He now supported a new “national life” and he described the transition from Ottomanism to Turkism in his article in the journal “Genç Kalemler”. The first success for the movement towards the new life concept was realized within the language. Toprak says that the takeoff point of Turkish nationalism was to be found in the language and Turkism required language independence before anything else. Significantly, the real issue was the great gap between the official and literary language, and folk language.²²⁸ Therefore, the language should be simplified and Toprak notes that Ömer Seyfettin was the leading figure in this endeavor. According to Toprak, there was a different literary language before and after Ömer Seyfettin. Although there were those who supported the simplification of the language, it was Ömer Seyfettin who systemized it.

4.1.2. Sociology, Journalism and Ideology

Sociology and populism emerged at a time when the world conflicted with the problems created by the Industrial and French Revolutions. In fact, revolutions were, so to speak, the products of these problems. There was a close relationship between sociology and populism because social inequalities and class problems had played an important role in birth of both approaches.²²⁹ Sociology began with the Second Constitutional Monarchy within the Ottoman intellectuals. Anthropology also began in Ottoman literature before this period. In the middle of the nineteenth century, writings about human evolution were being presented in the journal “Mecmua-i Funun”, by “Munif Paşa”. Thus, before the second constitutional era, there were publishing platforms for human sciences and anthropological information. Moreover, “Şemseddin Sami” made great contributions to anthropology. In those days, before the word “race” was introduced into Ottoman

²²⁸ Ibid., 178.

²²⁹ Ibid., 49.

literature, he mentioned the structure of two types of skulls, as discussed elsewhere in this paper.²³⁰ Toprak claims that anthropological studies gained more weight during the Second Constitutional years and opened the door to a sort of Turkish racism, while at the same time he asserts that anthropological studies in the Republican period had no racial discriminative content, as we can see in his book, *“Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji”*. It was initially thought by some academics that the black and yellow races were inferior to Europeans, and men were superior to women according to measurements of the female and male skulls. Then, anthropology and ethnography courses started to be given after The Young Turk Revolution. Another name closely related to anthropology and ethnography in this period was Satı Bey, who tried to bring Western style secular science and discussions to the Ottoman. According to Toprak, it was thanks to Satı Bey that modern norms were adopted in biology and geology, and a better scientific understanding was introduced to the Ottomans.²³¹

Meanwhile, one of the magazines that continued these discussions was the “Yeni Felsefe Mecmuası. “Yeni Fesefe Mecmuası” stated that nature’s laws do not allow unnatural conditions to be maintained for a long time. With all kinds of material or spiritual distortions, everything that has been deformed would eventually reform into a natural structure and submit to the laws of nature. The situation was valid for the human body. For instance, illness was not natural and was seen as a kind of distortion, so it could not be maintained for long by the body. It is either getting better or losing its naturalness, which would result in its death. Social structures were approached in a similar manner. Any individual or society had to make a concerted effort in order to survive. Those who did not make this effort would perish and disappear back into nature. Therefore, active steps should be taken to continue to exist under these evolutionary pressures. This point of view, i.e. the social Darwinist approach, could be applied to nations or races. Nations that wanted

²³⁰ Ibid., 54.

²³¹ Ibid., 75.

to keep up their existence had to enter a struggle for survival, or else perish. According to the laws of nature, the powerful will destroy the weak, and history was full of such struggles.²³²

After the 1908 revolution, sociology quickly became a dominant science and was perceived as a major field of study in Ottoman territory.²³³ The first comprehensive articles related to sociology were published in the magazines “Ulum-i İktisadiye” and “İçtimaiyye Mecmuası”.²³⁴ In these magazines, names such as Mehmed Cavid, Rıza Tevfik and Ahmed Şuayib spoke of the strides taken in sociology and underlined the writings of Auguste Comte and Le Play to highlight this field. In the introductory article of these three authors, it was thanks to sociology that philosophy, history, law and morality had opened their doors to new and different horizons, and they claimed that reforms and regulatory actions made by state in the name of society could not be successful without academic sociology. Toprak indicates, however, that the positivist worldview of the “Servet-i Funun” was conveyed to this magazine by Ahmed Şuayib. He claims that evolutionism had become the basic principle behind the magazine. As an example, authors influenced by Auguste Comte and Spencer concentrated upon evolution and the organic society in their writings.²³⁵ Likewise, the nation itself played an organic role. The influence of biology in nineteenth century sociology was of great importance. That is to say, society was similar to a living entity and its organs; in parallel to this, the nation was considered to be a living entity.

Moreover, the emerging field of psychology took part in sociology at that time. Auguste Comte enumerated the sciences such as mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry biology and sociology, but Spencer and Mill pushed psychology into this

²³² Ibid., 140.

²³³ Ibid., 93.

²³⁴ Ibid., 94.

²³⁵ Ibid., 97.

lineup as a foundational principal that fell somewhere between biology and sociology. Toprak says that sociology was established on the basis of psychology, and this view aroused a great interest in the Ottoman Empire.²³⁶ Toprak claims that trying to understand social life through the lens of biology was the *modus operandi* of Ottoman thought in the last half of the nineteenth century. In brief, the Ottomans met with sociology earlier than many countries within the World and many works were translated into the Turkish before other languages, as Toprak points out.

After 1908, the Turkism movement followed two different paths. While Istanbul advanced toward Turkism using a historical perspective, Salonica was followed a sociological approach. In the Istanbul branch of Turkism, the pioneers were Ahmed Midhat, Mehmed Emin, Ahmet Hikmet, Yusuf Akçura and Akil Muhtar. Meanwhile, the defense of Turkism was undertaken by “Yeni Felsefe Mecmuası”, and “Genç Kalemler” in Salonica. After the Balkan War, the defenders of the Turkish movement, especially Gökalep, came to Istanbul. These names later received great support from most of the Unionists. The ideological aspect of Turkism was more broadly developed in journals such as “Türk Yurdu”, “Türk Duygusu”, and “Büyük Duygu”. After the Balkan Wars, Turkism became a semi-official policy of Unionist.²³⁷

Besides the very concept of sociology, which was one of the achievements of the Second Constitutional Era, the word “folk” also entered the literature. The society previously defined as “reaya” or “subject” was now being described as “folk”. Toprak says that in spite of the fact that the word of “folk” was being used during the Ottoman Empire, it acquired a different meaning in the constitutional period. Hereafter, the masses (folk) had obtained a collective meaning, rather than simply the sum of individuals.²³⁸ Although the word “folk” usually defines the lower class,

²³⁶ Ibid., 99.

²³⁷ Ibid., 88.

²³⁸ Ibid., 165.

the Unionists used the word as a concept to describe the middle class. These Unionists started a journal called “Halka Doğru” in 1918. The mentality of their second journal was very different from the first in terms of its approach toward the “peoples”. Toprak claims that this journal was published for the “peoples”, but the word “peoples” now excluded low-income groups, landless peasants, daily workers and small shopkeepers.²³⁹

Toprak asserts that the reflection of sociology in everyday practice or politics became possible with the system of thought called populism, since the main theme of sociology was society. With the Constitutional Monarchy, the word “peoples” started to be used. In this new meaning, the “commons” symbolized the social will of "citizens". Yet, in the same breath, it was a significant element for the nation-state.²⁴⁰ Toprak remarks that, according to Gökalp, populism was synonymous with the word democracy in the West. Toprak claims that “one of the mainstreams that the Second Constitution brought to Ottoman thought was undoubtedly populism”.²⁴¹ The Ottoman populists, inspired by the Russian Narodnik movement, and the peasantry which was an extension of that movement in the Balkans, aggregated around the “Türk Ocağı”, “Talim ve Terbiye Cemiyeti” and published the journals known as “Halka Doğru”, and “Türk Yurdu”.

Toprak highlights that another Western-originated ideological movement brought by the Second Constitutional Era was socialism, which was initially supported in Salonica. The Second Constitutional movement was closely related with the French revolution. He indicates that most writers were heading to the West and trying to reconcile positivism with liberalism. According to Toprak, the Second Constitutional Era was, on the whole, a time of “Enlightenment”. Important advances in social sciences were also realized in this period; for example, sociology

²³⁹ Ibid., 195.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 166.

²⁴¹ Ibid., 170.

and economics began to take shape in these years. Economic consciousness underwent radical transformations at this time, too. According to him, the Ottoman economy was failing and many articles were written, both theoretical and practical, to find a solution to this problem. Agricultural and industrial options, especially, were discussed in newspapers and magazines every day.²⁴² Concepts such as solidarity, liberalism and collectivism began to be argued in this period. Solidarity was seen as a middle ground between collectivism and liberalism. In this sense, he indicates that state economics was also a gateway to the social state. The social depression caused by World War I required solidarity in general society. In this regard, the compromised professional classes would be put in the category of competing social classes, and the aspects of corporatist professions would be emphasized. Toprak asserts that the economic dimension of populism during these years was an economic solidarity which required the model of an interventionist state.²⁴³

Unionist intellectuals were also against a complete imitation of the West, which had started to decay and in which hunger, poverty and inequality were increasing, day by day. Therefore, the moral values and institutions of the West were not to be imitated completely. On the contrary, values previously appropriated by the West from Turkish culture should be taken back and adopted. Moreover, one of the main reasons for the collapse of the West was capitalism, itself, which had caused inequalities in wealth distribution. That is, while some enjoyed wealth and prosperity, the vast majority of society was struggling with hunger and misery. For them, it was important to realize that the economic institutions of the West were founded on the wrong principles. “Yeni Felsefe Mecmuası” gave a critique of this situation and supported the idea that there was nothing inspirational about the West. He claimed that if the economic institutions of the West were imitated without circumspection, a very small proportion of the population would be enriched and

²⁴² Ibid., 89.

²⁴³ Zafer Toprak, “Fikir Dergiciliğinin Yüz Yılı,” in *Türkiye’de Dergiler-Ansiklopediler (1849-1984)*, (İstanbul: Gelişim Yayınları, 1984), 22.

the rest would be faced with hunger and poverty in Turkey. In addition, family relationships in the West were suffering from a similar malaise. Family ties in the West were dissolving, he said, and corruption within the family was on the rise. Women were cheating their husbands and destroying the family institution. The collapse of family life was not limited to this, but now women and men in Europe did not want to marry until old age, or women did not want to have children even if they were married, and that had negative implications for the population. The most dominant element in the West was the individual's interest, and so the notion of solidarity had vanished. For these reasons, to take the West as an example would be suicide for the nation.²⁴⁴

Toprak writes that the Second Constitutional Monarchy advised a movement “toward the peoples”, in order to learn about and solve their problems. In this sense, the main responsibility belonged to the Ottoman intellectuals.²⁴⁵ According to them, the intellectuals of all the wealthy and prosperous countries such as Germany and Russia went toward the people to solve their problems. To accomplish this, they went to villages and tried to raise awareness through humanistic and nationalistic feelings brought to the villagers through education. Therefore, the Ottoman Turkish intellectuals need to learn from other countries that moved “toward the people”, especially Russia. For Akçura, a few Ottoman intellectuals may have followed this doctrine, but they were not Muslim. To raise awareness of the nation-state, it was important that Turkish Muslim intellectuals take these activists as an example.²⁴⁶ Their efforts eventually yielded positive results and Turkish youths began to go toward the peoples. These young people visited the Anatolian villages and made efforts to enlighten the peasants.²⁴⁷

²⁴⁴ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 140-146.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 173.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., 174.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., 175.

Toprak says that another important aspect of their movement towards the people was the notion of folk civilization; a point of view that symbolizes an orientation toward folklore. For Gökalp, the basic elements that initially raised the Turks to nationhood needed to be sought out in and the factors that caused the nation to regress needed to be identified by official institutions. He felt Ottoman society had forgotten their language, culture, folklore and had fallen into imitation of foreign nations over time. He saw these actions as a cause of the collapse of the state.

Populism was intertwined with the formation of civil society. For this reason, going toward the people meant the establishment of civil society organizations. When civil organizations became official institutions in the Ottoman Empire, however, the state began to collapse.²⁴⁸ One might say that civil society was a prerequisite for the progress and development of a country, but populism alone was not enough to build a nation-state. Another type of “nationalism” movement was required. Toprak indicates that nationalism and populism constituted the basis of the “new life”. The Turkism movement of Constitutional Monarchy symbolized, for him, the search for a civil society. That is, the growth of Turkish traders, the proliferation of Turkish riches and the opening of Turkish banks would determine the future of the country. The new structure required a population which did not expect everything from the state, especially in a material sense. Rather, it required individuals who were able to act for their own individual interests, who had a political consciousness, and who could provide capital accumulation.

Toprak states that those who were going toward the peoples and longing for a new life noticed that younger generations could play a leading role in this matter. Some of the items on their agenda were; to arouse awareness of the youth, to reduce distance between the intellectuals and the people, and most importantly to educate youth to create responsible individuals. The Turkish Forces, the Scout Quarters and Gymnastic Houses were some of the most important building blocks of the Turkism movement that was initiated by the Second Constitution. The fundamental aim of

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 180.

these organizations, which was supported by Peoples Houses was to create an awareness in Anatolia and to raise a strong Turkish youth.²⁴⁹ In accordance with the European examples, the Ottoman youth associations gradually obtained a paramilitary composition and fell under the supervision of the military. School Power Associations, Scout Associations, Power Associations, then Health Associations and Husky Associations²⁵⁰ turned into educational institutions where military information was provided before the military service was taken. According to Toprak, as a result of the rising of nationalism, the youth was prepared for a possible war. Giving youth a paramilitary formation was a development that was observed in the West. In this vein, Scout associations and paramilitary youth organizations were established nearly in all of European countries.²⁵¹ Turkey, therefore, needed to establish such organizations to be ready for a probable war.

Toprak states that the Balkan wars provided a great social and economic awareness in the Turks. The war left painful memories and nationalism spread all over the country. All sorts of methods for transitioning to the nation-state were put into practice. Toprak remarks that while the basis of the new national identity was shaped, the remaining "other" portion of society was intimidated and subjugated.²⁵² Yet, aside from the Turkish Muslim intellectuals, nationalism amongst the people was well received. That is to say, Turkish nationalism was popularized in cities and small towns and was followed by a large section of the population. According to Toprak, the greatest success of the Unionists was perhaps to create a sense of 'nation'. The nationalist struggle took precedence over economic accumulation and was crowned the major victory of the Republic.²⁵³

²⁴⁹ "Türk Ocakları"

²⁵⁰ Mektep Gücü Dernekleri, İzcilik Dernekleri, Güç Dernekleri, Gürbüz Dernekleri, and Dinç Dernekleri

²⁵¹ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 199.

²⁵² Ibid., 203.

²⁵³ Ibid., 204.

Toprak states that Republican Turkey was established over the ruins of World War I and the ensuing National Struggle was a model rebellion for other Third World countries. Although Republican Turkey had adopted the idea of the unity of power during the establishment phase, it had to espouse the separation of powers over time. Such a unitary understanding was necessary in the establishment phase of the national government and Mustafa Kemal's view on national sovereignty was based on this opinion. Although Mustafa Kemal was influenced by Montesquieu, he never supported the unity of national powers. However, this unity was an absolute requirement for national struggle.²⁵⁴

Lastly, Toprak claims that when talking about nationalism in Turkey, the first person that comes to mind is Ziya Gökalp, someone who rarely used the word nationalism. Instead, he always preferred to use the word "community"²⁵⁵. Community was an explanatory concept to a state model which was known as the nation-state for Gökalp. Toprak indicates that while nationalism is an ideology, the concept of community is a phenomenon. Gökalp expressed this nationalism as Turkism.²⁵⁶ At the same time, Turkism was a far more comprehensive idea than the current concept of nationalism. It was a system of thought that had a social dimension outside of its political dimension. Turkism, in Gökalp's thought system, was not a purely political platform, rather it meant a social transformation and an "organic revolution".²⁵⁷ So we can argue that the economic collapse caused by the war integrated the "national economy" into solidarism.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 399.

²⁵⁵ "Milletçilik"

²⁵⁶ Ibid., 321.

²⁵⁷ Ibid., 322.

4.1.3. Women's Roles in Populism

As the process of going toward the people was under way, women began to be visible in the public realm. The consolidation of the feminist movement throughout the world in the 1910s also affected Ottoman society and women began to take their place in Turkey. Toprak indicates that the concepts “freedom”, “justice”, “equality”, and “fraternity” which were espoused by the Young Turks brought the problems of women to the forefront in late the Ottoman Empire. He claims that the most important dimension of the new life was related to women's lives. Women had to leave the traditional way of life, socialize and expand their freedoms continuously in the Ottoman Empire. That is, they had to gain their freedom and deal with the consequences of that freedom in order to be visible.²⁵⁸ In the Ottoman Empire, a similar feminist movement to the West's came to light in the years of constitutionalism. The first feminist movement emerged in Salonica where there was a host of innovations, since the city was an enlightened and developed one thanks to its connection with the West and its rich cultural life. Local newspapers were publishing articles about the freedom of women in society. The first elaborative articles on feminism were also published in Salonica.

Toprak states that Müslihiddin Alim talked about the division of labor between men and women in his book, “Lectures on Economy”. According to Toprak, talking about the division of labor was a sign of the level of the feminist movement in the Ottoman Empire, because the division of labor was the main point of the feminist movement at that time. Müslihiddin Adil indicated that European and American women and men had to do all types of work together. That is, women could work in the fields of justice, physics, medicine, education and more. Therefore, it should also be like this in Turkey, otherwise the collapse of the country was inevitable.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 244.

²⁵⁹ Ibid., 249.

During the Constitutional Monarchy, many women's organizations were established. Some of them were charitable organizations and most of them worked for “Hilal-i Ahmer”. Women’s organizations and associations were established in this period within the framework of the feminist movement, as well as that of charitable associations. Toprak remarks that these associations, which aimed to educate women, plus modernize their lifestyles and clothing in order to give them job opportunities, as well as to teach arts and the similar topics to them, were under the protection of *CUP*. Toprak highlights that the association called “Teali Nisvan”, founded by Halide Edip, was in close contact with the women's movement in Britain, which advocated for the right of women to be elected and vote. He claims that some associations and organizations, more radically, advocated for women to work in factories and aimed to have equal status with men in every field.²⁶⁰ However, even though these organizations advocated the women’s rights in all field, it was the era of warfare that provided women visibility in the public realm, since men had to join army and women were mobilized to maintain production levels in the country. Women were hired in many areas such as trade, factory, road construction, and street cleaning,²⁶¹ however, due to the war, the population of the country was getting lower every day and this situation had to be prevented. For this reason, the Unionists encouraged women to marry and to have children. In fact, budgetary policies were made that would promote marriage and help married couples.

4.1.4. Populism and Solidarism

Toprak contends that in the Second Constitutional period, the journal “Yeni Mecmua” carried the idea of “enlightenment” to the top. The word “commons” was replaced with the word “people” or “folk”. Thanks to this journal, the concepts of populism and solidarity were fleshed out. The first indicators of populist ideas and

²⁶⁰ Ibid., 254.

²⁶¹ Ibid., 255.

peasantry emerged in the years when the “Türk Ocağı” was founded. The leading figure who aimed to go toward the peoples was Yusuf Akçura. He emphasized that the nation originated from the people and the concept of a nation distinct from people could not be considered in “Türk Yurdu”. It was necessary to rouse the people in order to become a nation. According to Akçura and populists in the Ottoman, the Ottoman intellectuals had to "walk towards the peoples" and understand the peoples.²⁶² Toprak claims that the sociological aspect of such understanding had been crystallized in the journal of the "Yeni Mecmua". In the meantime, Gökalp dealt with corporatist views and proposed to run the country with a parliament that would be composed of representatives from national corporations.²⁶³ Toprak says that Gökalp harmonized the French “solidaristic” thoughts with the German “national economy” towards the end of the war. In this way, he brought solutions to the economic and social depression caused by the years of conflict.

In many respects, the basis of social democracy in Turkey was settled during the constitutional years. From now on, the state would be able to actively participate in social life and be able to engage in public activities. Thus, the incomes from national property would be transferred to social services. While the interventionist state realized its economic expectations with a "national economy", it found its social content in "solidarism". That is to say, solidarism turned into a movement of social ideas which was represented by the ideologies of the Unionists and adopted by the single party period of Turkey. Toprak points out that nationalism, populism and statism were the fundamental ideas that Republican Turkey took over from the Second Constitution. Turkism symbolized nationalism, while Narodnik and solidaristic thoughts prepared the ground for populism and, most importantly, the

²⁶² Toprak gives the details about intellectual who was going toward people in the article; Zafer Toprak, “Osmanlı Aydını: Münevverden Aydına Popülist Özlemler”, *Milliyet Sanat Dergisi*, no 157, 1 December 1986, p. 5-6.

²⁶³ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 92.

national economic policy of the Unionists was a trial for statism.²⁶⁴ According to Tekin Alp, Western countries had decided on the third social current that excluded the negative aspects of both expansionist nationalism and socialism, and included the positive aspects of both currents. They named it solidarism. For him, the World War created a suitable environment for solidarism. The state needed to intervene in the economy and it would continue to do so after this war. The state intervened in order to provide opportunities and equality in distribution of income. If solidarism was adopted, the economic and moral decline of the country could be prevented. However, in order for state intervention to be effective in terms of solidarity, populism had to be applied in every field. With populism, the owners of capital would have to observe the rights and interests of the workers.²⁶⁵

Toprak claims that the basis of statism was founded during the Second Constitutional era. State socialism, state capitalism, state economics, and finally national economics, were forms of expression of statist attitudes in the economic field at that time.²⁶⁶ It was the responsibility of the state to ensure social peace, and to maintain order and balance among the social strata in the years of warfare. They blamed liberalism and its classical economic policies for the economic crisis caused by war.²⁶⁷ Like Durkheim, Gökalp's sociology replaced the economics with ethics.

²⁶⁴ Ibid., 304., Democracy and modernization, which have a 400-year history in the West, must be realized within a short time in non-Western societies. At this point, the tasks belong to the intellectuals who conceive the qualities of the modern state. Modernization can be realized as a result of intervention in this process by the actions of the intellectuals. This "intervention" observed in the process of change of non-Western societies is necessary during the transition from "traditional society" to "modern society" according to modernization theory (16). Democracy is a "political method" that can be applied to a social system that can be functional not to every social system. To be more precise, democracy gains functionality in the "modern social system", not "traditional social systems". For this reason, the existence of certain economic and cultural conditions is necessary for democracy to exist. (31). The political development means the reflections of economic and social modernization to the political process, that is to say, "political modernization" (39). See Levent Köker, *Modernleşme, Kemalizm ve Demokrasi*, 10th ed. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007).

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 305.

²⁶⁶ Toprak, *Fikir Dergiciliğinin Yüz Yılı*, in *Türkiye'de Dergiler-Ansiklopediler (1849-1984)*, 29

²⁶⁷ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 306.

The purpose of the rules of ethics was to harmonize and interconnect the individuals to one another. In a Kantian sense, every action that was made to take care of someone else was moral. The similarity between individuals in so-called ‘primitive’ societies created this solidarity. As the societies evolved, the mechanical solidarity based on similarity gave way to organic solidarity. The division of labor, like the collective conscience, provided solidarity.²⁶⁸

For Toprak, Gökalp’s concept of political populism put an end to the political privileges of the so-called feudal *beys*, and to the capitulations that provided privilege to the “non-Muslim nations” and foreigners.²⁶⁹ According to Gökalp, class societies that included discrimination and contradictory elements would gradually disappear and would be replaced with professional associations.

Any growing inflation and social upheaval which the “national economy” could not cope with was attributed to moral reasons. They also suggested that depression was more related to sociological factors than economic ones. In the meantime, they proposed a new social order. In a phase where ideologies were gradually forming, the Ottoman Empire was on a search to protect itself from the current world disorder. Indeed, “populism” based on the sovereignty of professional organizations would be a savior for the Empire. Professional organizations aimed to remove the “economic strata” in the society, and economic classes and their antagonistic relations would come to an end with “professions”. Populism became the dominant ideology in order to curb monopolist or privileged groups.²⁷⁰ According to Toprak, there was a solidaristic thought at the core of the system of Kemalism, which was a principle underrated by some, and it represented a unique understanding of democracy.²⁷¹ This was not the type of political democracy rooted in liberal

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 311.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 316.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 333.

²⁷¹ Ibid., 344.

thought. On the contrary, it was, for Toprak, a product of the egalitarian understanding of the French Revolution and a philosophy based on the sovereignty of the people that originated with Rousseau. Toprak claims that Gökalp's quote; "there is community, no individual, there is duty, no right, there are trades, no class", constituted the core of the solidaristic concept of the period.²⁷²

Mustafa Kemal brought populism to the agenda against the Bolsheviks.²⁷³ In 1921, populism was now one of the basic principles of domestic politics. Toprak asserts that while populism constituted the backbone of the system, statism, professionalism, corporatism and peasantry were somehow inspired by solidarism. In that vein, the populism of the *CHP* was also inspired by solidarism. Solidarism had made an important contribution to the establishment of the national government within the boundaries of "national pact".²⁷⁴

Toprak states that Turkey populism occurred over different stages. Until the multi-party period, populism was used as an ideological weapon. During the AP period, the political dimension of populism was revealed. For this reason, today, the word "populism" has turned into a vague concept. Whereas, there are common denominators for popularism shared between other nations, populism in Turkey had a number of unique characteristics. In Turkey, populism was a current of thought that was loaded with positive values in the early periods, although it had more negative connotations in recent days.²⁷⁵ It had ideological content and

²⁷² Ibid., 344.

²⁷³ Ibid., 405. About in the parliamentary discussion of populist program, see also; Zafer Toprak, "Halk Fırkası'nın Kuruluş Evresi: 'Halkçılık Programı' ve 1923 Nizamnamesi," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no 213, (September 2011): 20-29.

²⁷⁴ Zafer Toprak, "İkinci Meşrutiyet'te Solidarist Düşünce: Halkçılık", *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 1 (1977): 92.

²⁷⁵ Toprak says that when looking back over a century ago, it can be seen that populism had negative effects as well as positive on the democracy. In order to make this account, it is necessary to make definitions of populism and democracy, and to ask the question of which democracy and which populism is. Zafer Toprak, "Dünden Bugüne Popülizm ve Demokrasi Paradoksu", *Politus - Politik Kültür Dergisi*, year 4, no. 10 (winter 2014): 22-27.

transformative function in Constitutional and Republican Era Turkey, and was a social solution for the Second Constitutional intellectuals, together with nationalism. This type of populism, which has an ideological content, was active in Turkey until the late 1940s. Toprak points out that the “1948 Turkey Economy Congress” was a turning point in terms of all these values. The discourse of democracy in the multi-party regime transformed the content of populism. Its ideological character started to disappear and its political aspect started to outweigh its dogma.²⁷⁶ However, populism was shifted from left to right in this venture. According to Toprak, populism, which is one of six principles of *CHP*, was a kind of ideological populism. It was essentially very different from the political populism that came after 1950s. He claims that it was an egalitarian understanding of a homogeneous society.²⁷⁷

4.2. FEMINISM

Although Toprak wrote about feminism in Turkey early on in his academic career, his book “*Türkiye’de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm 1908-1935*” was published only recently. As with his other work, this book is presented to us as an anthology of articles published by Toprak over thirty years. Toprak explains the struggles for women’s freedom and the achievements of women which constituted the core of social transformation in the country during the first half of the 20th century. According to Toprak, at the beginning of the 20th century, feminism in Turkey was inspired by two main sources; those being the basic concepts of “equality” and “freedom” that constituted the agenda of the Second Constitutional era. The idea of equality was an issue that has been emphasized in law since the Tanzimat in the Ottoman Empire. However, the question of equality in terms of gender discrimination had begun to develop in the minds of the Young Turks. In addition to the intellectual dimension of the feminist movement, the hard conditions of the

²⁷⁶ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 424.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 425.

war years provided an environment for the socialization of women in Turkey. Toprak states that the stage in which women's studies in Turkey intensified is the period of “1908-1935”.²⁷⁸ He claims that women did not have a distinct identity outside of the “family” until the 1908 Young Turks Revolution, a period when all the basic transformations on the agenda such as freedom, equality, nation building, and secularism focused on women in some way. For him, through the constitutional discourse, woman became the subject. She perceived her body and gained her own identity in society during those years.

The First World War made women visible, while "poverty and freedom have progressed simultaneously".²⁷⁹ Because of men being taken into army, women's labor was needed to continue production and to meet the country's needs. Thus, after the idea-based feminist movement, the social depression caused by the war led to questions about the traditional division of labor. In this way, the efforts to ensure their livelihoods enabled women to be liberated. Along with World War I, official institutions started to employ female civil servants. Behind Galata dockyard, a Women's Merchant Market was opened consisting of female merchants who brought goods from surrounding cities, such as “Mudanya”. In order to convey the necessary basic knowledge about trade to these women, a branch of educational institutions was pressed into service. Volunteer military battalions were also formed during the war years by women, through an association in İstanbul.²⁸⁰ Other army commanders outside of Istanbul were involved in similar initiatives.²⁸¹ Thus, the hierarchical structures of the past partially collapsed during the war, and the

²⁷⁸ Zafer Toprak, “Türkiye’de Siyaset ve Kadın: Kadınlar Halk Fırkası’ndan Arsiulusal Kadınlar Birliği Kongresi’ne (1923-1935),” *İ.Ü. Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no. 2 (1994): 5.

²⁷⁹ Altay, Zeynep, “Türkiye’de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm,” *Cumhuriyet*, January 29, 2015, http://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/kitap/200449/Turkiye_de_Kadin_Ozgurlugu_ve_Feminizm.html (accessed August 27, 2017).

²⁸⁰ Zafer Toprak, “Osmanlı Kadınları Çalıştırma Cemiyeti, Kadın Askerler ve Milli Aile,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 51 (1988): 35.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 36.

private living space underwent a radical transformation. Toprak claims that the traditional family relationship was now insufficient for “free women”.

4.2.1. Debates about Equality of Women

Toprak says that the history of the women’s movement in Turkey is actually the history of rights and freedoms in twentieth century Turkey. Toprak claims that concepts such as "equality", "freedom", "nationalization", and "modernization" were discussed in detail during the Constitutional period.²⁸² One of the focal points of these discussions was the woman. In fact, the liberation and modernization of women whose existence was previously limited only to the family and who had no political rights, meant the liberation and modernization of the country as a whole.²⁸³ The first women’s society established by Fatma Aliye during the Second Constitutional period was the “Cemiyet-i İmdadiyye”. This community did not only help women, but it also carried out social services, such as helping soldiers who were fighting on the frontline. At the same time, the publication branch called “Kadın” of the foundation “Osmanlı Kadınları Şefkat Cemiyeti Hayriyesi” emphasized the equality of genders in its first issue. Toprak claims that this case depended on the fact that the publishing world which was liberated during the Constitutional period provided ideas that could spread freely. The literature on women's liberty began to take shape in basic law books from the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and the freedom of women was discussed in “Teali-i Vatan Osmanlı Hanımlar Cemiyeti” and its publishing branch called “Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete”.

Toprak points out that "feminism" was not first discussed in politics or law books, but in books, where the debate was started on the Ottoman economy. The main reason for this was the division of labor, which has been discussed in economic

²⁸² Zafer Toprak, *Türkiye’de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm (1908-1935)*, 2nd ed., (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2016), 3.

²⁸³ Ibid., xiii-xiv.

books since Adam Smith. In the Second Constitutional years, the discussion of the legal rights of women was carried out by men again, under the sections of “Hukuk-ı Nisvan or “Kadın Hukuku”. Müslihiddin Adil focused on equality between women and men with reference to the controversial debates about feminism in an article; “Kadın ve ‘Hukuk-ı Nisvan’”. Adil emphasized that women and men should be equal on the basis of the division of labor and in all other areas. He stated that Turkey would no longer benefit from the old customs and social order. For him, it was the prerequisite for the development of a nation that women should appear in business to be on equal footing with men. Moreover, he pointed out that the importance of women’s education was more critical than even male education, since those who established the foundations for any civilization were women. Toprak claims that this writer, and the magazine which was based in Salonica, shows that Salonica was a suitable place to discuss such topics in those years. For him, Salonica was the center of the “Hürriyet”’s movements in these years and almost all of the Western-leaning movements in the Ottoman Empire were spread from Salonica.²⁸⁴

Unlike Adil, Mehmed Cavid, who was educated in the Mülkiye, had a conservative stance on feminism. For him, the biological function of women came first. She was responsible for maintaining the population, so women should be concerned with giving birth and raising children. As a result, their participation in business life was unacceptable to him. Mehmed Cavid thought that it was inconvenient for a woman to be employed in many types of jobs.²⁸⁵ In Europe, women had started to work in several fields that had previously belonged to men exclusively. Mehmed Cavid thought that this was not acceptable according to Turkish cultural norms, where men and women were traditionally obliged to perform tasks separately. Although the issue was important to the public, for him, it was inconvenient for the population

²⁸⁴ Zafer Toprak, “Muslihiddin Âdil’in Görüşleri: Kadın ve ‘Hukuk-ı Nisvan’,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 75 (2000): 14-17.

²⁸⁵ Zafer Toprak, “II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İktisadi Düşünce,” *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. III (1985): 635.

if women started to do men's job. As feminism evolved, marriage and fertility rates were falling. He indicated that the future of the Ottomans depended on the fertility of women; he saw them as the source of Ottoman human capital.

As one of the leading female intellectuals of the period, Sabiha Sertel spoke about feminism and the term "Turkish feminism" was first used by Sertel in the magazine "Büyük Mecmua". According to Toprak, the magazine, which was concerned with reporting on matters in the Republic with a mission to promote modernization, had been censored many times for covering feminist issues.²⁸⁶ Sabiha Sertel was one of the pioneers of the women's movements in the publishing sector as a protector of women's rights. With her articles in "Büyük Mecmua", she provided an important accumulation of knowledge for women's studies in Turkey.²⁸⁷ She tried to spread feminist thought amongst Ottoman women with her articles, and the magazine published 19 issues, starting in 1919. According to Toprak, her publications enabled the initiation of feminist movements in Turkey. Sabiha Sertel was a woman who advocated for the equality of women and men in many matters, and she felt the necessary rights should be given to women. Toprak claims that the Sertel's arguments about women rights are not very different from that of today's feminist approaches. However, Sertel also emphasized that women should not forget their femininity, as did some of the other female intellectuals of the time. That is, women should fulfil the supreme duties given to her, such as to give birth, to be mother, to be a wife, and so on.²⁸⁸ In addition to Sertel, names such as Halide Edip (Adivar), Müfide Ferid, Şükufe Nihal, who were the leading intellectuals in the period, published articles about the women's movement. In this magazine, many topics from feminism to women legal rights, from the problems of working women to

²⁸⁶ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm (1908-1935)*, 175.

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 175.

²⁸⁸ Zafer Toprak, "Sabiha (Zekeriya) Sertel ve Türk Feminizmi," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 51 (1998): 7-14.

education, were subject to discussion and these debates in the magazine were also significant because they were conducted by women.

As a continuation of all these developments, in June 1923, an organization called “Kadınlar Halk Fırkası” was established by the intellectual women of the period. The goal of this organization was to provide education to women and an environment in which women could socialize. Toprak indicates that although its name included a reference to a political party, the name did not mean that it carried out the policy of that political party when demanding political rights. Additionally, although this organization was considered a feminist one, it did not actually have a political or economic purpose. Their purpose was to enhance the scope of education and the position of women in society. Political and economic activities would come at the end of their efforts, so they were in no hurry to expand their mandate. However, despite the fact that they did not intend to make women active in the political arena, there were also female activists who stressed that political and economic activity was important for the movement. As with many other women's organizations, this party has been criticized by male authors of the period and eventually the organization was shut down.²⁸⁹

Toprak also addresses the articles of Mizancı Murad, Ahmed Mithad, Şemsettin Sami and Mehmed Sedad who described how Jeanne d’Arc’, a French heroine, tried to save her country from its enemies. Jeanne d’Arc’ lived as a peasant girl until the age of 18. She went on to fight to save her country in the bloodiest days when France was at war with England. The fact that this story was praised and described as heroic in the Ottoman Empire was a demonstration of the desire for equality between men and women, according to Toprak. The story of a woman who threw herself into the fire to save her country was a message to the Ottoman woman who lived behind closed doors. At the same time, the story was useful to demonstrate how a human being disregarded his/her life for the sake of his/her country, an idea

²⁸⁹ Zafer Toprak, “Halk Fırkası’ndan Önce Kurulan Parti: Kadınlar Halk Fırkası,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 51 (1988): 30-31.

which was used to rouse nationalistic sentiment. Toprak claims that we can see in this story the core of the equal rights movement in Turkey. The popularization of this story in Turkey can also be regarded as the beginning of a modern life for women in Ottoman Empire toward the end of the nineteenth century.²⁹⁰

4.2.2. Women's and Child's Rights in the Field of Labor

When we come to the working conditions of women and children, although Toprak claims that the feminist movement in Turkey did lag behind its counterparts internationally, those conditions were not regulated until quite recently. Toprak indicates that in social policy writing, women's place has been limited in past decades. However, legislation concerning women (and children) was on the agenda of the Assembly in the Constitutional years. The first package of measures of Turkey's social policy history in 1910 was devoted to the problem of the employment of children and women in industrial establishments.²⁹¹ Toprak states that it is the general opinion of our policy experts that pre-Republican Turkey had undertaken very limited measures in the context of social policy. However, Toprak insists that while there were no detailed legislative measures enacted, the problems of working women and children at that time were addressed. While the 1908-1909 "Ta'til-i Eşgal Kanunu", which was intended to end strikes, did not include measures for social policy, the 1909 "Cemiyetler Kanunu" provided an environment for trade union organization by recognizing the right and freedom to form trade unions and related societies. In the strikes wide scale strikes that erupted in different regions of the country in 1908, a number of demands for women to be included in social policy, as well as wage increases for women, were expressed.²⁹²

²⁹⁰ Zafer Toprak, "Osmanlı'nın Dört Jeanne d'Arc'ı –'Karıların Sahibkıranı Jan Dark'," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 75 (2000): 4-9.

²⁹¹ Toprak, "Sosyal Politika Tarihimizin İlk Önlemler Paketi: "Müessesât-ı Sınaîyyede Çocukların ve Kadınların Çalıştırılması (1910)," 229.

²⁹² Ibid., 230.

In addition, weekly vacation, annual leave and health conditions in the workplace were the hallmarks of the demands that came to the fore during the 1908 strikes.²⁹³

A proposal by Ömer Şevki Bey attempted to regulate the working conditions of women and children in 1911. The children and women employed in factories, industrial buildings, manufacturing, stone pits and mine were subject to the statutes of this law.²⁹⁴ Children under the age of seventeen could not work more than nine hours a day. During this time, the work would be paused for at least one hour to rest. Children and women could work night shifts, or for more than six days a week. Official and religious days were to be vacations and women and children were banned from working in jobs that were harmful or dangerous to their health.²⁹⁵ Toprak states that Ömer Şevki Bey's proposal constitutes the first comprehensive package of protective measures of our social policy history.²⁹⁶ Although this included the working conditions of women and children, the first legislation regulating women's working conditions is the 1930 General Health Law. Articles of VI and VII included regulations on the protection of women, children and all adult workers. However, these provisions still forced working women to toil under extremely inadequate conditions. The provisions, which were far behind the international norms, could only be improved by the 1936 Labor Law.²⁹⁷

4.2.3. Modernization in Education and Clothes

Along with modernization, women's attire was also being debated. After the Young Turks Revolution, women, who now appeared more and more in the public realm, adopted a more secular style of clothing. Together with the Republic, the dress code

²⁹³ Ibid., 231.

²⁹⁴ Ibid., 232.

²⁹⁵ Ibid., 232.

²⁹⁶ Ibid., 233.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 234.

became an area that had to be changed. Toprak states that the typical Republican garment was a demonstration of how the Turkish people were modernizing, changing and redefining themselves.²⁹⁸ Women were most noticeable as indicators of this change. Toprak states that the Young Turks challenged the old ways of seclusion and veiling and made women a part of public life. Women began to wear a thin veil along with their traditional covering. After a while, they removed the veil completely. During World War I, most of the women wore a simple scarf without a veil.²⁹⁹ The journal “Yeni Mecmua”, the semi-official publication of the Committee of Union and Progress, led the war against veiling. This magazine claimed that there was no veil in Islam; on the contrary, the veiling has come from the Greek’s culture. The journal “İctihad” agreed with this view. On the other hand, conservatives supported the idea that veiling was a requirement of Islam, so women could not throw away the headscarf and veil.³⁰⁰ Toprak states that as the country approached to the Republican period, the socialization of women, their changing self-perception and liberation as an individual was seen by many as the reason for the increasing of prostitution.³⁰¹

Women soon began to attend both secondary schools and universities, thanks to a number of enlightened ministers of the time.³⁰² A university for women’s education was established in 1914. Discrimination between genders at the colleges was ended in 1918 when women participated in the same lectures as men for the first time.

²⁹⁸ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm (1908-1935)*, 251.

²⁹⁹ Zafer Toprak, “The Family, Feminism, and the State during the Young Turk Period, 1908-1918,” in *Première Rencontre Internationale sur l’Empire Ottoman et la Turquie Moderne*, (İstanbul-Paris: Éditions ISIS, 1991), 446.

For looking at the details about unveiling of women in the Ottoman Empire. Zafer Toprak, “Tesettürden Telebbüse ya da Çarşaf veya Elbise – ‘Milli Moda’ ve Çarşaf”, *Tombak*, no. 19, (1998): 52-63.

³⁰⁰ Zafer Toprak, “Darülfünun’a Kız Öğrencilerin Kabulü ve Gelenekçilerle Yenilikçiler,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 249 (2014): 23.

³⁰¹ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm (1908-1935)*, 125.

³⁰² Toprak, “The Family, Feminism, and the State during the Young Turk Period, 1908-1918,” 446.

Toprak claims that “the interconnections drawn between the "New Life," the "National Family,” and feminism during the Young Turk decade were manifestations of the social organizational component of Unionist ideology.”³⁰³

The matter of women in higher education was a problem that was discussed between the liberals and the conservatives while the controversy continued on veiling. The "İnas Darülfünun" school was established in 1914 for the female students of the Ottoman Empire. Despite the fact that this school was called a university, the education was at the high school level, which was called "*sultanî*" at that time. The Union and Progress government found the school inadequate and said that there should be an educational institution the same as men's for women, too. Students made an application to the commission of “Darülfünun” to end gender discrimination in the school and reported that they wanted to take classes with men. During the war years, women had to work in different fields of business due to the men being taken to the army. Women in many countries in the West had also become much more active than in the past. The students of "İnas Darülfünun" held up the West as an example that gathering girl into a separate class no longer made sense.³⁰⁴ Modernists supported the educational institutions that contemporary life required. The modern century required men and women to live and work together. It was not possible to ban women from going out, so it was impossible to prevent them from being taken to schools, businesses, and government offices. Mixed-sex education in “Darülfünun” was accomplished in a short time, although it encountered some obstacles in the period of National Struggle.³⁰⁵

Furthermore, Arnavutköy American Girl’s College was founded during the period of Abdulhamid. In the first years of its establishment, while the number of non-Muslim female students was in the majority, Muslim pupils, at the request of Abdülhamid, later started to attend this school. The number of Muslim female

³⁰³ Ibid., 449.

³⁰⁴ Toprak, “Darülfünun'a Kız Öğrencilerin Kabulü ve Gelenekçilerle Yenilikçiler,” 25.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 27.

students grew during the Second Constitutional and Republican era. According to Toprak, the American college had a very important place in terms of women's movements and feminism. While it was an only girls' school, it was considered to be the birthplace of the feminist movement in Turkish history, and a school that established the environment for nationalist movements. Toprak states that even if the nationalist ideology was not imposed directly there, the lectures that were given caused students to develop their consciousness in nationalism. In this school, different languages were taught, as well as lessons like home economics and Toprak contends that it was a very important part of the women's movement and women's modernization. Female students were freed by the secular education of this institution, and many female students went on to study abroad from there. This school was, for Toprak, a significant institution for feminist movements within Turkey.³⁰⁶

³⁰⁶Zafer Toprak, "Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Eğitim Tarihinden Örnekler – Arnavutköy Amerikan Kız Koleji," *Tombak*, no. 29 (1999): 48-50.

The classical concept of modernity emphasizes on the autonomy of man "reason". First of all, the emancipation from traditional political and cultural authority is realized. With the expansion of freedom and activity, man start to be master on nature by using its reason. This kind of modernity requires a very strong emphasis on participation of man to construction of the political and social order. Also in this sort of modernity, conscious human activity shapes the society. On the other hand, this concept necessitates a radical transformation in the political order i.e. the establishment of the political arena, and also in the features of the political process. That is to say, this radical transformation means the breaking down all traditional legitimation of the political order and the opening up of different potentialities in the establishment of a new order. These potentialities unite themes of revolts, protests, intellectual activities which enable to constitution of new-center formation, establishment of institutions. Furthermore, equality, freedom, justice and autonomy, solidarity and identity constitute the central components of the modern project of the emancipation of man. See S. N. Eisenstadt, "Multiple Modernities," *Daedalus*, Vol. 129, No. 1, (Winter, 2000): 5-6. In this sense, Toprak's explanations on feminist activities and women freedom fall into classical modernization theory mentioned above. However, Eisenstadt discusses that modernization is qualified by the specifications which are a type of change and a type of response to change. The former implies the structural differentiation while the later the capacity of institutions to absorb perpetually changing problems and demands. For modernization theories, the modernization of a country is determined not by its civilization and its change, but by its proximity to the institutions and values of the west. This approach is very problematic since according to Eisenstadt West or USA cannot be a reference point for a country which is in an effort to modernize itself (203). However, it is very crucial to pointing out that many historians or modernization theorists overlook the impact of internal dynamics of a country when evaluating the institutions or cultural and social change in terms of modernization. Also, they ignore or underestimate the external influences of sources upon social change. On the other hand, in the modernization theory, "everything which is not modern is labeled traditional". So to say, the concept of tradition was formed as antithesis to "modernity. For instance, according to this, the traditional societies are fundamentally static not

4.2.4. Women and Family

The connection between family and state was one of the fundamental concerns of governments during the Young Turk period and in the Single-party period of the Republic, according to Toprak. The humanities, as a newcomer to Ottoman scholarly life, affected the making of the Turkish nation-state and accommodated its ideologies about the social foundations of a new society. The “Yeni Hayat”, formulated by the intellectuals of the CUP, necessitated radical changes in the cultural codes and social structures of Ottoman society. Women and family were the new concern of the new regime.³⁰⁷ In the early years of the Young Turk regime, another ideological system was created in accordance with the rising nationalism of the time. For this new approach, patriarchies needed to be changed through partnerships within the family, since this new life required "liberty, equality and fraternity". The nuclear family needed to see this new partnership as the model family. According to Toprak, this model would lead to the emancipation of women, and in fact, feminism and the “Yeni Hayat” would expand simultaneously during this period. Sociology turned into an essential apparatus for the Unionists to comprehend the environment in which social orders developed. Gökalp, who has written many articles about Turkish family structure, emphasized that there were three basic types of social groups; family groups, occupational groups and political groups. Political groups were the most significant groups in this classification and family and occupational groups were part of those political groups. Political groups were seen as social organisms which have a life of their own. Family groups were the cells of this organism and occupational groups were the organs.³⁰⁸ Toprak claims that the birth of the feminist movement was embedded in this idea.

active and also the transition from traditional to modern society are the beginning of history for modernization theorists. Further, this transition is actually a result of contact with European societies of non-Western societies. Thence, this approach denies the fact that non-Western societies are beginning to modernize due to their internal dynamics (213). See Dean C. Tipps, “Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective”.

³⁰⁷ Toprak, “The Family, Feminism, and the State during the Young Turk Period, 1908-1918,” 442.

³⁰⁸ Ibid., 443.

For Unionists, the status of Turkish women has declined because of the experiences of Iranian and Byzantine civilizations. They contended that Turks had been not able satisfy their ancient, authentic egalitarian principles. According to them, the condition of Turkish women was specifically corrupted under foreign pressures that forced them to wear veils and be kept in seclusion. They were kept away from education and their legal status inside marriage weakened. Gökalp approached the structure of nuclear family as the most proper setting for modern Turkish society. For him, the equality of women was already there amongst the Central Asian Turks. For instance, “the Khan and the Hatun had equal rights in executive authority and a decree of the Khan alone would not be obeyed without the consent of the Hatun”.³⁰⁹ In Gökalp's view, monogamy also was the rule among the ancient Turks. Gökalp claimed that feminism originated with the Turks. He viewed democracy and feminism as the basic principles of old Turkish life. He contends that present day Turkish nationalists must embrace feminism and re-establish the dignity of womanhood and the family. Toprak states that feminism developed in line with the ideas of nationalism. Turkish nationalists saw themselves as populist and feminist. “Turkish nationalist ideology regarded the emancipation of women as one of the most important prerequisites of the larger social revolution (ictimai inkılâb) which was brought to the agenda of the Unionists following the 1908 (Young Turk) political revolution”.

4.2.5. Social Change and Its Effects on Magazines

In his studies, Toprak also focuses on social change to understand the evolving position of women within society. The women who became more visible in social life after World War I, in fact, were the main actors in this social transformation.³¹⁰ On the other hand, Toprak claims that although women became more visible in the

³⁰⁹ Ibid., 445.

³¹⁰ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm (1908-1935)*, 356.

society, the desire for men to control women also increased simultaneously.³¹¹ When the gains obtained by women were subjected to such an auditing mechanism, measures were taken to determine the ideal women or ideal male types in society. Toprak indicates that the survey “Who would marry Ms. Leyla?” published in the magazine of “Haftalık Mecmua” is an indicator of this situation. Ms. Leyla, who was an imaginary ideal woman, would ideally be married to a bank employer who graduated from Robert College as an ideal type of men. This same magazine was also in a search to determine the ideal woman for the Republican man. In fact, this survey revealed the social types of the era through imaginary typologies.

In this environment, some magazines started to bring male-female relationships into the debate. For instance, before the foundation of the Republic in the 1920s, “Süs” magazine prepared a survey asking people which methods (arranged marriage or individually selected) were more appropriate. Toprak claims that this survey showed what kind of freedoms the constitutional period provided, especially for women. The purpose of the questionnaire was to ask whether old traditional norms were better than new modern ideas, in terms of relationships. Famous writers and intellectuals of the period declared their stance on this issue. Here, they stood against the idea of modern norms in marriages, though most of the intellectuals of the constitutional period were considered modern and progressive. Even if intellectuals and the society at large were against modern marriages, it is a very important development that this issue was coming to the agenda, and that it became a matter of debate in a women's journal.³¹²

Toprak is also interested in female suicides and he investigates the effect of social change on suicides in the early Republican period. That is, he examines the problems women encountered in the first years of the Republic, and their increased suicide cases. For him, women's suicides were increasing in step with the rapid

³¹¹ Ibid., 356.

³¹² Zafer Toprak, “Cumhuriyet Arifesi Evlilik Üzerine Bir Anket: Görücülük mü ? Görüşücülük mü ?”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 50 (1988): 32-34.

changes in society.³¹³ Factors such as social change, social repression, love, and the desire to be free are among the causes behind female suicides, according to Toprak.³¹⁴ However, he claims that after 1927, news about suicide was censored. Furthermore, by the cultural revolution after 1930, the importance of education of girls was emphasized and marriages and family institution were encouraged. As a result, he says that after this period there was a decline in the number of suicide cases.³¹⁵ As women's suicides increased, some medical doctors claimed that expansion of freedom for women was the cause and the restriction of freedom should be required to prevent this situation. The Republic at that time also discussed how the freedom of woman was damaging to power, and therefore, efforts to restrain women and bring back the old social order were started. Herein, we can see that the freedom of women disturbed the men in power, and throughout society. According to Toprak, this was not only true for Turkey, but in many parts of the world, especially in Europe where there was a similar attitude towards women. Turkey was so late into the debate on women's freedom in society that some medical doctors were beginning to defend polygamy. It was recommended to families that they should pay attention to their girls' activities in puberty. Girls, they said, often experience psychological problems when they begin to grow due to the physiological changes within their body, so they tend to commit suicide because of the negativities of the modern world, such as immoralities, prostitution, the emulation of rich people, and general freedom. In the 1920s, there was an increase beyond expectations in young girls and women committing suicide in Istanbul. In their private lives, depression and lack of solutions to their problems resulted in suicide. The reason for such mental alienation was purported to be the passion for fashion and dance.³¹⁶ Toprak points out that the reason for suicide was, in part, the

³¹³ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm (1908-1935)*, 356.

³¹⁴ Ibid., 408.

³¹⁵ Ibid., 414.

³¹⁶ Zafer Toprak, "Dr. Cemal Zeki'nin 'Delişmen, Çılgın Kızlar'ı – Cumhuriyet'te Genç Kız ve Kadın İntiharları," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 87 (2001): 25.

influences of the social changes on society in the early Republican period. That is, suicide was an individual reaction to problems such as gender metamorphosis in urban culture, livelihood problems, intergenerational conflicts, new emotional bond types, and new male-female relationships.³¹⁷

4.2.6. Marxist Approach on Feminism

The issue of women in Turkey took center stage in post-1908 publications. The feminist movements in the West attracted attention in Turkey and the women associations started to inform public opinion on the subject of full equality. Toprak points out that this process in the 1910s continued into the 1920s, though it was not at the same strength. At the beginning of the period, following the work of magazines such as “İnci, Yeni İnci, Süs”, some magazines such as “Kadın Yolu” as a publication branch of “Türk Kadın Birliği”, then “Türk Kadın Yolu” brought a different dimension to Turkish feminist rhetoric. However, while the modernists emphasized women's freedom, the conservative sections of society criticized the discourse of women's liberation that had emerged with the Constitutional Period. This group claimed that women's emancipatory efforts were an emulation, and that women were moving away from Islam, in the name of emancipation.

According to Toprak, in the 1920s, the journal “Aydınlık” approached the discussions about feminism in Turkey with a different point of view. Aydınlık published many articles about feminism, emphasizing that feminism was a bourgeois movement and that these developments inspired by the West should instead be modeled after the women's movement in Soviet Russia. The articles outlined the economic and social measures to ensure equality of men and women that were taken by Soviet governments.³¹⁸ Şefik Hüsnü published the most profound articles about feminism and women. In “İctimaî inkılâb ve kadınlarımız”,

³¹⁷ Ibid., 28. For the additional information about this article, see: Zafer Toprak, “Genç Kız ve Kadın İntiharları II – Cumhuriyet erkeğinin Kadın İmgesi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 99 (2002): 15-19.

³¹⁸ Zafer Toprak, “Aydınlık Dergisi [1921-1925], Marksizm ve Feminizm,” *Müteferrika*, no. 50 (2016): 4.

he expressed how women were subjected to a deeper exploitation than men under the industrial revolution. He claimed that with the First World War, the exploitation of women spread to an extent that had not been seen before this period. During the war, women were employed in all areas of business in Turkey, as they were around the world. He indicated that women began to serve in the industrial sector in addition to being responsible for housework. That is to say, women were being exploited both at home and outside the home. Yet, women's political demands did not go beyond imitation, he maintained.³¹⁹ Political rights were not enough for the Marxists. Women should also have equality in law with men. But in capitalist society, realization of this goal was impossible. Before finding the answer to the question; “why was woman dominated by man?”, talking about the emancipation of woman would simply be impossible. It was necessary to first look at history to understand the process of male domination over women. The birth of private property corresponded to the captivity of a woman at home. Wealth accumulation further increased women's servitude. Before industrialization, women had been held under the strict bonds and obligations of family life, whereas they were now being heavily oppressed by capitalism. The woman, as well as the family, was under the domination of the factory and the government. The woman who was subject to her husband at home was also subject to her boss on the factory floor. Women were receiving lower salaries than men, even while their working conditions were worse than men's. According to the writer, as long as the power remains in the hands of the bourgeoisie and private ownership was the basis of community life, even if the maximum demands of feminism were obtained, this bondage chain would continue to exist³²⁰ and, women would not enjoy any real freedom unless they have wealth.

The fact that a woman had equal standing under the law was dependent upon two things; the removal of private ownership over the means of production and the

³¹⁹ Ibid., 5.

³²⁰ Ibid., 6.

establishment of social rules that would eliminate abuse.³²¹ Under these circumstances, women could gain their independence from their husbands within the family as a wife and mother, or outside the home. For Toprak, “Aydınlık” aimed to show women an alternative way to emancipation by criticizing the feminist movement that arose in the Constitutional era. That is to say, in an environment where private property and capitalism was dominant, the emancipation of women could not be discussed. Toprak states that this Marxist view would gain importance only in the 1970.³²²

In summary, Toprak takes all of these developments as signs of the progress of the feminist movement in Turkey. Even though women were not given concrete legal rights in this period, the beginning of these debates was evidence that women's place in society has changed. The position of women in society was also changing in line with the needs of the period. Some female intellectuals have published articles about the equality of women and men, while a few of their male counterparts thought that equality would disrupt society's cultural structure and would have a negative effect on population. The number of women embracing and discussing the feminist approach at the time was, in fact, not very high. Although Toprak does not indicate directly in his studies, it can be inferred that the issue of women's freedom was not generally discussed by women in academic and legal fields; however, this issue was being discussed mostly by men in the field of law and economy.

4.2.7. Women Studies In Turkey

Traditional history writing focuses on the historical experiences of men and deals with events that originate in men's lives. This historiography is described as the history of political institutions such as parliaments, wars, conquests, heroism, and power, areas where women are typically not involved. What is important for history

³²¹ Ibid., 7.

³²² Ibid., 7.

is the result of these events. This kind of historiography is not interested in the stage of preparation and development. The results emerge in the public arena, and there are only men in this arena.³²³ However, the difference between feminist historiography and traditional historiography needs to be clarified in order to get a different perspective on the women's liberation movement.

Like “history from below”, the history of feminism offers a new perspective on the past.³²⁴ For decades, women have not been visible to historians in terms of the importance of their daily lives and everyday work. Their political influence has generally been overlooked while historians emphasized male patterns in social mobility. Women’s work has generally been overlooked by male historians because they did not often encounter recorded documents about women in the archives. With the “total history” perspective, women began to be studied for the first time. Historians started to focus on the changing relationship between men and women, on gender boundaries and on conceptions of what defines the masculine or the feminine.³²⁵

Although the exclusion of women from the public sphere was once seen as morally correct, according to all Western civilization traditions that exclusion has led to the marginalization of women as historical subjects. All things associated with women, such as marriage, maternity and other housework were deemed as ahistorical, and women have accepted themselves as ahistorical, too. In women's history studies, the aim is to write the stories of prominent women, as well as to look at the history of ordinary women by moving away from the subject of prominent women to fully reveal the role of women in history as a whole. Women’s history may be possible only by adding them to existing fields of knowledge, rather than reducing women’s

³²³ Serpil Çakır, *Osmanlı’da Kadın Hareketi*, 3rd. ed. (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2011), 30.

³²⁴ Burke, *History and Social Theory*, 50.

³²⁵ Ibid., 52.

history to areas such as economic and cultural history.³²⁶ Feminist historians have been combing social memory in search of women and are trying to create a collective memory for them. Çakır says that history should be read, deciphered, and re-edited again for women in the frame of reference of the feminist movement, and in the direction of impartiality. Masculine records should be questioned with feminist methodologies.³²⁷

Feminist research is not enough to reach female-specific knowledge; this information needs to contribute to the struggle of women to transform their lives and to fight for liberation. In other words, female experiences that are uncovered as a result of research must be turned into political information that will transform the lives of women. For this reason, feminist action and knowledge must be in mutual relation. The problems revealed in the feminist movement should be the subject of science and politics. Only in this way, through the combination of theory and politics, will the oppressive sexist structure be resolved and the society in which women live will be transformed.³²⁸

After 1980, there was a serious political upheaval in Turkey. In this period, people started to make demands that directly concerned themselves, therefore, many specific groups were seeking their political, social, economic or religious rights. Islamic, environmental, women's groups, groups with a focus on human rights, economic groups, or groups pursuing alternative lifestyles were the leading actors in that period. In this respect, the feminist movements in Turkey came to the fore in both theory and practice after the 1980s.³²⁹

³²⁶ Çakır, *Osmanlı'da Kadın Hareketi*, 30-32.

³²⁷ Ibid., 47.

³²⁸ Serpil Çakır, "Feminist Tarih Yazımı: Tarihin kadınlar için, kadınlar tarafından yeniden inşası" ed. Serpil Sancar, *21. Yüzyıla Girerken Türkiye'de Feminist Çalışmalar*, Prof. Dr. Nermin Abadan Unat'a Armağan, (İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011), 506.

³²⁹ Ibid., 507.

The former, narrow-minded approaches in this area had been overcome and the symbolic and functional reasons behind the saying "rights were granted without efforts of women" were analyzed.³³⁰ The 1980s were a time when the feminist movement gained momentum, both theoretically and practically, and the issue of women came to more agendas in both formal and civilian structures.³³¹ Socialist, liberal, radical and Islamist feminists also began to be visible in Turkey in this period.³³²

Women from the feminist movement started to take part in universities during the second half of the 1980s in Turkey. This development has been decisive in the emergence of academic feminism, as well as of the women's movement. The emergence of the modern nation-state in Turkey and the role that women play in this process have been examined and criticized in academia. The feminist movement continues to take on various forms of activity parallel to this process.³³³ According to Çakır, in Turkey, women from different disciplines such as politics and sociology were more interested in women's history than were the historians. The reason for this may at first glance seem to be that historians have no interest in women's issues. However, there is a structural reason for this, too. The modernization and nationalization that constituted the focal point of social/political problems in Turkey also affected the social sciences. Studies concentrating on this area have come from the fields of political science and sociology, so women's movements were mainly studied in these academic areas.³³⁴ The history of women

³³⁰ Yaprak Zihnioğlu, *Kadınsız inkılap : Nezihe Muhiddin, Kadınlar Halk Fırkası, Kadın Birliği*. (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003), 18.

³³¹ Leyla Şimşek, *Günümüz Basınında Kadın(lar)*, (İstanbul: Alt Kitap, 2000), 12-15.

³³² Ibid., 12-15.

³³³ Serpil Sancar, "Türkiye'de Feminizmin Siyasal Bilimlere Etkisi", *İstanbul Üniversitesi, Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Special edition: Türkiye'de Siyaset Bilimi, (March 2009): 120.

³³⁴ Çakır, "Feminist Tarih Yazımı: Tarihin kadınlar için, kadınlar tarafından yeniden inşası," 518.

has been developed with a critical view towards traditional historiography in Turkey.

Here, it is necessary to talk about the work of pioneering female academicians in Turkey in the field of social sciences. Nermin Abadan Unat compiled a book in 1982 in which not only did she made significant contributions to different disciplines in Turkey, but she also included a report on an international meeting that brought together many women academicians to discuss the subject of women's reality.³³⁵ The book was known internationally as an important scientific contribution from Turkey.³³⁶

Another pioneer is Şirin Tekeli, who opened this field to women in academia through her dissertation on women, as she was both an activist in the women's movement and a political scientist.³³⁷ She has also played an important role in identifying the patriarchal content of the Republic, the question of state feminism, the women's movement, and she has made contributions on the establishment of institutions such as the Women's Works Library and KA-DER. Her original works and compilations about women were published at home and abroad.³³⁸ Tekeli began to question the subject of the Republican regime and women's rights. Parallel to the development of feminist studies in the academic field in Turkey after 1980, new developments, solutions and critical approaches emerged. The analysis of Turkish modernization in terms of women has been covered by researchers. Although there are differences between the two academicians, Tekeli and Unat, both of them have made important contributions to the inclusion of the female subject in academia in Turkey. Another academician who works on the subject of women is Deniz

³³⁵ For related account see: Nermin Abadan Unat, ed. *Türk Toplumunda Kadın*, (Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği, 1980).

³³⁶ Çakır, "Feminist Tarih Yazımı: Tarihin kadınlar için, kadınlar tarafından yeniden inşası," 517.

³³⁷ To her dissertation see: Şirin Tekeli, *Kadınlar ve Siyasal Toplumsal Hayat*, (İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları, 1982).

³³⁸ For reading the women activities in 1980s in Turkey see: Şirin Tekeli, ed. *1980' ler Türkiye' sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1990).

Kandiyoti. She works in England but writes on the subject of the women's movement in Turkey.³³⁹ Examples of Western women's history and historiography were first introduced in Turkey by Fatmagül Berktaş, a feminist scholar who brings together political science and historical science.³⁴⁰

Serpil Çakır, too, is an academician who is interested in women's subjects. She examines women's associations, journals and magazines, so as to trace the progress of women's movement in the Ottoman Empire, and she analyses the influence of the political developments on the women's status within society. Like Toprak, she claims that the position of women started to change during the modernization attempts of the Second Constitutional period.³⁴¹ Serpil Çakır completed her PhD in political science with her thesis *II. Meşrutiyet'te Osmanlı Kadın Hareketi* in which she asked the question; are women in Turkey struggling for their own salvation?³⁴² Çakır, after reading the books of foreign travelers by both men and women, plus literary works, stories and almost all the manuscripts written by men, settles on women's magazines of the era to make up the main source material for her work.³⁴³

³³⁹ To her related books see: Deniz Kandiyoti, "End of Empire: Islam, Nationalism and Women in Turkey," *Women, Islam and the State*, ed. D. Kandiyoti, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991), Deniz Kandiyoti, *Cariyeler, Bacılar, Yurttaşlar*, (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1998).

³⁴⁰ The studies of Fatmagül Berktaş see: Fatmagül Berktaş, "Kendine Ait Bir Tarih," *Tarih ve Toplum* no.183, (1989). Fatmagül Berktaş, "Salem'in Cadıları: Bir Kereliğine Kendi Adını Koymak," *Tarih Toplum* no. 195 (2000)., Fatmagül Berktaş, "Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Feminizm," *Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi*, ed. M. Alkan, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001a)., Fatmagül Berktaş, "Kadın Tarihi: Yeni Bir Gelecek İçin Geçmişi Geri Almak," *Cogito* no.29 (2001b)., Fatmagül Berktaş, ed. *Tarihin Cinsiyeti*, (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003a). Fatmagül Berktaş, "Tarih Yazımında Farklı Bir Perspektif," *Tarihin Cinsiyeti*, (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003b)., Fatmagül Berktaş, "Behice Boran: Karar Verme Selahiyetine Sahip Bir Kadın," *Tarihin Cinsiyeti*, (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003c).

³⁴¹ Çakır, *Osmanlı kadın hareketi*. 22.

³⁴² Çakır, "Feminist Tarih Yazımı: Tarihin kadınlar için, kadınlar tarafından yeniden inşası," 520., see also: Serpil Çakır, "II. Meşrutiyet'te Osmanlı Kadın Hareketi," Doctoral Thesis, İstanbul University, Faculty of Political Science, Political Science, 1991.

³⁴³ Çakır, "Feminist Tarih Yazımı: Tarihin kadınlar için, kadınlar tarafından yeniden inşası," 521.

According to Gündüz, the modernization attempts of members of the CUP questioned the status of women within the Empire, and reformist men in particular acknowledged that the development of the country was dependent on women's emancipation.³⁴⁴ Associations and magazines were the main instruments by which women expressed their demands.³⁴⁵ Although they supported their role in home as a wife and mother, they claimed their right to education and some equal rights in a political sense, in factories and industry.³⁴⁶

As seen above, women are generally analyzed in terms of their place in the modernization project in Turkey. This perspective created the perception that the modernization of Turkey was realized by men. Consequently, this view has overshadowed the women's struggle for liberation and the examination of their experience, in favour of concepts such as modernization, nationalism, socialism and human rights. Therefore, the history of the women's movement has long been out of sight, or has simply not been examined.

At the beginning of 1990s, doctoral and master theses started to be written in the branches of science mentioned above. These were followed immediately by theses produced at the women's research centers in universities. Studies on history of the women's movement in Turkey consist of biographies, bibliographies and studies on social history of women. However, women in Turkey were mostly examined in the context of Turkish modernization or Turkish nationalism. They were seen as an object of modernization, development, and progress. The close connection between the political project and the new gender relations models was studied by Ayşe Durakbaşı in her doctoral study entitled, *Halide Edib, Türk Modernleşmesi ve Feminizm*. Durakbaşı, criticized Turkish modernization from a feminist point of view. She also examined *Halide Edib*, who joined the Turkish Revolution, and

³⁴⁴ Zuhul Gündüz, "The women's movement in Turkey: From Tanzimat towards European Union membership," *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, (2004): 115.

³⁴⁵ Çakır, *Osmanlı kadın hareketi*, 22.

³⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 28.

explored how she saw the revolution as a woman. She determined that the Kemalist Republic ideology first made women genderless and then re-gendered them with its modernist policies.³⁴⁷ She investigated how *Halide Edib* internalized and criticized these modernist discourses on women's position and she identified certain things about the modern female notion. She revealed how women, who became symbols of the Turkish nation, saw the tensions they experienced between "modernity" and "tradition". Elif Ekin Akşin wrote a doctoral thesis entitled *Kızların Sessizliği: Kız Enstitülerinin Uzun Tarihi*. In this work, she looked at the girl's institutes which were established in the late period of Ottoman Empire, as another means of understanding modernization in Turkey. She analyzed women's and children's magazines published at a time when these institutions coined the term "the patriotic woman's identity". Yaprak Zihnioğlu, in her master's thesis on *Nezihe Muhiddin*, found that *Nezihe Muhiddin* had a conflict with the bureaucrats of single-party period and she described this period as a 'womanless' revolution.³⁴⁸

Leyla Ekmekçioğlu and Melissa Pınar brought five Armenian women writers to light by examining their works and roles from 1862 to 1932.³⁴⁹ Handan Çağlayan, in her book *Analar, Yoldaşlar, Tanrıçalar*, wrote about the Kurdish women's movement in the context of nationalism.³⁵⁰ Feminist women in history were introduced by academicians such as Fatmagül Berktaş who studied *Behice Boran*. In addition, Serpil Çakır studied *Fatma Aliye, Ulviye Mevlan, and Nezihe Muhiddin*, Ayşe Durakbaşı studied *Halide Edip Adivar*, Kadriye Kaymaz studied *Emine Semiye* and Yaprak Zihnioğlu examined *Nezihe Muhiddin*. Moreover, Nazan Aksoy investigated female writers in the history of literature. Works that can be considered

³⁴⁷ Çakır, "Feminist Tarih Yazımı: Tarihin kadınlar için, kadınlar tarafından yeniden inşası," 519.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 520.,

³⁴⁹ Ibid., 522., to look at the related book see: Lerna Ekmekçioğlu, Melissa Bilal, eds. *Bir Adalet Feryadı Osmanlı'dan Türkiye'ye Beş Ermeni Feminist Yazar: 1862-1932*, 3rd ed., (İstanbul: Aras Yayıncılık, 2017).

³⁵⁰ Çakır, "Feminist Tarih Yazımı: Tarihin kadınlar için, kadınlar tarafından yeniden inşası," 522., to look at the Çağlayan book see: Handan Çağlayan, *Analar, Yurttaşlar, Tanrıçalar: Kürt Kadın Hareketinde Kadınlar ve Kürt Kadın Kimliğinin Oluşumu*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007).

popular women's history were also published.³⁵¹ Serpil Sancar who studies women's movements makes a significant contribution on women's studies in Turkey. In the book *Türk Modernleşmesinin Cinsiyeti: Erkekler Devlet, Kadınlar Aile Kurar*³⁵², she tells us a history in which the role of women was excluded, and in that work the sexist policies became clear and the boundaries of sexual morality were identified. She discusses the paradigm of conservative modernization and how the middle class Turkish family was built. This study is perhaps one of the most comprehensive studies of women's studies in Turkey. At the same time, she published a compilation book, *Birkaç Arpa Boyu... 21. Yüzyıla Girerken Türkiye'de Feminist Eleştirinin Birikimi/ Prof. Dr. Nermin Abadan Unat'a Armağan*,³⁵³ which consists of two volumes. This book consists of thirty-five writers' reviews on the women's movement in Turkey.

Besides these studies on the women's movement, it must be mentioned that Zafer Toprak, as a social historian, was the first male historian in Turkey to be interested in women's participation in historical events. Toprak began to talk about the different issues related to women in the middle of the 1980s, mostly in the popular history magazines which played an important role in the development of social history in Turkey. Although Toprak examines women's positions within the society from a modernization standpoint, he looks specifically at the history of those women who came from very different segment of society. For instance, he looks at both intellectual women and ordinary women by examining newspapers and surveys in journals. Though Toprak's women's studies seems to be weak when compared to world literature, his studies do well in the context of Turkey. Toprak studies women's participation women in industrial work, the modernizing of their lives and the discourse of the intellectual woman of the time. In this respect, it is

³⁵¹ Çakır, "Feminist Tarih Yazımı: Tarihin kadınlar için, kadınlar tarafından yeniden inşası," 524.

³⁵² Serpil Sancar, *Türk Modernleşmesinin Cinsiyeti; Erkekler Devlet, Kadınlar Aile Kurar*, 4th ed., (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2017).

³⁵³ Serpil Sancar, *Birkaç Arpa Boyu... 21. Yüzyıla Girerken Türkiye'de Feminist Çalışmalar - Prof. Dr. Nermin Abadan Unat'a Armağan*, 2 vol. (İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011).

seen that his studies are well-rounded when compared to other women's studies in Turkey. Toprak's significance in women studies is not only because he is the first male academician to be involved in women studies, but also because he deals with topics more thoroughly than other studies in this period.

4.3. ANTHROPOLOGY

Zafer Toprak has not limited his research to just economic history. In recent years, he has concentrated on anthropology and feminism, as well as the economic and social history of Turkey. He investigated the roots of anthropological theory and its development in Republican Turkey. At first glance, one may assume that his book, "Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji" is an anthropological study, but it was mostly focused on the subject of the intellectual interests of Mustafa Kemal, rather than a historical examination of the field of anthropology. He explicitly states in the preface of this book; "The goal of this study is to shed light on the intellectual world of Mustafa Kemal as a prominent statesman, along with the readings of hundreds of research papers and memories written about him, his own readings, writings and orations, without ignoring the historical facts of the "dark ages" between the two World Wars". This book contains Toprak's articles on the development of anthropology and archeology during the early Republican era in Turkey. Toprak's objective is to indicate that anthropological studies carried out in this era should be thought of in the context of worldwide trends. Accusing these studies of racism and fascism is to fall into anachronism in the historical context. Racial studies at that time were not concerned with discrimination among the various societies living in Turkey. On the contrary, the state believed that these groups, together, had shaped and given meaning to Turkish society. In this respect, there were no racial and discriminative approaches against Kurds, Greeks, or Armenians. His research follows the belief that all of the ethnic and racial sectors living in Turkey belonged to the same ancestors as the Turks. According to Toprak, the efforts of Mustafa Kemal to develop anthropology and to find the roots of Turkish ethnicity was a task done to prove that Turkish ethnicity did not belong to any particular race - an attitude that was despised by the West and which changed

the West's attitude about the Turks. So, for Toprak, these racial studies carried out personally by Mustafa Kemal were very understandable in their historical context, because Kemal never targeted other races living in the borderlands of Turkey, such as Armenians, Greeks, or Kurds.³⁵⁴

The pioneers of anthropological science in Turkey were medical doctors as they were in the West. Their interest in the subject was natural because anthropology was initially seen as a subcategory of biology.³⁵⁵ The anthropological and archeological studies which were financially supported by Mustafa Kemal were done over the last twenty years of his life in an effort to bring together details, such as oral or written history remnants in primary and secondary sources that were previously overlooked. Toprak sees Mustafa Kemal as a truly charismatic person, so most of the academic or non-academic works about him have praise and accounts of valor that are concerning. For that reason, the dominant discourse of the Republican period has been a long way from being a reliable, critical consideration for many years in academic studies, according to Toprak. Still, a great number of the writings about Mustafa Kemal tie him to the hard reality of the geography of Turkey. Toprak implies, however, that it is impossible to perceive and understand Mustafa Kemal and the single party period of Republican Turkey without consideration of Europe's "dark age", which is the period between 1914 and 1945. Beyond daily political and military events, the reality is that the intellectual identity which formed during such a complicated phase of Mustafa Kemal's life would not follow a uniform line. Although his intellectual identity may have retained a fundamental perspective, it underwent a radical, or fundamental change. Toprak states that "as a matter of fact, the aim of this book is to trace the changes in Atatürk's mental state."³⁵⁶ For him, 1919 and 1928 constituted these breaking points in the life of Mustafa Kemal. The former is the beginning of political

³⁵⁴ Zafer Toprak, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2012), 7.

³⁵⁵ Ibid., 295.

³⁵⁶ Ibid., 7.

transformation; the latter is the beginning of the Cultural Revolution. Mustafa Kemal dedicated the last decade of his life to building the “new person” of the Republic.

Toprak states that one of the fundamental paradoxes in Turkish historiography is the problem of continuity and ruptures. This problem occupies a more primary place in countries that have recently experienced radical transformations, like Turkey. Toprak claims that some historians emphasize discontinuity, a concept that functions well for their pedagogical concerns, and others are attracted by the evolutionist or diffusionist approaches. As with every occupation, there is professional disagreement in the field of history, too. The effort to establish a teleological link between past and present is a common theme among historians. When the social and human sciences of delayed nations that are in the process of nation-state building are examined, historiography is the science most prone to homily. The phrase; “take a lesson from history” symbolizes a widespread understanding in such countries that the "causes" of today's events are the direct result of the events of yesterday. The "cause and effect" relationship taught in history lectures in schools is the product of this sort of teleological understanding, Toprak writes. Behind all these efforts, there is a hidden expectation of continuity. However, he states that a functionalist approach which is ordered by time is favored by a few historians, or most of the historians who do not have enough experience and intellectual profundity in different fields of social sciences keep away themselves from structuralist approaches. Therefore, the tradition of the narrative dominates history writing and the structures are ignored, or remain hidden in the background. Historians seem to be looking at history through the lens of the present, rather than through the social conditions of the past. Many academicians still give priority to epistemological concerns as they try to perceive the past while keeping the norms of today’s values in mind. Fundamental rights and freedoms, democracy, participation and similar concerns of the present are reflected their work, as if these

ideas existed in the past and went on, uninterrupted, over time. Judging past with current norms is a very easy way for them.³⁵⁷

4.3.1. Mustafa Kemal's Approach to History and Anthropology

The book explains the intellectual identity of Mustafa Kemal with reference to certain developments in the West. Toprak presents Kemal's cultural implementations, which were done to find a new identity for the people of Republican Turkey in the political, cultural and social fields.

Mustafa Kemal's first political implementations were inspired by the concept of "the Social Contract" by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, a philosophy which influenced Kemal's ideological approach on the subjects of "the national will", "national sovereignty" and "the union of power". The ideas of Montesquieu, such as "separation of powers", "freedom", and "concrete individual" which were realized in the Second Constitutional Era, were replaced with Rousseau's doctrines of the "abstract individual", "national sovereignty", and union of powers".³⁵⁸ The early years of the Republic, and the second area of focus for Mustafa Kemal, saw the concepts of Emile Durkheim such as "solidarity", "classless society" and "united society" take hold. The studies of Durkheim brought to light the intellectual works of the French Third Republic, with writers like Charles Seignobos, Charles Gide, Leon Duguit, and Eugene Pierre. Both Durkheim's studies and the intellectual works of the French Third Republic determined the political and social transformations of the twentieth century in Turkey and were followed by the Cultural Revolution of the 1930s. Toprak indicates that historian Herbert George Wells, anthropologist Eugene Pittard, and linguist Cari Brockelmann, have set the basic norms for the future in Turkey. These ideas were introduced to Mustafa Kemal by Yusuf Akçura, Şevket Aziz Kansu and Sadri Maksudi Arsal. At this time,

³⁵⁷ Ibid., 8.

³⁵⁸ Ibid., 10.

Mustafa Kemal moved towards a different “Enlightenment” when the boundaries of history and sociology were broadened into the fields of archeology and anthropology.³⁵⁹ Mustafa Kemal adopted the concept of "national" history, which could be described as "primordial" or primitive, and that concept grew more prevalent throughout the 1920s.³⁶⁰ According to Toprak, the main reason for emphasizing the sciences was to move away from Islamic superstition in society, and to build more scientific beliefs, instead of relying on legends like Noah.³⁶¹

Toprak states his anthology of articles was published because the anthropological studies of the period did not have an ethnic or racist base, and he wanted to prove as much with this book. He emphasizes that an “inclusiveness” ethnic policy, rather than “exclusionist” policies, were dominant throughout any given stage of a single party period.³⁶² In a physical anthropological context, the people who founded the Republic surmised that the Anatolian people had a skull index that was "brachycephalic", i.e., they possessed a short skull in proportion to its breadth, a description given at the time without discrimination. The skull index is the ratio between the horizontal width and the length of the head. This early type of anthropological measurement was subdivided into two types of skull structures which were “dolichocephalic”, a word that characterizes a long head, and “brachycephalic”, characterizing the more spherical head. In the light of this data, the European races were reduced to two basic types; Homo Europeus and Homo Alpinus. However, there was a third race called Homo Mediterraneus, common to southern Spain and Italy.³⁶³ According to Vacher de Lapouge, Homo Europeus was “dolichocephalic” and were native to Great Britain, Scandinavia, Northern Germany and the Netherlands. These people were also tall, had light-colored skin

³⁵⁹ Ibid., 10.

³⁶⁰ Ibid., 66.

³⁶¹ Ibid., 68.

³⁶² Ibid., 11.

³⁶³ Ibid., 21.

and were blue-eyed and long-faced. In terms of psychological characteristics, these people were considered to be ambitious, energetic and bold by nature. Homo Europeus was the entrepreneur, the initiator; dominant, self-confident, wealthy, far-sighted, funny and individualistic, adventurous, progressive and creative personality – all characteristics Homo Alpinus did not purportedly possess. Homo Alpinus was “brachycephalic”, short of stature, had brown eyes and was round-faced. Their homelands were France, Switzerland, South Germany, Poland, Northern Italy, Balkans, Anatolia and the Caucasus. Their basic psychological characteristics were cautious, conservative and mindful of local values. They were also prudent, hardworking, and traditional, very good at absorbing rather than creating ideas, they acted defensively and maintained their “servitude” mentality. The third type, Homo Mediterraneus, was usually short, had dark brown skin, a long-face and long head. They lived in some parts of the Mediterranean basin, Corsica, Sicily, South Italy and Spain.³⁶⁴

According to Toprak, one of the branches of science that came first in the Turkish Republic was anthropology, so anthropology in Turkey was as old as the Republic.³⁶⁵ However, this anthropology had a different content from the cultural anthropology that was gaining traction in the Anglo-Saxon world. Physical anthropology was, in fact, dominant in continental Europe until the end of the Second World War. In Turkey, the initial phase of anthropology was primarily physical anthropology, as well.³⁶⁶ The scientific theory which was widespread in the West in the first half of the twentieth century as an extension of physical anthropology as was “eugenics”.³⁶⁷ Even if it was never used in Turkey, Sabiha Sertel, who completed her education in the US, would have supported the idea of

³⁶⁴ Ibid., 22.

³⁶⁵ Toprak summarizes his arguments about Anthropological studies in early Republican period in the article; Zafer Toprak, “Erken Cumhuriyet’in Bilimi: Antropoloji – Türkiye’de Antropolojinin Doğuşu,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 204 (2010): 26-33.

³⁶⁶ Toprak, *Darwin’den Dersim’e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 53.

³⁶⁷ Ibid., 55.

eugenics if needed.³⁶⁸ The population policy for the Republic was very important because Anatolia had lost nearly five million people due to wars that lasted about ten years. Compared to European countries, Anatolia was empty in terms of population density. Henceforth, one of the most successful policies of the Republic became its health policies. By paying attention to public health, the outbreak of epidemics was largely prevented and the mortality rates of children and infants dropped. According to Toprak, Turkey actualized its demographic revolution and transformation between 1940 and 1980, thanks to the health policies of the first Republic period.³⁶⁹ He explicitly indicates that political action in the field of health was perceived as "science" in inter-racial rehabilitation and in political discourse.³⁷⁰ However, the main impetus for these anthropological studies was to reject the European thinking that categorized Turks as a so-called 'yellow race'. For that reason, physical anthropology became the most advanced scientific discipline in Turkey between the two World Wars.³⁷¹ For Toprak, despite the fact that physical anthropology had an academically independent quality in its early time in Turkey, it turned into "state science" over time because the state protected it and Mustafa Kemal had, in fact, played a large role on its development. The precepts of physical anthropology guided the Cultural Revolution of the 1930s.³⁷² Mustafa Kemal was a sympathetic to the sciences due to his positivist approach. He believed that it was necessary to acquire scientific knowledge to combat superstition, or religious beliefs, and he stated that the main reason for the underdevelopment of the country was the lack of contemporary education. Toprak asserts that the 1933 University

³⁶⁸ Ibid., 29.

³⁶⁹ Ibid., 55.

³⁷⁰ Ibid., 55.

³⁷¹ Ibid., 58.

³⁷² Ibid., 65.

Reform was a product of the rationale³⁷³ that contemporary civilization would only be possible with the guidance of science.

As can be seen in Toprak's work, he is, in fact, also a positivist and he views history as progressive. Toprak sees Mustafa Kemal as one of the key figures on the road to modernization, even if the modernization was initiated before Kemal's time. If we do talk about progress in history, and if there is a progress in Turkish history in the same way, it was progress that was actualized by Mustafa Kemal. For him, Kemal was not only farsighted, but also a person who thought that the country could only be developed through modern science and education, so he took all necessary precautions to remain on this path.

4.3.2. Anthropological Studies of the Period

Meanwhile, in Europe, books were still being written according to the theory of three races; white, yellow and black. Turks were considered part of the yellow race, as mentioned above, and during her education in Dame de Sion, Afet Inan was annoyed by this classification. Inan talked to Mustafa Kemal about this issue, saying that despite the victory by Turks against the West in the "national struggle war", the mentality and attitude of the West against Turks had not changed. Mustafa Kemal and his followers, therefore, needed to address the problem of the West, to change its mentality and attitude. To accomplish this, the best way was through the use of anthropological studies, just like studies the West utilized. In the process of nation-building, Kemal had, unlike the Unionists, showed a preference toward anthropology rather than sociology.³⁷⁴ However, the Republic had experienced a

³⁷³ Ibid., 65.

³⁷⁴ Ibid., 70.

Anthropology also began to take place in the Ottoman literature before this period. In the middle of the nineteenth century, writings about human evolution were being presented in journal called the "mecmua-i funun" by "Munif Paşa". Thus, before the second constitutional era, there was a publishing world for human science or anthropological information. Moreover, "Şemseddin Sami" made great contributions about anthropology in this area to Ottoman readers. In those days, before

breaking point with the 1929 world economic and social crisis that destroyed Europe culturally and economically. Toprak states that this was the main reason to turn to anthropological studies in Turkey. Accordingly, Emile Durkheim was replaced with Eugene Pittard. Sociological studies lost favor and anthropological studies were in demand. In this respect, historical events and facts were certainly interpreted in a much wider context when anthropological and archaeological studies were included in the history. But on the negative side, the excavations at that time were carried out by foreigners, and most importantly, there were still no qualified archaeologists in the country. It was the Republic that sent archaeological candidates to study to abroad. According to the “Anthropological Research Center” in Turkey, the nation had scored an important victory against world powers, so Turks must have better qualifications in order to further challenge these powers on the world stage. The Turkish race had to be held in high esteem among the nations of the world and the duty of anthropology was to reveal the distinguished position of Turks at the scientific level. Young scientists were to, therefore, be directed into this field.

In many articles, Toprak states that the word “race” was used in a different meaning from today. In the early twentieth century, the words "race" and "nation" were almost synonymous; the term “nation” had been used to define non-Muslim communities for many years in the past, so Turks did not want to use that specific term. The term “race” once had the same meaning as the term “nation” did in the West.³⁷⁵ The research centers run by the state gathered a collection of skulls from Muslim graveyards and human skeletons belonging to the ancient periods of

word of “race” was introduced in the ottoman literature, he mentioned about the structure of two types of skulls “Zafer Toprak, *Türkiye’de Popülizm 1908-1923*, (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2013), 54.

Another name closely related to anthropology and ethnography in this period was Satı Bey who tried to bring the Western style secular science and discussions to the Ottoman. According to Toprak, thanks to Satı Bey, modern norms were adopted in biology and geology, and a scientific understanding has been introduced into the ottoman. Toprak, *Türkiye’de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 75.

³⁷⁵ Toprak, *Darwin’den Dersim’e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 73.

Anatolia from their excavations.³⁷⁶ In 1934, the government began sending students to Europe and US to specialize in the fields of anthropological and archeological sciences. As a result, Afet İnan was sent to the University of Geneva where she prepared a dissertation related to anthropology of “Anatolian Turks” with Professor Eugene Pittard for her doctoral thesis, between the years 1936 and 1938. Professor Eugene Pittard was an anthropologist who has a close relationship with Mustafa Kemal. Toprak states that anthropology and archeology were two distinct disciplines that developed in harmony in the 1930s, a time when anthropology experts also began to take part in excavations.

According to Toprak, sociology and anthropology offer two metaphorical views of two different nationalization theories in Turkey. In the first, the nation was created out of nothing, and in the second, a “racial root” was sought in the depths of the past.³⁷⁷ At a time when sociology was being abandoned and anthropology was being adopted, the regime was also transformed. The country was gradually closing itself off to the outside world, looking for the shortest route to the "modernity" by switching to an "authoritarian" regime. In this regard, too, the ideological trends in continental Europe were also influencing Turkey. Toprak indicates that the problem at hand was how to rid themselves of the European “Enlightenment” that paved the way to French Revolution, so that they could discover an alternative Asian “Enlightenment”. The “litmus paper” for this process was physical anthropology.³⁷⁸

The desire to acquire the latest knowledge about the Turkish people prompted Mustafa Kemal to seek the racial and ethnic roots of the Turks. Eugene Pittard published research on the Balkan Peninsula about the anthropological character of the Turks and these preliminary studies attracted Mustafa Kemal's attention.³⁷⁹ Mustafa Kemal appointed Afet İnan to research anthropological studies on the

³⁷⁶ Ibid., 76.

³⁷⁷ Ibid., 99.

³⁷⁸ Ibid., 99.

³⁷⁹ Ibid., 105.

Turkish race at the Turkish History Congress in 1932. Then, she was sent to the University of Geneva to conduct her studies. From there, Afet Inan launched an anthropological survey on a scale never seen before that was personally directed by Mustafa Kemal.³⁸⁰ According to this survey, Anatolia was, first of all, separated into regions. In all, about 64 000 women and men were included in the survey and their skulls were measured by a special group trained to conduct this survey. Thanks to these teams, the measurements were carried out in Anatolia and Thrace. The results of this survey would demonstrate to the whole world whether or not Turks were "brachycephalic" or "dolichocephalic". The teams believed that Turks did not belong to the "yellow race", so they set out to prove this with their data. Until that time, there was no decision in the scientific realm about whether the Turks were "brachycephalic" or "dolichocephalic", however, when these ideas were raised after the Second World War, the field of physical anthropology gained in importance. Among the democratic European intellectuals, being "brachycephalic" was a mark of high breeding, in direct opposition to Nazi Germany who claimed that Germans were descended from the purer race.³⁸¹ It was thought, however, that "dolichocephalic" people could realize development only when they were 'hybridized'. For Turks, the brachycephalic skull indices of Anatolian people were perceived as a proof of being civilized. At Mustafa Kemal's directive, all state apparatuses were mobilized for this study and it created great interest around the world, since it was the largest survey ever seen until that time.³⁸² The "Turkish History Thesis" under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal in the 1930s used Middle Asia in the Neolithic age, rather than the Ottomans as a genesis point. Anatolia was identified as the home of the Alpinus branch of the white race to which the Turks had belonged since ancient times, and the Turkish people who live currently in Anatolia come from Middle Asia. The oldest inhabitants of Anatolia had the same

³⁸⁰ Zafer Toprak, "Atatürk, Eugène Pittard ve Afet Hanım – En Büyük Antropolojik Anket," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 205, (2011): 20-30.

³⁸¹ Toprak, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 111.

³⁸² *Ibid.*, 112.

anthropological features as the Hittites, Seljuks and Ottomans.³⁸³ Toprak states that Turkish anthropologists, archaeologists, linguists and historians have shown the evidence for this theory since the early 1930s, according to each of these specializations.

The fundamental pillars of "cultural revolution" envisaged by Mustafa Kemal were the Alphabet Reform, the Turkish History Thesis and The Language Revolution. Anthropology took place in the background of this gestalt. The Alphabet Reform severed the relationship with the Seljuks and Ottomans, and Central Asia was espoused thanks to the History Thesis. The Language Revolution further reinforced anthropological findings in the historical context. In the 1930s, five congresses pioneered by Atatürk were convened to organize these goals. Two of these congresses were held for history and the others for language.³⁸⁴ Although they were referred to as history or language congresses, the subject matter was anthropology and archeology. Many of the history books which Mustafa Kemal read in the 1930s contained the innovations of contemporary historiography. While these resources involved modern intellectual conventions, they bordered on romantic interpretations of history. However, Toprak asserts that in the process of nation-building, almost all countries go through similar stages as Turkey and Turks would be able to get a new image only through these two particular sciences in the Western World. Hereafter, archeology and anthropology became the centerpiece of historical studies in Turkey.³⁸⁵ Toprak says one congress that focused anthropology and history included romantic elements in accordance with the spirit of the period. The Turkish "race" that the West so disdained would be in some way elevated by anthropology and archeology. According to Turks, Turkish history in Western literature was full of mistakes, which was a conclusion drawn from the West's outmoded conception of history. Western researchers claimed that Turks left

³⁸³ Ibid., 114.

³⁸⁴ Ibid., 147.

³⁸⁵ Ibid., 150.

Babylonia and come to Middle-Asia at the direction of Noah's prophet of legend, and then passed into Western Asia, whereas Turks asserted that the homeland of the Turkish people was not Mesopotamia, but rather Middle Asia.³⁸⁶

While all of these efforts were actualized in the fields of anthropology and archeology, Toprak claims that The History Thesis had not actually addressed the race problem, since the main purpose of it was simply to respond to the Europeans. He insisted that the Thesis would never target the different ethnic and religious groups living in Turkey. As an Armenian intellectual, Agop Martaya has written about this thesis and supported it. Toprak cites Agop Martaya as an example to prove that the goal of the History Thesis was not based on racial concerns.³⁸⁷

Similar theses about language were put forward by members of the new political power in Turkey. They felt that of the strongest pieces of evidence that the world's great civilizations came from Central Asia and from Turks was the Turkish language, since civilization seemingly reached other geographical areas and communities through the Turks.³⁸⁸ Etymological, as well as historical and geographical studies also reinforced the belief that the Turkish language was a common ancestral language, because many foreign words shared a similar meaning with Turkish words and other languages complied with the structural features of the Turkish language.³⁸⁹ Briefly, the research on language would prove that the first civilization moved from Central Asia with the Turks to all spread across the globe. For them, a unity in history teachings was required for all schools and scientific institutions of the Republican Turkey. National culture could only gain strength in this way. The nation is a community of people from the common culture and for the purposes of cultural unity, history was the most important of the cultural

³⁸⁶ Ibid., 150.

³⁸⁷ For further details look at pages 137-150 of Ibid.

³⁸⁸ Ibid., 150.

³⁸⁹ Ibid., 151.

sciences. History education was also seen as important for maintaining "national discipline" in the context of nation-building.

Toprak often stresses that the concept of "race" as used by Eugene Pittard has no ethnic features. Instead, it had an anthropological content. The people who lived in Anatolia, such as Kurds, Armenian and Greeks, were described as members of the same race, i.e. "Turkish". These people might be the members of different religions and languages, but their races were the same and they all settled in Anatolia as a consequence of migrations. The common quality of these people was thought to be their characteristic "brachycephalic" skull index. Just like the concept of constitutional citizenship created in 1924, Pittard declared all of them to be Turks.³⁹⁰ The "Enlightenment" mentality was crowned with legal reforms in the 1920s, but it disappeared in the 1930's and an alternative "Enlightenment" came into existence. In the process, the place of sociology was taken over by anthropology and, as a result, fundamental transformations were made in the comprehension of culture and a new concept of history and language became important. At this time, The Research Center of Turkish History, The Research Center of Turkish Language, and The Faculty of Language, Geography and History were established.³⁹¹

The "brachycephalic" Turkish race constituted the oldest civilization in the world, one which founded the bases of the Aegean, Egyptian, Anatolian and Greek civilizations through migration. For this reason, there was Turkish blood at the root of the very race which was the source of pride for Europeans.³⁹² A racially-based understanding of history was highly prevalent in continental Europe at that time and nationalism had started its rise. Almost every historian from Europe was arguing that their race was superior to others, according to Toprak. Many European countries, mainly in the East and South-East Europe supported "eugenics" and

³⁹⁰ Ibid., 182.

³⁹¹ Ibid., 187.

³⁹² Ibid., 193.

“racism” under the threatening shadow of an oncoming war. As a result of this common racist attitude in Europe, Germany would undertake actions that would spark the Second World War.

According to Toprak, the mentality of new historical studies done in Turkey that were based on racial discrimination had very different content from European studies, since Turkey was still an "oppressed" country. In this regard, the “yellow race” concept was a premise also attributed to Turks in those days. Turkey was set to be wiped from history by the Treaty of Sevres, but the Anatolian people would not allow this to happen. Although the Treaty of Lausanne provided a place on the international stage for Turkey, it was still seen as an underdeveloped and “barbarian” nation by Europe. Victory in the “national struggle” was not enough to overcome prejudices against the Turks and during the single party period, members of the government, and Mustafa Kemal himself, made an effort to change this mentality of the West. All propaganda apparatuses were employed to overturn this prejudice. To summarize, the Turkish identity, which was built with the understanding of constitutional citizenship in the 1920s, was born through the process of anthropological construction, but under the influence of the culturalism of the 1930s.³⁹³ Toprak states the rise of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes in Europe had an influence on this process because Turkey closely followed these developments, especially in Italy. For instance, Turkey took lessons from Italy’s community associations in the evaluation of leisure time when establishing “People Houses”, or community leisure and cultural centers built to educate adults, in 1931.³⁹⁴ The discourse of the racial supremacy of the Turks was also reflected in their national anthems in these years. For example, they had lyrics that said; “we were superior to all the nations within the world and we had the most superior head, we were there before the history, so we would be there after the history”.³⁹⁵

³⁹³ Ibid., 194.

³⁹⁴ “Türk Ocakları”

³⁹⁵ Ibid., 195.

Moreover, Mustafa Kemal referred to the Turkish rebirth epic “Ergenekon” and among the titles attributed to him was the name of a legendary wolf “Bozkurt” that guided Turks when they went out “Ergenekon”. The wolf was a symbol on the flag of the “Gokturks” in the reconstruction of the past. The khans of Turks hold a widespread belief that Turks have wolf ancestry. The picture of wolf as a symbol ‘Turkishness’ has been placed on many things, such as on stamps, the clothes of Scouts, etc.³⁹⁶

According to Toprak, anthropology has ensured the secularization of science and kept scientific knowledge away from the mystical teachings and dogmas of religion. At the same time, it has prepared an environment for Darwinist solutions and allowed history to settle into an evolutionist line.³⁹⁷ Toprak claims that The Turkish History Thesis has led to a transformation that would carry the character of revolution in its essence.³⁹⁸ It has broken down the diplomatic and political structure of history into narrow patterns; enabling it to enter into the interdisciplinary arena. Another contribution of The Turkish History Thesis was that it allowed study over much longer time span and over a greater geographical area. Social scientists are no longer satisfied with data from only inside the borders of the country, they are also reaching for knowledge that is produced on a global scale.³⁹⁹

4.3.3. The Push for Quantification in the Republican Era

Toprak indicates that one of the most important transformations of the Republic was the birth of quantification.⁴⁰⁰ Numeric data gained a great importance with the

³⁹⁶ Ibid., 195.

³⁹⁷ Ibid., 204.

³⁹⁸ Ibid., 371.

³⁹⁹ Ibid., 411.

⁴⁰⁰For learn more about quantification in the Republican era see also; Zafer Toprak, “Sayısallaşma ya da Cumhuriyet’in Rasyonelleşmesi,” *Uluslararası Atatürk ve Çağdaş Toplum Sempozyumu*, (İstanbul; İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2002): 244-259., Zafer Toprak, “Osmanlı Devleti’nde

rise of the Republic. The Enlightenment philosophy had triggered positivism and rationality was closely related to measurement. That is to say, in an area where Reason is dominant, everything could, and should, be measured. The Republic elevated the value of rationalization, numbers and predictions so that it could predict future through counting. Statistics have been used as a tool of the state since Roman times, and it was thought by the Republic that there could be no hope for a community that did not know to count (survey), or that was unfamiliar with numbers. According to them, the Ottoman Empire was destroyed for not knowing how to count. For example, it could not save its currency from devaluation since it could not figure out the math. Counting, for the Republic, was as important as alphabetical literacy and it supported the idea that science needed statistics. In this context, physical anthropology was the best place to practice statistics, since anthropometrical and sociometrical studies that were based on numeric data measurements were the basis of almost all anthropological work. The solution of the racial problem was also thought to require measurement.⁴⁰¹ Therefore, quantification was the basis of Afet İnan's doctoral work and, as previously mentioned, the biggest survey in Turkish history was carried out for her research.

4.3.4. Anthropological Discrimination Against Women

Toprak contends that Republican Turkey had a paradoxical nature in terms of women's rights. The first stage of the Republic was a period of radical changes on the subject of gender. For instance, advances in the field of private law, especially in civil law, opened many doors to women, encouraged them to be educated in a profession and to work in their field. They were granted the right to be elected and vote, yet, while equality was emphasized in the political context, or as citizen identity, there was still a discriminatory attitude towards women in the biological field. According to Toprak, the fundamental reason for this situation was that the

Sayısallaşma ya da Çağdaş İstatistiğin Doğuşu,” in *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Bilgi ve İstatistik*, (Ankara; Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü, 2000), 95-112.

⁴⁰¹ Toprak, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 210.

expansion in the field of women rights was shaking the existing social order, both inside and outside the family unit.⁴⁰²

At this time, brain weight was considered proportional to the capacity of a person's intelligence. For example, the weight of the brains of black people was seen to be lower than that of whites. Likewise, the weight of women's brain was also lower than men's and with these anthropological and biological studies as fodder, gender discrimination deepened. Anthropologists examined the differences between the brains of races, as well as the differences between the sexes in Turkey. This subject was very important for Constitutional Turkey because the equality of men and women was being widely debated and defending equality disturbed some segments of society. This issue was constantly questioned by conservative sectors who felt that men and women could not be equal. Ultimately, the "scientific" evidence for this inequality was obtained by the "findings" of anthropology.⁴⁰³ Avanzade Mehmed Suleyman claimed that women as human beings were inferior to men in regards to their creation, and the evidence supporting that theory was the weight of their brains.⁴⁰⁴ With their larger brain volumes, men could develop their minds to be more involved in intellectual activities, whereas the smaller minds of women remained stable, and they prefer a comfortable life and to avoid every kind of mental activity.⁴⁰⁵ Here, we are offered a historical process behind the discrimination against the female brain. The difference between the male and female brains was thought to be small historically, but as time went on, the female brain began to shrink. The brains of modern women were weighed and it was revealed that they were lighter than men's. For this reason, female intelligence was assumed to be lower than male intelligence. As society progressed, women had to

⁴⁰² Ibid., 63.

⁴⁰³ Ibid., 302.

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., 307.

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., 308.

admit that their brains had become smaller than those of primitive tribes, although it was hard to make this fact acceptable to the women of advanced societies.⁴⁰⁶

4.3.5. Darwinist Curriculum in Schools

The science of anthropology was the focal point of the sciences in Turkey in the 1930s. Anthropological knowledge was accumulated through archaeological studies and those studies quickly entered elementary and high school books. Evolutionary theory was elaborately presented in textbooks, from biology to geology, and in logic books at the secondary level. It was the first time that the theory of evolution was intensely emphasized in education in Turkey. From this point on, both geology and biology textbooks would be built around the theory of evolution. In this period, Darwinism had great importance and its theories were discussed in the school curriculum. However, in the secondary school book, "Biology II", in the section on practical tasks set for the chapter; "Turkish Anthropology of Race", the skulls of the students in the school would be measured, and assigned an average based on the number of students in the school. Notably, the students whose skulls were measured were found to be "brachycephalic" in schools. Toprak clarifies that the authors of these textbooks could not see the disadvantages of this practical task.

Toprak states that the Single Party Period of the Republic was seen as a continuous process among social scientists for many years. Although particular social aspects of the 1930's were brought to the agenda from time to time, the reasons behind them and their effects on the scientific world were not emphasized enough. At the beginning of the 1930s, there was, he claims, an interruption in the progress of

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., 309., The relationship between brain size and intelligence was investigated in two ways. Cranial capacity was measured in people with known IQs. A very small correlation was found between cranial capacity and intelligence; but this was shown to be the result of the confounding effects of height. A large series of brains was also investigated; data being obtained on occupation from the case notes. When the effects of body height and weight were controlled for, it was possible to demonstrate a statistically significant, but very slight, relation between brain size and occupational group, "Richard Passingham, "Brain size and intelligence in man," *Brain, Behavior and Evolution* 16, no. 4 (1979): 253-70.

social and human sciences, particularly in the concepts of history and historiography in Turkey. Mustafa Kemal played a significant role in the formation of this breaking point. The concept of the history in the Republic was entering into a new phase through the Research Community of Turkish History (Türk Tarih Tetkik Cemiyeti). While initiatives to reconstruct history from the beginning were gaining strength, the historiography of the Second Constitutional era, based on the concepts of the European Enlightenment era, was called into question. The new trend was specific to the twentieth century and dependent upon an interdisciplinary “synthesis” to distance itself from the positivist history approach of the 19th century, which was described as Social Darwinist. He claims that there was an effort to develop the infrastructure for this new concept of history, which focused on mass information areas such as museums, libraries, scientific institutions, original textbooks, and archives. With the Faculty of Language and History-Geography (Dil, Tarih- Coğrafya Fakültesi), a concept of history that emphasized the axis of "culture" beyond the "civilization" became dominant. Toprak claims that this also created a paradoxical situation, because while social scientists acted upon concerns of creating a "new person", or a citizen's identity, they also wanted to impose upon history a contemporary “scientific” aspect, and to adopt a “total”, holistic, understanding of history.⁴⁰⁷

Toprak indicates that this expansion of cultural anthropology was short-lived. With the Sheikh Said Rebellion, the government needed to cover up cultural differences. In fact, the Health and Social Geography books that were released until that time were removed from the libraries. Toprak states that cultural differences included “risks” for the unitary state which was starting to establish itself. A homogeneous concept of society was incompatible with cultural anthropology. That is to say, cultural differences were creating an environment for interventions that came from outside world.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁷ Toprak, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 227.

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., 279.

4.3.6. The Sun-Language Theory

Scientific linguistic studies in Turkey started with The Turkish Language Revolution. Toprak asserts that although the Sun-Language Theory is described as an imaginary product, it brought about a significant methodological approach in linguistics. Hereupon, linguistics articulated with anthropology, and history and anthropology, which were then all studied together in a comparative way. He contends that it is necessary to evaluate the evolution of the Turkish language in light of anthropological studies; however, these efforts were harshly criticized in the political arena. The developments in the field of language constituted an important extension of culturalization in the 1930s.⁴⁰⁹ Alphabetical, language and history reforms became the basis of the cultural revolution. In today's Turkey, cultural identity is a direct result of these three social revolutions.

During the “Alacahoyuk” excavation of 1937, five suns were found lined up in rows at a grave. The “Alacahoyuk” excavation was the source of the Sun-Language Theory, which was developed under the leadership of Atatürk in the mid-1930s. The Turkish Language Institute compares phonetics, semantics, morphology and etymology between the Turkic language and other local languages and language groups. These studies required a theory which would allow for the eventual development of the Turkish language. Naturally, there would be Turkic proto-languages at the center of this theory.⁴¹⁰ The Sun-Language Theory was, in fact, in harmony with the Turkish History Thesis since it also surmised that Neolithic civilizations were born in Central Asia and then spread all around the world through migration. According to the Turkish History Thesis, the cradle of advanced culture was in the homelands of the Turks. It was the Turks who founded this culture and spread it to the whole world. According to the Turkish Language Theory, this nation had transported certain cultural artifacts which they created, and the idea systems connected to these works were brought along with them from Asia to Europe, then

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid., 415.

⁴¹⁰ Ibid., 451.

to the Americas and the whole world.⁴¹¹ For Toprak, these two theories did not imply that Turks were the fathers of all men, nor did they create the first civilization. On the contrary, they claimed that it was Turks who transmitted and spread the existing idea of civilization to the world through migration. Toprak states that, thanks to these two studies, the general belief that the origins of the Turks belonged to the yellow race was refuted. Nations around the world changed their views on the Anatolian people and placed them in the same social strata as Europeans.⁴¹²

4.3.7. Critiques of the Approach of Toprak on Anthropological Studies

Toprak's approach to anthropological studies in the early Republican period has some problems. He emphasizes that the racist studies carried out in this period should be evaluated only after considering the conditions of the period. He claims that these studies had very different content from similar work carried out in Europe and did not have the same effect in Turkey in terms of promoting racism. Rather, they have provided enlightenment for the country, and progress the development of sciences such as history, archeology and anthropology.

Although Toprak asserts that the anthropological and archeological studies conducted in the early Republican era did not have racist and discriminative content, the cultural history approach in Turkey has always supported the writing of political history: even political theses were often defended through cultural genres.⁴¹³ The most important basis of the cultural history approach has been the archaeological cultural history, stemming from anthropological data which sometimes has been used to promote biological (racist) perspectives. The basic assumption of archeological cultural history is that different archaeological cultures

⁴¹¹ Ibid., 465.

⁴¹² Ibid., 470.

⁴¹³ Suavi Aydın, "Kültür-Kimlik Modelleri Açısından Türk Tarih Yazımı," PhD diss., Hacettepe University, 1997, 81.

that are assumed to be related to today's peoples, (especially various national groups) are the keystones for the reconstruction of the past in the context of monolithic, singular integrations. Therefore, the main goal of this kind of archeological studies is "to follow the origin". In many cases, cultural history has facilitated the construction of long genealogies for contemporary national and ethnic groups who want to express their identity consciousness and ensure their current political legitimacy. Such a projection of the past was mainly created out of the bias of today's point of view.⁴¹⁴

According to Aydın, the Turkish establishment regarded such archeological and anthropological enterprise as an instrument for propaganda.⁴¹⁵ The main objective for anthropological and archeological studies was to examine Turks and Turkish society.⁴¹⁶ The main goal for Mustafa Kemal was to develop "The Turkish History Thesis" project as a way to construct a history of origins and an ethnic identity for the Turks in the early Republican era. In this sense, the project was similar to other nation-building efforts.⁴¹⁷

There was a close connection between modernization and the development of science in the Republican period. However, scientific studies have been used as a tool to create some backward ideologies, like nationalism and racism. The development of science in Turkey was a concept that fits into the relationship between state, ideology and science, which was firmly established in Europe before World War II. The most important object of this initiative is either to change "identity", or to create a "scientific model" in which different identities would be assimilated into a homogenous "national identity". In other words, the identity of

⁴¹⁴ Ibid., 83.

⁴¹⁵ Suavi Aydın, "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative," in *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, eds. Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kizilyürek and Umut Özkirimli, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 45.

⁴¹⁶ Ibid., 38.

⁴¹⁷ Ibid., 37.

citizens in the new state would be appropriate to this understanding of science. According to Peter Sugar, the most distinctive feature of nationalism is the shift in loyalty to the national state from patriotism, and this transformation requires the effort of creating scientific legitimacy.⁴¹⁸

Although anthropological and archaeological studies seem to glorify the Turks in the eyes of the West, it should not be overlooked that the basic assumptions of this concept were largely influenced by the "culturalist" and then "racist" theories, which were the dominant paradigms of the early 20th century.⁴¹⁹ According to Aydın, the role of the racist paradigm in the nationalism of the period are obvious in some of the statements from Afet İnan. This paradigm was deemed necessary to create a healthy race and a social structure that works in line with national goals.⁴²⁰ From 1938 until the middle of the Second World War, the race paradigm expanded its influence. The concern of the state was now to show the unity of race, rather than emphasizing the Turkishness of Anatolians and their contribution to the civilization.⁴²¹ The roots of this paradigm that was turning into a far more racist approach were based on anthropological studies carried out by Mustafa Kemal. Although Toprak claims that anthropological studies in this period did not have a racial character, it is obvious that this was not always the case.

On this point, Hanioglu regards this kind of approach as a popularization of “apologetic” historiography for the purpose of legitimizing the politics of the Republican period. This approach can be thought of as an improvement in Turkish historiography because, until a short time ago, studies on the Republican period canonised all the practices and applications of this period. This “apologetic”

⁴¹⁸ Suavi Aydın, “Cumhuriyetin İdeolojik Şekillenmesinde Antropolojinin Rolü: Irkçı Paradigmanın Yükselişi ve Düşüşü,” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce; Cilt 2: Kemalizm*, ed. Ahmet İnsel. 6th ed. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2009), 344.

⁴¹⁹ Ibid., 354.

⁴²⁰ Ibid., 362.

⁴²¹ Ibid., 363.

historiography acknowledges the studies, policies and practices conducted may contain problems, but emphasizes that the conditions of the period must be taken into account. Hanioglu says that it is important to remember that such types of historiography can cause serious problems. He contends that it can be seen as a positive stage when compared to the understanding of the canonised historiography, but it must be accepted that “apologetic” historiography is at least as problematic as the former approach. As a matter of fact, this kind of historiography, which tends to be popular in Turkey, is highly criticized in the world and cannot go beyond marginality.⁴²²

He stresses that the book “*Darwin’den Dersim’e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*” is one of the most striking examples of the popularization of “apologetic” historiography. An important problem for this approach is that it legitimates movements such as racism and social Darwinism; movements which became "one-party politics" through "intellectual popularity". In reality, intellectual debates and authoritarian state politics are different from each other. For instance, Pittard, Papillault and Haddon's thesis on the racist policies of Switzerland, France and England did not create similar results in racism in high school textbooks as they did in Turkey. Hanioglu points out that, according to Toprak, anthropometric studies, racism and social Darwinism were therefore used to provide "enlightenment". The most important contribution of this study to the “apologetic” historiography is found in the legitimization of the thesis based on the physical anthropology of the Early Republic; a study which was used to promote a serious and problematic racism. In the framework of this approach, according to Toprak, the Early Republic's "race problem" had inclusiveness rather than exclusionist content. Moreover, Hanioglu states that Toprak sees Turkish racism is at least a better racism compared to what transpired in Europe. This approach, naturally, either distorts historical material or ignores parts of it to construct its narrative. He says that it is quite controversial to

⁴²² M. Şükrü Hanioglu, “En asil duygunun tarihçiliğinden apolojetik tarih yazımına” *Sabah*, July 01, 2012. <http://www.sabah.com.tr/yazarlar/hanioglu/2012/07/01/en-asil-duygunun-tarihciliginden-apolojetik-tarih-yazimina>, (accessed: September 02, 2017).

accept an approach, which compares the samples taken from Turkish cadavers with bone specimens taken from Greek and Jewish cemeteries. In this sense, it is not possible to accept such attitudes as inclusive. On the other hand, the reason that Kurdish, Laz, and Circassian were not discriminated against in these studies was the denial of racial sub-identities.⁴²³

4.3.8. Kurdish Ethnicity in Border of Turkey

According to Toprak, the state had undertaken a social engineering mission in that region and aim of the state was to develop and join this region with other parts of country. He shows how this mission relied on the reports of Necmettin Sahir Sılan, who was working in the area. Necmettin Sahir Sılan had prepared regular reports about the ‘Eastern Question’ when he was engaged in politics and he had presented them to the leaders of the period. He prepared a total of thirteen reports about Bingöl and Tunceli, nine of which had been given to *CHP* and four to the *DP*. Sılan visited the region frequently, made contact with the people and was sensitive to the needs of the population there. He collected information from them, conducted surveys and did interviews. According to Toprak, these reports proved how politics developed in a country for those who showed disdain for the one-party system of the time, and in terms of who the political winners were in that period. These reports reflected social engineering during the period of the nation state. The problem that the Republic of Turkey faced was to integrate Eastern regions with the new nation state. Building roads, opening schools, hospitals and health clinics, as well as bringing water and electricity were all compulsory tasks to consolidate political power in this region. That the social structure of the region was different from any other region of the country was a fact known by the governments of the Republic. Eastern and South-Eastern Anatolian regions were regarded as autonomous in the Ottoman

⁴²³ M. Şükrü Hanioglu, “En asil duygunun tarihçiliğinden apolojetik tarih yazımına” *Sabah*, July 01, 2012. <http://www.sabah.com.tr/yazarlar/hanioglu/2012/07/01/en-asil-duygunun-tarihciliginden-apolojetik-tarih-yazimina>, (accessed: September 02, 2017).

period. The state had seen how problematic the issue of land was and for this reason, they did not touch it as long as the region remained peaceful. There is little mention of the presence of the state in those areas until the Republic. Ankara's main concern was to integrate those regions having different ethnic roots into the country's population at large.⁴²⁴ General information on Kurdish population and tribes for almost all of the eastern provinces of the Republican Turkey was well known by Ankara. The Sheikh Said Uprising in 1925 brought an end to Kurdish identity in official sources. Kurdish tribes had been provoked by England to revolt, causing Ankara to establish a unitary state to prevent such revolts. As part of this effort, the book about Gaziantep published in 1926 on behalf of the state defined the Kurdish people as Turks.⁴²⁵ The same book indicated that these people, who were shepherds and who spoke in Kurdish, were actually of Turkish ethnicity. In time, the Kurdish people started to be referred to as "mountain Turks".⁴²⁶ Abdülhalik Renda, who was sent to this region to research Kurdish tribes and social life, prepared a report verifying that the feudal *beys* (governors) and tribe leaders had been getting more powerful day by day in these regions. These feudal *beys* and tribe leaders had taken tributes from poor peasants and had even tortured them. In regions where the state was not active, the feudal *beys* and tribal leaders symbolized power.

Abdulhalik Renda's report emphasized that the state was not officially active in these regions. The geography of these lands, with its extremely difficult living conditions, was regarded as a place of exile, a place where civil servants were sent if they did not fulfill their duties properly. The residents saw themselves as victims; they lived in oppressive conditions and felt that they could not pursue their enthusiasms and desires. The number of police and soldiers in the area was extremely low. The towns and villages were poorly maintained, bad overall health conditions could not be ameliorated and nothing was done in the field of the public

⁴²⁴ Toprak, Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji., 539-541.

⁴²⁵ Ibid., 544.

⁴²⁶ Ibid., 544.

works.⁴²⁷ Moreover, the state held no assets in the field of education. The Kurdish population was growing quickly, but in most places government buildings and police stations were not successful in increasing the visibility of the state. Taxes went unpaid and there were no state records of land holdings.⁴²⁸ In the absence of the state, peasants had to consult with tribal chiefs to obtain their rights. For tribal members, the tribal regime and its chiefs were stronger than the government. Unless the state made itself more powerful than the leaders of these tribes, the tribal members had to submit to the tribal leader. The tribal members not only did not pay taxes, but they didn't enroll in the army. To change this, the state had to make itself more visible by building new police stations and state buildings. At the same time, the state had to build railroads to more easily access the region as needed, and because the railway represented the state to some extent. The Sheikh Sait Uprising created a turning point for the Kurdish identity. After that time, the word "Kurdish" would not be included in the press and or any other official publications.⁴²⁹

Toprak states that the "Eastern Problem" or the "Kurdish problem" was related to public order issues that went beyond concerns about the ethnicity at the state level.⁴³⁰ In the book "Dersim", he prepared to summarize the situation in the region by reviewing the anthropological findings about the Kurds. In accordance with the discourse of the period, it was emphasized that the people of this region came from the same ethnic roots as the Turks. According to this book, the people of the region were of "Khorasan" ethnicity, based on the findings of physical anthropologists who proved that the Kurds were also "brachycephalic". The book further asserted that the Kurdish language consisted of semi-Turkish and semi-Farsi words and structures. People of this region living in the eastern parts of "Hazar" spoke Turkish and Farsi languages at that time. They later migrated to the Westward after to the

⁴²⁷ Ibid., 546.

⁴²⁸ Ibid., 547.

⁴²⁹ Ibid., 560.

⁴³⁰ Ibid., 564.

invasion of Cengiz Khan. During this migration, they were influenced by the Persian language and culture. In the meantime, it was recorded that the “Zazas” had the same characteristic features as Turkomen, since the Zazas were also “brachycephalic”, which was upheld as concrete evidence of the theory. According to Toprak, Kurdish people living in the “Dersim” region were not subjected to an ethnic separation by the state. On the contrary, there was an effort to include them in the race of the Turks. In the prehistoric theses which they proposed, there was no nation called 'Kurdish', based on the brief examination of the history of the past three thousand years.

Toprak states that, in accordance with the social engineering project, people living in the Kurdish regions had to immigrate in order to maintain state order. Also, the geographical features of this area prevented economic investments due to their hard-living conditions and the local society was encumbered by poverty. Further, the fundamental aim of state was to prevent terrorist organizations from forming there, and to weaken the power of tribal chiefs, as well as to integrate local communities with the other regions of the Anatolia. Ankara was determined to capture lands that had not been ruled by the government for centuries. State-citizen relations mutually required a number of rights and responsibilities. “Dersim” has never been obliged to the state. That is, the people living in this region did not pay taxes and did not fulfill military service.⁴³¹ Health, education and road-construction services had to be brought to this area, however, the most important thing was to teach and remind these people of their ‘Turkishness’ through education.⁴³² Toprak contends that the “Dersim Operation” was the last rung of the civilization ladder for the Republican government according to the reports made for government. The Republic's "Eastern Question" and the project of civilization were, of course, different, but both were rooted in the colonial understanding of the birth of the phrase "civilization", i.e. “the white man’s burden”. He asserts that it was

⁴³¹ Ibid., 569.

⁴³² Ibid., 569.

impossible to flourish a colonial understanding in a country where capitalism was newly harvested. The main goal of the state was to end the exploitation mechanism created by feudal *beys* within the region. Tribal domination must be ended and the individual should be held responsible to the state. He claims that under these conditions, it is extremely difficult to distinguish the differences between "assimilation" and "integration". He adds that if assimilation was emphasized, the construction of all nation-states could be framed as "assimilation".⁴³³ The fundamental goal of the Republic was to establish a direct relationship between the individual and the state. In this context, the problem of "race" was not "exclusionist" but "inclusiveness".⁴³⁴

4.3.9. Critique of the Approach of Toprak on Kurdish Question

The Kemalist vision of Westernization included the reinvention of the past, the reterritorialization and nationalization of Anatolia as a homeland, and the cultivation of militant patriotic sentiments amongst its citizens.⁴³⁵ Unlike Toprak's thoughts on the Kurdish question, the Kemalist vision and project of Turkish nation-building had not only a territorial-political, but also an ethnocultural basis.⁴³⁶ Kemalist nationalism tried to unite Turkish lands with Turkish-Muslim elements. While the Kemalist regime emphasized citizenship as a model of civil society, it used a cultural concept of nation that focuses on Turkish language, Turkish national history and Muslim identity, which was simultaneously a combination of inclusion and exclusion to the very heterogeneous population of Republic.⁴³⁷ The territorial

⁴³³ Ibid., 578.

⁴³⁴ Ibid., 579.

⁴³⁵ Günay Göksu Özdoğan, "Turkish Nationalism Reconsidered: The 'Heaviness' of Statist Patriotism in Nation-Building," in *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, eds. Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kizilyürek and Umut Özkirimli, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 47.

⁴³⁶ Ibid., 47.

⁴³⁷ Ibid., 49.

and political aspect of Turkish nationalism implied that all citizens living in Turkey's borderlands were considered to be Turkish, regardless of their religion and race, and all of these people were identified as Turks in terms of citizenship.

The attitude against the Kurds changed completely after the establishment of the nation-state. The first concern of the founders of the Republic was to prove that the lands defined as "Misak-ı Milli" belonged to "Turks (or rather Muslims living here)" and to refute the arguments that would register the existence of Pontus, Armenian and Kurdish political formations, after the treaty of Sevres paved the way for these political formations. Therefore, the decisions for Turkey, at least for the larger states, must have been influenced to the contrary until the Lausanne. The name of the place was given great importance in this frame and names which were thought to have originated from Greek, Armenian, Georgian, Circassian, Laz, Arabic and Kurdish languages in these lands, or which were not understood in origin but thought to be not Turkish, were rapidly changed. However, micro measures such as changing the names of geographical units like villages, rivers, hills, valleys were not enough for decision makers. Their main objective was to "Turkify" the geographical area within the borders of the Republic of Turkey. The practical way for this was to adopt the name "Anatolia" for the region. The decision to name the whole of Turkey's land "Anatolia" was made at the First Congress of Geography which gathered from June 6th through 21st, 1941. The problem is that the rulers of Turkey were still not very sure about the long-term survival of the state, and the mood of the Ottoman Empire's decline was continuing. For this reason, all sorts of reflexive reactions and allergies toward the two great "others" - "Kurds" and "Armenians" - of the nation-state process were created. The changing of names was not only limited to geographical regions, but the names of animals (like Kurdish Vulpes, and Armenian sheep) in Kurdish or Armenian languages were also changed.⁴³⁸

⁴³⁸ Suavi Aydın, "Bir Tilkinin Ettigi: İsimler Milli Birliği Nasıl Bozar?," *Birikim*, December 20, 2006, <http://www.birikimdergisi.com/guncel-yazilar/1001/bir-tilkinin-ettigi-isimler-milli-birligi-nasil-bozar#.WarSnsirRPY>, (Accessed September 02, 2017).

The Kurds began to be seen as a community which had the potential to revolt at any time, under the motivation of the "provocation of external forces" in the early Republican era. According to Yeğen, the state discourse on the Kurdish question in the texts of the Republican era shows that the state did not recognize the Kurdish question at all. For almost seventy years, they consistently denied the existence of Kurds as an ethnic element. In other words, there were no Kurds to be recognized in Anatolia.⁴³⁹ Therefore, the Kurdish question can be described as "categorical denial" in the state discourse of the Republican period.⁴⁴⁰ According to the 1924 Constitution, the Kurds could be elected as a member of the parliament as long as they forget, postpone or cancel their identity (their Kurdishness), although these statements were not patently specified in the constitution (it pointed out that only a person whose language was Turkish could be a candidate to the election). Moreover, the discourse of denial and consideration of the problem constituted the essence of the approach to the Kurdish question during the "Single Party" period. The *CHF*, which was also a branch of "Turkish Fascism" in the early Republican period, carried the nationalist rhetoric one step further. According to the *CHF*'s constitution, "every Turkish citizen who could speak Turkish and who adopted all the wisdom of Turkish culture and politics, could enter the party".⁴⁴¹ In a sense, the Kurds were asked to deny their memories, their language, their history and their identities, in order to be elected to the parliament and enter the *CHF*. The exclusion rationale mentioned here is a special logic. This logic is known as exclusion by assimilation; in other words, the logic of the establishment of the nation state.⁴⁴²

The 1924 constitution was the first step in denying the existence of the Kurds' political and legal status, by denying their own physical existence of a more comprehensive way. In the 1930s, with the sympathy of the rising totalitarian

⁴³⁹ Mesut Yeğen, *Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999), 110.

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., 111.

⁴⁴¹ Ibid., 123.

⁴⁴² Ibid., 120.

regimes in Europe and the fear of foreign provocation combined with a need for creation a nation-state, Turkey pursued a racist rhetoric when the “categorical denial” rhetoric based on the denial of the physical presence of the Kurds emerged. By the 1930s, the state would claim that there was no other ethnic element except Turkish in Turkey. The regime, which was conditioned by a racist rhetoric, would soon promote Kurds as “mountain Turks”. This attitude was the main thesis of the state discourse toward Kurds until the 1990s.⁴⁴³ The state, which denied the physical presence of the Kurds, made an extraordinary effort not to use the term of “Kurd” in official records.⁴⁴⁴

Kurdish identity is one of the “others” spoken of as a founding element of Kemalist discourse, like Islamic identity. Coincident with the foundation of the Republic, especially during the 1920s and 1930s, was the physical repression of Kurdish rebellions. These rebellions were a threat to Anatolia's ownership of “Muslim-Turks”, and to the project of the assimilation of different Muslim ethnicities into a political supra-identity. The Kurdish rebellion refers to a forbidden trauma that cannot be expressed and symbolized in Kemalist discursive order. For this reason, the Kurdish question can only be expressed by Kemalism with signs and symbols belonging to the discourse of the struggle against Islamic fundamentalism, economic backwardness, or external forces and imperialism.⁴⁴⁵

The official state legitimized their actions in Kurdish regions through the discourse of civilization and claimed that the purpose was to bring civilization and state service to Eastern regions where the Kurds primarily lived. The state argued that this region was ruled by tribal *beys* and bandits, so it was crucial to intervene, ‘civilize’ these regions and rescue those living there from these perils. It was, however, difficult to consolidate power in these regions due to these *beys* and

⁴⁴³ Ibid., 126.

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid., 127.

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid., 222.

bandits. The state could not build hospitals, schools, or collect taxes and so on. As mentioned in “Kurdish Ethnicity in the Borderlands in Turkey”, the so-called main purpose of the state was to integrate these regions with other regions of Anatolia and to carry civilization to the utmost corners of the country. However, the Republic aimed to consolidate its power and to complete the establishment of a nation-state which consisted of only Turks, or people who felt themselves to be Turks. But unlike Toprak’s assumption, the objective of the Republic was not to modernize, civilize and to bring state services to these regions. On the contrary, the different ethnicities living in Turkey were to be assimilated for the survival of the state. Kurds were a great danger to the state at that time because the predominant elements of the territory of Turkey were the only the Turks and the Kurds. This meant that the Republic of Turkey was in a two-way partnership to administrate the country. This was absolutely unacceptable for the state. At the same time, the policies of resettlement, which were conducted until the 1938s, aimed to reduce Kurdish domination in the region and increase Turkish influence.⁴⁴⁶ The motivation behind the policies of these resettlements was, of course, the nationalization of the place / country and the population (Turkification).⁴⁴⁷ As is well known, one of the main goals of Turkish bureaucracy / politics in the last quarter of the 19th century was to make the homeland and the population a national one (Turkification).

Turkish nationalists prioritized state survival over any other goal, so it can be argued that Turkish nationalism developed diversity-phobic and authoritarian-assimilationist values that suppressed the ethnic-linguistic differences in society.⁴⁴⁸ Kurds were being assimilated on the basis of common “Turkishness” and Turkish nation-building constituted a mainstream public-political discourse that completely

⁴⁴⁶ Dilek Kurban, Mesut Yeğen, *Adaletin Kıyısında: ‘Zorunlu’ Göç Sonrasında Devlet ve Kürtler 5233 sayılı Tazminat Yasası’nın bir Değerlendirmesi-Van Örneği*, 2nd ed. (İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 2012), 47.

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid., 44.

⁴⁴⁸ Murat Somer, “Defensive and Liberal Nationalisms: The Kurdish Question and Modernization/Democratization” in *Remaking Turkey: Globalization, Alternative Modernities, and Democracy*, ed. E. Fuat Keyman, (Oxford: Lexington Books, 2007), 108.

left out the Kurdish language and population category.⁴⁴⁹ The state took great pains to prove that Kurds were actually of Turkish origin, but had lost their Turkishness because of the foreign influence.⁴⁵⁰ On the other hand, the Kurdish question was in reality a matter of public order and Kurds were the most prospective new Turks. If the state has not resorted to the option of ethnic destruction, even during the most difficult times in the Kurdish affairs over the course of eighty years, (meaning, if the Kurdish question did not go the way of the Armenian question) this was because of the opinion that Kurds could be assimilated.⁴⁵¹

Although Toprak does not provide us with the full Renda report, after the revolt of Sheikh Said, the Renda report constituted the framework of the Eastern Reform Plan (Şark Islahat Planı) and described the situation in the most clear way. According to this report, the Kurdish population living in the eastern region of the Euphrates numbered more than a million, and the Turkish population in the region amounted to less than one quarter compared to the Kurdish population. The proposed solution in the Renda report was clear: there was no possibility that two nations would have the same power and authority in this region. Therefore, it is necessary to make the Turkish population and influence dominant.⁴⁵²

⁴⁴⁹ Ibid., 109.

⁴⁵⁰ Ibid., 109.

⁴⁵¹ Mesut Yeğen, *Son Kürt İsyanı*, 3rd ed. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2016), 35.

⁴⁵² Kurban, Yeğen, *Adaletin Kıyısında: 'Zorunlu' Göç Sonrasında Devlet ve Kürtler 5233 sayılı Tazminat Yasası'nın bir Değerlendirmesi-Van Örneği*, 46.

CHAPTER 5

THE METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW OF TOPRAK'S STUDIES

In this section, I will examine Toprak's position in terms of his studies on economy, feminism, populism and anthropology. First of all, I will present his theoretical framework in regard to modernization and the Annales School. Then, I will examine Toprak's historical methodology as a whole through concepts such as comparison, causality, cultural history, intellectual history, history of ideas and mentality and his relationship with fact and documents, official historiography, narrative and quantitative methods in history writing.

5.1. HISTORIOGRAPHY

Collingwood states that the Greeks acknowledged not only that history is a science, but also that it has to do with human action. Greek history is not just legend; it is research.⁴⁵³ According to him, history is the science of human action as Greeks saw it. He points out that "what the historian puts before himself is things that men have done in the past, and these belong to a world of change, a world where things come to be and cease to be".⁴⁵⁴ According to Tosh, the term 'history' contains two different meanings. On one hand, it addresses what happened in the past and, on the

⁴⁵³ Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, 17.

⁴⁵⁴ Ibid., 18.

other hand, it refers to the representation of the past in the works of historians.⁴⁵⁵ All people have a sense of history which enables them to reinforce their own beliefs and obtain a sense of identity. Moreover, for Carr, "there is a mutual interaction process between the historian and his case; an endless dialogue between today and the past".⁴⁵⁶ Braudel perceives history as a complex science; in Braudel's point of view there is not a single history or a single method. That is, as there are histories, curiosities and opinions today, and there will be different curiosities, perspectives tomorrow.⁴⁵⁷ Moreover, history is not simply the telling of stories: it is the telling of well-justified stories in an intersubjective, disciplinary space.⁴⁵⁸

One of the most important points that Collingwood puts forward in *The Idea of History* was that "historians have made a study linked to the present time rather than the past". At the same time, a historian is actually a part of the historical process they have studied. If the historian knows his/her own history, they know themselves, too. That is why it is necessary for historians to understand that they are both a "participant" and an "observer" in historical work. Historical "data" and "interpretation principles" are the two basic elements of all historical thinking and can only exist together. Further, Collingwood asserts that "Man, who desires to know everything, desires to know himself" and "self-knowledge is desirable and important to Man, not only for its own sake, but as a condition without which no other knowledge can be critically justified and securely based".⁴⁵⁹ For him, history is not a story or a narration of successive events, nor it an account of change.⁴⁶⁰

⁴⁵⁵ John Tosh and Seán Lang, *The Pursuit of History*, Fourth Edition, (Edinburgh: Pearson Longman, 2006), XXVI.

⁴⁵⁶ Carr, *what is History?* 30.

⁴⁵⁷ Salih Özbaran, "Tarihçilik Üzerine Bazı Çağdaş Görüşler," *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 32 (1979): 594.

⁴⁵⁸ Allan Megill, "Epilogue: On the Current and the Future State of Historical Writing", in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing* 5, eds. Axel Schneider, Daniel Woolf, (2011): 682.

⁴⁵⁹ Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, 205.

⁴⁶⁰ Ibid., 216.

The understanding that has dominated the historiography until now was to describe events in a sequential manner and to draw specific lessons from these events. In medieval and early societies, history was understood as the story of what rulers and statesmen did. Historians have looked at history in the sense of states and administrators and tried to guide statesmen with their writings. Later on, in the period when national states were established, historians made comments that advocated for the existence and integrity of their nation-states by looking at events in history. Although such trends continue today, the general approach towards history is that the cause and effect relationships between events are sought out, and historical studies now explain developments and changes within a cause-effect framework. Historians in the present time are no longer looking for "what happened", but "why it happened".⁴⁶¹ An important goal of those who are trying to understand the causes of past events is to understand cause and effect relationships in today's societies, and to understand the direction of development and imagine solutions for today's societal issues. With the influence of these trends, history is increasingly becoming a social science.⁴⁶² Marc Bloch, as an Annales scholar, says that history is the science of change before anything else. In the same direction, according to E. H. Carr, history is the examination of causes and effects.⁴⁶³

For instance, if one decides to examine a historical event, first of all, s/he should ask how this event come into existence and what its social and economic stages are. In order to find the answer to such questions, it is necessary to use the methods and the analysis tools of various social sciences. Pamuk states that, in addition to the change of understanding that have dominated historiography over the last century, the subjects that historians were interested in have also changed. The topics for study have shifted from political and religious events to social and economic developments. In the contemporary historiography, the history of the masses draws

⁴⁶¹ Şevket Pamuk, *Osmanlı-Türkiye İktisadî Tarihi 1500-1914*, 11.

⁴⁶² Ibid., 12.

⁴⁶³ Ibid., 12.

considerable interest, rather than the stories of statesmen or rulers. Along with this trend, the areas of interest of historians are becoming increasingly enriched. Historians are now dealing with the slowly changing material catalysts for change in long-running economic and social developments. Thus, besides economic and social history, new fields such as the history of agriculture, and history of technology, history of childhood, and so on, are emerging. The social institutions, thought and cultural trends that rise alongside this material focus are starting to create different research topics. Historians have adopted not only political science, economics or political economics, but also new methods of social sciences such as sociology, demography, anthropology, psychology, and they implement new tools for analysis. Importantly, a historian should be careful when interpreting a historical document because those who prepared these documents centuries ago had a certain place in society and they looked at events from their own perspective, or perhaps even documented them to protect their own interests. If the historian does not take a critical attitude towards these documents and those who prepare them, s/he will only be in a position to write and interpret from the point of view of those who prepared them, or from the point of view of a particular, limited segment or class in history. It is not possible to write history only from the observations and facts found in archival documents. Reconstructing historical events in cause-effect relationships can only be possible through a broader theoretical approach, i.e. from the viewpoint of a theory.⁴⁶⁴ History always requires a general theory in order to be able to interpret the events of the past. Without an advanced theory in place before entering archives, it is not possible to interpret the facts in those piles of documents. Fernand Braudel summarizes this necessity by saying; "[i]f there is no theory, there is no history."⁴⁶⁵ At the same time, he warns historians to approach the material according to the theory, but not to take theories as explanations for every place and every society.⁴⁶⁶ Similarly, Koselleck says that "theory, by its explicit formulation

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid., 13.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid., 14.

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid., 14.

as hypothetical, delimits, but in so doing secures the claim to warrant: “excluding certain questions under certain theoretical premises makes it possible to find answers that would otherwise not have come up”.⁴⁶⁷

5.1.1. Toprak’s Studies on Economic History

In the former parts, Toprak’s works were summarized in detail and the arguments he had put forth in fields such as Ottoman economic, labor, feminist and history of populism were discussed. In doing so, I tried to give a general sketch of his works and arguments. In this section, I will investigate his studies on economic and social history in terms of his methodological approach. First of all, I will look at economic history and then I will move on to Toprak’s social history writing.

Economic history is very different from other branches of the social sciences in terms of subject matter and approach. It is primarily concerned with the material basis of human presence, i.e. how individuals make a living, how sustenance is delivered, and how various social orders, lifestyles, and organizations are circulated⁴⁶⁸. Therefore, the best economic history is not only connected to economic life, but also political, social and cultural life. Donald Coleman stresses two aspects that distinguish economic history from both history and economics. Firstly, economic history identifies and measures forces normally outside the control of single individual actors. Secondly, he emphasizes the common knowledge that economic phenomena are not independent of the social, political, religious and physical environments where they emerge.⁴⁶⁹ As a result, economic historians should keep in mind that an interdisciplinary approach is a necessity. Priorities in history have not focused on military, political phenomena for some

⁴⁶⁷ John Zammito, “Koselleck’s Philosophy of Historical Time(s),” *History and Theory*, no. 43 (2004): 131.

⁴⁶⁸ Pat Hudson, “Economic History,” in *Writing History Theory & Practice*, eds. Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore, (London: Arnold, 2003), 223.

⁴⁶⁹ Hudson, “Economic History,” 224.

time. Historians have turned to cultural history, and to the use of literary and dramatic metaphors and methods of analysis, instead of using the mechanical or causative reasoning that economic historians and economists used to employ.⁴⁷⁰ For Menger, economics was no longer concerned with the study of economic system and processes, but it was a discipline which focused on the economizing aspects of human behavior.⁴⁷¹

As noted previously, economic history is at the forefront of Toprak's interest in his historical studies. The book "*Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918*" (National Economy in Turkey 1908-1918) is a product of his doctoral study. The book was designed as a response to the debates on Ottoman economic history during the period. It has been conceptualized from a totally different perspective compared to the studies of feudalism, dependency and imperialism. Other than "National Economy", the books *İttihat-Terakki ve Cihan Harbi – Savaş Ekonomisi ve Türkiye'de Devletçilik 1914-1918* (The Committee of Union and Progress and World War-Economy and Etatism 1914-1918), *Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum (1908-1950)* *Milli Burjuvazi, Milli İktisat*, (Economy and Society in Turkey (1908-1950) National Bourgeoisie, National Economy), and *Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum (1908-1950)* *İttihat-Terakki ve Devletçilik*, (Economy and Society in Turkey (1908-1950) the Committee of Union and Progress and Etatism) all examine the economic history of the late Ottoman Empire and the early Republican period. Moreover, there are numerous articles, some of which were anthologized in his books about economic history of Turkey. The book "*Türkiye'de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*" (Worker Class in Turkey 1908-1946) consists of his articles on labor history in which he examines the worker's strikes after the 1908 Revolution, as well as trade unions, and legal rights on the labor.

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid., 224.

⁴⁷¹ Geoffrey M. Hodgson, *How Economics Forgot History*, (London: New York: Routledge, 2001), 93.

Toprak does not simply take an economy-centered approach in these studies. On the contrary, he examines this period through a multifaceted method, from the ideological and intellectual dimension of the bureaucrats to institutional structures. For the ideological and intellectual dimensions, he investigates the industrial and economic journals of the period, as well as political economy and discourses on economic policies. He further looks at the subjects such as financial structure, banking, economic and credit institutions, trade chambers, stock exchange, foreign trade chambers, foreign exchange, agricultural and structural developments and policies, capital and accumulation, price and speculations, inflation change, supply and demand equilibrium, as well as the effects of globalization on the Ottoman economy. He pursues the development of areas such as consumption patterns, inflation, labor and capital relations and advertising, and by doing so, he tries to explain the development of the economy up until its incorporation into the world capitalist system. His economic explanations fall into the concept of classical modernity in terms of his progressivist and modernist approaches.

5.1.2. Toprak's Studies on Social History

In the 1890s, Frederick Jackson Turner initiated an attack on the traditional history method. He claimed that all aspects of Man's activities should be considered in the context of history writing, and every corner of social life must be included when examining a society, structure and phenomenon. It was not just Turner who defended this idea in this period. James Harvey Robinson was another defender who advocated a concept of history in which anthropology, economics, psychology and sociology should be included. Like Turner and Robinson, Febvre and Bloch were opposed to the domination of political history. They tried to replace political history with what they called a "wider and more human history". That is, they aimed to create a concept of history which would encompass all human activities and which were less concerned with the chronological narrative of events. Instead, this new history concept would be more related to the analysis of "structures". History of childhood, history of food, history of the body, history of housing and history of

language became parts of a holistic accounts of past societies.⁴⁷² With Hobsbawm, who provided a departure from “social history to history of society”, social history has broadened historians’ approach to the past immensely. In the 1970s, this new perspective enabled the democratization of history.⁴⁷³ “Social historians studied human collectivities and movements in the past as well as social structures and changes”.⁴⁷⁴ They examined demographic, economic and social processes, and mentalities, cultures, everyday life, family associations and other social groups in a society became the new objects of historical research. However, the relationship between structure and agency still creates a duality;⁴⁷⁵ the problem of the relationship between structure and society, or the individual and their action, is a controversial issue which lies at center of the social theory.

In the context of social history, Toprak has several books and many articles outside of his economic studies. *Türkiye’de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm (1908-1935)* (Women's Freedom and Feminism in Turkey (1908-1935)), *Türkiye’de Popülizm (1908-1923)* (Populism in Turkey (1908-1923)), *Darwin’den Dersim’e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji* (Republic and Anthropology from Darwin to Dersim) were studies in which Toprak analyses social structures of the late Ottoman Empire and early Republican Turkey. As reviewed in the previous section of this study, Toprak tries to examine Turkish history by embracing all development in order to grasp society and reach a tenable conclusion. In parallel with economic developments, Toprak examines what kinds of changes and transformations society has experienced, and he analyses the effects of economic developments upon society. As a result of the modernization of the economy, society also underwent changes and he emphasizes

⁴⁷² Peter Burke, *History and Social Theory*, 2nd edition, (Ithaca & New York: Cornell University Press, 1992), 14-17.

⁴⁷³ Thomas Welskopp, “Social History” in *Writing History Theory & Practice*, eds. Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore, (London: Arnold, 2003), 203.

⁴⁷⁴ Ibid., 205.

⁴⁷⁵ Ibid., 208.

that there was a transformation in every aspect of society that went along with changes in economic infrastructure.

5.1.3. Toprak's Attack on Official Historiography

Toprak takes a very clear attitude against official historiography and he firmly criticizes the official historiography of the early Republican period. He emphasizes that contemporary historiography must refrain from official history writing and that a more objective historiography should be adopted. He states that history as “knowledge” is over-functionalized by power groups or governments. Republican Turkey, like every country, undoubtedly has a dominant historical consciousness which emphasizes nationhood. The metamorphosis of the early Republican period led the intellectuals of the period to seek new historical expansions. However, while Toprak stands against official history writing, he claims that it had a functional task in this period. To establish nation-state and to strengthen the new-born structure, an official historiography was needed, as most newly established nation-states also determined. Furthermore, although he is a supporter of the Republic, he claims that he absolutely opposes the state-centered historiography of the Republican period. In his book “National Economy”, and in other related research, he claims that the enlightenment and the modernization of Turkey depended upon the Tanzimat period, rather than Republican Turkey. This, in spite of the fact that social scientists and historians of the Republican period mark the beginning of the transformation and modernization of Turkey as May 19th, 1919. He criticizes their approach and thinks that their opinion on the matter it is not objective knowledge. However, he looks at this period from a functional viewpoint and emphasizes that it was necessary to ensure social cohesion and integrity. He states that the opposite view will certainly be the wrong perspective and says that it is impossible to look at history only through the lens of today's concepts and concerns. Although he explicitly criticizes the “past” functionalist approaches to history and official history writing, he implicitly defends the early Republican policies by emphasizing that they were *necessary* to establish a nation-state.

According to Toprak, the “social Darwinist” understanding of history in the 1930s became dominant in Turkish historiography as it was dictated by the needs of nation-state building. A romantic past is a necessary step to acquire assets for a nation.⁴⁷⁶ However, besides its functionalist aspect, when history was made official, it acquired, so to speak, a “scholastic” dimension. At this point, ideology takes the place of knowledge. Ideology is a tool used to create identities. In Turkish history, “official history” has been known for many years as the version of history which protected the Republic. The goal was to guarantee the future of the Republican regime. Republican historiography contained a feature that broke its connection with the past i.e. before the National Struggle War and many of its tools were intended to legitimize the current regime.⁴⁷⁷ He states that a contemporary, and rational, structuralist historiography approach in which national identities are supplanted and common values are emphasized should be adopted in historical studies of Turkey.⁴⁷⁸ At this point, it is important to examine whether or not Toprak overcomes national identities, and whether or not he emphasizes common values. When we look at his study on anthropology and his comments on the Kurdish question, it appears that he does not embrace this approach completely.

5.1.4. Modernization Approach in Toprak’s Studies

There are two distinct ways of using economic theory in history. The first includes taking the economy as the essential element within an overall explanation of history. It contains an acceptance that the nature of the economy has a major role in conditioning all aspects of society, culture and politics. There are various forms in the Marxian approach to history espousing this position, as some modernization theorists do. The Marxian approach to the social, cultural, legal, or other aspects of life in the past, investigates the nature of subjects and the change of subjects over

⁴⁷⁶ Zafer Toprak, “Türkiye’de Tarih Yazımının Evrimi ve Yarının Tarihi,” *TÜBA Günce*, no. 37 (2007): 28.

⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 29.

time to find the true nature of the economy and shifts in the economic base of society. Marxist historians take economic structure as a major variable in analyzing society and culture, both past and present. Another approach, which is not in metanarrative very different from the first, is to use a variety of economic theories and various concepts and explanatory apparatuses which are drawn from economic theories. Historians of this position use many different methods of economic theory and concepts from economic sociology, plus economic and social anthropology and economics. Some use the principles of economics, especially supply and demand theory, taking into consideration the impact of food shortages or population expansion if the various evidence is lacking.⁴⁷⁹

Modernization theory, which implies that social changes can be explained by the biological evolution of individual organisms, has dominated Western thinking surrounding social change. That is to say, the idea of progress and social evolution constituted the core concept of modernization in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Evolutionary theory and twentieth century functionalism have been most influential in the formation of modernization theory.⁴⁸⁰

Huntington classifies modernization as a multifaceted process containing the changes in all areas of human thought and activity.⁴⁸¹ Modernization is also conceptualized with industrialization, economic growth, rationalization, structural differentiation, political development, social mobilization and secularization. Every component of the modernization process is seen as a representation of change at the

⁴⁷⁹ Hudson, "Economic History," 225.

⁴⁸⁰ Evidences of their effects may be traced in many specifications of modernization theory. To Tipps, these are; "the frequent use of dichotomous type constructions and concepts such as 'social differentiation' and 'social system'; an emphasis upon the ability to adapt to gradual, continual change as the normal condition of stability; the attribution of causal priority to immanent sources of change; and the analysis of social change as a directional process". Dean C. Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15, no. 2 (1973): 201.

⁴⁸¹ Dean C. Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15, no. 2 (1973): 201.

national level.⁴⁸² Moreover, modernization theories are closely linked to the theories of transformation of national state. Although there are multiple approaches behind modernization theories, the point they have in common is that modernization is related to change. Accordingly, modernization is a sort of social change which is not only transformational but also progressive in its impact.⁴⁸³ In this respect, it can be more convenient to analyze Toprak's studies as part of modernization theory and Enlightenment.

Toprak identifies the Tanzimat period as a transition from provisionalism to economic process and, as emphasized previously, he sees the Tanzimat period as an "enlightenment" process. This period is now considered the beginning of Turkey's march towards modernization. He claims that by the Young Turk Era (1908-1918), Ottoman finances and "economy were modern in every sense."⁴⁸⁴

He also asserts that banking institutions in its modern sense and modern credit institutions and policies were created during the administration of the Young Turks. National banks were opened during this time and capital accumulation began in this period, too. The Young Turks' attempt to generate national capital caused the liquidation of the non-Muslim element in the banking system, and capital accumulation and Turkish-Muslim element gained control in these fields. As a result, there was not only an attempt to establish a modern economic system, but also to create national capital by transferring Muslim participants into the economy, primarily by removing non-Muslims from economic activities⁴⁸⁵. Although most of the companies operating in Ottoman lands belonged to foreign capital until the

⁴⁸² Ibid., 202.

⁴⁸³ Ibid., 202. On the other hand, for some, the term of modernization identifies a special and open-ended sort of social change and they define modernization with regards to the expansion of man's rational control over nature and its physical environment.

⁴⁸⁴ Toprak, "Proto-Globalization and Economic Change in the Late Ottoman Empire: A Commentary," 133. Also see p. 38 of this study.

⁴⁸⁵ See also p. 63.

Second Constitution, after that time, joint-stock companies, industrial companies like railway, mining, and so on, were founded.⁴⁸⁶

With these rapid increase in investments, the improvements in transportation, the increase of capital in business, the growth of cities, the increase in the number of modern enterprises in the economy and the expansion of production for the market, all increased the needs for money and credit; thus investments in the banking sector became more attractive.⁴⁸⁷ The last century of the Ottoman State had been the scene of significant transformations and the basis of a modern state was laid in this century. Attempts at economic development were also actualized in this period.

The Ottoman economy at this time changed shape fundamentally; it was transformed into a different structure and stripped of its traditional framework, both in a social and a financial sense. In addition to municipal services, a series of contemporary institutions emerged during this period.⁴⁸⁸ Thanks to Tanzimat, the Ottoman economy had been monetized, internal and foreign trade had expanded and the road to economic development had opened; thence, the Ottoman economy integrated with the world economy. Closed, stable, provisionist economic structures had dissolved and a dynamic, growing, and evolving economic structure flourished. With the advent of Tanzimat, there were radical transformations in the Ottoman currency, as well as its economy and banking system.⁴⁸⁹

In conclusion, the modernization and monetization of the Ottoman economy started in 1838 and it has been an ongoing process ever since. Thus, we can infer that the economic history of Turkey is a progressive structure for Toprak.⁴⁹⁰ The

⁴⁸⁶ See also p. 54.

⁴⁸⁷ Zafer Toprak, "Cumhuriyet ve Bankacılık," *Toplumsal Tarih* 14, no. 80 (2000): 26-31.

⁴⁸⁸ Zafer Toprak, "Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyete Sermaye Birikimi ve Kredi Kurumlarının Evrimi 1850-1950," *Activity – special addition of journal of Active*, (November- December 2001): 2-5.

⁴⁸⁹ Toprak, "Osmanlı Bankası ve Tarihten İzler," 18.

⁴⁹⁰ For Kant, the essence of man is reason so history is the progress of the reason in the course of history. So to speak, history is a progress towards rationality, at the same time it is progress in

development of the Turkish economy has been continuing since 1838, with occasional interruptions, which means continuity is as important as change in historical studies.

Toprak's approach to the Tanzimat period as a modernization process is not limited to economic cases. Toprak does not see the Tanzimat period as a modernization process only in economic terms. He looks at the structures of this period as a whole and argues that the modernization of the economy was influential in many areas, including workers' rights and worker consciousness. Before the 1908 Revolution, the workers moved from farms to factories, and from time to time, they made an attempt to strike to express their demands. But according to Toprak, all of these were far from being mass movements. However, it was the achievement of the 1908 Revolution when workers' actions became mass movements that general strikes could be said to occur, according to the terms of the day.⁴⁹¹

The mass movements triggered by the 1908 revolution were concrete proof of that the Ottoman Empire had been transformed.⁴⁹² Naturally, the process of consciousness had begun at the time when employees were increasingly purified from the process of "alienation", and when the working people were actively concerned about their own future.⁴⁹³ In other words, the 1908 Revolution was the period in which the class consciousness of the workers became evident. At this very moment, Toprak claims that the modern concept of "worker" entered the literature.

rationality. "Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, 97.", "Consequently the purpose of nature for the development of man's reason is a purpose that can be fully realized only in the history of the human race and not in an individual life". "Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, 97."

⁴⁹¹ See the chapter, Labor studies.

⁴⁹² Toprak, *Türkiye'de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 7.

⁴⁹³ Ibid., 8.

A section of a society consisting of reaya, proletariat, civil servant, tradesman, and so on were described as worker in modern sense after the 1908 Revolution.⁴⁹⁴

Toprak also addresses trade union organizations in his labor studies. The trade unions came to the agenda for the first time in 1908, after which time strikes were seen in almost all industries because of the in the free environment provided by "İlan-i Hürriyet" (Declaration of Freedom).⁴⁹⁵ As he emphasizes in all his works, Toprak looks at worker-laborer consciousness, movements and strikes within a modernization paradigm. That is, he focuses on the effects of modernization on the worker's consciousness and strikes as a whole, without reference to individual and cultural codes.⁴⁹⁶ However, although he mentions the changing workers' consciousness and mentality, he did not conduct any study which touched upon the mentality of the workers in a direct way. He takes his conclusions only from the workers' movements, through which they made wage demands and fought for better working conditions. For Toprak, in order to prove that workers' consciousness has changed, the workers themselves need to be examined.

Thompson says that just as economic determination is important to society in to drive consciousness and daily life, so are cultural codes and lifestyles essential elements to consider. Thompson asserts that class is not just a product of economic relations, but also a cultural construct and dynamic.⁴⁹⁷ Moreover, he emphasis that class consciousness comes both from the class' own cultural traditions, and the industrial traditions which they experience, so it cannot, therefore, be said to exist spontaneously. Thompson claims that "men are both the authors and actors of their own drama". He argues that "the working class did not rise like the sun at an appointed time. It was presented at its own making. The working class made itself

⁴⁹⁴ Ibid., 8.

⁴⁹⁵ Ibid., 252.

⁴⁹⁶ See also chapter "Labor studies".

⁴⁹⁷ E. P. Thompson, "The Peculiarities of the English," in *The Socialist Register*, 1965, re-edited in *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays*, (London: Merlin Press, 1978), 295.

as much as it was made”.⁴⁹⁸ According to Thompson, there is no one who depends solely on others. There is no a moral ideology belonging to a superstructure. He was interested in culture, social values, jurisprudence and moral preferences in society when he defined social classes and their structures.

However, Toprak presents to us the transformation of society and class as though individuals did not have free will, and when their structures started to change, these transformations quickly shaped the society. Indeed, the underlying reason for all of the strikes was that modernity had penetrated every area of Ottoman society, from everyday life to industrial production. And as a consequence, it led to the enlightenment of the working class and the formation of Western-like demands. Modern life had begun to penetrate every field from consumption patterns to advertising, from everyday life to the tourism sector, and from the formation of public space to the development of worker consciousness. With modernity, workers now knew their rights and were vocally opposed to exploitation of labor.⁴⁹⁹

The transition into industrial production also had a social dimension in society. For instance, the railway, for Toprak, symbolized modernity for the Ottoman Empire. First of all, the railway dissolved the traditional and social textures and created a passion for secularism. The railway represented contemporary values in many ways. Moreover, industrialization dissolved the traditional perception of time in society. People started to regulate their lives according to railway schedules rather than *ezani* time.⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁸ Wade Matthews, *The New Left, National Identity and The Break-up of Britan*, (Leiden: Boston: Brill, 2013), 20.

⁴⁹⁹ Meeting one’s own needs and being able to dominate the environment in order to realize its own aims are the most fundamental characteristics determining the relation of the modern man to nature. In order for this sovereignty to be established, a rational balance between goals and means is required. The element to be expressed by the search for rational balance is, in its essence, is based on the assumption that man is an unlimited "consumer", while scarcity of resources to meet the demands of unlimited consumption. See Köker, *Modernleşme, Kemalizm ve Demokrasi*, 41.

⁵⁰⁰ Toprak, *Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 78.

Toprak takes on populism in Turkey with the same modernist approach. According to him, the Second Constitutional Era was, on the whole, a time of “enlightenment”. Important advances in social sciences were also realized in this period; for example, sociology and economics began to take shape in these years. Economic consciousness underwent radical transformations at this time, too. Toprak points to how the Ottoman economy was failing and how many articles were written, both theoretical and practical, to find a solution to this problem.⁵⁰¹ Concepts such as solidarism, liberalism and collectivism began to be argued in this period.⁵⁰²

The emergence of populism was also related to the modernization of Turkey. The development of publishing houses, and the development of sociology by Turkish academics, following the dramatic events in Europe and Russia spread populist thoughts within Turkey. Society was supposed to be in unity to establish a nation-state, and populism would allow the whole of society to coexist and provide the division of labor through solidarism. To ‘go toward the people’ was a prerequisite for establishing a nation state, and populism was therefore, again, a result of modernization.⁵⁰³

The clearest examples of the concept of classical modernization in Toprak’s writing are his studies on feminism in Turkey. Toprak states that the stage in which women's studies in Turkey intensified is the period of “1908-1935”.⁵⁰⁴ He claims that women did not have a distinct identity outside of the “family” until the 1908 Young Turks Revolution, a period when all the basic transformations on the national agenda such as freedom, equality, nation building, and secularism focused on women in some way. For him, through the constitutional discourse, woman became the subject. She perceived her body and gained her own identity in society

⁵⁰¹ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 89. See also page 71

⁵⁰² Toprak, “Fikir Dergiliğinin Yüz Yılı,” 22. See also page 71

⁵⁰³ See also chapter “Populism”.

⁵⁰⁴Toprak, “Türkiye’de Siyaset ve Kadın: Kadınlar Halk Fırkası’ndan Arsiulusal Kadınlar Birliği Kongresi’ne (1923-1935),” 5.

during those years. Women began to receive equal status with men, and many rights were granted to women during this period.⁵⁰⁵

As indicated in the preceding chapters, Toprak generally looks at the Tanzimat period as an enlightenment and modernization period. In almost all his studies, he stresses the rationalization and modernization of the Ottoman Empire, from its economy to social life. Toprak emphasizes that the main reason for the use of the class concept in his book *“Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946”* is the belief in the philosophy of the Enlightenment and his desire to bring to the fore the role that modernity plays in the construction of contemporary Turkey.⁵⁰⁶ He also states that he used the concept of “class” in this book as a reaction to Post-modernity.⁵⁰⁷

5.1.5. The Influence of Annales School On Toprak’s Studies

As in other social sciences, historical science in the twentieth century made great progress when compared with work in the previous century. This is a type of natural progression in the field of historical science, as seen in other sciences (each knowledge is built on its own prior knowledge). Science generally advances and enriches by putting a forth new theory that can be applied to a wider field, in the place of an outdated one. Therefore, in the historiography in the twentieth century, social, cultural and economic as well as the political fields became popular, and the field of study and specialization in history expanded. The historiography of the Annales School made a great improvement to works of the past. The Annales School consisted of groups of French historians working in the late twentieth century. These historians developed a different style of historiography and emphasized long term social history. The group took its name from the magazine “Annales d'Histoire Sociale et Economique”. The most influential members of this

⁵⁰⁵ See also chapter “Feminism”.

⁵⁰⁶ Toprak, *Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 11.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid., 12. See also page 69.

group included Lucien Febvre, Marc Bloch⁵⁰⁸, Fernand Braudel⁵⁰⁹, Georges Duby, Jacques Le Goff and Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie.

⁵⁰⁸ Bloch's work was to "tell us what happened and to explain the reason behind it. He, as a historian, was interested in understanding the medieval European society as a meaningful society and in finding the boundaries of time and space where relatively durable, regular patterns of economic, social, political and cultural life were valid. In Bloch's view, the task of the theories was to help historians to seek only better evidence in the past, See Theda Skocpol, "Sosyolojinin Tarihsel İmgelemi," in *Tarihsel Sosyoloji Bloch'tan Wallerstein'e Görüşler ve Yöntemler*, ed. Theda Skocpol, trans. Ahmet Fethi, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999): 21.

The growth of historical work in sociology has greatly increased the reputation of the Annalists. According to Chirot, Bloch's twenty-year unprecedented scientific work and publications consolidated the Annales' intellectual foundation and reputation. In his study called "French Rural History" published in 1931, he founded the basis of a modern comparative rural history study all over the world. Both the substantive results and the ways to reach these results, and both the maps of the recent times to complete the old documents and the existing landforms provided a model for the viewers. There were two types of useful historical periods for Bloch; generations and civilizations. "Civilization" pointed to the psychological and structural components of the society that changed very slowly. Bloch has listed the types of evidence appropriate for the historical analysis in Feudal Society. That is, every aspect of social life was included in the list. Official documents, place names, field forms, customs, collective psychological attitudes (if they can be estimated), money, trade records and architectural styles were used. At the same time, the evidences of the modern period were as important as the evidence of the period that he was studying for the results he obtained. In "French Rural History", Bloch completely abandoned the concept of linear history and instead, he wrote by moving away from present to past or past to present. See Daniel Chirot, "Marc Bloch'un Toplumsal ve Tarihsel Manzarası", in *Tarihsel Sosyoloji Bloch'tan Wallerstein'e Görüşler ve Yöntemler*, ed. Theda Skocpol, trans. Ahmet Fethi, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999): 25-34.

⁵⁰⁹ Braudel's Mediterranean book in which Braudel differentiates three distinct time exactly improved the idea of this new kind of historiography, each of them has its own speed. The most stable time was geographic time (*longue duree*), the other time, which was slower than geographic time, was the time of social and economic structure (*conjunctures*) and lastly, the fast time was the time of political events (*evenements*). Iggers points out that "*Annales* historians increasingly want to be scientists. They often call their institutes "laboratories" and speak of history as a science, a social science to be sure, but nevertheless one that, as they repeat, must work quantitatively if it is to be scientific". These historians paid attention heavily on quantification, and statistical data. They were focusing on demographic and numerical studies. At the same time, they examined by covering an entire area and from this point, they went to the generalities. The narrative has been completely abandoned and the description has begun to be used. On the other hand, their focus on culture and symbol to make modern political traditions understandable was another distinctive approach of Annales scholars. The effect of Annales school has spread all around the world. Although they were not Marxist, most of the socialists noticed increasingly that the Annales presented much better access to analyze the material culture and to the everyday life of common people than Marxism which was based on just the economic structure. See Georg G. Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*, (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1997), 57-64

The Annales writers saw all of social science as a holistic entity. They changed the concepts of what constitutes and who makes history⁵¹⁰ and they recommended to social scientists a very different interpretation of historical time. Before the Annales school, most historians, from Ranke to Marx and Weber, had approached history in the sense of movements across one directional time, from past to future. However, these historians completely changed this conception by emphasizing the relativity of time. They claimed that they presented new methods and approaches to historical research and, indeed, they have played a significant role in changing the attitudes of historical research on state, art, economy, religion, law and literature.⁵¹¹ All of these categories lost their unique privileges and were seen as part a whole structure. Culture was no longer considered something belonging only to the upper class, rather it included the experiences and the lifestyles of every segment of society. Historians of this period now included other sciences in their historical research, such as geography, anthropology, sociology, political science and psychology. Febvre and Bloch paid particular attention to the feelings and experiences embedded in collective mentalities. For Annales historians, history constituted the core of the social sciences which dealt with Man and his acts. They removed all boundaries among the sciences and claimed that they could only understand the actions of Man in this way.⁵¹²

Bloch studied feudalism anthropologically as a complex of interpersonal relations. In this style of history writing, nothing was held up as superior, i.e. all elements in the society have equal effect. On the other hand, these historians abandoned nearly every aspect of the linear approach that was the main feature of historical thought since the period which Reinhart Koselleck has described as the transition between

⁵¹⁰ Georg G. Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*, (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1997), 52.

⁵¹¹ Ibid., 52.

⁵¹² Ibid., 54.

the 1750 and 1850, from the pre-modern to the modern time.⁵¹³ Annales historians see a plurality of coexisting times, both among different civilizations and within each civilization.

Although Toprak does not claim that he follows the Annales tradition in his history writing, he makes many references to it in order to demonstrate his views on history writing. He says that, after World War II, the Annales School, gained a prestigious position in Turkey, particularly from Barkan's studies.⁵¹⁴ It also enabled the development of history writing in Turkey.

Braudel's Mediterranean has become an example of a total "histoire globale". The geography, society and politics that had the inclusive quality of structures and events constituted the primary history of the twentieth century.⁵¹⁵ Structures behind day-to-day events, in other words, a "structuralist" approach, were seen as a gap that must be addressed in our historiography. This structural expansion enlivened the field and history was taken beyond the traditional historiography (vak'anüvis) practices. History was integrated with other disciplines; turned into a method.⁵¹⁶ In other words, a total "new history" understanding provided an open repository for all knowledge. It overlaps with all kinds of information and, importantly, it integrates this information. It provides an input to all sciences and evaluates their data.⁵¹⁷ In short, Toprak calls the comprehensive history of the Annales School a "new history", and says that this new understanding of history is a milestone in Turkish historiography.

⁵¹³ Ibid., 57.

⁵¹⁴ Zafer Toprak, 2012, "Türkiye'de Çağdaş Tarihçilik ve Eric Hobsbawm Faktörü", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 227 (November 2012): 41.

⁵¹⁵ Zafer Toprak, 'Yeni Tarih' Anlayışı ve İlhan Tekeli-Selim İlkin İkilişi," in *İlhan Tekeli İçin Armağan Yazılar*, editörler: Selim İlkin, Orhan Silier, Murat Güvenç, İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yayını (2004): 78.

⁵¹⁶ Ibid., 79.

⁵¹⁷ Ibid., 80.

In a sense, Toprak follows the Annales School in terms of looking at history as a whole not just at a particular event or phenomena, and not from a single angle. Toprak is interested in social, economic, political and intellectual history, but he has not made any contribution to the geographic, or psychological aspects of events, or phenomena in history up until now.

Toprak maintains the classical approach of historical writing with regards to what constitutes and who makes history. He looks only at structures and examines their short-term transformations. Although he does not explicitly imply that great men make history, the influence of more common people on the formation of history is not evident in his writing. Toprak further approaches economic history of the late Ottoman Empire and Republican period through unity and continuation rather than ruptures. He says that the development of the Turkish economy has been continuing since 1838, with occasional interruptions, which means continuity is as important as change in historical studies for Toprak.⁵¹⁸ In this regard, it can be claimed that he stand close to the Annales School too.

According to Toprak, historiography in Turkey has always blamed the past to legitimize the Republic, and change has always been emphasized instead of continuity. However, after consolidating the gains of the new social order, looking at the past in a more tolerant way and looking for continuity as well as change in the development of societies constitutes one of the main aspects of historical studies. In other words, he contends that we should shift our interest from “state” to “society” in order to understand history and to arrive at more realistic solutions.⁵¹⁹

It is clear that Toprak focuses on structural changes rather than daily life to understand the shifts from old constructions to new ones. In these emergent structures, he examines the effects of the state, bureaucrats, and internal and

⁵¹⁸ See also p. 67.

⁵¹⁹ Toprak, “Osmanlı Bankası ve Tarihten İzler,” 15.

external dynamics upon this reconstruction. As we can unambiguously see from his studies in the field of economics, many reforms in the late Ottoman and early Republican period were made from the top to down. The nationalization of the economy, the increase in trade, the modernization and secularization of education, the emergence of public life and sphere, plus the individual becoming subjects have all taken place through state efforts and reforms. If we take a Marxist explanation, even if the infrastructure was put in place by the state, it would later transform the superstructure. Although Toprak approaches history with a structuralist view, he cannot be called a Marxist historian except his uses of class concept. Yet, the effect of the Marxist tradition cannot be denied in the Turkish historiography and in his structuralist view. Moreover, the structuralist approach of the Annales stream is undoubtedly dominant on his history writing, although he does not explicitly claim this. He believes that it is necessary to examine all social, cultural, political and economic spheres and to address them as a whole in order to put forward a meaningful historical study. Although the effects of Annales and Marxist historiography seem to be found in the writings of the Toprak, his explanations on economy and society fall show more of the concept of classical modernity in terms of his progressivist and modernist approaches, rather than a full grasp of Annales School.

While the effects of the Annales School approach can be seen on his historical studies, he contradicts with the Annales School in terms of his attitude of enlightenment and progress. He, instead, takes the structuralist and total history views from this movement and deals with the rest in a completely modernist way in his history writing.

“With the abandonment of the concept of linear time in the Annales School, the confidence in progress and with it the faith in the superiority of Western culture also break down”.⁵²⁰ However, in almost his all texts, Toprak uses the concepts of

⁵²⁰ Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*, 58.

enlightenment and progress in a positive sense. Toprak claims in all his studies that every field, from economics to social life, began to modernize and progress with the Tanzimat. The Tanzimat period is considered as the beginning of modern life and this progress was reaching an apex during the Republican period. Everything is seen as progress, including the Western style development of industrialism to the development of women's rights, workers' consciousness, and everyday life and science. This period was the renaissance of the Turkish rationalization in the direction of Enlightenment.

In discussing this type of progress, Hegel saw history as stages and processes of human reason. All of history, from an individual's decisions and ideas, to larger movements and events were seen as a part of this process.⁵²¹ Toprak's approach to the history of the Tanzimat in the early Republican period, and also to the present day, emphasizes continuity since for Toprak, the economic policies, society, and structures of the Tanzimat era were as a transition from classical Ottoman economic structure to the modern economy.

Furthermore, the story with a focal plot in which people have their place as free agents was removed in Annales School.⁵²² That is, socioeconomic circumstances affect individuals, just as individuals affect socio-economic circumstances.⁵²³ Like Annales School, for Schmoller, individuals and structures are mutually constitutive of each other.⁵²⁴ Ethical ideals form institutions and social institutions form human habits and behaviour.

However, in Toprak's studies, this mutual interaction is not clear. That is, when the economic structure started to change, the society and structures were affected by

⁵²¹ James Brien, "The Role of Causation in History," in *History in The Making* vol. 2, no. 1 (2013): 75.

⁵²² Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*, 58.

⁵²³ Hodgson, *How Economics Forgot History*, 115.

⁵²⁴ Hodgson, *How Economics Forgot History*, 116.

these changes simultaneously. For instance, as the economic activities in society increased, the capitalist mode of production was embedded within the society, and the society was more individualizing. Also, when education became secular, society and especially women became more visible in the social life, business life and public spaces. However, he does not refer to the activities of the people in this formation of structures or society. He only shows the transformation of society with structural change. That is to say, people do not have free will to construct their history. They are bounded by the structures, which form their way of life, and mentality.

5.1.6. Narrative

A narrative is not only a simple description of a series of events. Although every narrative hold description in its essence, it also means something more than description. Narrative means that it helps to explain facts in a coherent way.

“Morton White has given the following example: the sentence “The King of England died, which led the Queen to grieve, which led the princess to worry.” could be an example of a (historical) narrative, while the sentence “The King of England died, and then the queen grieved, after which the princess began to worry.” could not.”⁵²⁵

In the first sentence, the events have causal relationship with each other, while in the second, the events come in a successive order.⁵²⁶ Furthermore, narrative text must also include a clear and meaningful beginning and ending. If it does not include these, it cannot be said to be a narrative. Every narrative must also have a plot, which Hayden White identifies as “*a structure of relationships by which the events contained in the account are endowed with a meaning by being identified as parts of an integrated whole*”.⁵²⁷ Narrative generates a story, and narrative must

⁵²⁵Anton Froeyman, “Concepts of Causation in Historiography,” in *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History* 42, no.3 (2009): 13.

⁵²⁶ Ibid., 13.

⁵²⁷ Ibid., 14.

have a central subject. Causation plays an important role in narrative description. In narrative description, every statement should reflect the effects of the preceding statement. Narrative can, in this way, be identified as a “causal chain”.⁵²⁸

However, historical narratives must discover new types of expression under the conditions created by the Annales School. In the Annales stream, the narrative has been completely abandoned and descriptive history writing has become dominant amongst its adherents.⁵²⁹ The descriptive explanation has three tasks; providing detailed information about an event, a person’s life and a society. An explanation is a response to a question. Historians try to give a systemic, comprehensive account of a historical subject, such as an event, a life or a society. And descriptive explanations do give a systematic account of their subject. They are designed to include all the fundamental characteristics of the subject, in line with the historian’s conception of that subject.⁵³⁰

In this sense, Toprak uses description as a method of explaining the use of historical phenomenon rather than narration. He criticizes the uses of narrative in historiography and he states that descriptive explanation in historiography has lost its value with postmodernity, where narrative is used both as fact and fiction. So Toprak states that history is straddling a line between dream and reality. The romantic style has become fashionable in historiography. In a sense, he takes a stand against postmodern history writing and defends a structuralist, rational and modern historiography. He states that a contemporary, and rational, structuralist historiography approach should be adopted for historical studies in Turkey.⁵³¹

As can be clearly seen in the historiography review of previous chapters, there is successive order to consider, but not plot, beginning and ending. Instead of these,

⁵²⁸ Ibid., 17.

⁵²⁹ Burke, *History and Social Theory*, 16.

⁵³⁰ C. Behan McCullagh, *The Truth of History*. (New York: Routledge, 1998), 83.

⁵³¹ Toprak, “Türkiye’de Tarih Yazımının Evrimi ve Yarının Tarihi,” 29.

he gives the details of the structures which were exposed to change, and simultaneously caused change. He explains, for instance:

“It is evident, then, that when World War I started, radical steps had to be taken by the Unionists to protect themselves from the destructive effects of war. Capitulations were unilaterally abolished by the government and repayment of national debts was postponed. They enacted new custom tariffs, which provided protective measures for small industries and local products. Small merchants, consisting of Muslim elements, provided the accumulation of capital. Many new small-scale companies opened and a considerable number of companies and trading activities took shape.⁵³²”

As understood from this paragraph, Toprak uses the descriptive explanation rather than narrative. Although there is a causal relationship, there is no beginning or ending, nor is there a plot. He tries to describe the social and economic structures and to find a logical interconnection between them. Most importantly, there are many chapters in his books, which did not have a plot. They are only explanatory parts of different segments of society. He certainly advocates the scientific historiography, and so it can be assumed that he has a close relationship with the Annales School for this reason.

5.1.7. Comparison

“If history is more than chronology, any attempt to explain and interpret what has been going on in a particular place and at a particular time involves comparing it with what has been going on before or later or at other places at the same time”.⁵³³ In comparative history, two or more historical phenomena are systematically analyzed to find similarities and differences in order to explain better description and interpretation.⁵³⁴ Narration of structures is based on comparison but this

⁵³² Toprak, “Proto-Globalization and Economic Change in the Late Ottoman Empire: A Commentary,” 133. Also see page 67

⁵³³ Stefan Berger, “Comparative History” in *Writing History Theory & Practice*, eds. Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore, (London: Arnold, 2003), 164.

⁵³⁴ Jürgen Kocka and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, “Comparison and Beyond: Traditions, Scope, and Perspectives of Comparative History.” *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European*

comparison is made implicitly rather than explicitly.⁵³⁵ Most of historians depend on comparative history when they make a research since they desire to obtain a better knowledge of their own society by means of comparison. There is no any historical method except comparison which is the most suitable to test, modify and falsify historical explanation. It is the comparison, which demonstrates so effectively the range of developmental possibilities.⁵³⁶

In the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, the most of the comparative studies by European historians concentrated on social and economic history. “They generally privileged the comparative analysis of processes, structures, and institutions, among them social groups and classes, strike waves, divorce rates, welfare states, school systems, employment patterns, business, industrialization processes, urban structures, minorities and modernization”.⁵³⁷

Burke states that comparison has, all times, a central place in social theory.⁵³⁸ Comparison needs interpretation of ways in which the ingredients of human societies were capable of transformation, across space as well as through time.⁵³⁹ Actually, Durkheim expressed that “comparative sociology is not a special branch of sociology; it is sociology itself”.⁵⁴⁰ He separated comparison into two distinct type. The first is comparison between societies which are essentially the same in the given structure i.e. he expressed it with a biological metaphor, “of the same

Approaches and New Perspectives. Eds. By Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, (New York: Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2009), 1.

⁵³⁵ Berger, “Comparative History,” 161.

⁵³⁶ Berger, 2003, “Comparative History,” 165.

⁵³⁷ Kocka and Haupt, “Comparison and Beyond: Traditions, Scope, and Perspectives of Comparative History,” 17.

⁵³⁸ Burke, *History and Social Theory*, 23.

⁵³⁹ Michael Roberts, “Postmodernism and the Linguistic Turn.” in *Making History*, edited by Peter Lambert and Phillipp Schofield, (London: Routledge, 2004), 229.

⁵⁴⁰ Burke, *History and Social Theory*, 23.

species”. The second comparison between societies, which were exactly different from each other. On the one hand, the former requires comparing two communities having the same characteristics. It means to look for different elements besides all their sameness or to examine what differences lead to some particular phenomenon. On the other hand, the second addresses to look for different elements by comparing two completely different communities to find similarities or differences and observe what they lead. It is only thanks to comparison that we are able to see what is not there, in other words to understand the significance of a particular absence.⁵⁴¹

However, when one makes research with the context of comparative history, s/he needs to be clear about geographical and time boundaries because geographical and time boundaries may change from time to time according to those who study and those who have different context for different purposes.⁵⁴² In addition, historians should be very careful when they used western concepts for non-western countries. They need to consider about terminology and theories, which must be used self-reflexively. That is, comparative historians should think the origins and politics of their concepts.⁵⁴³

On the other hand, comparisons became the center to stage theory and these depend on the assumption that institutions, economic systems and societies follow certain regular development patterns. Even if they are different in terms of space, time and details, they are essentially comparable. One of the example of this was Walt W. Rostow’s theory of industrialization. According to Rostow, “every industrialized country passes through the same phases of development with the same problems and similar solutions”.⁵⁴⁴ However, this approach were criticized and lost its value.

⁵⁴¹ Ibid., 23.

⁵⁴² Berger, “Comparative History,” 166.

⁵⁴³ Ibid., 168.

⁵⁴⁴ Kocka and Haupt, “Comparison and Beyond: Traditions, Scope, and Perspectives of Comparative History,” 7.

It is, of course, impossible to achieve a historical result without making comparisons or a model. Each historian makes a historical research on a model or by making comparisons in different ways. At this point, Toprak makes comparison implicitly rather than explicitly in most of his explanation on structures. He approaches the Ottoman Empire's economic system with modernization concept from economy to social life. Moreover, nothing can be explained without comparison to its previous situation. That is to say, comparison cannot be made without reference to the past and so Toprak compares implicitly the period he studies with the past to analyze the level of development and change in society and structures. In addition, he examines the extent to which ideas in Europe influenced Turkey that requires a comparison too. For instance, he states; The Second Constitutional Period was a period of enlightenment peculiar to the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman modernization model was originally inspired by the French example to a great extent.⁵⁴⁵ The Turkish-speaking intellectual segment of the Ottoman Empire gradually began to define themselves as "Turks", in a similar way of the non-Muslim "nation" or "elements". The main reference point of this understanding was the Western thought which they regarded as "contemporary". In short, the understanding of progress that was dominant in the 19th century in Europe also transformed the Ottoman society.⁵⁴⁶

In his approach to feminist movements, Toprak explains the feminist movements in the Ottoman Empire by taking the West as reference to explain the content of them. For example, he contends; the most important aspect of "new life" was related to women's life. The women should leave the traditional way of life, socialize, expand their freedoms, and become visible in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, a similar feminist movement in the West came to light in Turkey during the Constitutional Monarchy. The Ottoman women initiated a movement, similar to the feminist trend in the West, in the atmosphere of freedom created by the Second Constitutional

⁵⁴⁵ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 15.

⁵⁴⁶ Toprak, *Türkiye'de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 16.

era.⁵⁴⁷ In addition, the 1910s, when the feminist movement gained power on the world scale, was the period in which women achieved significant gains in the direction of their freedom in Turkey.⁵⁴⁸

Accordingly, in his study of Anthropology, he also makes comparison between the ethnic discrimination in the West and in Turkey. He expresses that ethnic discrimination in Europe affected Turkey but that although anthropological studies in Turkey had some similarities, they were very different from those of Europe. That is, they were not studies expressing discrimination like in Europe. He says; racial-based understanding of history was highly prevalent in continental Europe at that time. Nationalism has reached a very advanced stage. In the context of race, almost historians of every nation was arguing that their nation were superior to others. Many European countries, especially in the Eastern and Southeastern Europe, were supporting racism and eugenic against the threat of war on the horizon. The calamitous outcome of this attitude would emerge in a short time, Germany would, consequently, launch the Second World War. The understanding of history made in the Republican period in Turkey was different from race-oriented historiography in the developed western countries since Turkey was still an "oppressed" nation. Historical researches was carried out to change the "yellow race" concept attributed to the Turks in those days. Turkey was desired to be wiped out from history with the Treaty of Sevres, but the Anatolian people had not allowed it. Although Turkey had obtained an international position with the treaty of Lausanne, Turkey was still seen as a backward, even "barbarian" by nations in Europe.⁵⁴⁹

Moreover, he claims that Kurdish question was very different from the concept of "white man's burden" of Europe. He indicates that " the Republic's Eastern

⁵⁴⁷ Toprak, "Osmanlı Kadınları Çalıştırma Cemiyeti, Kadın Askerler ve Milli Aile", 35.

⁵⁴⁸ Ibid., 4.

⁵⁴⁹ Toprak, 2012, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 194.

Question” were, of course, very different from the “project of civilization” rooted in the understanding of the colonization”.⁵⁵⁰

As a result, it is not seen obviously that Toprak makes clear comparison in his historical writing except a few example. However, it seems that he makes evaluations most of the issues he deals with in context of modernity and developed European countries in a implicit way.

5.1.8. Causality

“Causality is a genetic connection of phenomena through which one thing (the cause) under certain conditions gives rise to, causes something else (the effect)”.⁵⁵¹

E.J Tapp asserts that if there is not concept of causation, there can be no history.⁵⁵²

Investigating of history is the study of causes. A historian constantly asks the question: “why” as long as s/he hopes to find an answer. A good historian - big thinker – is one who is asking “why” about new events or in new contexts.⁵⁵³ For Montesquieu, there were spiritual or material general reasons for raising, driving or destroying every kingdom and all of the things happened as a result of these reasons in his book *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and their Decline*. It was absurd to assume that "all the events we see in the world emerged coincidentally. That is, human behaviors follow determined laws and principles from nature. For almost two hundred years after that, historians and philosophers of history have worked intensively to regulate the past experiences of mankind by finding the causes of historical events and the laws governing them. Causes and laws were sometimes considered in mechanical, sometimes biological terms;

⁵⁵⁰ Toprak, 2012, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 578.

⁵⁵¹ Alexander Spirkin, “The Principle of Causality” in *Dialectical Materialism*. Progress Publishers, 1983. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/spirkin/works/dialectical-materialism/ch02-s06.html>, 1.

⁵⁵² Brien, “The Role of Causation in History,” 72.

⁵⁵³ Carr, *What is History?*, 108.

sometimes metaphysically, sometimes economically, sometimes psychologically. However, historians and social scientist do not follow this view today because this view leads to a completely deterministic outlook.⁵⁵⁴ However, the accepted theory was that history was a consequence of successive events and causes in the past.⁵⁵⁵

Historiography requires answering for three different sorts of questions: “why, what and how” questions.⁵⁵⁶ The question for “what” is not related to causal explanation but if one tries to find the answers for the questions of “how” and “why”, s/he needs to construct a causal relationship between events and phenomenon. That is, questioning a historical event will always lead us to ask the question “why”. Therefore, a historian can never escape the question “why”. The first feature of a historian’s approach to the question of “why” is that there are several reasons for the same phenomena. That is to say, Historians work with many causes. As the historian broadens and deepens his research, he collects and accumulates more answers without stopping to ask “why”.⁵⁵⁷ The axiom that everything has a cause is a condition of our ability to understand what happens.⁵⁵⁸

Stanford claims that true causes should be sought in human action and decision and the motivations for making them. To explain why an event occurred, the intentions of participant must be sought and historian must examine the conditions under which they acted.⁵⁵⁹ Most of the methods that try to define a cause have to deal with the problem, which is extremely difficult to single out just one factor. So it is not possible to say that there is just one cause which leads to one event. On the contrary,

⁵⁵⁴ Ibid., 89.

⁵⁵⁵ Ibid., 88.

⁵⁵⁶ Michael Stanford, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of History*, (Oxford: Cambridge: Wiley-Blackwell, 1998), 128.

⁵⁵⁷ Carr, *What is History*, 90.

⁵⁵⁸ Ibid., 93.

⁵⁵⁹ Brien, “The Role of Causation in History,” 77.

there are many causes to any one event. Very few historians can claim that there is not plurality of causes for any event. That is, historians are encountered with a multitude of facts, conditions, events, actors and ideas that may provide a coherent explanation for their questions they are investigating.⁵⁶⁰ Moreover, the greatest contribution of causation on the historical research is to emphasize the effect of external factors that may have on human agency. In addition, it reveals to a more comprehensible understanding about why people behave as they did.⁵⁶¹

On the one hand, causal explanation leads to some problems about determinism, free will and chance when explaining a historical event. On the other hand, causal explanation is vital to explaining a historical event and it improves the understanding of the past. Without causal explanation, historians would deal with a collection of unrelated facts.⁵⁶² According to Carr, they have nothing to do with determinism; because the determinist point of view says that the causes must be different in order for them to be different.⁵⁶³ The historian's relationship with causes leads to the same duality and reciprocity as the relationship with phenomenon. Causes determine his/her interpretation of historical process. It is the essence of the historian's interpretation to put causes in order of importance, or to determine why a cause or its sequence is relatively more meaningful. If we use the expression of Talcott Parsons, history is system not only of scientific, but also causal approaches.⁵⁶⁴ "Historian's role is to give an account of what, how and why events in the past occurred as they did".⁵⁶⁵ When one tries to explain the questions of "how" and "why", the causal explanation became crucial because history consists of the activities of men and women so it is essential to search why and how these

⁵⁶⁰ Ibid., 78.

⁵⁶¹ Ibid., 80.

⁵⁶² Ibid., 72.

⁵⁶³ Carr, *What is History*, 96.

⁵⁶⁴ Ibid., 105.

⁵⁶⁵ Brien, "The Role of Causation in History," 73.

events come into existence. Causal explanation helps to make events in the past coherent and intelligible.⁵⁶⁶

If we turn back Toprak from this causal explanation point of view, it can be claimed that Toprak connects phenomenon and events with several causes, which were influential to reveal his outcome. Toprak looks at structures and society as a whole to understand the change in the late Ottoman economy and society. He is trying to explain the Ottoman modernization by looking at the many changes that occurred in the economic and social structure. For example, he says; the period of 1908-1918 were the years in which an industrialization consciousness arose in Turkey.⁵⁶⁷ The problem of industrialization had come to the fore in newspapers and magazines. To more clearly identify the direction of industrial development for the country, the total number of industrial establishments was surveyed, competitions for industrial goods were organized and industrial exhibitions, expos and fairs were opened. Foreign specialists were brought in to establish industrial schools and workers and students were sent to Germany for technical education. The second constitutional monarchy was when the nation strived to become an industrial society, and when the overall conception of industrialization was born in Turkey.⁵⁶⁸

Toprak asserts that the economy increasingly integrated with politics, and accumulation fully embraced economic and social development. He seems to touch upon several causes to show the outcome of the change into society like that: Although labor movements and strikes were seen in the industrial sector during the period of Abdulhamid, they were short-lived and disconnected local movements. However, the worker's strikes and demands for rights, seen after 1908, were a long-term revolt against exploitation of labor. In fact, the reason for the emergence of these claims was the discourses of the newly emerging power, the reflections of the

⁵⁶⁶ Ibid., 74.

⁵⁶⁷ Toprak, "II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İktisadi Düşünce," 639.

⁵⁶⁸ Ibid., 639.

developments of Europe in Turkey, and precisely was related to the beginning of formation of the worker consciousness.⁵⁶⁹

In addition, most of the causes, which led to strikes of workers he gives, was the result of the economic development, modernization, external and internal factors. For example, he contends that Ottoman entered the process of integration with the world economy, vertical production system which consisted of master-foreman-apprentice, were increasingly transformed, and as a result, this whole process has led to the birth of “transition organizations” including the extensions of the traditional structures.⁵⁷⁰ From these examples, we can clearly see that he connects multiple-causal relationship of the changing within society i.e. as a result of modernization, economic transformation, external and internal factors.

According to him, all other transformations brought by the administrative, judicial, political, financial, and economic and Tanzimat to the agenda are a sensitive, critical pattern related to each other like the interdependent wheels of a clock.⁵⁷¹ He makes connection among structural changes and believes that some changes influenced and provided the other structures to form into a new one. Moreover, as aforementioned, to find causal relationship between events and phenomenon, it is essential to ask the questions of “how” and “why”. As parallel, he shows multiple-causal relationships in his studies, he says for instance in the book “Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı”, that his goal is not to show how the workers' movements were shaped or concluded, (there is not a beginning and ending) but to demonstrate what were the causes that led to it, what factors exist, what the workers' rights claims were and what were the points that were different from to the past while he tries to find the answers to the question “what”.⁵⁷²

⁵⁶⁹ Toprak, *Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 8.

⁵⁷⁰ See also p. 81.

⁵⁷¹ Toprak, “Tanzimat Ekonomisi ve ‘Günah Keçisi’,” 21. see also page 41.

⁵⁷² See also p. 83.

Accordingly, he gives multiple-causality to explain the development of feminist movement within the Empire. He says that the First World War made women visible, while "poverty and freedom have progressed simultaneously".⁵⁷³ Because of men being taken into army, women's labor was needed to continue production and to meet the country's needs. Thus, after the idea-based feminist movement, the social depression caused by the war led to questions about the traditional division of labor. In this way, the efforts to ensure their livelihoods enabled women to be liberated. Along with World War I, official institutions started to employ female civil servants. Behind Galata dockyard, a Women's Merchant Market was opened consisting of female merchants who brought goods from surrounding cities, such as "Mudanya". In order to convey the necessary basic knowledge about trade to these women, a branch of educational institutions was pressed into service. Volunteer military battalions were also formed during the war years by women, through an association in İstanbul.⁵⁷⁴ Other army commanders outside of Istanbul were involved in similar initiatives.⁵⁷⁵ Thus, the hierarchical structures of the past partially collapsed during the war, and the private living space underwent a radical transformation. The traditional family relationship was now insufficient for "free women".

As is seen, he presents a lot of reasons and factors which may lead to actualize freedom of women within society. On the one hand, the material culture brought by industrialization, and on the other hand, the principles of "freedom" and "equality" which affected the Ottoman Empire gradually, transformed the women and the family structure. Especially in the years of World War I, the social depression caused by the conditions of war led the state to deal with the problems of family

⁵⁷³ Zeynep Altay, "Türkiye'de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm," Cumhuriyet, January 29, 2015, http://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/kitap/200449/Turkiye_de_Kadin_Ozgurlugu_ve_Feminizm.html (accessed August 27, 2017), 1.

⁵⁷⁴ Zafer Toprak, "Osmanlı Kadınları Çalıştırma Cemiyeti, Kadın Askerler ve Milli Aile", *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 51 (March 1988): 35.

⁵⁷⁵ Ibid., 36.

and women. As a result, the traditional family structure has begun to dissolve and the new nuclear family structure has come to the fore.⁵⁷⁶ For the socialization of women, he points out that in addition to the intellectual dimension of the feminist movement, the concrete conditions of the war years have provided an environment for the socialization of women in Turkey.⁵⁷⁷

Toprak does not only look at the feminist movements, he investigates women's suicides in society. He says that the reason for investigating the suicides is to examine the effect of social change on suicides in the early Republican period. Also he examines the consequences of transformation in value judgments caused by Republican era in society. He says that metamorphosis in urban culture, livelihood problems, intergenerational conflicts, new emotional bond types, male-female associations, etc. the problems and the reaction of the individual to these social changes resulted in suicides.⁵⁷⁸ That is, he does not refer to merely one reason to understand why women committed suicide, on the contrary, he emphasizes that social change, economic situation and so on caused women to take this action.

At the same time, in the family-woman dilemma, the war conditions created an environment for the favour of females. As the area of freedom of women expanded, the existing traditional order was shaken, causing the society to seek solutions beyond norms that were familiar to both the family and the outside.⁵⁷⁹ On the other hand, he indicates that the republican Turkey had a paradoxical structure in terms of women. Radical transformations in gender were experienced in the early stages of the Republican era. The gains in the field of civil law, the opening of doors to women in many educational institutions, the promotion of women in the professions, the right to elect and be elected made them visible in the public realm.

⁵⁷⁶ Toprak, “Osmanlı Kadınları Çalıştırma Cemiyeti, Kadın Askerler ve Milli Aile”, 35.

⁵⁷⁷ Toprak, “Türkiye’de Siyaset ve Kadın: Kadınlar Halk Fırkası’ndan Arsiulusal Kadınlar Birliği Kongresi’ne”, 5.

⁵⁷⁸ Toprak, “Dr. Cemal Zeki’nin ‘Delişmen, Çılgın Kızlar’ı – Cumhuriyetten Genç Kız ve Kadın İntiharları”, 26.

⁵⁷⁹ Ibid., 26.

All these developments have resulted in feminist movements and women have begun to claim their rights so as to be equal with men.⁵⁸⁰

It is seen that Toprak emphasizes the causes and effects of events and developments. Most of his studies present the economic and social reasons for historical events and he focus on the interaction between them. He says that as in many underdeveloped countries, nationalism-communitarianism, traditionalism-modernity, conservatism-fundamentalism has been trying to coexist in Turkey. As a result, rapid social transformation, urbanization, modernization, the new-old conflict, the relative poverty of the rural population stimulated the populist anticipations.⁵⁸¹ Moreover, problems such as unbalanced income distribution, and moral corruption in the constitutional years led the constitutional and republican populism; therefore, the ideology of populism has received great interest from society.⁵⁸² Moreover, he indicates that the “bourgeois” lifestyle and consumption patterns in the West encompass the Ottoman Empire too.

To explain the transformation of the historiography in the world, he says that “the dissolution of colonialism after the second World War led to a radical transformation in historiography. The end of colonialism, the deterioration of European powers, and the rise of new great powers became the factors which determined this transformation”.⁵⁸³

5.1.9. Facts

Historians assert that they deal with facts and so their texts reflect historical realities.⁵⁸⁴ The nineteenth century was the brightest age in terms of the historian’s

⁵⁸⁰ Toprak, 2012, *Darwin’den Dersim’e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 63.

⁵⁸¹ Toprak, *Türkiye’de Popülizm 1908-1923*, 17.

⁵⁸² Ibid., 24.

⁵⁸³ Toprak, “Türkiye’de Tarih Yazımının Evrimi ve Yarının Tarihi,” 28-30. See also p. 112.

⁵⁸⁴ Burke, *History and Social Theory*, 127.

love of facts. "What I want", said Mr. Gradgrind in *Ward Times*, 'is Facts.... Facts alone are wanted in life.' Nineteenth-century historians on the whole agreed with him".⁵⁸⁵ According to Ranke, the fundamental "task of the historian was simply to show how it really was" in the 1800s. This approach was a significant achievement among historians. The positivists who want to confirm their thesis that history is a science are also tightly bound to the cult of facts. A positivist will say; first of all "reveal" the facts and then "draw a conclusion" from them.⁵⁸⁶ According to them, history is a set of confirmed facts. These facts are obtained in documents and according to this idea, all facts are in the documents, and the historian reaches fact by examining documents in a certain order, then explaining what happened. However, "[n]o document tells us more than what the author of the document thought - what he thought had happened, what he thought ought to happen or would happen, or perhaps only what he wanted others no think he thought, or even only what he himself thought he thought."⁵⁸⁷ This is a well-known feature of all reports of diplomatic negotiations. These documents tell us what to think, rather than the truth or perhaps they show what bureaucrats want us to think about what is happening.⁵⁸⁸ Of course, facts and documents are necessary for the historian, but it is essentially important that we must not fetishize them. We must always look at them in a critical way.

In this respect, Toprak's articles about Kurds and the Dersim Event significantly reflect a state-centered approach, which is derived from government documents. The latter are far from objective in historiography and clearly not based on just written facts. Although it is discussed in the previous section, here, I will very briefly touch upon Toprak's studies on Kurds⁵⁸⁹ in terms of his use of government

⁵⁸⁵ Carr, *What is History*, 8.

⁵⁸⁶ Ibid., 9.

⁵⁸⁷ Ibid., 16.

⁵⁸⁸ Ibid., 18.

⁵⁸⁹ See also pp. 156-160.

reports. Toprak's articles about the Kurdish question are based on the facts of government reports which were made by Necmettin Sahir Silan and Abdülhalik Renda who were working in the area for the government. Relying on these reports, Toprak states that the government had undertaken a social engineering mission in that region, with the goal of developing and joining this region with other parts of country. Silan visited the region frequently, made contact with the people and was sensitive to the needs of the population there. According to Toprak, these reports reflected social engineering during the period of the nation state. The problem that the Republic of Turkey faced was to integrate Eastern regions with that new nation state. Building roads, opening schools, hospitals and health clinics, as well as bringing water and electricity, were all compulsory tasks to consolidate political power in this region. That the social structure of the region was different from any other region of the country was a fact known by the governments of the Republic. Ankara's main concern was to integrate those regions which had different ethnic roots into the country's population at large.⁵⁹⁰

Toprak states that the "Eastern Question" or the "Kurdish Question" was related to public order issues that went beyond concerns about the ethnicity at the state level.⁵⁹¹ In the book "Dersim", he prepared to summarize the situation in the region by reviewing the anthropological findings about the Kurds. In accordance with the discourse of the period, it was emphasized that the people of this region came from the same ethnic roots as the Turks.

Toprak carries out his research on Kurds by depending on government reports. Tosh says that most of the historian's research is limited to libraries and archival

⁵⁹⁰ Toprak, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 539-541. Toprak examines the reports of the state about Kurdish regions in the articles; Zafer Toprak "Cumhuriyet Bürokrasisi ve Toplum Mühendisliği," in *Dersim Harekâtı ve Cumhuriyet Bürokrasisi - 1936-1950*, ed: Tuba Akekmekçi & Muazzez Pervan, (İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2011), ix-xxviii., Zafer Toprak, "Cumhuriyet Bürokrasisi ve Doğu'nun Makus Talihi," in *Doğu Anadolu ve Cumhuriyet Bürokrasisi (1939-1951)*, ed: Tuba Akekmekçi & Muazzez Pervan, (İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2011), ix-xv., Zafer Toprak, "Antropolojik İrk Sorunu ve Dersim'de 'Uygarlaştırıcı Misyon'," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 202 (October 2010): 60-67.

⁵⁹¹ Toprak, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 564.

documents that we call primary sources. However, “many primary sources are inaccurate, muddled, based on hearsay or intended to mislead, so it is very crucial for historians to scrutinize the source for distortions of this kind”.⁵⁹² However, Toprak uses these reports as the main resource in his research without considering the fact that they were prepared for the state and are biased. He neglects the facts behind reports and he accepts everything that was written and recorded in these reports, as can be noted when he uses the state’s own language.

However, according to Collingwood, a historian who collects information related to his/her research, then presents it without critique should be called a scissors-paste historian.⁵⁹³ The true historian should provide us with a statement about the validity of their information when it is presented. In Toprak’s studies on Kurds, he made no critique and gave no information to the reader about the validity of his collected information, so it becomes impossible to infer whether or not Toprak has confirmed these ideas, which may or may not reflect reality.

5.1.10. Quantitative Studies in History

Quantitative methods of research are not a new approach in historiography. Economic historians have used these methods since the nineteenth century, and they based their analysis on statistics for prices and production.⁵⁹⁴ Quantitative methods have started to be used in many areas, such as sociology, psychology, politics, and demography. According to Burke, “without quantitative methods, certain kinds of history would be impossible, most obviously the study of price and population movements”.⁵⁹⁵ These methods enable historians to predict the differences between the terms “less” or “rise” and “fall”. In addition, this approach ensures we see

⁵⁹² Tosh and Lang, *The Pursuit of History*, 61.

⁵⁹³ R. G. Collingwood, *Tarih Tasarımı*, trans. Kurtuluş Dinçer, (Ankara: Ara Yayıncılık, 1990), 50. also for more detailed information see pages 250-256.

⁵⁹⁴ Burke, *History and Social Theory*, 34.

⁵⁹⁵ Ibid., 36.

similarities and differences between two societies or cultures, or between elements such as urbanization and literacy.

In many cases, comparative studies have utilized quantitative analysis. However, for more than a decade, historian's preferences for the analysis of structures and processes have been profoundly questioned. The reconstruction of experiences, attitudes and actions has taken center stage for historians. Symbolic forms, cultural practices, values and meaning have been significant subjects of more recent historical research. The importance of language in historical studies has also been understood by historians. Quantitative data has become less important. That is, by focusing "on the ways in which statistical data are produced, they have learned to perceive them as artifacts with sometimes very limited value".⁵⁹⁶ Historians have also become aware that quantitative comparison may lead some wrong assumptions. For instance, a statistical analysis of strikes in a particular industry across various nations does not imply the radicalism of workers. Only a qualitative examination of motivations for strikes, the workings of different systems of industrial relations and the potential variations in the meanings of strike activity will allow the researcher to discern the degree of radicalism of the workers employed in that industry.⁵⁹⁷

Although Toprak is an economic historian, we do not find quantitative studies in his history research. Nonetheless, he indicates that quantitative research is very important to rationalization in the Republican era. Everything seemed to be counted and quantification and this era saw the development of demographic and statistical research in Turkey. Although he emphasizes the importance of quantitative research, he himself does not make use of it.⁵⁹⁸

⁵⁹⁶ Kocka and Haupt, "Comparison and Beyond: Traditions, Scope, and Perspectives of Comparative History," 18.

⁵⁹⁷ Ibid., 168.

⁵⁹⁸ Toprak, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 209-221.

On the other hand, Toprak, in a sense, criticizes studies which are based on only quantitative method. For example, history of labor that can be evaluated under the title of economic history will not make any more sense than the numbers when labor history is based on purely quantitative method. Studies based on purely quantitative method neglect the political dimension of the subject. He says that determining the political dimension of history of labor depends largely on the field of history of ideas. Seeking the material environment of “labor” requires a broad-based understanding of social history.⁵⁹⁹ So, as well as quantitative studies, social history and history of ideas are also important part of economic history. In this sense, it can be claimed that Toprak fills the void of social history and history of ideas in the field of economic history.

5.1.11. Intellectual History, History of Ideas and Mentality

“What is intellectual history? Broadly speaking, intellectual history is the study of intellectuals, ideas, and intellectual patterns over time”.⁶⁰⁰ Intellectual history involves many fields such as history of philosophy, of science, of religious, political and economic or aesthetic ideas.⁶⁰¹ That is, “intellectual historians are interested in “ideas” of all sorts, not only ideas as they are defined within the current guidelines of academic philosophy”.⁶⁰² Linguistics is a crucial field for intellectual history, too. The analysis of language and its forms, uses and effect has a vital role in text-based studies.⁶⁰³ According to Quentin Skinner, the meaning of an idea can only be possible to understand when it is placed in the historical context of linguistic

⁵⁹⁹ Zafer Toprak, “Tarih Yazımının Evrimi ve Türkiye’de Çağdaş Tarih,” içinde, *Sosyal Bilimler Öngörü Çalışması, 2003-2023 – Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Raporlar*, Ankara; TÜBA Yayını, 2007, p. 228

⁶⁰⁰ Peter E. Gordon, “What is Intellectual History?,” Harvard University, (2012), 1.

⁶⁰¹ Beverley Southgate, “Intellectual history/history of ideas,” in *Writing History Theory And Practice* eds. Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore, (London: Hodder Arnold, 2003), 243.

⁶⁰² Gordon, “What is Intellectual History?,” 4.

⁶⁰³ Southgate, “Intellectual history/history of ideas,” 244.

utterances, written or verbal.⁶⁰⁴ Moreover, intellectual history cannot be studied without social influences, political application and literary expressions.⁶⁰⁵ That is to say, intellectual history cannot be studied without reference to the culture in which one lived. Cultural beliefs are made up of ideas and social memories.⁶⁰⁶ Ideas in this case refers not only to knowledge, but also to power as a discourse. Institutions such as churches, universities, or scientific societies give crucial insight into understanding the formation of ideas. Ideas are a both condition of, and conditioned by, their social context.⁶⁰⁷ However, many historians study only ideas themselves without referring to culture and society.

Intellectual history is different from the history of ideas. The former means that an idea can be identified without reference to the outside world, so some intellectual historians emphasize purely “the ideas of one”, without making reference to the conditions outside them.⁶⁰⁸ However, intellectual history should not be done only by looking at one person's ideas; the concrete environment and life relationships are very important in the formation of ideas. Moreover, Skinner says that “to know what a writer *meant* by a particular work is to know what his primary *intentions* were in writing it”⁶⁰⁹

It is not possible to study social history without introducing the history of ideas, which is of course a history of everyone’s ideas instead of the ideas of the ‘thinkers’ in a society. If a historian wants to know the attitudes and values of everyone who lives in a given society, s/he has to deal with the fields of mentality and ideology.

⁶⁰⁴ Gordon, “What is Intellectual History?,” 6.

⁶⁰⁵ Southgate, “Intellectual history/history of ideas,” 247.

⁶⁰⁶ History is not memory, but without memory, including some sort of communal memory, there can be no history. See Megill, “Epilogue: On the Current and the Future State of Historical Writing,” 683.

⁶⁰⁷ Gordon, “What is Intellectual History?,” 13.

⁶⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁶⁰⁹ Southgate, “Intellectual history/history of ideas,” 250.

The history of mentality differs from the intellectual history. History of mentality emphasizes collective attitudes rather than individuals, on unspoken assumptions rather than explicit theories, on common sense, or what appears to be common sense, in a particular culture, and on the structure of belief systems.⁶¹⁰

If it needs to be categorized Toprak's studies on intellectual history, it is possible to say that his studies on this field have entered the field of history of ideas rather than history of mentality. Toprak made many contributions to the field of history of ideas. In all his studies on feminism, populism, anthropology and economy, he examines the ideas of the intellectual to explain social change. For instance, he examines the ideas of intellectuals of the period to show how the changes in the economic structure have come into being. To research the ideas of these intellectuals in the economic thought, he looks at articles in journals, magazines and books for the period he studies.

For instance, in his studies on economy, Toprak states that the more critique of Ottoman economic thoughts against free trade policies came from Musa Metmetcanoğlu Akyiğitzade who was influenced by the economists such as Friedrich List and Paul Cauwes. Akyiğitzade claimed that the only way forward for the Ottoman State was to be industrialized but first condition for industrialization could be possible with a protective foreign trade policy.⁶¹¹ Also Toprak gives the approach of Cavid Bey who was against the protective foreign trade policies. According to Cavid Bey, protective foreign trade policy would cause the country and the workers to become increasingly impoverished.⁶¹² The owners of capital would become weak and remain less competitive behind the protective barrier of custom walls. Cavid Bey also attached more significance to railway, road, port and other public works initiatives that would enable the broadening of agriculture to

⁶¹⁰ Burke, *History and Social Theory*, 93.

⁶¹¹ Zafer Toprak, "II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İktisadi Düşünce", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. III (1985): 635.

⁶¹² Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)*, 23.

commodity production and foreign markets, and he emphasized that domestic and foreign capital must be directed to these areas instead of industry.⁶¹³ Moreover, Ahmed Midhat claimed that free trade policies could be only compatible with the concrete reality of the British economy: Britain had to provide foodstuffs from external sources, or else face famine. All British industrial units needed to get raw materials from foreign countries lest the factories be forced to terminate production. Therefore, free trade was inevitable for Britain and necessary for its survival.⁶¹⁴ Nevertheless, economic policies should have different prescriptions for each country. While there was not any, alternative except trade for Britain due to the fact that it was industrialized and its trade activities were developed, it did not have land for agricultural activities. Mizancı Murad, one of the leaders of Young Turks, shared similar views with Ahmed Midhat, Namık Kemal and other members of that group. As a result, Ottoman intellectuals enabled to the restriction of liberal economic policies and initiated the mercantilist policies, which were well-suited to build a nation state and establishing an independent economic structure.⁶¹⁵

For spreading of populist ideas within Ottoman Empire, Toprak asserts that the immigrant Muslim intellectuals who carried the ideas of Russia into the Ottoman territory were a significant impact on the Young Turks. Musa Akyiğitzade, Yusuf Akçura, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, and Hüseyinzade Ali were the most prominent among them. Thinkers such as Sadi Maksudi and Zeki Velidi have played similar roles in the Republican years.⁶¹⁶ In this city, the Unionists who convened around the journals of “Yeni Felsefe Mecmuası and Genç Kalemler” discovered “the people” after the Second Constitution. Then, after the loss of Salonica, the populist discourse started to bloom in Istanbul. Journals such as “Halka Doğru”, “Türk

⁶¹³ Ibid., 110., see also p. 44

⁶¹⁴ Toprak, “II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İktisadi Düşünce,” 635., see also p. 43

⁶¹⁵ Ibid., 636., see also p. 45.

⁶¹⁶ Zafer Toprak, 2014, “II. Meşrutiyet'te Popülizm: Falih Rıfkı ve Ziya Gökalp'in Halkçılık Anlayışları”, *Yakın Türkiye Tarihinden Sayfalar - Sina Akşin'e Armağan*, hazırlayan: Mehmet Ö. Alkan, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, p. 11

Yurdu”, “Türk Sözü”, “Türk Duygusu”, “Büyük Duygu” and “Talebe Defteri” began to spread the discourse of “going toward people”.⁶¹⁷ In addition, arguments about populism as an ideology came to the agenda through articles on immigrant Turkish intellectuals from Russia, in particular the articles of Yusuf Akçura in the journal “Halka Doğru”. In the Second Constitutional period, the “commons” and populism constituted an important dimension of Gökalp’s thought system.⁶¹⁸

For the Feminist movement into the Ottoman Empire, Toprak states that the first women’s society established by Fatma Aliye during the Second Constitutional period was the “Cemiyet-i İmdadiyye”. This community did not only help women, but it also carried out social services, such as helping soldiers who were fighting on the frontline. At the same time, the publication branch called “Kadın” of the foundation “Osmanlı Kadınları Şefkat Cemiyeti Hayriyesi” emphasized the equality of genders in its first issue. Toprak claims that this case depended on the fact that the publishing world, which was liberated during the Constitutional period, provided ideas that could spread freely. The literature on women's liberty began to take shape in basic law books from the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and the freedom of women was discussed in “Teali-i Vatan Osmanlı Hanımlar Cemiyeti” and its publishing branch called “Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete”.

In the Second Constitutional years, men carried out the discussion of the legal rights of women again, under the sections of “Hukuk-ı Nisvan or “Kadın Hukuku”. Müslihiddin Adil focused on equality between women and men with reference to the controversial debates about feminism in an article; “Kadın ve ‘Hukuk-ı Nisvan’”. Adil emphasized that women and men should be equal on the basis of the division of labor and in all other areas. He stated that Turkey would no longer benefit from the old customs and social order. For him, it was the prerequisite for the

⁶¹⁷Ibid. p. 45, Further reading about journalism; Zafer Toprak, “Fikir Dergiciliğinin Yüz Yılı”, in Türkiye’de Dergiler-Ansiklopediler (1849-1984), İstanbul: Gelişim Yayınları, 1984, p. 13-54.

⁶¹⁸Further Reading about Gökalp’s thought; Zafer Toprak, "II. Meşrutiyet'te Popülizm: Falih Rıfkı ve Ziya Gökalp'in Halkçılık Anlayışları", Yakın Türkiye Tarihinden Sayfalar - Sina Akşin'e Armağan, hazırlayan: Mehmet Ö. Alkan, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2014.

development of a nation that women should appear in business to be on equal footing with men. Moreover, he pointed out that the importance of women's education was more critical than even male education, since those who established the foundations for any civilization were women.⁶¹⁹ In addition, Sabiha Sertel was one of the pioneers of the women's movements in the publishing sector as a protector of women's rights. With her articles in "Büyük Mecmua", she provided an important accumulation of knowledge for women's studies in Turkey.⁶²⁰ She tried to spread feminist thought amongst Ottoman women with her articles, and the magazine published 19 issues, starting in 1919. Her publications enabled the initiation of feminist movements in Turkey.⁶²¹

Toprak's studies on intellectual history are based especially on texts. He focuses one dimension of intellectual history and Toprak wrote of this period as if the intellectuals of the era had created a trend towards modernization and enlightenment, and then concluded that the old social and economic structure had begun to dissolve, so a new modern and rational system emerged as a result of these intellectuals.

Gürpınar claims that in Turkey, intellectuals are generally treated as a reflection of certain mentalities without being objectified within a specific structural framework as if historical trends are determined by the mentalities of academics. Favorable mentalities have a positive effect on historical progress, while unfavorable consciousness negatively affect societies and states, and this obsession toward intellectuals and mentalities is especially centralized in the conception of Turkish history.⁶²² In this regard, the positive effects of the intellectuals of the period which Toprak studies can be traced. Most were treated as though they could predict future

⁶¹⁹ "Zafer Toprak, "Muslihiddin Âdil'in Görüşleri: Kadın ve 'Hukuk-ı Nisvan'" Toplumsal Tarih, no. 75, March 2000, pp. 14-17.

⁶²⁰ Toprak, *Türkiye'de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946*, 175.

⁶²¹ See also p. 112.

⁶²² Doğan Gürpınar, *Türkiye'de Aydınlanın Kısa Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Etkileşim Yayınevi, 2013), 52.

trends, so they tried to create a trend for the future of the country through the promotion of modernization.

Besides these, the significant contents needed to study intellectual history, which include culture, linguistic, and social environment elements, are lacking in his works. He studies intellectual history as a text-based concept and does not look at the role of social, cultural and linguistic elements in the formation of ideas.

In conclusion, despite some flaws of Toprak's studies, they are helping us to learn the ideas and ideological stance of the intellectuals of the era and what the current ideas and ideological perspective of the era were.

5.1.12. Cultural History

Culture is a concept with an embarrassing variety of definitions. In the nineteenth century, culture generally referred to the visual arts, literature, philosophy, natural science and music. However, over time, culture grows an awareness about the arts and sciences that are formed by their social environment. This growing awareness enabled to the rise of sociology and a social history of culture.⁶²³ Increasing attention to culture led to the birth of popular culture, which values the attitudes and ideas of ordinary people and their expression in folk art, folk song, folktales, festivals, and so on.⁶²⁴ Any individual cannot be understood without reference of his/her historical and cultural context.⁶²⁵ Conversely, social bodies require an explanation in terms of the individuals who are involved. Accordingly, Weber argues that the ultimate stage of explanation for social and economic phenomena should include the examination of the purposes and actions of the individuals involved.⁶²⁶ While structuralists claim that the culture has been created by social

⁶²³ Burke, *History and Social Theory*, 118.

⁶²⁴ Ibid., 119.

⁶²⁵ Hodgson, *How Economics Forgot History*, 114.

⁶²⁶ Ibid., 118.

and economic structures, recent cultural studies claim that the individual has his own free will, and that the individual has his own creativity. Cultural history is very important to understand society and structures. Without fully grasping both society and the individual, we cannot claim that structures give shape to society because all structures, cultural codes, and the perspectives of individuals form the society and individual together.⁶²⁷

For instance, as an intellectual who is engaged in cultural studies, Bourdieu identifies the cultural field itself by the name ‘habitus’; in the simplest form, as a “community which turns into a body”. Habitus is conceptualized as an identity, which reveals the relationship between cultural essence and life conditions in individual essence, and as a distinctive category that is related to the practice of individual consumption, cultural habits and the exercise of judgment. Concurrently, he regards habitus on the basis of the reproduction of class formation.⁶²⁸ For him, the productive principle of social practices is not found merely in objective structures or purely in subjective minds. Instead, it means the relationship between those two elements. “The socialized subjectivity” means the habitus in which individuals produce social practices.⁶²⁹ Thompson also says that “class cannot explain by itself or abstractly, but it can be explained with regard to relations with other classes and mostly it is a social and cultural formation that finds institutive explanations for itself.”⁶³⁰

That is to say, in cultural studies, the practices and actions of individuals are important, as well as structural entities like religious belief, discourses, and so on. However, when we look at Toprak’s studies, there is no reference to these entities.

⁶²⁷ For Weber, just as structures are shaped and changed by individuals, individuals are also changed by structures. See Hodgson, *How Economics Forgot History*, 120.

⁶²⁸ Pierre Bourdieu, *Ayrim : Beğeni Yargısının Toplumsal Eleştirisi*, trans. Derya Fırat Şannan. (İstanbul: Heretik Yayınları, 2015), 265.

⁶²⁹ Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 101.

⁶³⁰ Thompson, “The Peculiarities of the English,” 295.

He tries to explain society with structures, which are not cultural structures like religion, traditional structures within society and so on. Moreover, he actually comes out against cultural studies in the postmodern era because he thinks that cultural studies neglect structures and tend to favour individual bases. By examining only individual activities and culture without political context, we cannot reach a full explanation. He says that the new trend in historiography which emerged in 1980s discouraged the structural historiography. Postmodernism was now stamping its mark on history. Turkey was also affected from this new paradigm over time. The historiography was shifting from the social problems of modernity to the cultural sphere of postmodernity. The analysis of class abandoned its place to cultural identity. This new approach gives more priority to individual rather than the society. Numbers lost their importance and quality became more important factor in history. Numerical history was seen as extremely “rational”. Postmodernity does not like rationality. In this context, another transformation was seen from “macro” to “micro” studies. Macro analysis, i.e. “grand theory” was not focused on. Looking at the individual was preferred and ultimately, descriptive history writing was replaced with narrative.⁶³¹ However, a structuralist approach needs to be addressed to fill the void in our historiography.⁶³²

However, for Thompson, history cannot be understood without reference to human activity. The inherent logic of capital does not determine capital society. On the contrary, it develops when people from different classes search to comprehend and give a shape to their own lives. Thompson argues that structuralists’ theory reflects their own isolation from society, mass movements, and they lack of experience in practical politics.⁶³³ For Cox, social development cannot be solely clarified by economy, on the contrary, cultural facts are as important as economical structure,

⁶³¹ Toprak, “Tarih Yazımının Evrimi ve Türkiye’de Çağdaş Tarih,” 215.

⁶³² Ibid., 231.

⁶³³ E.P. Thompson, *Teorinin Sefaleti*, Trans. Fethi Yıldırım. (İstanbul: Alan Yayıncılık, 1994), 46.

and cultural facts mean collective images and inter-subjective meaning.⁶³⁴ Unlike Toprak's attitude on history, Cox perceives it as a field of change by means of the changing nature of human mind and institutions that are created together, and he claims that neo-realism views history as a continuity⁶³⁵

Cultural studies are very important to understand cultural codes and the meaning, which varies from context to context or from culture to culture. Each culture has its own codes and meaning and so individuals are constituted both by structures, their cultural codes and also their experiences that they practice with their own will. The social position of an individual is insufficient to be understood his/her experiences. It is important to understand how the experience is perceived by the individual rather than the experience itself. Individual experiences gain their meanings thanks to the culture in which the individual lives. Class experiences are not exception. Individual members of the same class might have different cultural values and therefore experience the "class position" differently from each other. So each of them will probably perceive their experiences in the direction of principle of conformity of its own culture. In short, structures are not enough to reach a holistic conclusion about society. However, structuralist approach does not allow the free will and various cultural codes in the formation of history. Therefore, the cultural codes and free will in the formation of history has lesser space in the Toprak's structuralist historiography.

⁶³⁴ Robert Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations," *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 10, no. 2 (1981): 128.

⁶³⁵ Anthony Leysens, *The Critical Theory of Robert W. Cox*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 41.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This study sought to examine Zafer Toprak's work as a historian and a well-known academician in Turkey. After the introduction and his biography in which the evolution of Toprak's history writing i.e. in which period he focused which problems and under which political/social processes his historiography was influenced, were pointed out, his studies on economy, populism, labor, feminism, and anthropology were touched upon briefly to understand his methodological background and the details of his studies. National Economy still maintains its significant place among the studies on Tanzimat economy up until now. With the National Economy, Tanzimat economy have shifted from provisionalism to economics. In addition, his study on populism is an important one because it maintains the characteristic of being one collective work among the studies on republican populism in Turkey. Further, his studies on feminism is also very important since he was the first male figure who studies on feminism when he started to produce in the field in 1980s and 1990s. it can also be said that he was one of the leading person who studies on feminist movements in that time, in respect to deal with many issues in his feminist studies.

Then, in the last chapter, his theoretical foundation related to modernization theory and the Annales School were examined. He follows a modernization paradigm and focuses his work in this direction. He emphasizes the modernization of the Ottoman Empire in almost all of his studies, from the economy to anthropology and feminism. Moreover, he takes a modernization paradigm as a stage on which the developed Western countries constitute a reference point. He supports the structural

approach toward historical studies and he gives structural explanations. He also looks only at structures when examining the Ottoman Empire and the early Republican period. Although he does not claim that he follows the Annales tradition in his history writing, his structural and total history approach are close to it. However, he contradicts with the Annales historiography in terms of his enlightenment and progressive approach on history. He sees Turkish history as a progress from the Tanzimat period to present day and he contradicts with the Annales School that stands against modernization paradigm, which Toprak embraces.

His attitude on official historiography was analyzed in the light of his written arguments. Toprak claims that he is always against the official historiography because he believes that almost all of the positive practices and policies were attributed to the Republican period in official historiography and the Tanzimat period was considered a scapegoat. However, he thinks that this understanding is completely wrong and claims that he stands against the approach, especially in the book “National Economy” in which he emphasizes the continuity between the Tanzimat and Republican periods. He contends that the roots of most applications and policies of the Republican era are found in the Tanzimat period. The development and modernization of Turkey was based not only on the Republic, but also on the Tanzimat period. On the other hand, he asserts that undemocratic policies and application in the Mustafa Kemal’s authoritarian regime were a requirement of the Republican period because the state needed to develop and complete its own nation-building process. This point of view means a legitimization of the discriminatory policies of the Republican era. That is to say, his point of view on the official historiography has a dilemma.

In this study, his methodological approach to history writing was also examined in terms of his relation with narrative, comparison, causality, facts, quantitative studies, intellectual history and mentality, and lastly in relation to cultural history. He does not have a narrative historiography approach (perhaps in this sense, too, he can be placed in Annales School tradition). On the contrary, he advocates for

descriptive explanations in history writing and he believes it is more scientific than narration. In parallel, he uses descriptive explanations in all of his studies. Besides narrative, it was noted that Toprak does not make clear comparisons in his studies. He evaluates facts and phenomena with reference to the modernization theory implicitly, and compares them with the past in this way, too. However, even if he does not make an explicit comparison when conducting a historical study, it cannot be asserted that he does not make comparison. In almost of his studies, an implicit comparison can be found. Accordingly, Toprak's relation with causality in his studies was examined under the heading of "causality". In his historical studies, we can see that causal relationship takes a large area. That is, he tries to find the answer for question of "how" rather than "what". Also he looks at the external and internal dynamics within society and on structures to reach his outcome.

In addition, despite the fact that quantitative studies in social sciences, and especially in economic history, are essential, Toprak does not work with quantitative methods in his studies. This may be thought as a deficiency in his economic studies because in economic history, historians may have to deal with mathematical calculations like annual productivity in agriculture, demographic numbers and calculation of annual treasury revenues. It is unlikely that the economic situation of the country will be predicted without calculations for these areas. However, as Toprak believes, quantitative studies do not make sense on their own, that is, they need to be in harmony with political and social aspects of a society. Therefore, these entities should not be neglected in order to understand the history of economy. So it can be claimed that Toprak fills this gap with his studies on ideas and society.

Furthermore, Toprak's studies on intellectual history were analyzed in regards to his methodological perspective. Like the deficiency in his quantitative studies, there is a problem, too, in this field because he only handles the writings of intellectuals, without looking at the culture, language, or the primary intent of the intellectuals when writing their works. That is to say, his studies on intellectual history may be considered unidimensional works. On the other hand, in spite of some deficiencies

of his studies on intellectual history, they provide us a framework of the ideas, ideologies and the perspectives on the society of the intellectuals of the era. Furthermore, he does not write on the history of mentality, which is crucial to understanding the ideas of intellectuals because they were not ‘out of their time’. That is, they lived within a certain period of time in which people's ideas, thoughts and lifestyles had similarities.

Cultural history is essential to explain any phenomenon in a society. For instance, a structure does not take its shape without cultural influence, and culture does not exist on its own in an abstract way from structure. However, Toprak examines structures without looking at culture even if he emphasizes the importance of cultural studies. Because of the fact that structuralist view of history does not allow free will and the effects of cultural differences on the formation of history and society, Toprak as a structuralist social scientist has less interest on the cultural studies.

Toprak describes the Tanzimat period as the beginning of modernization in Turkey in terms of both economy and society and this approach still maintains its validity in this field. While the dominant paradigm in Turkish history started the modernization process with the Republican period, he claimed that it should be started with the Tanzimat period. In other words, the Republican era is not a period in which all innovations were initiated but it is a continuation of the Tanzimat period. Besides all, Toprak is a historian that closely follows the trends in the world historiography. In this sense, in Turkey, he contributes to historiography to be put on a more scientific basis and also contributes to the popularization of the history through his publications in the magazines such as History and Society (Tarih ve Toplum) and Social History (Toplumsal Tarih). He tries to pull history from a purely scientific and academic area to daily life, and he helps to make history a daily occupation that attracts the attention of ordinary people. It is also worth to remember that, he trained countless students at the History Department and Atatürk Institute in Boğaziçi University. We should also underline his “institution building”

capacity: Thanks to Zafer Toprak's efforts and courageous initiatives Atatürk Institute today is one of the most prominent history departments in Turkey

All in all, Toprak has made a significant contribution to the development and the progress of Turkish historiography. Toprak's distinctive approach expresses a historical understanding that is largely consistent within itself, in spite of its subjectivities and its apparent shortcomings and some contradictions that I tried to show in this study.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmad, Feroz. "Politics and Political Parties in Republican Turkey." in *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Vol. IV: Turkey in the Modern World*, edited by Reşat Kasaba, 226-265. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Altay, Zeynep, "Türkiye'de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm," *Cumhuriyet*, January 29, 2015, http://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/kitap/200449/Turkiye_de_Kadin_Ozgurlugu_ve_Feminizm.html (accessed August 27, 2017).

Aronowitz, Stanley, "A Metatheoretical Critique of Immanuel Wallerstein's "The Modern World System"," *Theory and Society* 10, no. 4 (1981): 503-520.

Aydın, Suavi. "Bir Tilkinin Ettiği: İsimler Milli Birliği Nasıl Bozar?," *Birikim*, December 20, 2006, <http://www.birikimdergisi.com/guncel-yazilar/1001/bir-tilkinin-ettigi-isimler-milli-birligi-nasil-bozar#.WarSnsirRPY>, (Accessed September 02, 2017).

"Kültür-Kimlik Modelleri Açısından Türk Tarih Yazımı," PhD diss., Hacettepe University, 1997.

"The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative," in *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, eds. Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kizilyürek and Umut Özkirimli. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

"Cumhuriyetin İdeolojik Şekillenmesinde Antropolojinin Rolü: Irkçı Paradigmanın Yükselişi ve Düşüşü," in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce; Cilt 2: Kemalizm*, ed. Ahmet İnsel. 6th ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2009.

Berger, Stefan, “Comparative History” in *Writing History Theory & Practice*, eds. Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore, London: Arnold, 2003.

Berktaş, Halil, *Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü*, İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 1983.

Kabilelerden Feodalizme, İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 1983.

Berktaş, Fatmagül. “Kendine Ait Bir Tarih.” *Tarih ve Toplum* no.183, (1989).

“Salem’in Cadıları: Bir Kereliğine Kendi Adını Koymak.” *Tarih Toplum* no. 195 (2000).

“Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet’e Feminizm” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt I: Cumhuriyet’e Devreden Düşünce Mirası*. edited by Tanıl Bora and Murat Gültekinil, 348-361. İstanbul: İletişim yayınları, 2001.

“Kadın Tarihi: Yeni Bir Gelecek İçin Geçmişini Geri Almak.” *Cogito* no.29 (2001b): 270-282.

ed. *Tarihin Cinsiyeti*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003.

“Tarih Yazımında Farklı Bir Perspektif.” in *Tarihin Cinsiyeti*, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003b.

“Behice Boran: Karar Verme Selahiyetine Sahip Bir Kadın,” in *Tarihin Cinsiyeti*, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003c.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Wacquant, Loïc, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Bourdieu, Pierre, *Ayrim : Beğeni Yargısının Toplumsal Eleştirisi*, trans. Derya Fırat Şannan. İstanbul: Heretik Yayınları, 2015.

Brien, James, "The Role of Causation in History," in *History In The Making* vol. 2, no. 1 (2013): 72-81.

Burke, Peter, *History and Social Theory*, 2nd edition. Ithaca & New York: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Carr, Edward Hallett. *What is History?*. London: New York: Victoria: Toronto: Auckland, Penguin Books, 1987.

Chiot, Daniel. "Marc Bloch'un Toplumsal ve Tarihsel Manzarası", in *Tarihsel Sosyoloji Bloch'tan Wallerstein'e Görüşler ve Yöntemler*, ed. Theda Skocpol, trans. Ahmet Fethi. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999.

Cizakça, Murat, Incorporation of the Middle East into the European World Economy, *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* Vol. 8, No. 3 (Winter, 1985): 353-377.

Collingwood, R.G.. *The Idea of History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Collingwood, R.G.. *Tarih Tasarımı*. Trans. Kurtuluş Dinçer, Ankara: Ara Yayıncılık, 1990.

Cox, Robert. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations." *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 10, no. 2 (1981): 126-155.

Çağlayan, Handan. *Analar, Yurttaşlar, Tanrıçalar: Kürt Kadın Hareketinde Kadınlar ve Kürt Kadın Kimliğinin Oluşumu*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

Çakır, Serpil. *Osmanlı'da Kadın Hareketi*. 3rd. ed. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2011.

“Feminist Tarih Yazımı: Tarihin kadınlar için, kadınlar tarafından yeniden inşası.” in *21. Yüzyıla Girerken Türkiye’de Feminist Çalışmalar*, Prof. Dr. Nermin Abadan Unat’a Armagan, edited by Serpil Sancar, 505-533. İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011.

“II. Meşrutiyet’te Osmanlı Kadın Hareketi,” Doctoral Thesis, İstanbul University, Faculty of Political Science, Political Science, 1991.

Çitçi, Oya. “Yeni Siyaset: Neoliberalizm Ve Postmodernizmin Siyasal Projesi.” *Journal of Social Sciences* 1, no.2 (2008): 2-32.

Eisenstadt, S. N. “Multiple Modernities,” *Daedalus*, Vol. 129, No. 1. Winter, 2000.

Ekmekçioğlu, Lerna and Bilal, Melissa. eds. *Bir Adalet Feryadı Osmanlı’dan Türkiye’ye Beş Ermeni Feminist Yazar: 1862-1932*, 3rd ed., İstanbul: Aras Yayıncılık, 2017.

Faroghi, Suraiya. *Osmanlı Tarihi Nasıl İncelenir? Kaynaklara Giriş*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999.

Froeyman, Anton. Concepts of Causation in Historiography, *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History* 42, no.3 (2009): 116-128.

Gambetti, Zeynep. “Linç Girişimleri, Neoliberalizm ve Güvenlik Devleti.” *Toplum ve Bilim* No. 109, (Summer 2007): 7-34.

Gordon, Peter E. “What is Intellectual History?”, Harvard University, (2012).

Gündüz, Zuhâl. “The women’s movement in Turkey: From Tanzimat towards European Union membership,” *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, (2004): 115-134.

Gürgeç, Melahat Kutun. “Neoliberal Politikalar Üzerinde Kimlik Politikalarının İdeolojik İşlevi: Ana-Akım Söylemin Eleştirel Bir Değerlendirmesi.” *Toplum ve Demokrasi* no.13-14, (January-December 2012): 1-24.

Gürpınar, Doğan. *Türkiye’de Aydınlanma’nın Kısa Tarihi*, İstanbul: Etkileşim Yayınevi, 2013.

Hanioglu, M. Şükrü. “En asil duygunun tarihçiliğinden apolojetik tarih yazımına” *Sabah*, July 01, 2012. <http://www.sabah.com.tr/yazarlar/hanioglu/2012/07/01/en-asil-duygunun-tarihciliginden-apolojetik-tarih-yazimina>, (accessed: September 02, 2017).

Harrison, Robert. “History and sociology” in *Making History: An Introduction to the History and Practices of a Discipline*, Eds. Peter Lambert and Phillipp Schofield, London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Hobsbawm, Eric. “Karl Marx’s Contribution to Historiography.” *Diogenes* 16, no. 64, (1968): 37-56.

Hobson, John A. *Imperialism: A Study*. New York: James Pott & Company, 1902.

Hodgson, Geoffrey M. *How Economics Forgot History*. London: New York: Routledge, 2001.

Hudson, Pat. “Economic History,” in *Writing History Theory & Practice*. eds. Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore, London: Arnold, 2003.

Hunt, Lynn. "Against Presentism", American Historical Association, May, 2002.
<https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/may-2002/against-presentism> (accessed August 28, 2017).

Iggers, Georg G. *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1997.

Islamoğlu, Huri and Keyder, Çağlar. "Agenda for Ottoman History." *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 1, no. 1 (1977): 31-55.

Islamoğlu, Huri and Keyder, Çağlar. "Osmanlı Tarihi Nasıl Yazılmalı? Bir Öneri." *Toplum ve Bilim*, no.1 (1977): 49-80.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. "End of Empire: Islam, Nationalism and Women in Turkey." in *Women, Islam and the State*, ed. Deniz Kandiyoti, 22-47. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. *Cariyeler, Bacılar, Yurttaşlar*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1998.

Kansu, Aykut. *The Revolution of 1908 in Turkey*. Boston: Brill Academic Pub., 1997.

Kasaba, Reşat. "Incorporation of the Ottoman Empire, 1750-1820." *Review X*, (1987): 805-847.

Keyder, Çağlar. *The Definition of a Peripheral Economy Turkey 1923-1929*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Kılınçoğlu, Deniz Taner. Book Review: A History of Ottoman Economic Thought: Developments Before the Nineteenth Century. *Ekonomik Yaklaşım* 24, no. 87 (2014): 85-91.

Kocka, Jürgen and Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard. "Comparison and Beyond: Traditions, Scope, and Perspectives of Comparative History." *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*. Eds. By Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 1-32. New York: Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2009.

Koçal, Vedat. "Ak Parti'nin Siyasal Sosyolojisi." in *Yeni Sağ, Küreselleşme ve Türkiye, Türkiye'nin AK Parti'li Yılları*, edited by Nafiz Tok, Mehmet Özel, Vedat Koçal, 19-128. Ankara: Orion Kitabevi, 2014.

Koloğlu, Orhan. "Tarih Öğretiminde Bugüncülük/Presentizm Yanılsamalar ve Sonuçları." *Tarih Öğretimi ve Ders Kitapları 1994 Buca Sempozyumu*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995.

Köker, Levent. *Modernleşme, Kemalizm ve Demokrasi*, 10th ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

Kruger, Daniel H.. "Hobson, Lenin, and Schumpeter on Imperialism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 16, no. 2 (1955): 252-259.

Kurban, Dilek and Yeğen, Mesut. *Adaletin Kıyısında: 'Zorunlu' Göç Sonrasında Devlet ve Kürtler 5233 sayılı Tazminat Yasası'nın bir Değerlendirmesi-Van Örneği*, 2nd ed. İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 2012.

Leysens, Anthony. *The Critical Theory of Robert W. Cox*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Love, Joseph L.. "Raul Prebisch and the Origins of the Doctrine of Unequal Exchange." *Latin American Research Review* 15, no. 3 (1980): 45-72.

Matthews, Wade. *The New Left, National Identity and The Break-up of Britan*. Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2013.

McCullagh, C. Behan. *The Truth of History*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Megill, Allan. "Epilogue: On the Current and the Future State of Historical Writing," in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing* 5, eds. Axel Schneider, Daniel Woolf, (2011): 678-88.

Özbaran, Salih. "Tarihçilik Üzerine Bazı Çağdaş Görüşler." *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 32 (1979): 587-606.

Özbaran, Salih. *Tarih ve Öğretimi*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1992.

Özbay, Cenk, Maral Erol, Aysecan Terzioglu and Z. Umut Turem, eds., *The Making of Neoliberal Turkey*. Surrey: Ashgate-Routledge, 2016.

Özdoğan, Günay Göksu. "Turkish Nationalism Reconsidered: The 'Heaviness' of Statist Patriotism in Nation-Building," in *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, eds. Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kizilyürek and Umut Özkirimli. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Özel, Oktay and Çetinsaya, Gökhan. "Türkiye'de Osmanlı tarihçiliğinin son çeyrek yüzyılı: Bir bilanço denemesi." *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 91 (2001): 8-38.

Pamuk, Şevket. *Osmanlı-Türkiye İktisadî Tarihi 1500-1914*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları: 2007.

Passingham, Richard. "Brain size and intelligence in man." *Brain, Behavior and Evolution* 16, no. 4 (1979): 253-70.

Quataert, Donald, *Social Disintegration and Popular Resistance in the Ottoman Empire, 1881-1908, Reactions to European Economic Penetration*. New York: New York University Press, 1983.

Roberts, Michael. "Postmodernism and the Linguistic Turn." in *Making History*, edited by Peter Lambert and Phillipp Schofield, 227-40. London: Routledge, 2004.

Sahillioğlu, Halil. "Ömer Lütfi Barkan." *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 41, no. 1-4 (1985): 3-38.

Sancar, Serpil. "Türkiye’de Feminizmin Siyasal Bilimlere Etkisi." *İstanbul Üniversitesi, Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Special edition: Türkiye’de Siyaset Bilimi, (March 2009): 119-32.

Saraçoğlu, Cenk. *Şehir, Orta Sınıf ve Kürtler İnkar’dan “Tanıyarak Dışlama”ya*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2011.

Seren, Ahmet [Toprak, Zafer], "Türkiye İşçi Sınıfı ve Tarihte 1 Mayıslar (1906-1925)," *Yurt ve Dünya*, no. 3 (1977): 393-412.

Skocpol, Theda, Evans, Peter B., Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, eds., *Bringing the State Back in*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Skocpol, Theda. "Sosyolojinin Tarihsel İmgelemi," in *Tarihsel Sosyoloji Bloch'tan Wallerstein'e Görüşler ve Yöntemler*, ed. Theda Skocpol, trans. Ahmet Fethi, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999.

Smith, Tony. "The Logic of Dependency Theory Revisited." *International Organization* 35, no. 4 (1981): 755-761.

Somer, Murat. "Defensive and Liberal Nationalisms: The Kurdish Question and Modernization/Democratization" in *Remaking Turkey: Globalization, Alternative Modernities, and Democracy*, ed. E. Fuat Keyman. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2007.

Southgate, Beverley. "Intellectual history/history of ideas." in *Writing History Theory And Practice* eds. Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore, 243-260. London: Hodder Arnold, 2003.

Spirkin, Alexander. "The Principle of Causality" in *Dialectical Materialism*. Progress Publishers, 1983.
<https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/spirkin/works/dialectical-materialism/ch02-s06.html>

Stanford, Michael. *A Companion to the Study of History*. Oxford: Cambridge: Blackwell, 1994.

Stanford, Michael. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of History*. Oxford: Cambridge: Wiley-Blackwell, 1998.

Şımanov, Dimitri. *Türkiye İşçi Ve Sosyalist Hareketi*, 2nd Ed., İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1990.

Şimşek, Leyla. *Günümüz Basınında Kadın(lar)*. İstanbul: Alt Kitap, 2000.

Taner, Özkan. "Toprak, Zafer: Tarihi, Faydacı Bir Yaklaşımla Manipüle edilen Pedagojik Bir Araç Olarak Görüyoruz," *Yeni Düşün*, no. 53 (August 88): 21-31.

Tarih ve Toplum, *Hakkımızda*,
<http://www.tarihtoplum.com/public/sayfa.aspx?id=749> (accessed Aug. 27, 2017).

Tekeli, Şirin. *Kadınlar ve Siyasal Toplumsal Hayat*. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları, 1982.

ed. *1980' ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1990.

Thompson, E. P., "The Peculiarities of the English." in *The Socialist Register*, 1965, re-edited in *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays*. London: Merlin Press, 1978.

Thompson, E.P., *Teorinin Sefaleti*, Trans. Fethi Yıldırım. İstanbul: Alan Yayıncılık, 1994.

Tipps, Dean C., "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15, no. 2 (1973): 201.

Toprak, Zafer, "Aydınlık Dergisi [1921-1925], Marksizm ve Feminizm," *Müteferrika*, no. 50 (2016): 4.

"I. Dünya Savaşı'ndan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye'de Devletçilik," *Teori*, no. 325, (2017): 10-15.

"II. Meşrutiyet'te Popülizm: Falih Rıfkı ve Ziya Gökalp'in Halkçılık Anlayışları", in *Yakın Türkiye Tarihinden Sayfalar - Sina Akşin'e Armağan*, ed. Mehmet Ö. Alkan, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2014.

"Tarih Yazımında Bilimsellik," interviewed by Fevziye Özberk. *Bilim ve Ütopya*, no. 262, April 2016, 76-85.

"Türkiye'de "Narodnik" Milliyetçiliği ve Halkçılık (1908-1918)", in *Türkler* vol.14, eds. H.C. Güzel, K. Çiçek & S. Koca, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Stratejik Araştırma Merkezi Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002), 801-806.

Türkiye'de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2016.

Türkiye'de Kadın Özgürlüğü ve Feminizm (1908-1935), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2015.

Türkiye'de Popülizm 1908-1923, İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2013.

Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908-1918, İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2012.

Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji, İstanbul; Doğan Kitap, 2012.

İttihat-Terakki ve Cihan Harbi – Savaş Ekonomisi ve Türkiye'de Devletçilik 1914-1918, İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2003.

Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum (1908-1950) Milli Burjuvazi, Milli İktisat-Milli Burjuvazi, İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995.

Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum (1908-1950) İttihat-Terakki ve Devletçilik, İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995.

Toprak, Zafer ve Şevket Pamuk (eds.), *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2000)*, Ankara; Yurt Yayınları, 1988.

Türkiye'de Milli İktisat (1908-1918), Ankara; Yurt Yayınları, 1982.

"Nâzım Hikmet, Üçüncü Enternasyonal ve Mahatma Gandhi", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 264 (2015): 58-66.

Toprak, Zafer [söyleşi], "Cumhuriyet Toplumu Nasıl İnşa Etti?" *Bilim ve Ütopya*, no. 254 (2015): 43-49.

"Nâzım Hikmet'in Putları Kırıyoruz Kampanyası ve Yeni Edebiyat", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 261 (September 2015): 34-42.

"Mayakovski'nin İntiharı ve Nâzım Hikmet", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 260 (August 2015): 22-31.

"Savaşların En Yoğunlu: Çanakkale Harbi- 1915", *Yeni Türkiye - Çanakkale Özel Sayısı*, no. 65 (January-February 2015): 209-214.

"Çanakkale'de Kara, Deniz ve Hava Gücü Koordinasyonu- Amfibi Harekâtı, Denizaltılar, Uçak Gemileri, Sabit Balonlar", *Yeni Türkiye-Çanakkale Özel Sayısı*, no. 65 (January-February 2015): 482-490.

"Sanayiden ve Emekten Yana Bir Dergi: Sanayi Mecmuası", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 253 (January 2015): 60-70.

"Dünden Bugüne Popülizm ve Demokrasi Paradoksu", *Politus - Politik Kültür Dergisi*, year 4, no. 10 (Winter 2014): 22-27.

"Hukuk-ı Esasiyye ve Hukuk-ı Nisvân: Leon Duguit'de Kadın Hukuku - 1923", *Akademik Yaşamının 55. Yılı Onuruna Rona Aybay'a Armağan-Legal Hukuk Dergisi Özel Sayı* (December 2014): 2209-2233.

"Hukuk-ı Nisvân' ya da Osmanlı Kadın Hukuku", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 248 (August 2014): 36-46.

"Gazi, Afet Hanım ve Kadınların Siyasal Hakları", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 247 (July 2014): 28-37.

"TİP Kongreleri, Kürt Sorunu ve E. J. Hobsbawm", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 236 (August 2013): 56-62.

"Şerif Mardin ve Bilimi- Çoğulcu Bir Modernleşme Sorunsalı", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 235 (July 2013): 58-63.

"Türkiye'de Durkheim Sosyolojisinin Doğuşu", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 238 (October 2013): 22-32.

"Bir Çağa Damgasını Vuran Savaş: Çanakkale Harbi", in Haluk Oral, *Arıburnu 1915- Çanakkale Savaşı'ndan Belgesel Öyküler*, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları (2012): x1-xxxvii,

"Türkiye’de Çağdaş Tarihçilik ve Eric Hobsbawm Faktörü", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 227 (November 2012): 36-49.

"Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye’sinde Finansal Yapı," *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal’in Türkiye’si- La Turquie Kamâliste*, İstanbul; Boyut Yayıncılık (2012): 118-125.

"Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye’de Tarihçilik," *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal’in Türkiye’si- La Turquie Kamâliste*, İstanbul; Boyut Yayıncılık (2012): 176-181.

"Mekteb-i Mülkiye, İlm-i Akâm ve Antropolojiya," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 224 (August 2012): 26-39.

"Antropolojik Dilbilim, Dil Devrimi ve Sadri Maksudi," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 219 (March 2012): 38-49.

"Antropolojiden Biyolojiye – Erken Cumhuriyet’in Doğa Bilimleri," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 218 (February 2012): 22-34.

"Tekinalp ve Rıfat Bali’nin Yanılgısı," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 218 (February 2012): 88-90.

“Darwinizm’den Ateizm’e Türkiye’de Tarih Eğitiminin Evrimi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 216 (December 2011): 2-14.

“Cumhuriyet Bürokrasisi ve Toplum Mühendisliği,” in *Dersim Harekâtı ve Cumhuriyet Bürokrasisi- 1936-1950*, eds. Tuba Akekmekçi & Muazzez Pervan, İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları (2011): ix-xxviii.

“Halk Fırkası’nın Kuruluş Evresi: ‘Halkçılık Programı’ ve 1923 Nizamnamesi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 213 (September 2011): 20-29.

“Sosyologların ve Psikiyatrist Hekimlerin Farklı Yorumları: Erken Cumhuriyet Genç Kız-Kadın İntiharları,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 212 (August 2011): 40-48.

“Westphalia’dan Dersim’e Kürt Sorunu,” in *Kürt Sorunu ve Devlet – Tedip ve Tenkil Politikaları (1925-1947)*, ed. Tuğba Yıldırım, İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları (2011): vii-ix.

“Şerif Mardin ve Türk Modernleşmesi,” in *Mardinîzadeler ve Büyük Âlim Ebül’ûla Mardin*, İstanbul; Mardin Valiliği Neşriyatı (2011): 37-49.

“‘Mukaddes’ten ‘Temeddün’e Kültür Devrimi – Şemsettin Günaltay ve Türk Tarih Tezi Eleştirilerine Yanıt,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 208 (April 2011): 38-50.

“Dolikosefalden Brakisefale Türk Irkı – Şevket Aziz Kansu ve Antropolojinin Evrimi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 207 (March 2011): 18-29.

“Âdem Havva’dan Homo-Alpinus’a – Eugène Pittard, Antropoloji ve Türk Tarih Tezi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 206 (February 2011): 16-29.

“Atatürk, Eugène Pittard ve Afet Hanım – En Büyük Antropolojik Anket,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 205 (January 2011): 20-30.

“Erken Cumhuriyet’in Bilimi: Antropoloji – Türkiye’de Antropolojinin Doğuşu,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 204 (December 2010): 26-33.

“Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet’e Bankacılık Sektörü,” *Geçmişten Geleceği Türk Bankacılık Sektörü*, Ankara; Bankacılık Düzenleme ve Denetleme Kurumu (2010): 35-44.

“Antropolojik Irk Sorunu ve Dersim’de ‘Uygarlaştırıcı Misyon’,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 202 (October 2010): 60-67.

“Doğu Anadolu’da ‘Uygarlaştırıcı Misyon,’ in *Doğu Anadolu’da Toplumsal Mühendislik – Dersim-Sason (1934-1946)*, İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları (2010): vii-xx.

“Küreselleşme Evreleri ve Türkiye’de Finansal Yapının Evrimi,” in *Küreselleşen İstanbul’da Ekonomi*, ed. Çağlar Keyder, İstanbul; Osmanlı Bankası Arşiv ve Araştırma Merkezi (2010): 85-90.

“Doğu Sorunu ve Necmeddin Sahir Sılan’ın Raporları,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 195 (March 2010): 48-56.

“Toplumsal Mühendislik ve Necmeddin Sahir Sılan,” in *‘Doğu Sorunu’ – Necmeddin Sahir Sılan Raporları (1939-1953)*, eds. Tüba Akekmekçi & Muazzez Pervan, İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları (2010): ix-xxiii.

“Balkan Harbi ve ‘Total’ Tarih”, in Oya Dağlar Macar, *Balkan Savaşları’nda Salgın Hastalıklar ve Sağlık Hizmetleri*, İstanbul; Libra Kitapçılık ve Yayıncılık (2010): 11-15.

“Adam Smith’ten Maynard Keynes’e Türkiye’de İktisadi Düşünce,” *Aydınlanma ve Ekonomi*, in, Yayına hazırlayan: Taner Berksoy, İstanbul; Osmanlı Bankası Arşiv ve Araştırma Merkezi Yayını (2009): 28-32.

“Balkan Yenilgisi, Kimlik Sorunu ve Averof Zırhlısı,” in *Osmanlı Donanmasının Seyir Defteri – Gemiler, Efsaneler, Denizciler*, İstanbul; Pera Müzesi Yayını (2009): 77-87.

“The Financial Structure of the Stock Exchange in the Late Ottoman Empire,” in Philip L. Cottrell (ed.), *East Meets West – Banking, Commerce and Investment in the Ottoman Empire*, Burlington; Ashgate Publishing Company (2008):143-159.

“‘Reel’den ‘İmajiner’e Güvenlik Meselesi – Osmanlı Kolluk Kuvvetleri ve Marjinaller,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 175 (July 2008): 54-62.

“Osmanlı’nın Son Döneminde İstanbul Sokaklarında Marjinaller: Hırsızlar, Dolandırıcılar, Yankesiciler,” in *İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, no. 38 (March 2008): 275-279.

“Cumhuriyet, Demiryolu ve Laiklik – Bir ‘Modernite’ Metaforu,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 168 (December 2007): 26-31.

“Üçüncü Cumhuriyet Fransa’sı, ‘Aydınlanma’ ve Osmanlı’da Tarih yazıcılığı,” in Binnaz Toprak (yayıma hazırlayan), *Aydınlanma Sempozyumu*, İstanbul; Osmanlı Bankası Arşiv ve Araştırma Merkezi (2007): 79-87.

“Türkiye’de Tarih Yazımının Evrimi ve Yarının Tarihi,” *TÜBA Günce*, no. 37 (November 2007): 28-30.

“A War that Left its Mark on an Era: The Gallipoli Campaign,” in Haluk Oral, *Gallipoli 1915 – Through Turkish Eyes*, translated by Amy Spangler, İstanbul; Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları (2007): x1-xxxv.

“Tarih Yazımının Evrimi ve Türkiye’de Çağdaş Tarih,” in, *Sosyal Bilimler Öngörü Çalışması, 2003-2023 – Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Raporlar*, Ankara; TÜBA Yayını (2007): 203-231.

“From Plurality to Unity: Codification and Jurisprudence in the Late Ottoman Empire,” in *Ways to Modernity in Greece and Turkey – Encounters with Europe, 1850-1950*, eds. Anna Frangoudaki & Çağlar Keyder, London-New York; I.B. Tauris (2007): pp. 26-39.

“Türkiye’de Barış Ortamında Savaş Travması: Hava Taarruzuna Karşı Pasif Korunma,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 163 (July 2007): 40-47.

“Türkiye’de Enflasyon ve Yapısal Dönüşüm: II. Dünya Savaşı Örneği,” *Sentez – Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, no. 1 (2007): 10-12.

“Tahtelbahir’den Denizaltı’ya Çağın Vurucu Gücü,” in, Otto Hersing, *Çanakkale Denizaltı Savaşı*, translated by Bülent Erdemoğlu, İstanbul; Türkiye İş Bankası (2007): xxxiii-xlii.

"20. yüzyılda 1960'lar gerçekten çok önemli bir kırılma noktası", *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Mithat Alam Film Merkezi Söyleşi, Panel ve Sunum Yılığ*, İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi (2006): 435-440.

“Proto-Globalization and Economic Change in the Late Ottoman Empire: A Commentary,” in *New Perspectives on Turkey [Special Issue on Comparative Turkish and Japanese Modernities]*, no. 35 (Fall 2006): pp. 129-134.

“Düyyûn-ı Umûmiye-i Osmaniye,” in, *Düyyûn-ı Umûmiye’den İstanbul (Erkek) Lisesi’ne*, İstanbul; İstanbul erkek Liseliler Eğitim Vakfı (2006): 19-38.

"Ermeni Sorunu'nda Dünü İnşa Etmek ya da 'Mukatele'nin İcadı," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 147 (March 2006): 18-25.

"Bir Hayal Ürünü: İttihatçıların 'Türkleştirme Politikası' ", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 146 (February 2006): 14-22.

"'Yeni Tarih' Anlayışı ve İlhan Tekeli-Selim İlkin İkili," *İlhan Tereli İçin Armağan Yazılar*, editörler: Selim İlkin, Orhan Silier, Murat Güvenç, İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yayını (2004): 75-83.

"Türkiye'de Muhalefetin Doğuşu: II. Dünya Savaşı ve Tek Parti'nin Sonu," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 121 (January 2004): 70-75.

"Türkiye'de 'Sol Faşizm' ya da Otoriter Modernizm 1923-1946," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 100 (Spring 2004): 84-99.

"Türkiye'de Amerikan Üniversitesi Sorunu: Demokrat Parti, Lozan ve Robert Kolej," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 120 (December 2003): 92-97.

"Cumhuriyet'in Kilit Taşı: Harf Devrimi," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 118 (October 2003): 68-73.

"80. Yıldönümünde Lozan Barış Antlaşması," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 115 (July 2003): 64-71.

"Railways, The State and Modernity," in *Iron Track – Age of the Train*, Yapı Kredi Cultural Activities, Arts and Publishing (2003): 10-23.

"Osmanlı Donanması, Averof Zırhlısı ve Ulusal Kimlik," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 113 (May 2003): 10-19.

“Savaşların En Yoğunlu: Çanakkale Harbi – 1915,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 111 (March 2003): 74-79.

“Çanakkale’de Kara, Deniz ve Hava Gücü Koordinasyonu,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 111 (March 2003): 84-93.

“Sayısallaşma ya da Cumhuriyet’in Rasyonelleşmesi,” *Uluslararası Atatürk ve Çağdaş Toplum Sempozyumu*, İstanbul; İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, (2002): 244-259.

“Radikal Sosyalist ‘Enternasyonal’ ve Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası 1927 Kongresi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 106 (October 2002): 42-49.

“Türk Maarif Cemiyeti / Türk Kültür Kurumu: Ankara’DA İlk Özel Kolej 1928-1938,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 18, no. 105 (September 2002): 54-57.

“Cihan Harbi’nin Provası: Balkan Harbi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 104 (August 2002): 44-51.

“1980’ler Sonrası Yeni Aşırı Sağ,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 102 (June 2002): 2-3.

“Genç Kız ve Kadın İntiharları II – Cumhuriyet erkeğinin Kadın İmgesi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 99 (March 2002): 15-19.

“19. ve 20. Yüzyıllarda Kültür Tarihimizin Müzeciliğe Yansıtılması,” in *Kent, Toplum, Müze – Deneyimler-Katkılar*, editör: Burçak Madran, İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı Yayını (2001): 176-181.

“Osmanlı’da Toplumbilimin Doğuşu,” Cumhuriyet’ten Devreden Düşünce Mirası – *Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet’in Birikimi*, İstanbul; İletişim Yayınları (2001): 310-327.

“National Economy and Ethnic Relations in Modern Turkey,” in *State Formation and Ethnic Relations in the Middle East*, Usuki Akira (ed.), Osaka; The Japan Center for area Studies (2001): 187-196.

“Dr. Cemal Zeki’nin ‘Delişmen, Çılgın Kızlar’ı – Cumhuriyetten Genç Kız ve Kadın İntiharları,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 87 (March 2001): 25-29.

“Cumhuriyet ve Bankacılık,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 14, no. 80 (August 2000): 26-31.

“Osmanlı Devleti’nde Sayısallaşma ya da Çağdaş İstatistiğin Doğuşu,” in *Osmanlı Devleti’nde Bilgi ve İstatistik*, Ankara; Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü (2000): 95-112.

“Nâzım Hikmet’in Açlık Grevi – Mayıs 1950,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 77 (May 2000): 9-17.

“Amerika’nın Ülke Dışında İlk Koleji: Robert Kolej,” *Tombak*, no. 31 (April 2000): 18-25.

“Osmanlı’nın Dört Jeanne d’Arc’ı – ‘Karıların Sahibkıranı Jan Dark’ “ *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 75 (March 2000): 4-9.

“Muslihiddin Âdil’in Görüşleri: Kadın ve ‘Hukuk-ı Nisvan’” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 75 (March 2000): 14-17.

“Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyete Sermaye Birikimi ve Kredi Kurumlarının Evrimi 1850-1950,” *Activity – Active Dergisi’nin özel eki*, (November-December 2001): 2-5.

“Social Project in the Second Constitutional Period (Meşrutiyet): Solidarity, Profession and National Economy,” in *The Great Ottoman, Turkish*

Civilisation –2- Economy and Society (editor: Kemal Çiçek), Ankara; Yeni Türkiye, (2000): 245-263.

“İstanbul’da Mekân ve Sayısal İlişkiler,” in *Aptullah Kuran İçin Yazılar – Essays in Honour of Aptullah Kuran*, Çiğdem Kafesçioğlu & Lucienne Thys-Şenocak (eds.), İstanbul; Yapı Kredi Yayınları (1999): 453-459.

Toprak, Zafer. Seyfettin Gürsel, Ahmet Kuyaş, “Açıkoturum – ‘Yerli Malı Yurdun Malı; Her Türk Bunu Kullanmalı’,” *Cogito*, no. 21 (Winter 1999): 178-218.

“Jön Türk Devriminin Görselleşmesi – 10 Temmuz Bursa Sergisi –1909,” *Tombak*, no. 29 (December 1999): 72-82.

“Osmanlı’dan Günümüze Eğitim Tarihinden Örnekler – Arnavutköy Amerikan Kız Koleji,” *Tombak*, no. 29 (December 1999): 48-50.

‘Postmodernite, Kültür ve Tarih’, *Tarih Vakfından Haberler/ Aylık Bülten* (June 1999).

“Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e İstanbul’un Yönetimi: Şehremâneti,” *Tombak*, no. 28 (October 1999): 32-40.

“Türkiye’de Olimpiyatlara Başlangıç ve 1922 Taksim Mini-Olimpiyatı,” *Tombak*, no. 26 (June 1999): 102-109.

“Cumhuriyet Arifesi Türkiye’de İzcilik,” *Tombak*, no. 25 (April 1999): 71-81.

“II. Meşrutiyet’ten Mütareke yıllarına: Türkiye’de İzciliğin İlk Evresi,” *Tombak*, no. 24 (February 1999): 19-27.

“From Liberalism to Solidarism: The Ottoman Economic Mind in the Age of the Nation State (1820-1920), in *Studies in Ottoman Social and Economic Life*, editörler: Raoul Motika, Christoph Herzog, Michael Ursinus, Heidelberg; Heidelberger Orientverlag (1999): 171-190.

“Tek-Parti Cumhuriyeti ve Demokrasi,” *Yeni Türkiye*, year 4, no. 23-24 (September-December 1998): 1053-1058.

“Türkiye’de Sporun Tarihi – Spor Alemi Dergisi ve Türkiye’de İdman,” *Tombak*, no. 20 (June 1998): 4-9.

“Demokrasiye Geçerken Muhalefete Gözaltı – Fişler ve Fişlenenler,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 53 (May 1998): 4-9.

“Bir muhalefetin ‘Mikro’ Tarihi – Antalya, 14 April 1952,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 53 (May 1998): 10-14.

“Meşrutiyet ve Mütareke Yıllarında Türkiye’de İzcilik,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 9, no. 52 (April 1998): 13-20.

“Tesettürden Telebbüsü ya da Çarşaf veya Elbise – ‘Milli Moda’ ve Çarşaf,” *Tombak*, no. 19 (April 1998): 52-63.

“1968’i Yargılamak ya da 68 Kuşağına Mersiye,” *Cogito*, no. 14 (Spring 1998): 154-159.

“Sabiha (Zekeriya) Sertel ve Türk Feminizmi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 51 (March 1998): 7-14.

“Osmanlı Bankası ve Tarihten İzler,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 50 (February 1998): 15-22.

“Akbank’ın K lt r ve Sanat Etkinlikleri,” *T rkiyemiz*, year 27, no. 82 (November 1997): 4-11.

“Seyyahtan turiste - Sinaattan end striye,” *Forum*, 15 (August 1997): year 4 no. 8, 70-73.

“Bol evik İttihat ılar ve İslam Kominterni - İslam İhtilal Cemiyetleri İttihadı- İttihad-ı Selamet-i İslam,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 43 (July 1997): 6-13.

“Edo-Tokyo M zesi’nden Dersaadet-İstanbul M zesi’ne,” *Tombak*, İstanbul, no. 22 (July 1997): 31-37.

“Cumhuriyet’in İlk Yıllarında Adana’da Amele Buhranı ve Amele Talimatnamesi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 41 (May 1997): 7-13.

“Uluslararası Kimlik ve Kozmopolitlik,” *Tombak*, İstanbul, no. 20 (January 1997): 63-66.

“Liberty-Equality-Fraternity – ‘There’s Whirlwind of Politics All Around,’ “ in *The Proclamation of Freedom in Manastir 1908-1909*, İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayıncılık (1997): 14-18.

“Cumhuriyet İstanbulu,” in *İstanbul’un D rt  ağı*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul (1996): 70-75.

“Sivil Toplum, Temek Hak ve  zg rl kler ve Kanun-ı Esas ,” in *Mill  Egemenlik Sempozyumları 1996*, Ankara; TBMM K lt r, Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayını; TBMM Basım evi (1998): 189-196.

“1934 Trakya Olaylarında Hükümetin ve CHF’nin Sorumluluğu,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 34 (October 1996): 19-25.

“Masonluk ve Tek Parti: Sütunların Yıkılması - Masonluk uykuya giriyor - 1935,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 33 (September 1996): 30-35.

“Türkiye’de İlk İş Kanunu Teklifi: Amelenin Suret-i İstihdamına Dair Kanun Teklifi (1911),” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 6, no. 32 (August 1996): 6-10.

“1946 Sendikacılığı: Sendika Gazetesi, İşçi Sendikaları, Birlikleri ve İşçi Kulüpleri,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 6, no. 31 (July 1996): 19-29.

“Şirket-i Hayriye Amele Cemiyeti ve 1925 Grevi,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 5, no. 30 (June 1996): 6-14.

“Cumhuriyet Türkiye’si’nin Damat Adayları: Leyla Hanımı Kim Alacak,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 5, no. 28 (April 1996): 6-12.

“Cumhuriyet Damat Adaylarının (1927) Dikkatine: Hangi Kızla Evlenmeli,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 5, no. 27 (March 1996): 6-11.

“Tüketim Örüntüleri ve Osmanlı Mağazaları,” *Cogito*, no. 5 (Summer 1995): 25-28.

“Aydın, Ulus-Devlet ve Populizm,” *Türk Aydını ve Kimlik Sorunu*, der: Sabahattin Şen, İstanbul; Bağlam Yayınları (1995): 39-81.

“Tarih Yolculuğunda İstanbul Borsası,” *Görüş*, no. 22 (September-October 1995): 62-68.

“Türkiye’de Siyaset ve Kadın: Kadınlar Halk Fırkası’ndan Arsiulusal Kadınlar Birliği Kongresi’ne (1923-1935),” *İ.Ü. Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no. 2 (1994): 5-13.

“Çağdaş Hukuk Düzenine Yöneliş: Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye’de Adalet Örgütü,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Hukuk Devrimi*, İstanbul; Türk Hukukçu Kadınlar Derneği Yayını (1994): 33-49.

“Cumhuriyet, Devlet ve Sanat,” *Boğaziçi* (Autumn 1994): 47-53.

“YMCA,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 7, 531-532.

“Ticaret Odaları,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 7, 269-270.

“Şehreminleri,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 7, vol. 149-150.

“Şehremaneti,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 7 (1994): 147-149.

“Seçimler,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 6 (1994): 482-486.

“Robert Kolej,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 6 (1994): 335-338.

“Nüfus,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 6 (1994): 108-111.

“Mütareke Döneminde İstanbul,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 6 (1994): 19-23.

“Kemal Bey (Kara),” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 4 (1994): 519-520.

“İstanbul İşveren Sendikaları Birliği,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 4 (1994): 226.

“İstanbul İktisat Kongresi (22-27 November 1948),” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 4 (1994): 223-225.

“Güvenlik Hizmetleri,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 3 (1994): 457-458.

“Genelevler,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 3 (1994): 392-393.

“Fuhuş,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 3 (1994): 342-345.

“Fes Boykotu,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 3 (1994): 297.

“Esnaf (Osmanlı Dönemi - Cumhuriyet Dönemi),” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 3 (1994): 212-216.

“Borsalar,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2 (1994): 300301.

“Birinci Dünya Savaşı’nda İstanbul,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2 (1994): 239-242.

“Bir Mayıs Kutlamaları,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2 (1994): 236-238.

“Belediye Zabıtası,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2 (1994): 145-148.

“Belediye,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2 (1994): 137-140.

“Bankacılık,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2 (1994): 46-49.

“Nationalism and Economics in the Young Turk Era (1908-1918),” in *Industrialisation, Communication et Rapports Sociaux en Turquie et en Méditerranée Orientale*, (eds. Jacques Thobie et Salgur Kançal) Paris; L’Harmattan (1994): 260-266.

“Dünle Bugünü Örtüştüren Tarihçilik: Kent Tarihçiliği,” *Kent Tarihçiliği*, İstanbul; Toplu Konut İdaresi -Tarih Vakfı (1994): 3-7.

“Taksim Stadında Mini-Olimpiyat 1922,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 1, no. 4 (April 1994): 15-18.

“The Tourism Industry in Ottoman Times,” *Biannual*, İstanbul (Winter 1994): 20-23.

“Yeni Ölçülerle 60 Yıl: Arşından metreye, okkadan kiloya,” *Ekonomik Yorum* (March 1994/3): 68-72.

“İstanbul’da Spor: Vay Em Si Ey (YMCA) Jimnastikhaneleri,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 1, no. 2 (February 1994): 8-12.

“Cumhuriyet, Tevhid-i Tedrisat ve Robert Kolej 1923-1939,” *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi’nden Haberler* (January 1994): no. 1, 11.

“II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi’nde devlet, aile ve feminizm”, *Sosyo/Kültürel Değişme Sürecinde Türk Ailesi* vol. 1, Ankara (1993): 216-227.

“Aydınlatma,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1 (1993): 476-481.

“Atatürk Bulvarı,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1 (1993): 382-383.

“Arnavutköy Amerikan Kız Koleji,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1 (1993): 317-318.

“Amele Teali Cemiyeti”, *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1 (1993): 341-342.

“Altıncı Filo’yu Protesto Olayları,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1 (1993): 225-226.

“Altıncı Daire-i Belediye,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1 (1993): 220-223.

“Altı-Yedi Eylül Olayları”, *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1 (1993): 213-216.

“Adalet Örgütlenmesi,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1 (1993): 74-77.

“ ‘Seyyah’tan ‘Turist’e, ‘Sınâat’tan ‘Endüstri’ye : “Ecânib Sınâatı,” (Türkiye’e ‘Ecânib Sınâatı’ ya da ‘Turizm Endüstrisi’,” *İstanbul*, no. 6 (July 1993): 66-69.

Toprak, Zafer. “Önsöz,” David Fromkin, *Barışa Son Veren Barış*, İstanbul; Sabah Kitapları (1993): xiii-xv.

“Tarihçiliğin Alanı: Denizaşarı Tarih,” *Tarih Vakfı’ndan Haberler*, no. 24 (June 1993): 6-7.

“Tarihçiliğin Alanı: Çocuğun Tarihi,” *Tarih Vakfı’ndan Haberler*, no. 23 (May 1993): 6-7.

“Tarihçiliğin Alanı: Kitabın Tarihi,” *Tarih Vakfı’ndan Haberler*, no. 22 (April 1993): 8-9.

“Tarihçiliğin alanı: Kentlerin tarihi”, *Tarih Vakfı’ndan Haberler*, no. 21, İstanbul (1993): 9-10.

“70. Yılında İzmir İktisat Kongresi,” *Görüş*, no. 8 (March 1993): 64-69.

“Tarihçiliğin Alanı: Amanvermezlerin, Fakabasmazların Tarihi,” *Tarih Vakfı’ndan Haberler*, no. 20, (February 1993): 9-10.

“Tarihçiliğin Alanı: Reklamın Tarihi,” *Tarih Vakfı’ndan Haberler*, no. 19 (January 1993): 7-8.

“İzmir in an Unpublished Monograph 1920-1921,” in *Three Ages of İzmir – Palimpsest of Cultures*, İstanbul; Yapı Kredi yayınları (1993): 227-235.

“Tarihçiliğin Alanı: Frenginin Tarihi,” *Tarih Vakfı’ndan Haberler*, no. 18 (December 1992): 9.

“Tarihçiliğin Alanı: Meçhul Askerin Tarihi,” *Tarih Vakfı’ndan Haberler*, no. 17 (November 1992): 8.

“Modernization and Commercialization in the Tanzimat Period: 1838-1875,” *New Perspectives on Turkey*, no. 7 (Spring 1992): 57-70.

“Tarihçiliğin Alanı: Damak Tadının Tarihi,” *Tarih Vakfı’ndan Haberler*, no. 16 (October 1992): 10.

“Tarihçiliğin Alanı: Jestlerin Tarihi,” *Tarih Vakfı’ndan Haberler*, no. 15 (September 1992): 10.

“Tarihsel Nüfusbilim Açısından İstanbul’un Nüfusu ve Toplumsal Topografyası,” *Dünü ve Bugünüyle Toplum ve Ekonomi* (April 1992): No. 3, 109-120.

“Eski Türkçe Yazında Temel Hak ve Özgürlükler,” *Tarık Zafer Tunaya’ya Armağan*, İstanbul; İstanbul Barosu Yayını (1992): 531-555.

“Popülizm ve Türkiye’deki Boyutları,” *Tarih ve Demokrasi - Tarık Zafer Tunaya’ya Armağan*, İstanbul; Cem Yayınları; Üniversite Öğretim Üyeleri Derneği (1992): 41-65.

“Tarık Zafer Tunaya’nın Ardından,” *Tarih ve Demokrasi - Tarık Zafer Tunaya’ya Armağan*, İstanbul; Cem Yayınları; Üniversite Öğretim Üyeleri Derneği (1992): 13-28.

“Sosyal Tarihin Alanı ve Türkiye Gerçeği,” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 54/55 (Summer-Autumn 1991): 77-88.

“Tarık Zafer Tunaya ve Cumhuriyet’i Savunmak,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 87 (March 1991): 23-27.

“Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Şehremaneti,” *Türk Belediyeciliği’nde On Yıl - Bildiriler ve Tartışmalar*, Ankara; Büyükşehir Belediyesi (1991): 75-84.

“The Family, Feminism, and the State during the Young Turk Period, 1908-1918,” in *Première Rencontre Internationale sur l’Empire Ottoman et la Turquie Moderne*, İstanbul-Paris, Éditions ISIS (1991): 441-452.

“Cumhuriyet Ankarası’nda İlk Nüfus Sayımı (Tecrübe Tahriri - 1927),” *Ankara Dergisi*, vol. 1, no. 2 (May 1991): 57-66.

“Osmanlı’da Alafranga Evlenme İlanları,” *Aile Yazıları – 4 – Evlilik Kurumu ve İlişkileri*, Ankara; T.C. Başbakanlık Aile Araştırma Kurumu (1990): 555-559.

“Milli Mücadele Günlerinde Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri,” *Ekonomi ve Politikada Görüş*, no. 49 (December 1990): 30-31.

“ 'Anadolu’da Yeni Gün’de Kafkasya: Mustafa Kemal, Lenin ve Neriman Nerimanof,” *Görüş*, no. 41 (April 1990): 26-27.

“Yaşayan Türkologlar: Stanford Shaw ile Söyleşi,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 76 (April 1990): 9-10.

“Osmanlı’da ‘Ecnebi’ Ticaret Odaları,” *Finans Dünyası* (February 1990): 78-81.

“Osmanlı Kambiyoları,” *Finans Dünyası*, January (1990): 72-74.

“‘Milli Moda’ ve Çarşaf,” *Boğaziçi* (Winter 1989): 35-38.

“Tanzimat Ekonomisi ve ‘Günah Keçisi’,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 70 (November 1989): 21-22.

“Tanzimat ve Çağdaş Türkiye,” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 46-47 (Summer 1989-Autumn 1989): 41-55.

“Ali Reşad, Pozitivizm ve Fransız Devrimi,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 68 (August 1989): 54-56.

“Eski Türkçe Yazınımızda Fransız Devrimi ve Temel Hak ve Özgürlükler,” *Yayın Dünyasında Çerçeve - 200. yılında Fransız Devrimi* (July-August 1989): no. 46-47, 13-15.

“Mustafa Nermi ve Fransız İhtilâl-i Kebiri,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 67 (July 1989): 59.

“Diran Kelekyan, Fransız Devrimi ve Mülkiye Mektebi,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 67 (July 1989): 39-41.

“Kemalizm ve İslam,” (kitap eleştirisi), *19 Mayıs 70 Yaşında* (Cumhuriyet özel eki), 7.

“‘İçtimai inkılap’tan ‘ihtilal’e,” *19 Mayıs 70 Yaşında*, (Cumhuriyet özel eki), 3 (19 May 1989).

“Hobsbawm ve Türk Devrimi,” *Cumhuriyet* (18 May 1989): 5.

“II. Türk Bilim Tarihi Sempozyumu,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 65 (May 1989): 38-39.

Toprak, Zafer. “Prof. Feroz Ahmad ile Söyleşi,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 64 (April 1989): 44-46.

“Monetization and Commercialization in the Tanzimat Period (1838-1876)”, in *The State and the Economy in the Ottoman and Republican Periods*, ed. Faruk Birttek, İstanbul; 1988.

“Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Reklâmcılık”, *Boğaziçi*, no. 2 (1988): 22-29.

“80. Yıldönümünde ‘Hürriyetin İlânı’ (1908) ve ‘Rehber-i İttihad’”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 42 (Summer 1988): 157-173.

“İlân-ı Hürriyet ve Anadolu Osmanlı Demiryolu Memurin ve Müstahdemini Cemiyet-i Uhuvvetkâranesi”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 57 (September 1988): 45-50.

“Türkiye Tarımı ve Yapısal Gelişmeler”, in *Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2000)*, Ankara; Yurt Yayınları / Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği (1988): 19-35.

Toprak, Zafer, Şevket Pamuk, in “Sunuş”, *Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2000)*, Ankara; Yurt Yayınları / Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği (1988): 9-18.

“Hürriyetin İlânı ve Ermeni Tüccarlar”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 55 (July 1988): 43-45.

“Türkiye’de Toplumbilimin Doğuşu”, *Türk Toplumbilimcileri* (in) , vol. 2, der: Emre Kongar, İstanbul; Remzi Kitabevi (1988): 13-29.

“Osmanlı-Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Üzerine”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 40 (Winter 1988): 159-165.

“Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet Türkiye’si’ne Sendikal Gelişmeler: İstanbul Umum Deniz ve Maden Kömürü Tahmil ve Tahliye Amele Cemiyeti”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 40 (Winter 1988): 141-153.

“Türkiye’nin ‘Siyasal İktisad’ı,” *Cumhuriyet* (28 April 1988): 5.

“Osmanlı’da Alafranga Evlenme İlanları”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 51 (March 1988): 44-46.

“Osmanlı Kadınları Çalıştırma Cemiyeti, Kadın Askerler ve Milli Aile”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 51 (March 1988): 34-38.

“Halk Fırkası’ndan Önce Kurulan Parti: Kadınlar Halk Fırkası”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 51 (March 1988): 30-31.

“Ömer Seyfettin ve ‘Sivil Toplum’”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, No. 31/39 (Autumn 1985): (Autumn 1987): 113-127.

“Cumhuriyet Arifesi Evlilik Üzerine Bir Anket: Görücülük mü ? Görüşücülük mü ?”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 50 (February 1988): 32-34.

“İstanbul’da Amele Bayramları: II, Cumhuriyet’in ilk Yılları”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 43 (July 1987): 44-47.

“İstanbul’da Amele Bayramları:-I- Cumhuriyet Öncesi”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 41 (May 1987): 35-42.

“İstanbul’da Fuhuş ve Zührevi Hastalıklar 1914-1933”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 39 (March 1987): 31-40.

“Meşrutiyet’ten Cumhuriyet’e Müstehcen Avam Edebiyatı”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 38 (February 1987): 25-28.

“Bir Evrak-ı Muzır: Şehrah Gazetesi”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 37 (January 1987): 45-47.

“Kısırlığa Meydan Okuyan Zanaatkâr,” *Yeni Gündem*, no. 13, (2-8 June 1986): 54-55.

“Osmanlı Aydını: Münevverden Aydına Popülist Özlemler”, *Milliyet Sanat Dergisi*, no. 157 (1 December 1986): 5-6.

“70. Yıldönümünde İttihat ve Terakki’nin 1916 Kongresi”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 33 (September 1986): 5-10; no. 34 (October 1986): 13-16; no. 35 (November 1986): 10-13; no. 36 (December 1986): 15-18.

“Türkiye’de Çağdaş Tarihçilik (1908-1970)”, *Türkiye’de Sosyal Bilim Araştırmalarının Gelişimi*, ed. Sevil Atauz, Ankara; Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği (1986): 431-438.

“Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Osmanlı Ekonomisindeki Gelişmeler”, in *1885-1985 Türkiye Ekonomisinin 100 Yılı ve İzmir ve İzmir Ticaret Odası*, İzmir; Mert Ofset (1986): 22-27.

“Tek Parti Döneminde Çalışma Yaşamı ve Amele Teali Cemiyeti”, *Düşün* (June 1986): 20-24.

“İktisat, Siyaset ve İttihat ve Terakki”, *Düşün* (April 1986): 29-31.

“1935 İstanbul Uluslararası ‘Feminizm Kongresi’ ve Barış”, *Düşün*, (March 1986): 24-29.

“Tanzimat’ta Osmanlı Sanayii”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. V (1986): 1345-1347.

“II. Meşrutiyet ve Osmanlı Sanayii”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. V (1986): 1348-1359.

“Osmanlı Devleti ve Sanayileşme Sorunu”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. V (1986): 1340-1344.

“Türklerin Şarlok Holmes’i Aman Vermez Avni”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. V (1986): 1274-1276.

“Osmanlı’nın Son Döneminde Hırsızlar, Dolandırıcılar, Yankesiciler”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* vol. V (1986): 1272-1273.

“Tanzimat’tan Sonra Osmanlı Kolluk Kuvvetleri”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. V (1986): 1269-1276.

“Meşrutiyet’te Seçimler ve Seçim Mevzuatı”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. IV (1986): 973-976.

“II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İç Borçlanma”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. IV (1986): 942-943.

“Osmanlı Devleti’nde Para ve Bankacılık,” *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. III (1985): 760-770.

“Milli İktisat”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. III (1985): 740-747.

“II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İktisadi Düşünce”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. III (1985): 635-640.

“II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde Paramiliter Gençlik Örgütleri”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. II (1985): 531-536.

“Osmanlı Devleti’nde Uluslaşmanın Toplumsal Boyutu: Solidarizm”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. II (1985): 377-381.

“Osmanlı Devleti’nde Korporatif Dünya Görüşü: Meslekçilik”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. II (1985): 371-376.

“1909 Cemiyetler Kanunu”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. I (1985): 205-208.

“II. Meşrutiyet’te Fikir Dergileri”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. I (1985): 126-132.

“Sosyal Politika Tarihimizin İlk Önlemler Paketi - Müessesat-ı sınaîyyede çocukların ve kadınların çalıştırılması”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 27 (Autumn 1984): 229-237.

“Osmanlı Narodnikleri: ‘Halka Doğru Gidenler’”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 24 (Winter 1984): 69-81.

“Fikir Dergiciliğinin Yüz Yılı”, in *Türkiye’de Dergiler-Ansiklopediler (1849-1984)*, İstanbul; Gelişim Yayınları (1984): 13-54.

“Ölçüler Kanunu (1931)”, *Yapıt*, no. 47/2 (December-January 1983/84): 37-43.

“‘Yüzyıllık Pahalılık’ Üzerine”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 23 (Autumn 1983): 133-135.

“Unutulan Kongre: 1948 Türkiye İktisat Kongresi”, *İktisat Dergisi*, no. 211-212 (June-July 1982): 37-42.

“1909 Tatil-Eşgal Kanunu Üzerine,” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 13 (Spring 1981): 141-156.

“Almanya’ya İlk İşçi ve Öğrenci Göçü: 1916-1918,” *Bilim ve Sanat*, no. 3 (March 1981): 26-27.

“Türkiye’de Korporatizmin Doğuşu”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 12 (Winter 1980): 41-49.

“Ahmed Cevat’ın Bir Risalesi: Amele ve Köylü Kitleleri Nasıl Fırka Teşkil Eder?”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 9-10 (Spring-Summer 1980): 103-121.

“Osmanlı Devleti’nin Birinci Dünya Savaşı Finansmanı ve Para Politikası”, *ODTÜ Gelişme Dergisi* (1979-1980) -(1980): 205-238.

“İttihat ve Terakki’nin Paramiliter Gençlik Örgütleri”, *B.Ü. Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, VII (1979): 95-113.

“İslâm İhtilâl Cemiyetleri İttihadı (İttihad-ı Selamet-i İslâm) ve Panislamizm”, in *Türk Arap İlişkileri: Geçmişte, Bugün ve Gelecekte*, Ankara; Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayını (1979): 174-181.

“Cihan Harbi Yıllarında İttihat ve Terakki’nin İaşe Politikası”, *B.Ü. Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, VI (1978): 211-225.

“Türkiye Sosyalist Fırkası’nın bir Risalesi: Sosyalistlik Nedir”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 1 (Spring 1977): 13-38.

“Halkçılık İdeolojisinin Oluşumu”, in *Atatürk Döneminin Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Sorunları*, İstanbul (1977): 13-38.

“İkinci Meşrutiyet’te Solidarist Düşünce: Halkçılık”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 1 (Spring 1977): 92-123.

Ahmet Seren [Toprak, Zafer], “Türkiye İşçi Sınıfı ve Tarihte 1 Mayıslar (1906-1925),” *Yurt ve Dünya*, no. 3 (May 1977): 393-412.

Onur, Hakkı. [Toprak, Zafer], “1908 İşçi Hareketleri ve Jön Türkler,” *Yurt ve Dünya*, no. 2 (March 1977): 277-295.

“Geçiş Dönemi Toplamları İçin Teorik bir Çerçeve -1-’ Üzerine”, *Birikim*, no. 15 (May 1976): 57-61.

“İlhan Tekeli ve Selim İlkin – Bilimde Otuz Yıllık İşbirliği,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 132, (December 2004): 16-20.

“‘Yeni Tarih’ Anlayışı ve İlhan Tekeli-Selim İlkin İkili,” *İlhan Tekeli İçin Armağan Yazılar*, eds. Selim İlkin, Orhan Silier, Murat Güvenç, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 2004.

"Aydınlık Dergisi [1921-1925], Marksizm ve Feminizm," *Müteferrika*, no. 50 (2016): 4.

"I. Dünya Savaşı'ndan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye'de Devletçilik," *Teori*, no. 325, (2017): 10-15.

"II. Meşrutiyet'te Popülizm: Falih Rıfkı ve Ziya Gökalp'in Halkçılık Anlayışları", in *Yakın Türkiye Tarihinden Sayfalar - Sina Akşin'e Armağan*, ed. Mehmet Ö. Alkan, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2014.

“Tarih Yazımında Bilimsellik,” interviewed by Fevziye Özberk. *Bilim ve Ütopya*, no. 262, April 2016, 76-85.

“Türkiye’de “Narodnik” Milliyetçiliği ve Halkçılık (1908-1918)”, in *Türkler* vol.14, eds. H.C. Güzel, K. Çiçek & S. Koca, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Stratejik Araştırma Merkezi Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002), 801-806.

Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfı 1908-1946. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2016.

Tosh, John and Lang, Seán, *The Pursuit of History*, Fourth Edition. Edinburgh: Pearson Longman, 2006.

Unat, Nermin Abadan. ed. *Türk Toplumunda Kadın*. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği, 1980.

Welskopp, Thomas, “Social History” in *Writing History Theory & Practice*, eds. Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore. London: Arnold, 2003.

Yeğen, Mesut. *Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999.

Son Kürt İsyanı, 3rd ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2016.

Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999.

Yılmaz, Levent. “Bir Tarihçinin Metnini Okumak,” in *Tarih Nasıl Yazılır? Tarih Yazımı için Çağdaş Bir Metodoloji*, ed. Ahmet Şimşek. İstanbul: Tarihçi Kitapevi, 2011.

Zammito, John, “Koselleck’s Philosophy of Historical Time(s),” *History and Theory*, no. 43 (2004): 131.

Zihnioğlu, Yaprak. *Kadınsız İnkılap: Nezihe Muhiddin, Kadınlar Halk Fırkası, Kadın Birliği*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET

Bu alışmanın temel amacı, Trk tarihilięinde nemli bir yere sahip olan Zafer Toprak'ın alışmalarının ve metodolojik yaklaşıminin bir analizini yapmaktır. Sosyal ve ekonomi tarihisi olarak, Toprak'ın alışmaları Trk tarih yazımı ierisinde bir ok alana yayılmıştır. Ekonomi tarihinden iři tarihine, feminist tarihten dnemin antropolojik alışmalarına kadar bir ok alanda retimde bulunan Toprak, zellikle ge Osmanlı ve erken Cumhuriyet dnemlerine dair alışmalar yapmaktadır. alışmalarından dolayı bir ok akademik dle layık grlen Toprak, Boęazii niversitesi'nde uzun yıllar ders vermiř ve 2013 yılında emekli olmuřtur. Ko niversitesi'nde tarih dersleri vermeye devam etmektedir.

ocukluęunun bir blmn Heybeliada'da geiren Toprak, lise eęitimini en başarılı ęrenciler arasına girerek St. Joseph'te tamamlamıřtır. Toprak'ın sosyal bilimlere olan ilgisi bu dnemlerde bařlamıř ve lise yıllarında dnemin sol eęilimli literatrn takip etmeye bařlamıř ve bu ilgisi niversite eęitimini sosyal bilimler alanında yapmasını saęlamıřtır. Lise eęitiminden sonra Ankara niversitesi Siyasal Bilimler Fakltesi'ne bařlamıř, lisans eęitiminden sonra, yksek lisans eęitimi iin Londra'ya gitmiř ve burada, 1838 Osmanlı-İngiliz Ticaret Anlaşması zerine, yksek lisans tezini hazırlamıřtır. Yksek lisans eęitiminden sonra, 12 Mart 1971 muhtırasından dolayı, bir sre Trkiye'ye gelmeyi ertelemiř ve 1973 seimiyle birlikte Trkiye'ye dnř yapmıřtır.

Doktora alışmasını İstanbul niversitesi İktisat Fakltesinde tamamlayan Toprak, doktora alışması devam ederken Boęazii niversitesi'nde ders vermeye bařlamıřtır. 1960 ve 1970'lerin politik ortamı Toprak'ın ideolojik duruřu ve akademik alışmalarında etkili olmuřtur. 1970'ler aynı zamanda Trk tarih yazımının da geliřmeye bařladığı yıllardır. Bu dnemde, bir ok tarihi, Annales Okulu'nun tarih yazımına getirdiğı yenilikler erevesinde alışmalar yapmıř ve Trkiye'de tarihilik geliřim evresine girmiřtir. Fakat 1980 darbesiyle birlikte

Türkiye neoliberal ekonomi politikalarına geçmiş, 1960 ve 1970'lerin görece özgürlük ortamı yok olmuş ve bundan akademi de nasibini almıştır. Bu yeni neoliberal dönemde, işçi hakları ve görece liberal ortamın getirdiği özgürlükler yok olmuş, hak talep hareketleri bastırılmıştır. Buna karşın Toprak ve dönemin bir çok muhalif akademisyeni ekonomi alanında, sınıf, makro yapılar ve işçi sınıfına vurgu yapan çalışmalarına devam etmiştir. Yine neoliberalizm ile gündeme gelen post-modernizm'e karşı Zafer Toprak, bütünlüğü, ekonomik yapıları ve sınıf olgusunu savunmuş ve bu alanda çalışmalarına devam etmiştir.

Toprak doktora tezi olarak *Türkiye'de Milli Ekonomi* adlı çalışmasını yapmış ve bu çalışmada sınıf ve ekonomik yapı üzerine vurgu yapmıştır. Yükselmekte olan post-moderniteye karşı, bu çalışmasında, makro-yapılar üzerinde durmuştur, sınıfların oluşumunu göstermiş ve Türkiye'nin modernleşmesi üzerinde sürekliliğe vurgu yapmıştır. Cumhuriyet dönemi tarihçiliği, Türkiye modernleşmesini Cumhuriyet'in başlangıcı olarak ele alırken, Toprak, modernleşmeyi Tanzimat dönemiyle birlikte başlatmış ve Cumhuriyet döneminin Tanzimat'ın uzantısı olduğunu göstermiştir. Yani Türk modernleşmesi tarihinde kırılmaların değil devamlılığın olduğunu, modernleşme anlamında bütün yeniliklerin Cumhuriyet döneminde değil, aksine Tanzimat döneminde başladığını vurgulamıştır.

Toprak'ın doktora tezini hazırladığı yıllarda, Türkiye ekonomi tarihi üzerine hakim olan tartışmalar, Emperyalizm, Asya Tipi Üretim Tarzı ve Bağımlılık kuramı çerçevesinde ilerliyordu. 1960'ların liberal ortamı sayesinde Marksist yazın Türkiye'ye de girmiş ve bu dönemde Türkiye'nin ekonomik geri kalmışlığı tartışılmaya başlanmıştı. Türkiye'nin neden geri kaldığı, neden gelişemediği gibi sorulara, bu kuramlar vasıtasıyla cevap aranmaya çalışılıyordu. Fakat Toprak, Milli Ekonomi'de, bütün bu tartışmaları bir kenara bırakıp, son dönem Osmanlı ekonomisinin aslında dünya ekonomileri paralelinde gelişmekte olduğunu, salt liberal ekonomi politikalarının terk edilmeye başladığını, bunların sonucu olarak da devletçilik politikalarının uygulamaya konulduğunu göstermeye çalışmıştır. Yine ekonomiye paralel olarak, toplumun da bu doğrultuda evrildiğine ve geliştiğine vurgu yaparak, son dönem Osmanlı ekonomisini geri kalmışlıkla, emperyal

devletlerin sömürgesi veya yarı sömürge olmakla suçlayamayacağımızı iddia etmiştir.

Toprak, bu dönemde bir çok aydın ve bürokratin, Osmanlının, uyguladığı liberal politikaları bir an önce terk etmesi gerektiğine vurgu yaptığını, ve bu çerçevede düzenlemeler ve yasalar çıkarıldığını, yine aynı doğrultuda, milli ekonominin gelişmesi için bir gereklilik olan yerli bir burjuva sınıfının yaratılmaya çalışıldığını söylüyor. Yerli bir burjuva sınıfı yaratmak adına, Türk-Müslüman unsurun ticaret ve farklı sanayi dallarında etkinlik göstermeleri sağlanmış, bir çok yasal kolaylık sunulmuş ve devlet eliyle sermaye olanakları sunularak, bu yeni burjuva sınıfının gelişmesine katkıda bulunulmuştur. Ekonominin bel kemiği olan, bankacılık sektörünün gelişmesi için çaba sarfedilmiş ve daha önce yabancı sermayeye ait olan bankacılık sektöründe Müslüman-Türk iş adamları boy göstermeye başlamıştır. Ülkenin ekonomik sistemini geliştirmek için benimsenen korporatizm çerçevesinde toplumun bütünleşmesi sağlanmış ve küçük sermayenin büyümesi doğrultusunda devlet ekonomiye müdahale hakkını elinde tutmuştur. Korporatizm ve solidarizm ile Müslüman-Türk unsur birleştirilmeye çalışılmış, küçük sermayenin büyümesi sağlanmış ve sınıf ayrımının olmasına engel olunmuş yani “imtiyazsız ve sınıfsız bir toplum” yaratılmaya çalışılmıştır.

Yine, *Türkiye’de Milli Ekonomi* çalışması paralelinde, Toprak, dönemin işçi hareketlerini incelemiş ve modern anlamda işçi hareketlerinin ilk nüvesinin bu dönemde görüldüğünü, işçi bilincinin yine bu dönemde oluştuğunu söylemiştir. Her ne kadar Abdülhamid döneminde küçük çaplı işçi hareketleri görülse de, bunlar maaş artışı talebinin dışına çıkamamış, fakat Tanzimat’la birlikte işçiler maaş taleplerinin yanı sıra sosyal haklarını da talep etmiş ve bunun için aylar süren grevlere başlamışlardır. İşçilerin greve gitme nedenleri, kötü çalışma koşulları, günlük on iki saatten fazla mesai yapmaları, herhangi bir sağlık güvencelerinin olmaması gibi sebeplerdi. 1908 Devrimi’nin yaratmış olduğu özgürlük ortamında, işçiler hak talebinde bulunabileceklerini düşünüp, grevlere başlamışlardı. Ülkenin dört bir yanında, fabrikalarda ve ağır sanayi kuruluşlarında işçiler ayaklanmış ve maaş artışının yanı sıra, sağlık güvencesi, sendikal haklar, daha az mesai saati gibi

taleplerde bulunmuşlardı. Bu doğrultu da, çok kısıtlı da olsa, işçilerin çalışma şartlarında bazı düzenlemeler yapılmış ve işçi hakları artık gazete ve dergi köşelerinde tartışılmaya başlanmıştır. Dönemin bazı dergileri, endüstriyel iş sahalarının önemine vurgu yapıyor ve ülke ekonomisinin gelişmesinin ön şartı bu alanların gelişmesi olduğuna inanıyorlardı. Ve bu doğrultuda işçi haklarına da vurgu yaparak yazılar yayınlıyordu.

Bir diğer taraftan baktığımızda, her ne kadar *Hürriyet*'in ilanı eşitlik, adelet ve özgürlük bağlamında işçileri cesaretlendirmiş olsa da, Ta'til-i Eşgal kanunuyla birlikte işçiler bastırılmış ve sendikal hakları ellerinden alınmıştır. Bu kanundan sonra uzun bir süre işçiler sendikal örgütlenmeye gidememiş, hak talebinde bulunamamıştır. İttihat ve Terakki üyeleri, *Hürriyet* kavramının yanlış anlaşıldığı ve bir an önce bu grevlerin bastırılması gerektiğini düşünmüş ve bu doğrultuda en sert tedbirleri almaktan geri durmamıştır.

Yine ilk feminist kadın hareketleri de 1908 Devrimi sonrası ortaya çıkmış ve kadınlar, devrimin yarattığı özgürlük ortamında sadece anne ve eş pozisyonunda değil, artık birey olarak kendilerini ifade etmeye başlamışlardır. Kadınların giyim kuşam değişikliği, kamusal alanda görünmeye başlaması, ve liberal ortamın yarattığı kadın erkek eşitliği söylemi kadınları etkilemiş, ve dönemin kadın entellektüellerinin dile getirdiği kadın hakları üzerinden kadınlar, toplumda özne olmak için hak taleplerinde bulunmaya başlamışlardır. Her ne kadar annelik ve eş olma durumuna vurgu yapılsa da, Türkiye'de görülen kadın hareketleri Batı'daki kadın hareketlerinden etkilenmiş ve kadınlar, Batı'daki kadınlarla aynı ölçüde hak taleplerinde bulunmuşlardır.

1908'den sonra kadınların eğitime önem verilmiş, kadın liseleri açılmış ve meslek okullarında kadınlara da eğitim verilmeye başlanmıştır. Toprak, feminist hareketlerin ortaya çıkmasındaki temel etkenin sadece, 1908 Devrimi'nin yaratmış olduğu özgürlük ortamının olmadığını, aynı zamanda, I. Dünya Savaşının yarattığı ortamın da etkili olduğunu vurguluyor. Savaş döneminde erkek iş gücünün azalması, erkeklerin askere alınması, kadınların iş hayatında görülmesine olanak sağladı. Artık kadınlar erkeklerin çalıştığı gibi fabrikalarda çalışmaya başlamıştı.

Bundan dolayı, toplumda kadınların iş hayatına atılması gerektiği doğrultusunda yazılar yazılıyor, makaleler yayınlanıyor ve kadınlar çalışma hayatına özendiriliyordu. Ülkenin ekonomisinin çökmemesi için kadınların iş hayatına girmesi kaçınılmazdı. Ancak bu şekilde iş gücü krizi aşılabılır ve ülke ekonomisi toparlanabilirdi.

Dönemin bir çok aydını iktisat kitaplarında, gazete ve dergi gibi yayın organlarında, kadın erkek iş bölümüne değiniyor, ve kadınların da, Avrupa’da olduğu gibi, erkeklerle aynı alanda çalışabilmesi ve üretime ortak olması gerektiği tartışılıyordu. Dönemin bir çok aydını, her ne kadar kadının geleneksel rollerine sadık kalması gerektiğine vurgu yapsa da, nihayetinde kadın da erkek gibi dışarıda çalışabilmeli, eğitim alabilmeli ve erkeklerin sahip olduğu bir çok hakka sahip olması gerektiğini söylüyordu. Bütün bu tartışmalar, ve dönemin gereklilikleri doğrultusunda, kadın özne olabilmiş ve haklarını talep etmek için sesini yükseltmeye başlamıştı. Kadının kamusal alanda görülmeye başlaması, kadın erkek ilişkilerinde de değişime sebep olmuş, dönemin gazete ve dergileri, kadın ve erkek ilişkileri bağlamında anketler düzenlemeye başlamıştı. Görücü usulü evlenme tartışmaya açılmış, erkeklerin ve kadınların evelenecekleri kişilerde ne gibi özellikler aradıkları gazete anketleriyle araştırılmaya tabi tutulmuştu. Bu durum açıkca gösteriyordu ki, modern hayat toplumun en derinine kadar işlemeye başlamış ve geleneksel yapı çözülmeye yüz tutmuştu.

Toprak, ekonomi, işçi ve kadın hareketlerini büyük oranda modernizasyon teorisi bağlamında ele alıyor ve ekonominin modernleşmesiyle beraber toplumun bütün kesimlerinde eş zamanlı bir modernizasyonun gerçekleştiğini vurguluyor. Toprak, ekonomi, kadın ve işçi hareketlerini incelerken, hepsine bir bütün olarak bakıyor ve yapılarıdaki değişimin birbirlerini nasıl etkilediğini ve nasıl toplumsal ve bütünsel bir değişime olanak sağladığını inceliyor. Ekonomi alanındaki çalışmalarında, bankacılıktan, mecliste tartışılan konulara kadar her alana bakıyor. Dönemin aydınlarının ekonomi politikası üzerindeki söylemlerini inceliyor ve bunun yapılan yasalara nasıl etki ettiğini değerlendiriyor. İşçi hareketleri üzerine yaptığı çalışmalarında, dönemin işçi grevlerini, hak taleplerini, ve bunlar doğrultusunda

elde ettikleri kazanımlar ve kayıpları inceliyor. Yine aynı doğrultuda geçmişteki işçi hareketleri ile aralarındaki farklara değiniyor. Kadın hareketi incelemelerinde kadınların söylemleri ve talepleri, dönemin aydın kadınlarını ve yazılarını inceliyor. Kadınlar için açılan eğitim kurumlarının yanı sıra, değişimin getirdiği toplumsal bunalımlara “kadın intiharları”na değiniyor. Kısacası kadın hareketlerini incelerken tek taraflı bakmıyor ve bir bütün olarak bir çok alandaki gelişmeleri takip ediyor.

Toprak Popülizm çalışmasında da yine, milli ekonomi, işçi hareketleri ve kadın hareketlerindeki modernizasyon yaklaşımına benzer bir şekilde, Türkiye’de popülizm akımını inceliyor. Erken Cumhuriyet dönemi popülizminin Rusya’nın Narodnik hareketinden esinlendiğini, köylü ve alt sınıfa vurgu yaparak toplumun bütünleşmesinin sağlanmaya çalışıldığını öne sürüyor. İkinci meşrutiyet yıllarında ulusal kimlik arayışı, dayanışmacı ve bütüncül bir toplum modelini gündeme getirmiş ve güçlü bir orta sınıfın olmayışı, popülist gelişmelerin ortaya çıkmasına olanak sağlamıştı. Toprak, Türkiye’de milliyetçilik ve halkçılığın aynı anlama geldiğini ve halkçılığın Meşrutiyet yıllarına ve Cumhuriyet Türkiye’sinin ilk evrelerine damgasını vuran bir tür popülizm olduğunu iddia ediyor. Türkiye’de görülen bu popülist akım, Rusya’dan etkilenmiş ve Rusya’da eğitim görmüş aydın müslüman aracılığıyla Türkiye’de kök salmıştı. Yani, Rus Narodnik hareketi, modernleşmede gecikmiş olan Türkiye için çok uygun bir örnek teşkil ediyordu. Toprak’a göre, Narodnik veya halkçılık Türkiye’de aynı zamanda toplumcu bir özellik taşıyordu. Amaç toplumu birleştirmek, sınıfsal ayrımı ortadan kaldırmak, ve ülkenin gelişmesini sağlamaktı. I. Dünya Savaşı’nın neden olduğu ekonomik buhran, toplumda eşitsiz gelir dağılımı, çökmekte olan ahlaki yapı gibi sorunlar, meşrutiyeti ve cumhuriyeti popülizme yönlendirmiş ve bu döneme halkçılık damgasını vurmuştu. Türkiye’de popülizm, savaş yıllarında Gökaltı öncülüğünde solidarizm ile bütünleştirilerek, devletin takip ettiği resmi bir ideolojiye dönüştürüldü ve Halk Fırkası bu ideoloji çerçevesinde ortaya çıktı.

Toprak, Türkiye’de popülizmin köycülük hareketine benzediğini ve dönemin aydınlarının, popülizm için geleneksel kültürün kaynağı ve koruyucusu olan köylülüğe sahip çıkılması gerektiğini düşündüklerini söylüyor ve bu doğrultuda,

toplumsal bütünlüğü sağlamak için bir tür devlet ideolojisi olarak popülizm takip edilmeye başlandı diyor. Bu dönemde, yabancı literatür Türkiye'ye girmiş, ve Osmanlı aydını Avrupa'yı takip etmeye başlamıştı. Sosyoloji, antropoloji gibi bilim dalları Türkiye'de de tartışılmaya başlanmış ve bu alanda yazılar yayınlanıyordu. Kısacası, *aydınlanma* düşüncesi Türkiye'ye de girmiş ve dergiler bu bağlamda tartışmalar başlatmıştı. Bu yıllarda, *avam* kelimesi yerine artık *halk* kelimesi kullanılıyor, halkçılık ve dayanışmacılık önem kazanıyordu. Halka gitmek, halka inmek Osmanlı aydınının şiarı olmuştu. Bir ulusun halktan oluştuğunu ve bundan dolayı halktan ayrı bir ulus kavramının düşünülmemeyeceğini ve uluslaşabilmek için halka yükselmek gerektiğini düşünüyorlardı. Yani Osmanlı aydını halka doğru inmeli, halkı anlamalı ve toplumu bütünleştirmeliydi. Bu doğrultuda, halk ve üst tabaka kaynaşacak ve daha güçlü bir ulus oluşturulacaktı. İlk görev gençlere ve aydınlara düşüyor, halka inecek, ve halkla bütünleşeceklerdi. Toprak, bu dönemki popülist hareketlerin, 1950'lerden sonra ortaya çıkan ve günümüzdeki popülist hareketlerden tamamen farklı bir nitelik taşıdığını söylüyor. Bu dönemki halkçılık bir devlet ideolojisiydi ve sınıfları ortadan kaldırmayı amaçlıyordu. Halkı yükseltmek, ve halka inmek gibi kaygılarla ortaya çıkmış ve toplumun bütünleşmesini amaçlamıştı.

Toprak, diğer çalışmalarında olduğu gibi, popülizmin, Türkiye'nin modernleşmeye başlamasıyla birlikte Osmanlı toplumuna girdiğini dile getiriyor. Sosyoloji gibi bilim alanlarının Türkiye'de tartışma konusu olmaya başlaması, *Aydınlanma*'dan etkilenen aydınların toplumu ele alarak nasıl bir ulus inşa edileceğini düşünmeleri üzerine, popülist söylem de Türkiye'ye girmiş oldu ve zamanla bir devlet ideolojisi haline geldi diyor.

Fakat Toprak'ın antropoloji çalışmalarına gelindiğinde kendi içinde bazı sorunlar taşıdığı gözlemleniyor. Toprak bu çalışmasında, Mustafa Kemal'in entellektüel uğraşları üzerinde duruyor ve dönemin antropolojik çalışmalarını inceliyor. Mustafa Kemal 1930'larda kültürel çalışmalara ağırlık vermeye başlıyor ve bu doğrultuda *Türk Tarih Tezi* ve *Antropoljik Irk* çalışmalarına bizzat ön ayak olup bu alanlarda çalışmaların yürütülmesini sağlıyor. Toprak bu çalışmaların yıllardır Türk

tarihçiliğinde haksız yere suçlandığına vurgu yapıyor ve bu çalışmaların temel amacının ırkçılık olmadığını, aksine Türkiye sınırları içerisinde yaşayan bütün toplumların aynı ırktan geldiğine vurgu yapıldığı iddia ediyor. Kürt, Türk, Laz, Çerkez gibi etnik ayrım yapılmadığını, hepsinin aynı ırka mensup olduğunu ve asıl amacın Avrupa’da yürütülen ırkçı çalışmalara cevap vermek için bu çalışmaların başlatıldığını öne sürüyor. Avrupa’daki *beyaz ırk ve sarı ırk* ayrımında Türklerin sarı ırka mensup olduğu ve sarı ırkın aşağı bir ırk olduğu iddia ediliyordu. Bu durumdan rahatsız olan Mustafa Kemal, Türk ırkının sarı ırka mensup olmadığını aksine beyaz ırktan geldiğini kanıtlamaya çalışmıştır. Ve bu doğrultuda antropolojik ırk çalışmalarını yürütmüştür. Bu çalışmaların sonunda her ne kadar, dünya genelinde ve Türkiye’de bazı çevreler tarafından kabul görmese de, Mustafa Kemal beyaz ırka mensup olduğunu bu çalışmalar aracılığıyla kanıtlamıştır. Toprak bu çalışmalar, her ne kadar olumlu sonuçlar doğurmasa da, dönemin bir gerekliliği olduğunu ve ulus-devlet inşası için yapılması gerektiğini öne sürüyor. Bu çalışmaları dönemin kendi gereklilikleri doğrultusunda incelemek gerektiğini, aksi halde anakronizme düşmüş olacağımızı iddia ediyor.

Yine antropolojik çalışmalar kapsamında ele alınabilecek *Kürt Sorunu* çerçevesinde, kürtlere karşı bir ayrımcılık olmadığını, Kürtlerin de Türk ırkına mensup olduğunu ve aslında Kürtçe olarak bilinen dilin “Dağ Türkçesi” olduğunu iddia eden çalışmaları inceleyen Toprak, bu bağlamda da yine etnik bir ayrımcılık veya asimilasyon olmadığını, aksine yine ulus-devlet çerçevesinde farklı etnik grupları kendi bünyesine dahil etmeye çalıştıklarını söylüyor. Kürt bölgelerinin, ekonomik ve sosyal anlamda geri kalmış olması, bölgedeki aşiret reislerinin bölge insanı üzerinde baskı uygulaması, vergi vermemesi ve devlete karşı çıkması, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nin bir an önce önlem almasını gerektirmiştir. Toplumsal mühendislik çerçevesinde, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti gereken tedbirleri almak zorunda kalmış ve bu bölgeyi iyileştirmek ve bütüne dahil etmek için bazı askeri müdahalelerde bulunmuştur. Kısacası, Toprak, devletin Kürt politikasının *dışlayıcı* değil, aksine *kapsayıcı* bir niteliğe sahip olduğuna inanıyor.

Bu çalışmada, yukarıda kısaca bahsedilen Toprak'ın çalışmalarının genel analizi ve argümanlarının sunulmasından sonra, metodolojik yaklaşımı ele alınmıştır. Bu doğrultuda, öncelikle belirtmek gerekir ki, Toprak Osmanlı modernleşmesini, modernite teorisi kapsamında ele alıyor ve ortaya çıkan bir değişimin diğerlerini de etkilediğini söylüyor. Bu bağlamda yaptığı bütün çalışmalar bir bütünlük arz ediyor. Osmanlı Tanzimat dönemini *Osmanlı rönesansı* olarak ele alıyor ve bir çok yeniliğin bu dönemde başladığını çalışmalarıyla göstermeye çalışıyor. Türk modernleşme tarihine ilerleme olarak bakıyor ve bu doğrultuda gelişmeleri ele alıyor.

Toprak Annales Okulu'nu her ne kadar takip ettiğini iddia etmese de, Annales okulunun *total history* ve *yapısalcılık* kapsamında ele alınabileceğini iddia edebiliriz. Annales Okulu gibi tarihe bir bütün olarak bakıyor ve bu bütün içerisindeki yapısal parçaları inceleyip genel bir sonuca varmaya çalışıyor. Fakat, Toprak'ın tarih yazımı, Annales Okulu'nun kesinlikle karşı durduğu aydınlamacı ve ilerlemeci tarih anlayışıyla çakışmaktadır. Toprak, yapısalcı ve bütüncül bir tarih anlayışına sahip olsa da, Osmanlı tarihini aydınlanma ve ilerleme üzerinden ele alıyor. Yine Annales okuluna paralel olarak, Toprak, Marksist tarih yazımı içerisinde ele alınabilir. Marksist sınıf kavramı ve yine yapısalcılığının Toprak'ın eserleri üzerinde hakim olduğunu görüyoruz. Annales Okulu'nun öncülüğünü yaptığı *betimleyici* (descriptive) tarih yazımını destekliyor ve *öyküleme* (narrative) tarih yazımından uzak duruyor. Tarih yazımında bilimselliği ve rasyonaliteyi savunuyor. Bu anlamda da, Toprak, Annales Okulu tarih yazımı çerçevesinde değerlendirilebilir.

Toprak, tarih yazımında her ne kadar açıkca bir karşılaştırma yapmasa da, kendi içerisinde gelişmiş Batı ülkelerini referans alarak ve modernizasyon teorisi çerçevesinde üstü örtük bir karşılaştırma yaparak, Osmanlı toplumu açıklamaya çalışıyor. Toprak bütün çalışmalarında, tarihte nedensellik üzerinde duruyor ve herhangi bir olayın ortaya çıkmasındaki nedenleri inceliyor. Bu anlamda, Toprak'ın, çalışmalarında çoklu nedensellik ilişkisi kurduğu söylenebilir. Ekonomi tarihi alanında kantitatif çalışmaların önemi çok büyük olsa da, Toprak kantitatif

alıřmalar yapmıyor. Bu durum her ne kadar bir eksiklik gibi grnse de, Toprak, bu alanda daha ok fikirler tarihi kapsamında ele alınmalıdır. Toprak'a gre, kantitatif alıřmalar her ne kadar ekonomi alıřmalarında byk nem tařısa da, toplumsal, fikirsel ve ideolojik tarafı olmadan, kantitatif alıřmalar sadece sayılardan ibaret olacaktır ve kendi bařına topluma dair bir aıklama getirmeyecektir. Bundan dolayı, Toprak'ın bu bořluęu doldurduęu iddia edilebilir. Toprak, alıřmalarında, sayılardan ok, topluma, ideolojiye ve fikir akımlarına odaklanmaktadır.

Toprak, 1980'lerin resmi tarih anlayıřına karřı net bir tavır sergiliyor ve tarih biliminin daha rasyonel temellere oturtulması gerektięine inanıyor. Yine dnemin neoliberal yaklařımı eleřtiriyor ve post-modernite ile tarih biliminin yapısalcılıktan uzaklařtıęını, artık btne deęil, tekil paralara nem verildięini, sınıf kavramının ortadan kalktıęını, gerek ve kurgu arasındaki farkın yok olmaya bařladıęını, ve bundan dolayı, yapısalcı bir tarih anlayıřının benimsenmesi gerektięini dile getiriyor. Ancak yapısalcı ve btncl bir tarih anlayıřıyla birlikte toplumun gereęine ulařılabileceęini vurguluyor.

Post-modernite ile birlikte nem verilmeye bařlanan Kltrel alıřmalar alanında da, herhangi bir alıřması mevcut deęil. Kltr olmadan, sadece yapılarla toplumu aıklayamayız. Yapıların oluřumu, kltr ve bireyden baęımsız deęildir. Bireyin anlam dnyası iinde bulunduęu kltrden etkilenererek řekil alır ve bu da btne yansır. Fakat, Toprak'ın yapısalcı tarih anlayıřı, kltre ve bireye bakmaya izin vermez ve dolayısıyla kltr alıřmaları Toprak iin yapılardan daha az nem tařımaktadır. Entellektel tarih kapsamında da Toprak'ın bir ok alıřma yapmıřtır. Toprak'ın fikir tarihi alanında yaptıęı alıřmalar, dnemin aydınlarının ideolojik yaklařımını ve fikirlerine dair bilgi edinmemizi saęlamaktadır. Bu anlamda, Toprak'ın, Trk tarihilięinde nemli bir konuma sahip olduęunu syleyebiliriz.

Btn bunların yanı sıra, Toprak dnemin siyasi durumundan etkilenmiř ve zellikle 1990'lar sonrasında, hem alıřmaları hem de siyasi duruřunda deęiřimler gstermiřtir. 1990'ların neoliberal ve post-modern yaklařımına karřı bir tavır sergilemiř, sosyal bilimler alanında, btnlę ve byk yapıları vurgulamıřtır.

Yine bu doğrultuda, özellikle 2001'den sonra, Akp rejiminin muhafazakar, islamcı politikalarına karşı bir tavır almış ve Cumhuriyet dönemi politikalarını savurnur bir pozisyona geçmiştir. Tarihçiliği de bu doğrultuda evrilmiş ve Akp'nin politikalarından etkilenen laik bir çok kesim gibi, erken Cumhuriyet dönemi yazınına bu tavrını aksetmiştir.

Toprak'ın çalışmalarının ve metodolojik yaklaşımının yanı sıra, kurumsal tarihçiliği, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk Enstitüsü bölümünde yapılan yeniliklerde öncülük yapması, yetiştirdiği sayısız öğrenci gibi alanlardaki katkısı Toprak'ı Türk tarihçiliğinde önemli bir yere koymaktadır.

Toprak Tanzimat dönemi ekonomi tarihini, Türkiye'de modernizasyonun başlangıcı olarak açıklıyor ve bu konuda, alanında hala öncülüğünü korumaktadır. Türkiye modernleşmesi Cumhuriyet dönemi ile başlatılırken, Toprak aksini kanıtlamış ve Tanzimat dönemiyle başladığını iddia etmiştir. Yani Cumhuriyet dönemi bütün yeniliklerin başlatıldığı bir dönem değil, Tanzimat döneminin bir devamı niteliğindedir. Bunun yanında, Toprak Dünya tarihçiliğini yakından takip eden bir tarihçidir. Bu anlamda, Türkiye'de tarihçiliğin daha bilimsel temellere oturtulmasında emeği geçmiş ve aynı zamanda özellikle *Tarih ve Toplum* ve *Toplumsal Tarih* gibi dergilerdeki yayınları sayesinde tarih biliminin popülerleşmesine katkıda bulunmuştur. Tarihi salt bilimsel ve akademik bir alandan, günlük bir uğraş haline getirmiştir. Boğaziçi Üniversitesinde Atatürk Enstitüsü bünyesinde sayısız öğrenci yetiştirmiş ve Türkiye'de Tarih biliminin ilerlemesi ve gelişmesine çok büyük katkılarda bulunmuştur. Atatürk Enstitüsü'nün geliştirilmesi ve daha bilimsel temellere oturtulması anlamında büyük emek harcamış ve bugün Atatürk Enstitüsü'nün Türkiye'nin sayılı Tarih bölümleri arasında yer almasını sağlamıştır. Bundan sonra, Atatürk Enstitüsü, dünyaya Atatürk ilke ve inkılaplarını tanıtan bir kurum olmaktan ziyade Türkiye'nin genel olarak modernleşme serüvenine eğilen, dünya yazınına takip eden, daha modern ve bilimsel bir kurum haline dönüşmüştür. Türkiye'de kurulmuş olan Atatürk Enstitüleri, tarihi 19 Mayıs 1919'da başlatıp, 1938'de bitirirken, Toprak, modern Türkiye tarihini Tanzimattan başlatıp günümüze kadar getirmiştir. Bir diğer

taftan, Enstitünün İngilizce ismini *Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History* olarak deęiřtirmiřtir.

Sonu olarak, Trkiye’de en retken tarihiler arasında sayılabilecek Zafer Toprak, Trk tarihilięine ok byk katkı saęlamıř ve Trk tarihilięinde Tanzimat dnemi zerine yaptıęı alıřmaları, bu dnemin ekonomik yapısına dair bir dnm noktası oluřturmuř ve bu dneme dair yeni bir bakıř aısı getirmiřtir. Her ne kadar kendi iinde bazı eksiklikler ve znel eliřkiler barındırsalar da, Toprak’ın alıřmaları kendi ierisinde bir btnlk oluřturmaktadır.



APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Yılmaz

Adı : Tülay

Bölümü : Tarih A.B.D

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : A CRITICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL
ASSESSMENT OF ZAFER TOPRAK'S HISTORICAL STUDIES

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☒ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☒
3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: