

## CHAPTER 4

# DEVELOPMENTALISM AND RURAL SOCIOLOGY: THE IDEOLOGICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC KNOWLEDGE IN THE EARLY COLD WAR PERIOD IN TURKEY

**Sinan YILDIRMAZ\***

\*Asst. Prof. Dr., İstanbul University, Faculty of Political Sciences, Political Science and  
International Relations Department, İstanbul, Turkey.  
e-mail: sinany@istanbul.edu.tr

DOI: 10.26650/B/SS30.2020.004.04

### **Abstract**

The focus of this study is on the “making” of the ultra-conservative intellectual dominance in Turkish rural sociology discipline. Discussions among intellectuals, the anti-communist “nature” of this academic field, the foundation of a new developmentalist perspective and how these sociology studies re-defined peasantry and the rural structure of the country in general will be discussed in this study. The change from the previously dominant Kemalist “peasantist” approach to a “new-peasantism”, which was transcribed for the changing Cold War conditions, will also be examined in this article. The ideological framework of defining developmentalism in the 1960s would be influenced from the dominance that had been created during the post-war period of intellectual discussions.

**Keywords:** Rural Sociology, Developmentalism, Le Play School, *Science Sociale*, *Prens* [Prince] Sabahaddin.

## 1. Introduction

Aziz Nesin, an important writer of humorous stories in Turkey, describes in his story *Üniversite Heyetinin Bir Köyde Sosyolojik İncelemesi* [The Sociological Investigation of the University Committee in a Village] the “funny” reaction that the villagers give to the sociologists who came to “investigate” them (Nesin, 1997). The peasants see the act of getting informed about them as the harbinger of imminent danger, whether it comes from the state or the university. The villagers, who are being targeted as the research object, are in doubt about the intentions of the researchers. At the end of the story, funny dialogues occur between the villagers that are trying to avoid the bad results they may encounter and those who research themselves. In terms of sociological research, the most important issue that this story reveals is the nature of the relationship between the process of “producing knowledge” and the subject of that “knowledge produced”. As Aynur İlyaoğlu stated, the distinctive feature of sociology lays in the theoretical existence of “mutual subjective relationship” between the researcher and the researched, from which the knowledge is gathered (İlyasoğlu, 2001, p. 84). The researcher is not independent of his/her reality in the process of reaching the reality of the subject of the research. The intention of the research, or the “intention of the researcher”, becomes important in this case. This study will examine the early “developmentalism” debates with a special emphasis on the development of the Rural Sociology discipline in Turkey by focusing mostly not on the reality revealed by the sociological knowledge gathered through the research during that period but through analyzing the changing reality of the researchers. In this way, it will be possible to emphasize the effect of the transformation of the sociological perspective on how the peasantry was defined in this period as both an academic and a political subject.

The intention of this study is to create a discussion on the origin of a concept, which became popular in the 1960s among intellectuals and sociologists in Turkey. “Developmentalism”, which became a symbolic discourse of the progressive and socialist understandings of the 1960s, actually found its place in a struggle within the discipline of sociology just after the Second World War. Although there can be divergent sources in the making of a developmentalist approach, the Turkish example has been shaped by the ultra-conservative ideological hegemony of the post-war period.

The focus of this study is on the “making” of this intellectual dominance in Turkey. Discussions among intellectuals, the anti-communist “nature” of this academic field, the making of a developmentalist perspective and how these sociology studies re-defined peasantry and the rural structure of the country in general will be discussed in this study. The

change from the previously dominant Kemalist “peasantist” approach to a “new-peasantism”, which was transcribed for the changing Cold War conditions, will also be examined in this article.

The development of the field of rural sociology in the world will first be explained. Secondly, the dominant hegemonic position of the Le Play sociology school in the area of rural sociology worldwide and its influence on the struggle of sociology schools in Turkey will be defined. In the last section, with the analysis of the *Prens* [Prince] Sabahaddin school as the followers of the Le Play school in Turkey, how this discipline of sociology met with developmentalism will be defined through the discussions made in the pages of *Forum* magazine. In this way, this article intends to answer the question of how this version of developmentalism became a dominant perspective in Turkey.

## **2. The “Profundity” of Rural Sociology**

The definition of Rural Sociology in the early periods of its development as an institutional identity is as follows:

Rural sociology is concerned with the relations of rural people to each other, the relations of rural people to other sections of national and world populations, with rural institutions, with the rural standard of living and with the social problems attaching themselves to life and labor on the farm and in farm communities (Taylor, 1923, p. 592).

At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, more than a third of the US population lived in the countryside, which was considered an important element in the elections and social mobility (Lobao, 2007, p. 465). The political rise of William Jennings Bryan from the Populist Party, who received great support from the countryside in the 1896 presidential election, led to an interest in the problems of the rural sections of society. City-centered industrialists initiated *The Country Life Movement* at the turn of the century with the concern that turmoil in the countryside could create a barrier to the production of a cheap food supply for the working class in the cities. This movement, which was created as a result of the concern of making a city-centered alternative to the radical economic proposals of the populist movement, proposed a social, cultural and moral reform program with the claim that the rural society lagged behind the evolution of the developed urban society. The reasons for the backwardness of the peasant groups were stated as the failure of organizational and the technological infrastructure and the failure of education and social institutions in the countryside, as opposed to the populists’ claims that base their assumptions mainly on the destructive effects of capitalism (Summers & Buttle, 2000, p. 2426). Towards the First World War, the intense population movement from

villages to cities also ended up with a crisis in food production, which ideally should flow at a stable pace especially in times of war. This rural to urban migration consequently caused problems in urban lifestyle and American society faced an increasing “peasant problem” in the pre-war period. In 1908, Theodore Roosevelt established an interventionist institution to carry out studies to solve the problems of the rural areas called the *Commission on Country Life*. The studies that were prepared in this commission paved the way for the implementation of two legal arrangements: *Smith-Lever Act* (1914) and *Purnel Act* (1925). These arrangements would provide institutional support for those who were willing to conduct sociological research on the rural structure to solve the probable and current problems of agricultural production. After this support, research departments specialized in this field grew rapidly. In 1936, the scholars working in the field related to the countryside published their research journal, *Rural Sociology*, and immediately left the *American Sociological Society* to develop their organization, which is the *Rural Sociological Society* (Summers & Buttle, 2000, p. 2426-27). The most important feature of the Commission and the subsequent organizations could be investigated in their sociological perspective to the problems of the rural structure. This new perspective and its followers particularly avoided focusing on the structural problems of agricultural producers and instead, they centered their attention on the individual characteristics of the peasants, their perception of cultural values, and the incompetence of village schools and religious institutions. The studies only consist of a compilation of results based on surveys and monographs focused on the “peasant family” (Lobao, 2007, p. 466).

Instead of regulating the rural relations of the country in the post-war period, these studies try to focus on the world where restructuring takes place. Village Sociology, which would be reshaped under the influence of the USA, has led to the acquisition of social knowledge and the collection of information that forms the basis of the projects to be realized all around the world in the future.

Carle C. Zimmerman and Pitirim Sorokin two important precursors of rural sociology studies also had an important effect on the development of this academic field in Turkey (Zimmerman & Sorokin, 1929). Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu invited Zimmerman to Turkey to give a series of lectures and their studies were translated into Turkish simultaneously (Baloğlu, 2008, p. 555-79).

As the disciples of Ferdinand Tönnies, Zimmerman and Sorokin praised the romanticized moral existence of peasantry against the destructive and unethical penetration of capitalism to modern urban life. Tönnies’ social analysis that built on the *Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft* distinction, becomes one of the most popular forms of analysis in the period following the

Second World War. The separation of social structures into “traditional” and “modern” is directly related to the politics that are thought to be carried out as a result of this separation. Durkheim’s dissociation of society based on mechanical and organic solidarity, or the separation of Edmond Demolins -also one of Le Play’s followers- into *formations communautaires* and *formations particularistes*, is similar to that of Tönnies. But the differences between their perceptions are related to the social imagination each one creates as a result of this distinction. According to Tönnies “the triumph of *Gesellschaft* over *Gemeinschaft* must sooner or later destroy modern civilization in the same way as the civilization of Rome was destroyed in the early centuries of the Christian era” (Ranulf, 1939, p. 16). This perspective also inspired *fin-de-siècle* anti-Enlightenment ideas that glorified the preservation of *Gesellschaft*-like structures (Ranulf, 1939, p. 17). Even if he distanced himself from these anti-enlightenment ideas towards the end of his life, the distinction he created about social structures would become one of the sources of anti-modernist conservatism in the following decades. These views of Tönnies would be incorporated into the conceptualization used in the post-World War II period to define “developed” and “underdeveloped” countries at different levels. The hierarchy between these countries created by the modernization theory coincides with the post-war aims of village sociology. In this way, rural structures in *Gemeinschaft*-like countries can be controlled by social projects to be carried out after the researches framed by village sociology methods.

### 3. Le Play Sociology and Social Reform

Auguste Comte, who named sociology as a “scientific” discipline, considered social science research as the science of transforming society. Like most intellectuals of the Enlightenment, Comte saw social sciences as a means to create mechanisms that would produce and render knowledge that would enable society to exist in a better and “healthier” structure. In this sense, Comte regarded social scientists as the highest priests of the “religion of humanism” he created (Coleman, 1997, p. 672). To establish the society of the future, a knowledge of existing society is needed, and the science of sociology becomes the functional “supplier” of this knowledge. The most important event that set Comte on the path of obtaining and organizing such information would be the destruction and social upheaval caused by the French Revolution. Shaped by the understanding of the motto “*Ordre et Progrès*”, he would offer to carry out the work of “ordering” the post-revolutionary France through sociology (İlyasoğlu, 1985, p. 2165).

Durkheim, following Comte’s footsteps, adds *solidarité* as a new principle that brings order to the themes of “freedom, equality and fraternity” to solve the social catastrophe

brought about by the continual revolutionary wave of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Durkheim also develops his plan *-sociologie reformiste-* for the reorganization of communal existence (İlyasoğlu, 1985, p. 2164).

In addition to the Comte-Durkheim school, Pierre Guillaume Frédéric Le Play develops a different school of sociology. Le Play witnesses all the revolutions of 1830, 1848 and 1870/71 and would be most influenced by these developments while developing its own understanding of sociology. Le Play tries to perceive and become a reformer of the turbulent revolutionary period in which the working class and peasantry are more active than the bourgeoisie. Therefore, his studies were carried out mainly on working-class families and he would be called the founder of the school of empirical sociology. His research would mostly focus on developing the field and survey studies and a new applicable classification system (Wernick, 2006, p. 331). Le Play had very close relations with the state authorities and worked as the executive of various reform projects. His major work, *Les Ouvriers Européens* (The European Workers), becomes a source of data for the *La Réforme Sociale en France* (Social Reform in France) project which he prepared in 1864 (Philippe, 1998, p. 344). He conducted his work for this reform program using the monograph technique, which is said to have been used for the first time by Le Play in the field of sociology. He conducted an operational work throughout the region through his organization, *Unions Pour la Paix Sociale* (Union for Social Peace), by implementing the monograph method (Cuin, 2004, p. 591).

Le Play is described by his followers as one of the two founders of sociology with Comte (Kösemişal, 1958, p. 8). Doğan Ergun says that Le Play is “an extreme Catholic thinker who does not act for any universal and decisive motives”, so that he cannot be regarded as the founder of sociology (Ergun, 1990, p. 53). Apart from all these comments, it would be more meaningful to say that Le Play is an important sociologist and social reformer whose influence is also felt outside of France.

In forming his methodology, Le Play placed himself particularly in opposition to the sociology of Comte-Durkheim. Against the Comte-Durkheim school’s so-called “theoretical” approach, he tried to establish a new understanding shaped by the monograph technique. So he called his sociological approach *science sociale* instead of Comte’s concept of *sociologie*. By differentiating himself with the “monograph technique”, he claimed that the “real science of society” can only be achieved in this way. To reach the general monographic map of society through monographic research requires a long time and financial support, and this could be gained only by the sponsorship of those who find themselves close to the logic of social reform. For this reason, Le Play was first supported by the emperor Napoleon III and

various aristocratic statesmen. The reform program which he prepared in 1864 was commissioned by the emperor himself and consequently, he would be awarded by various state posts. After the fall of the empire, Le Play did not receive much support from the Republican government, but this time he would get the support of the Catholic Church. Through these sponsorships, he managed to patronize a circle of researchers to undertake the monographs under his institution, *Unions de la Paix Sociale* (Clark, 1973, p. 105-06).

The family is chosen as the unit of analysis in Le Play's methodology. The reason for taking the family as a basis is generally stated as its being the smallest observable form of social organization. This "smallest form" enables the micro-survey of the society through the budget analysis of the family, in which the expenses and income are evaluated (Boyacıoğlu & Boyacıoğlu, 2008, p. 301). Le Play tries to understand the general *habitus* (although not defined in terms of Bourdieu) and living conditions of families by evaluating the general income expenditures. Le Play thought that in this way, it would be possible to get information about the "basic moral rules" of the society (Coleman, 1997, p. 673). The information collected through this method also provides a basis for social reform. Le Play's choice of the family as the unit of analysis is not only due to its acceptance as the basic unit of society, but also because he commissions the family a pivotal role in the model society he had desired. He believed that "social peace" could only be restored through an understanding of this "social reality". This reality was based on the protection of the social hierarchy in the existing society (Elwitt, 1988, 212). Nurettin Şazi Kösemihal lists Le Play's principles for social peace as follows:

According to Le Play, to ensure peace, stability, prosperity, and in short, happiness in societies, it is necessary to obey the following principles: a) Commitment to God (Decalogue) and paternal authority, b) Transfer of property from generation to generation without fragmentation. With the first one, resistance to the evil tendency that exists in human creation is gained; thus solidarity, honesty, and mutual assistance prevail in the relations of individuals and classes. With the second one, the stability of the material means of living, that is, welfare, one of the main conditions of bliss, is obtained (Kösemihal, 1958, p. 12).

According to Robert Nisbet, these views of Le Play stem from his being "an extreme monarchist, a Roman Catholic and entirely traditionalist in moral philosophy" (Nisbet, 1997, p. 122). Within the methodological view that consisted of the combination of these features, Le Play evaluates the family institution in three different types. These are the patriarchal family (*famille patriarcale*), the stem family (*famille souche*) and the unstable family (*famille instable*). The patriarchal family is a non-dispersed type of father, son, and brothers living

together. The stem family consists of the father and the son who is chosen as the heir. In the unstable family, the property of the family is distributed equally among all members. Therefore, it is the type of family that is defined as the worst (Boyacıoğlu & Boyacıoğlu, 2008, p. 301). For Le Play, who thinks with a feudal mentality, it is the stem family that ensures the progress and order of society.

Followers of the Le Play school, H. de Tourville and Edmond Demolins, developed this sociological and social reformist perspective and created a more institutional structure. In 1904, the *Société Internationale de Science Sociale* was established and new publications occurred in which new products of the Le Play school was presented (Philippe, 1998, p. 343). Tourville, one of the most important representatives of the school, conducted a methodological study for sociological research and systematized the technique of the monograph works. With this technique, developed under the name of *la nomenclature de la science sociale*, they endeavored to understand not only the family institution but the whole of social life (Boyacıoğlu & Boyacıoğlu, 2008, p. 302).

Demolins, another prominent name of the Le Play school, developed a perspective targeting not only the inspection of social structures but also the improvement of existing structures. Education has a very important place in the “action plan” of Le Play school’s social reform mentality. Demolins opened a school called *Ecole des Roches* in 1899 to create a community of more elite individuals to serve the development of the most appropriate family type (Zengin, 1997, p. 1976; Kösemihal, 1950, p. 122).

Finally, another conceptualization introduced by Le Play school representatives, intends to classify countries according to their social structure characteristics. Demolins separated social structures into *formations communautaires* (community formations) and *formations particularistes* (individualist formations). According to Niyazi Berkes, “in the first type of society, it is not the individual but family, tribe, clan, or state are superior. The best representative of this type is Eastern societies. In the second type, the individual is the important person in society; social clusters gather around the individual. A good example of this type is the Anglo-Saxon society” (Berkes, 1973, p. 350).

#### **4. Prince Sabahaddin and the Politics of Sociology in Turkey**

The 19<sup>th</sup> century can also be described as the most widely accepted period of positivist approaches. Positivism also entered into an approach to eliminate religious forms of thought in every field. The reinterpretation of the world with advances in natural sciences made it typical to consider “scientific” thinking as the most valid way. Comte’s “religion of



humanism” also included the questioning of religious knowledge based on holy books. Even though there was a transition from religious to scientific thought, it may be asserted that treating scientific knowledge as a religious belief was also one of the most important aspects of this approach. In this context, intellectuals, the producers of scientific knowledge, were perceived as the creator or representative of a kind of new religion. We can say that this approach is dominant in the development of sociology. During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, intellectuals who were active in the field of sociology were described by their followers as the “prophets” of this new science religion.

The emergence of sociology in a period of social upheavals in the modern age brought a sense of commitment and exaltation to those who developed these sociological systems that address salvation from the current problems. These “modern-day prophets” would be defined as “exemplary people” not only by their thoughts but also by their personality and lives. For example, Tahsin Demiray says the following about Le Play:

As is customary, even the dogs walking on his left and right have difficulty in following him. He travels 80 kilometers a day. It takes about 1 and 8 minutes to complete a kilometer under the intense sun and without complaining about the high and sharp cold of the mountains. At the end of a long and arduous day’s journey, he doesn’t think about resting upon arrival, but he immediately starts research and investigation (Demiray, 1958a, p. 4).

Adopting a school of sociology also meant being a “disciple” of that school. The main reason for this lies in the understanding of sociology in this period as an “ideology of salvation”. In the later periods of the Ottoman Empire during which disintegration and losses in wars could not be stopped, political unrest prevailed. The social/political reform proposals of 19<sup>th</sup> century sociologists were defined as methods to “liberate” the country from its desperate situation. The positivist understanding that each society has a “common/universal social nature” led to the spread of the idea of a universalist order. In this direction, the wide acceptance of this “positivist belief” that leads to the formation of social transformation projects through a “social engineering” mentality also became widely popular among the Ottoman intellectuals of Turkey (Özlem, 2001, p. 458-59).

During the Ottoman-Turkish modernization process, on the basis of politics and sociology, there were three dominant sociological views. These were, Prince Sabahaddin and later on *Ilm-i İçtima* school (The Ottoman-Turkish version of the *science sociale*) who was influenced by Le Play; the followers of Spencer’s organisationist views of which the first representatives were Ahmet Şuayıp, Bedi Nuri and Satı Bey; and last but which remained dominant for some time, the Comte and Durkheimian school represented by Ahmet Rıza and Ziya Gökalp (Sezer,

1989, p. 31-32). One of the common features of all of these followers is that none of them adopted their sociological understanding directly from their initial representatives but through versions developed by their followers. Ahmet Rıza was influenced by Pierre Lafitte, the follower of Comte, whom he met in France, and Prince Sabahaddin was influenced by Edmond Desmolinis, who was the follower of Le Play (Türkdoğan et al., 1976, p. 264-65).

The sociological conception developed during the Constitutional Monarchy period and transferred to the Republic was largely based on Ziya Gökalp and the Durkheimian solidarism he represented. As Zafer Toprak says, the principles Gökalp formulated according to his solidarism, such as “there is no individual but community”, “there is no class but occupation (*meslek*), and “there is no empire but national states”, would be a dominant understanding in both politics and sociology for a long time (Toprak, 2001, p. 326).

The struggle between the Durkheim and Le Play schools also reflects a political fight over his followers in Turkey. For example, Nureddin Şazi Kösemihal described the similarities between France and Ottoman-Turkish sociological developments as follows:

There are many similarities between our sociological movements and the sociological movements in France. a) Sociology was born with practical imperatives in both countries, and in both the major agent was the social crisis. (...) b) Just as two sociological currents based on scientific understanding emerged in France, two sociology based on scientific understanding emerged in the correspondingly sickening Ottoman Empire c) In contrast to the Comte-Durkheim school, the Le Play school in France has neither taken place in universities or high schools nor has it received any state aid. Likewise, the Le Play school represented by Prince Sabahattin, in contrast to the Comte-Durkheim school represented by Gökalp, has not taken place in our university desks, in high schools and received any state aid -except for the last twelve years- (Kösemihal, 1950, p. 122).

As seen in the above example, almost all the common views of the representatives of the Le Play school in Turkey, Le Play and his representative Prince Sabahaddin were excluded or ignored as a result of taking a political stance in Turkey. The main reason for that is the defeat of the Le Play school and its representative through Prince Sabahaddin in Turkey in the struggle with the Committee of Union and Progress in the political arena in which the Comte-Durkheim school became dominant. After the foundation of the modern Turkish Republic, this sociological struggle was inherited and the Comte-Durkheim school became the core principle of establishment in the Republican Turkey. It is through the developments after the Second World War that Le Play-Sabahaddin approach became more popular and dominated sociological understanding. Besides, it should be stated that this separation and

conflict was not a definite separation. Although Kurtuluş Kayalı states that this separation was important and contributed to the development of sociology in Turkey as a result of these debates, he argues that not all issues should be considered within this framework. In Kayalı's words, at the last instance, "it is possible to determine that in addition to the hegemony of Ziya Gökalp, the influence of Prince Sabahaddin is inclusive" (Kayalı, 2001, p. 61).

The Le Play school was first known in the Ottoman Empire through Ali Suavi (Sezer, 1989, p. 48). Ali Suavi met the Le Play school during his years in France and when he returned to the country he advised Mithat Pasha to follow and learn from Le Play by mentioning that there was an issue of "maintenance of the establishment of the sovereignty" in the Le Play school of sociology. Although the later Le Play followers in Turkey accused Ali Suavi of misinterpreting the school, it can be said that Suavi understood the real political essence of Le Play (Fındıkoğlu, 1962, p. 66-67). One of those who thinks Ali Suavi misunderstood Le Play is Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. Tanpınar says the following about Suavi's misinterpretation:

Surprisingly, he relies on the famous French economist Le Play, who tries to solve the economic and social crisis of Europe with the ideas of *Religion, Family, and Property*, while attacking our ideas of constitutionalism with an implicit loquacity. This was nothing more than a search for a western *imam* in support for the struggle that Suavi was afraid to lay the essence of (Tanpınar, 1942, p. 176).

Another suggested source of Le Play's initial impact on Turkey came from Tevfik Nevzat, a journalist who migrated to Europe for political reasons. Nevzat came into contact with this school in Europe and, more importantly, when he returned home, he prepared one of the first village monographs using Le Play's nomenclature (Fındıkoğlu, 1962, p. 68). But it would be Prince Sabahaddin who established and settled this school.

Prince Sabahaddin, who should be seen as a product of the efforts of liberation and re-establishment in the last period of the Ottoman Empire, was more likely to propose a reformist solution. In the words of Tahsin Demiray, Sabahaddin advocated the idea of "merging to make" instead of "merging to destroy" (Demiray, 1958b, p. 22). To define the importance of Sabahaddin in the making of rural sociology in Turkey it is essential to understand the ideological impact not in the late Ottoman period but during the post-Second World War period. The followers of Sabahaddin in this period tried to validate his thoughts to "cure the illness" that Turkish society was struggling into. To project their perspective in a "scientific" way they did not hesitate to use terms from "medicine". They asserted that to cure the illness, diagnosis was first required; and that should be achieved only by applying scientific methods

to sociology, by which they meant the *science social*. The sociological method of one of the disciples of Le Play, Paul Descamps, which is called “experimental sociology”, was strongly asserted by Turkish Le Playists (Descamps, 1965).

Prince Sabahaddin, in general, asserts that Turkey does not have a management problem; rather, the core of the problem is structural. He believes that these structural problems should be examined through sociological tools and consequently reforms should be made especially in the field of agriculture and education (İlyasoğlu, 1985, p. 2168). He thinks that this result can be achieved only by reshaping an underdeveloped communitarian structure with an individualistic understanding. To accomplish this, he uses the method of *Science Sociale*, which he calls *İlm-i İçtima*. While acknowledging the determining effect of the geographical factors, he states that “*istihale*” (metamorphosis, or the transition from one social structure to another), could be achieved only as follows: “Until now these two institutions have born instinctively due to their natural essentiality. However, from now on, it will be possible to achieve this metamorphosis by human will after it is known how they were born thanks to the ‘science of society’” (Kösemihal, 1950 p. 131). As can be understood, Sabahaddin sees the intervention of human will as a necessary factor of societal transformation. The most important role in this intervention is given to education.

According to Sabahaddin, the Ottoman social structure shows the characteristics of a communitarian peasant society. Such a social structure needs to be educated to protect the members of society in the face of the destruction that will arise with industrialization and to create a structure that will adapt to the new conditions. The young people to be educated would be discouraged from the idea of becoming civil servants, undergoing a special education and being raised to form the “individualist family” and sent to Anatolia to be the master of the villagers (Kansu, 2001, p. 161). In this context, Sabahaddin’s design of ideal society aims to create a capitalist peasant class which is directed to industrialization under the leadership of these educated “gentlemen” (Durukan, 2001, p. 155) For this purpose, it is seen that the followers of Prince Sabahaddin opened educational institutions similar to the *Ecole des Roches* established by Demolins in France. Twenty years after the first schools opened in France, the Turkish version of these types of institutions were established in Istanbul by Satı Bey in the name of “*Yuva*” (Nest), which were visited and inspected also by Prince Sabahaddin himself (Zengin, 1997, p. 176; Kösemihal, 1958, p. 17). Founded by Nezahet Nureddin Ege, the “*Güneş*” (Sun) college was established for similar purposes (Zengin, 1997, p. 176). The Village Institutes, which were founded as a state initiative in the early 1940s, were considered by the followers of Sabahaddin to have a similar purpose. Cavit Orhan Tütengil said that it is

important to concentrate on village research by turning Village Institutes into “social observatories” (Tütengil, 1950, p. 67). He says the following for the Institutes, where he thinks that experimental sociology offers one of the most important opportunities for village research:

After our visit to *Kayalar* School in 1951, we believe that it is possible to find many similarities between our Village Institutes and this school. The pedagogical views on which they are based, the way they are established and functioning, are similar with some differences arising from the purpose. Although no documents show the extent to which the founders of the Village Institutes were influenced by the education thoughts of Sabahattin, there are indications that the previously published publications affected them (Tütengil, 1954, p. 64).

Prince Sabahattin’s ideas were maintained by his followers in an institutional structure during the Republican period. Le Play’s followers in Turkey, which continued in the footsteps of France, also expressed the importance of institutionalization to achieve success. The first institutionalization attempt would be realized by Mehmet Ali Şevki (Avcı, 2008). In 1919, Şevki established a society called *Meslek-i İctimaî* to examine the villages of Anatolia and Rumelia and, for a short time, to publish a magazine with the same name (Ülken, 1951, p. 22). This magazine can be described as the first of the areas where Sabahaddin’s ideas are most materialized. Before that, *Say-ü Tettebbü Mecmuası* (Work and Investigation Journal) published in Edirne in 1910 and *Müşahede* (Observation) magazine published in 1919 also included Sabahaddin’s ideas (Tütengil, 1954, p. 63). But only the most systematic ones and those which acted as the representative of *Science Sociale* in Turkey would be in Mehmet Ali Şevki Bey’s journal and society.

With the activity of Mehmet Ali Şevki in the *Muallimler Birliği* (Teachers Union), the publications of Mehmet Ali Şevki would appear in the *Muallimler Birliği Mecmuası* (Journal of Teachers Union) and in the *Mülkiye Mecmuası* (Civil Service Journal) in the 1930s. The *İnsan* (Human) journal of Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu and *İş* (Work) journal published by Hilmi Ziya Ülken, can be said to have influenced the next period in terms of expressing similar ideas. These journals did not only represent the thoughts of Prince Sabahaddin but should be considered important in terms of “Le Playist knowledge” to be transferred to the next period. The *Sosyoloji Dergisi* (Journal of Sociology), published under the chairmanship of Hilmi Ziya Ülken in 1942, would become the place where the most common and effective products of the Sabahaddin School were given. With the *Türk Sosyoloji Cemiyeti* (Turkish Sociological Society) to be established in 1949, it can be asserted that sociological researchers gathered and institutionalized within the framework of Prince Sabahaddin’s understanding (Türk Sosyoloji Cemiyeti, 1950, p. 137-38).

Both national and international developments played an important role in the prominence of the Le Play-Sabahaddin school in the post-World War II era. After the one-party period, together with the DP (Democrat Party) government, not only were the RPP's (Republican People's Party) past practices criticized but also those of the Durkheim-Gökalp school as the dominant sociological understanding of the single-party period. At the same time, the new proposals of the developmental modernization approach to the underdeveloped countries under the leadership of the United States coincided with Prince Sabahaddin's "liberalism" and sociological perspective. The US development program on Turkey "Turkey: An Economic Appraisal", prepared by Max Weston Thornburg and translated to Turkish as "*Türkiye Nasıl Yükselir?*" (How Turkey Arises?), resembled the title of the Sabahaddin's work, "*Türkiye Nasıl Kurtarılabilir?*" (How Turkey Can Be Saved?). The analogy between these two books was emphasized even in that period (Tütengil, 1954, p. 4).

The "modernization theory", which would emerge in the post-war period all over the world, tends to address the common "village problem" in underdeveloped countries where capitalist development is delayed. The way of solving this problem by gaining widespread and "real" knowledge of the village would be achieved through the "rural sociology" studies, which were developed by Le Play methodology.

### **5. The Making of Rural Sociology in Turkey**

Populism, one of the six basic principles of Kemalism, attaches special importance to the peasantry in the creation of national identity. In Turkey, the conceptualization of the peasantry, fed from a theoretical content of 19th century romantic nationalism, made to glorify the "pure" and "unchanged" nature of the national essence against the urban identity. For this view, urban identity was often identified as the center of capitalism and cosmopolitanism. In dialogue with this perspective, monographic studies were handled in the "Peasantism" (*Köycülük*) branches of the People's Houses (*Halkevleri*) to define the "imagined" national essence of the peasantry before the development of a rural sociology field in Turkey. These studies, which emphasize how a peasantry, which was left out of the Ottoman past, developed with the republic and became the basis of national existence, led to the creation of an "imaginary" image of the peasantry instead of a "real" one (See, Karaömerlioğlu, 2006).

In the period after the Second World War, in correlation with rural studies developed around the world, two basic approaches of sociology in Turkey became dominant. The first of these was the Le Play-Sabahaddin school aiming to form a unique synthesis with Ziya Gökalp's thought established under the umbrella of the *Sosyoloji Dergisi* (Journal of

Sociology) of which Hilmi Ziya Ülken was the chairman. The other one would be created by the younger generation of sociologists who returned to Turkey from abroad after studying modern sociological methods. In this second group, Niyazi Berkes, Behice Boran, Mediha Berkes and later İbrahim Yasa replaced an economic-based analysis rather than a culturalist approach at the center of their sociological views (See, Yıldırım, 2017).

After the expulsion of Berkes and Boran from the university under the pretext of making communist propaganda at the beginning of the period, the Le Play-Sabahaddin School develops its understanding of sociology as the only method in village studies. The most important element of this school is the effort to define sociology studies from a so-called “non-political” perspective. This understanding, which is also mentioned in the editorial introduction article titled “*Maksad*” (Intention) in the first issue of *Sosyoloji Dünyası* (World of Sociology), is defined as not to “confuse politics with science ” (1951). This critique intended to make an “anti-communist” confrontation with Marxist sociology.

This so-called “non-political sociology method” discourse, which becomes hegemonic in the field of rural studies in Turkey, has also adopted the method of Georges Gurvitch to get strong intellectual support for itself. Gurvitch’s sociology, which opposes Durkheim’s sociology, provides a layered and in-depth theory of sociology. But as Vahap Sağ states, Gurvitch’s sociology has been understood quite incorrectly due to using the terms “method” and “technique” interchangeably (Sağ, 1982, p. 307-08). The attempt of sociologists in Turkey to identify Gurvitch’s methodology from an anti-communist perspective ended with glorifying Gurvitch’s objections on explications based on “singular-causality” perspective. In this way, by integrating “in-depth sociology” perspective of Gurvitch to Le Play’s monograph “technique”, they aimed to praise this “mixture” as the only acceptable “method” in sociological studies.

After the Second World War, the widespread development of rural sociology studies on Turkey would not only be practiced by native researchers but also by foreign scholars who were mostly using the modernization theory paradigm in their studies. Leading researchers in this period such as Paul Stirling, Barbara and George Helling, Daniel Lerner, Richard Robinson would also analyze the relationship of modernization and rural structures in Turkey (See, Kolars, 1962). As Cangül Örnek mentions in detail, in this period sociological studies in Turkey were mostly constructed under the effect of this US-based scientific understanding (Örnek, 2015, p. 194-255). To put it in another way, the Le Play-Sabahaddin school in Turkey, which was overshadowed under the one-party rule for many years, coincided with the modernization theory paradigm and determined each other directly.



All these studies have led to the definition of a different peasantry through sociological studies, unlike the one-party Kemalist Peasantist approach. The “imagined” peasantry of the single-party period as a descriptor of the romanticized national identity began to be replaced with the “real” and “underdeveloped” peasantry during this period. This leads to the definition of the relationship between village development and sociology in a complementary interaction, and rural sociology also “politicizes” at a level that assumes the key role of development. This “new” knowledge on the peasantry, which constitutes the basic scientific background of the developmentalist third world analyses of the period, would have a direct impact on the formation of political and academic knowledge, especially in the 1960s.

## 6. Rural Development and Sociology

When Cahit Tanyol concluded his study “*Peşke Binamlısı* Village”, he needed to express his views on the development of the villages as follows:

At the time of this investigation, the village problem for the party in power was at the forefront of its propaganda. However, their aim in assisting the villages was only a vote-hunting, deprived of any plans and programs. (...) We explained how the assistance to the village and the villagers should be made in a plan and program, in a way that would be done in the conditions of those times and system. Unfortunately, although some American universities were interested in our study as a social report, those who held the social and economic fate of the country insisted on the same erroneous understanding of rural development and continued to impose a deadlock (Tanyol, 1961, p. 55-56).

The fact that Tanyol complained of this indifference in his “social report” on the villages represents a clear differentiation from the previous period. It reveals a different understanding in an “open letter” written by Hilmi Ziya Ülken to the Ministry of National Education, in the early stages when village sociology did not develop (Ülken, 1954, p. 61, 64-65). In this letter, Ülken stated that monographs needed to be prepared to understand the “realities” of the village and that this should be considered as part of a state-supported social reform within a centralized administration. Tanyol is no longer talking about the pursuit of “reality” but the implementation of “social reform”. It can be asserted that, by the end of the period, the re-definition of the peasantry through sociological research was completed with a certain perception of reality and now it was the time of the implementation of reforms through using the knowledge of that reality.

The problem of rural development has also been discussed in the single-party period. But at that time, development was meant to improve the means of agricultural production and technical infrastructure. For example, in an article in *Cumhuriyet* newspaper at the beginning of the period in question, the factors affecting development were listed as follows:



Nine moral agents influence the peasant development. 1-To eliminate the conflicts between the peasants and neighboring villagers, 2-To remove the difference of honor and influence and privilege between a village population, 3-To awaken trust and affection towards the gendarmerie and district officers who are in close contact with the villagers on behalf of the state, 4-To make publications that will be read by the peasant with interest and enjoyment, 5-To teach the peasants the laws and regulations that are related to them in a proper way, 6-To save the villagers from the kinds of scribes in the cities, who are benefiting from the purity of the villagers and diverge them to wrong paths and unfair cases, 7-To make ways of collecting taxes from the villagers most suitable form, 8-By reviewing the village law to reform the authority of the village headmen (*muhtar*) without giving the chance of abuse, 9-To make a detailed inspection of the village budgetary by taking its evaluation out from the rogue formal way as it is today (Aren, 20 November 1946).

As can be seen above, rural development was perceived as an educational, cultural and technical problem. However, an article by Nadir Nadi again in *Cumhuriyet* newspaper soon states that this problem should be solved with another perspective in this period.

The situation of our villagers, who do not have any clothes other than the shirts they are wearing, is embarrassing in the name of Republican Turkey. This situation cannot be corrected with brilliant speeches or great ideas. It is necessary to get into the village, to understand the social structure of the Turkish villagers and to learn their private problems well. There is no other way to find a cure (Nadi, 28 November 1946).

Nadi wants us to learn the “realities” of the village for the development of the rural areas. This call exactly resembles the call made by the rural sociology protagonists. But this call does not last long. During the period when village sociology studies increase their practices, the idea of seeing and understanding the reality of the villagers becomes more dominant than the problem of rural development. The main reason for this would be the fact that the DP government has made the villagers strong both politically and economically due to the economic development in the early years of its rule.

The resumption of the rural development discourse would begin again in 1956-1957, when the DP entered the crisis both politically and economically, and would continue even more intensively until the end of the period. It would be meaningful to follow this development on the pages of the *Forum* magazine, which is widely followed by the intellectuals of the period.

*Forum* magazine was functioning as a platform in which the economic and political-administrative policies that are going to be installed after the May 27, 1960 military intervention in Turkey, were discussed. The intellectuals who wrote in *Forum* had an

especially active role in the formation of the basic institutions of the new state structure to be established in the period after the coup. The concepts of development and planning are first discussed in the *Forum* magazine and a state-oriented planning alternative to socialist planning is proposed following the new developmental perspective that has become hegemonic in the international academic and political fields (Somel, 2009, p. 325).

The discussions in *Forum* first began with an article by Aydın Yalçın on how urban and peasant culture can be transformed. Yalçın, who calls the old type of culturalist understanding “village romanticism”, points out that it is necessary to remove the obstacles to the development of the village from a similar culturalist perspective (Yalçın, 1 May 1955). From this point of view, Yalçın repeats the thoughts of the dominant developmental approach of the period. His assertion bases on the “reformation” of the old “*Gemeinschaft*” structures, which stands as an obstacle on the way to the development to ease the transition to “*Gessellschaft*” structures. In the next issue on the “Forum of the Readers” section of the magazine, there was an article supporting the perspective of Yalçın (Çetintürk, 15 May 1955). In the same issue, Metin And says that a prominent village novel writer of the period, Mahmut Makal, depicts the reality of the villagers in his stories, but this needs to be done by rural sociology studies (And, 15 May 1955). In two different articles by And, it is stated that studies of rural sociology have developed and they have come a long way in determining the peasant reality. Mehmet Kaya, who claims that Makal’s efforts in this direction were formed by both ideological and non-scientific methods, offers a more “scientific” perspective than Makal’s (Üstünök, 1 June 1955; Kaya, 15 June 1955). Here the similarities with Prince Sabahaddin’s followers in their search for “non-political scientific” methodology became very apparent.

After these discussions, Aydın Yalçın agrees with the other commentaries and writers that the development business should be based on scientific foundations (Yalçın, 1 January 1956). From that time on, there appear long comments and suggestions for rural development, especially on the pages reserved for readers’ comments of *Forum* during 1957. Two or three different articles in each issue give opinions on rural development. What is interesting here is that the discussion has come to an agreement at a certain common point. The issue of rural development, especially discussed at the level of cultural barriers to development, has been moved to a different dimension based on the criticism of this idea. Opinions on development meet in a common understanding, which is shaped by Kemal Karpat’s articles. He says that development is a holistic issue and that there should be a holistic understanding of “country development” instead of putting rural development as a separate category. Karpat also presents the roadmap for the developmental understanding that would be transferred to the

next period by stating the institutional principles of the development plan that can be accepted and supported internationally (Karpaz, 1 August 1957). The importance of the Karpaz's article lies not in the fact that it is the first time to address these issues as such, but in the acceptance of the formula on the rural development for all discussants in *Forum*. Ultimately, Karpaz argues that rural development should be based on a "real" peasantry based on scientific and sociological principles:

Although rural development programs vary according to the specific conditions of each country, they all have a common aspect. It is to see the peasant as a fully qualified, respectful person in all respects and to admit that the word "village" refers to a community of people, not underdevelopment. Thus, the "sacrificial" intellectual who will be the custodian of the peasants and bring the so-called "civilization" to them is replaced by the expert sociologist, who closely analyzes the village and knows the peasantry. The peasant is given real possibilities of development instead of emotional speeches which do not rely on sound principles (Karpaz, 15 June 1957).

In the same article, Karpaz points to another author who has been writing on the pages of *Forum* for a long time, saying that we can derive the information necessary for rural development from such studies. The writer that Karpaz mentions is Halil Aytakin, who writes under the pen name *Harmandaliođlu* and who has regularly presented the "income" and "expenditure" reports of the peasant families, meaning the "family budgets", since the 64<sup>th</sup> issue of *Forum*. Halil Aytakin is a village teacher who also published the magazine *Yađmur ve Toprak* (Rain and Soil). He writes under the name *Harmandaliođlu* because he claims that he was threatened by the Minister of National Education at the time, Tevfik İleri, to be dismissed from teaching. He says that he will not leave this name anymore even if he declares his identity from the *Forum* pages after the coup of 27 May 1960 and as he says the articles continues with the name of *Harmandaliođlu* (Aytakin, 15 June 1960). *Harmandaliođlu* combines the peasant family budgets and his peasant views with Le Play sociology's budget analysis. In this sense, we can say that he was a follower of the rural sociology understanding devoted to the Le Play/Sabahaddin school.

The discussions in *Forum* started over the rural development project, the critique of village novel, and the developmental approach of classical peasantism. But then, through discussions, a common point has been reached on the basis of a scientific sociological understanding of the real peasantry and the formation of a development plan through it. In this sense, it is possible to say that after the critique of old village romanticism, a new discourse of peasantism has been reached in the pages of *Forum* under the influence of developmentalism and the prevailing understanding of rural sociology.

## 7. Conclusion

During this period, it is observable that the Le Play-Sabahaddin sociology approach is a process of academic knowledge production, which is shared with the understanding of the US rural sociology and developmentalism. As a result of all these developments, peasantry in Turkey is redefined sociologically through academic interaction and struggles. Peasantry was not regarded only as an ideological entity as it was before, but as “real” beings revealed by these sociological researches. With the transformation of the rural structure, peasantry has become a “reality” such that its existence needs to be noticed by everyone. The main reason for this, unlike in the previous period, is that the peasantry, which can be isolated from the market and kept under state control through ideological mechanisms, is replaced by the peasantry formed by market relations. This new form of peasantry necessitates larger and more comprehensive projects. To realize these projects, real, scientific knowledge of the peasantry, which was not needed before, must be obtained. The task of obtaining this information was undertaken by representatives of the Le Play-Sabahaddin school, which had long been waiting to emerge in a sense. Revealing the reality of the peasants, the object of a sociological research also reshaped the perception of how a program can be implemented with this reality. Returning to the words at the beginning of this article, the research object whose knowledge is produced, also transformed the perception of the producer of knowledge. This necessitated new theoretical expansion in the light of new knowledge acquired in theoretical and practical fields. The peasantry has become “more real” in this sense and consequently has become more recognized.

The transformation of social structure in Turkey after the Second World War changed self-sufficient small scale agricultural production to cash-crop production and this paved the way for the rural-to-urban migration. These changes and developments necessitated the control of social transformation in order not to cause any probable social problems in the country. The Rural Sociology discipline flourished during this period in Turkey and its main goal was to find a solution to the “social problem” that occurred after this transformation. The previously dominant Durkheimian solidarist sociological approach lost its hegemony and the Le Play sociological method became the main academic discipline. With the help and the support of the American experts the followers of this sociological approach carried out numerous village surveys to maintain the effects of the transformation of the countryside in Turkey.

This sociological method, integrated with the developmentalist approach, dominated the main intellectual framework in Turkey in the post-war period. The developmentalist

approach, defines under-developed countries through the “modern” Western perspective. During the Cold War period, the developmentalist perspective was used as a tool to define the “social problems” of the peripheral countries and control their problems through social reform programs. In order to apply a program general information of a society is needed. The Rural Sociology studies created this knowledge. Consequently, the cooperation of developmentalism with the Rural Sociology field intellectually “re-defined” the Turkish peasantry. This new definition of social structure through the hegemony of the above mentioned intellectual background would also effect the developmentalist discourse of the 1960s, which is for the most part defined wrongly as having a “socialist perspective”. It was not a socialist, but a more conservative anti-communist Cold War sociological perspective, defined here as the Le Play-Sabahaddin School, that inherited the next decade of Turkish politics.

## References

- And, M. (1955, 15 May). Toplumbilimci Makal [Sociologist Makal]. *Forum*, 3(28).
- Aren, Y.M. (1946, 20 November). Köylünün Kalkınma Davası II [The Development Struggle of the Villagers II]. *Cumhuriyet* [Republic].
- Avcı, N. (2008). Mehmet Ali Şevki (Sevündük) (1882-1963). In M.Ç. Özdemir (Ed.) *Türkiye’de Sosyoloji (İsimler-Eserler) I* [Sociology in Turkey (Names-Works) I]. Ankara, Turkey: Phoneix Yayınevi.
- Aytekin, H. (1960, 15 June). Milli Eğitim Bakanı Tevfik İleri’ye Açık Mektup [Open Letter to Minister of National Education Tevfik İleri]. *Forum*, 13(147).
- Baloğlu, B. (2008). Carle Clark Zimmerman (1897-1983). In M.Ç. Özdemir (Ed.) *Türkiye’de Sosyoloji (İsimler-Eserler) I* [Sociology in Turkey (Names-Works) I]. Ankara, Turkey: Phoneix Yayınevi.
- Berkes, N. (1973). Türkiye’de Çağdaşlaşma [Secularism in Turkey]. *Ankara, Turkey: Bilgi Yayınevi*.
- Boyacıoğlu, A.Ö. & Boyacıoğlu, L. (2008). Prens/Sultanzâde Mehmed Sabahaddin Bey (1879-1948). In M. Ç. Özdemir (Ed.) *Türkiye’de Sosyoloji (İsimler-Eserler) I* [Sociology in Turkey (Names-Works) I]. Ankara, Turkey: Phoneix Yayınevi.
- Çetintürk, A. (1955, 15 May). Köy Üstüne [On Village]. *Forum*, 3(28).
- Clark, T.N. (1973). Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Coleman, J. (1997). Sosyolojik Çözümleme ve Sosyal Politika [Sociological Analysis and Social Policy]. In T. Bottomore & R. Nisbet (Eds.) *Sosyolojik Çözümlemenin Tarihi* [History of Sociological Analysis]. (M. Tunçay, Trans.) Ankara, Turkey: Ayraç Yayınevi.
- Cuin, C-H. (2004) Sociology. In C.J. Murray (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Modern French Thought*. New York: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Demiray, T. (1958a). Modern Cemiyet İlmi’nin Kurucusu Le Play’in Hayatı [The Life of Le Play, Founder of Modern Social Science] In Türk Sosyoloji Cemiyeti (Ed.) *Le Play Sosyolojisinin 100. Yılı-Dünyada ve Türkiyede Tesirleri* [The Effects of Le Play Sociology in its 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary on Turkey]. İstanbul, Turkey: Türkiye Yayınevi ve Basımevi.

- Demiray, T. (1958b) Science Sociale'in Türkiye'ye Gelişi ve Bizdeki Tesirleri [The Arrival of Science Sociale to Turkey and its Effects]. In Türk Sosyoloji Cemiyeti (Ed.) *Le Play Sosyolojisinin 100. Yılı-Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Tesirleri* [The Effects of Le Play Sociology in its 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary on Turkey]. İstanbul, Turkey: Türkiye Yayınevi ve Basımevi.
- Descamps, P. (1965). Deneysel Sosyoloji [Experimental Sociology] (N.Ş. Kösemihal, Trans.). İstanbul, Turkey: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Durukan, K. (2001). Prens Sabahaddin ve İlm-i İçtima – Türk Liberalizminin Kökenleri [Prince Sabahaddin and Science Sociale – The Roots of Turkish Liberalism]. In M.Ö. Alkan (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 1, Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi* [Political Thought in Modern Turkey, Vol 1, The Intellectual Background of the Republican Thought Inherited from Tanzimat and Meşrutiyet Periods]. İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayınları, 2001)
- Elwitt, S. (1988). Social Science, Social Reform and Sociology. *Past and Present*. 121.
- Ergun, D. (1990). 100 Soruda Sosyoloji El Kitabı [The Handbook of Sociology in 100 Questions]. İstanbul, Turkey: Gerçek Yayınevi.
- Fındıkoğlu, Z.F. (1962). Le Play Mektebi ve Prens Sabahaddin [The Le Play School and Prince Sabahaddin]. İstanbul, Turkey: *Fakülter Matbaası*.
- İlyasoğlu, A. (1985). Türkiye'de Sosyolojinin Gelişmesi ve Sosyoloji Araştırmaları [The Development of Sociology in Turkey and Sociological Researches]. In *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi-Cilt. 8* [Encyclopedia of Turkey in the Republican Period-Vol 8]. İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayınları.
- İlyasoğlu, A. (2001). Türkiye'de Sosyolojinin Tarihin Yazmak: Bir Sorunsallaştırma ve Yaklaşım Örneği [Writing the History of Sociology in Turkey: An Example of Conceptualization and Approach]. In *Sempozyum Bildirileri – Sosyal Bilimleri Yeniden Düşünmek* [Symposium Proceedings – Rethinking Social Sciences]. İstanbul, Turkey: Metis Yayınları.
- Kansu, A. (2001). Prens Sabahaddin'in Düşünsel Kaynakları ve Aşırı-Muhafazakâr Düşüncenin İthali [The Ideological Sources of Prince Sabahaddin and the Export of Ultra-Conservative Thought]. In M.Ö. Alkan (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 1, Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi* [Political Thought in Modern Turkey, Vol 1, The Intellectual Background of the Republican Thought Inherited from Tanzimat and Meşrutiyet Periods]. İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayınları.
- Karaömerlioğlu, M. A. (2006). Orada Bir Köy Var Uzakta – Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Köycü Söylem [There is a Village Far Away - Peasantist Discourse in the Early Republican Period]. İstanbul, Turkey: *İletişim Yayınları*.
- Karpat, K. (1957, 1 August). Köy Kalkınmasının Esasları [The Basics of Rural Development]. *Forum*, 7(81).
- Karpat, K. (1957, 15 June). Köy Kalkınmasında Bilim Metodu [Scientific Method in Rural Development]. *Forum*, 7(78).
- Kaya, M. (1955, 15 June). Köy Sosyolojisi [Rural Sociology]. *Forum*, 3(30).
- Kayalı, K. Türk Düşünce Dünyasının Yol İzleri [The Pathways of Turkish Intellectual World]. İstanbul, Turkey: *İletişim Yayınları*.
- Kolars, J.F. (1962). Community Studies in Rural Turkey. *Annals of the Associations of American Geographers*. 52(4).
- Kösemihal, N.Ş. (1950). Memleketimizde Tecrübi Sosyolojinin Doğuşu ve Gelişmesi [The Birth and Development of Experimental Sociology in our Country]. *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 6.

- Kösemihal, N.Ş. (1958). Fransa'da Sosyolojinin Doğuşu ve Le Play Okulu [The Birth of Sociology in France and Le Play School]. In Türk Sosyoloji Cemiyeti (Ed.) *Le Play Sosyolojisinin 100. Yılı-Dünyada ve Türkiyede Tesirleri* [The Effects of Le Play Sociology in its 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary on Turkey]. İstanbul, Turkey: Türkiye Yayınevi ve Basımevi.
- Lobao, L. (2007). Rural Sociology. In C.D. Bryant & D.L. Peck (Eds.) *21st Century Sociology: A Reference Handbook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Maksad. (1951). *Sosyoloji Dünyası* [Sociology World]. 1(1)
- Nadi, N. (1946, 28 November). Köylüyü Kalkındırmak [Developing the Villagers]. *Cumhuriyet* [Republic].
- Nesin, A. (1997). Üniversite Heyetinin Bir Köyde Sosyolojik İncelemesi [The Sociological Investigation of the University Committee in a Village]. In *Sosyalizm Geliyor Savulun* [Socialism is Coming, Beware]. İstanbul, Turkey: Adam Yayınları.
- Nisbet, R. Muhafazakârlık [Conservatism]. In T. Bottomore & R. Nisbet (Eds.) *Sosyolojik Çözümlemenin Tarihi* [History of Sociological Analysis]. (M. Tunçay, Trans.) Ankara, Turkey: Ayraç Yayınevi.
- Örnek, C. (2015). Türkiye'nin Soğuk Savaş Düşünce Hayatı [The Intellectual Life of Turkey during the Cold War Period]. *İstanbul, Turkey: Can Yayınları*.
- Özlem, D. Türkiye'de Pozitivizm ve Siyaset [Positivism and Politics in Turkey]. In U. Kocabaşoğlu (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt. 3, Modernleşme ve Batıcılık* [Political Thought in Modern Turkey, Vol 3, Modernism and Westernization] ed. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu. İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayınları.
- Philippe, P. (1998). Le Play and His Followers: Over a Century of Achievement. *International Social Science Journal*. 50(157).
- Ranulf, S. (1939). Scholarly Forerunners of Fascism. *Ethics*. 50(1).
- Sağ, V. (1982). Nurettin Şazi Kösemihal. In E. Kongar (Ed.) *Türk Toplum Bilimcileri I* [Turkish Sociologists I]. İstanbul, Turkey: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Sezer, B. (1989). Türk Sosyologları ve Eserleri I [Turkish Sociologists and Their Works I]. *Sosyoloji Dergisi 1988-1989* [Journal of Sociology 1988-1989]. 3/1.
- Somel, A. (2009). Türkiye'de Kalkınma Planlaması Efsanesi [The Myth of Developmental Planning in Turkey]. In Ö. Laçiner (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce Cilt 9 – Dönemler ve Zihniyetler* [Political Thought in Modern Turkey, Vol 9 – Periods and Mentalities]. İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayınları.
- Summers G.F. & Buttle, F.H. (2000). Rural Sociology. In E.F. Borgatta & R.J.V. Montgomery (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Sociology*. New York: Macmillan Reference USA.
- Tanpınar, A.H. (1942). Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi [The Nineteenth Century History of Turkish Literature]. *İstanbul, Turkey: Bürhaneddin Matbaası*.
- Tanyol, C. (1961). Peşke Binamlısı Köyü [The Peşke Binamlısı Village]. *Sosyoloji Dergisi* [Journal of Sociology]. 16.
- Taylor, C. (1923). The Field of Rural Sociology. *Journal of Social Forces*. 1(5).
- Toprak, Z. (2001). Osmanlı'da Toplum Biliminin Doğuşu [The Birth of Sociology in the Ottoman Empire]. In M.Ö. Alkan (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 1, Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi* [Political Thought in Modern Turkey, Vol 1, The Intellectual Background of the Republican Thought Inherited from Tanzimat and Meşrutiyet Periods]. İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayınları.
- Türk Sosyoloji Cemiyeti (1949) [Turkish Sociological Association (1949)]. (1950) *Sosyoloji Dergisi* [Journal of Sociology]. 6.

- Türkdoğan, O., Magnarella, P.J., Zahra, N.A., Eberhard, W., Erdentuğ, N., Güvenç, B. & Yasa, İ. (1976). The Development of Turkish Social Anthropology [and Comments and Reply]. *Current Anthropology*. 17(2).
- Tütengil, C.O. (1950). Köy Enstitülerinde Sosyoloji Öğretim [The Education of Sociology at the Village Institutes]. *İş, Felsefe, Ahlak ve İctimaiyet Mecmuası (İş ve Düşünce)* [Work, Philosophy, Ethics and Sociology Journal (Work and Thought)]. 16(104).
- Tütengil, C.O. (1954). Prens Sabahaddin. *İstanbul, Turkey: İstanbul Matbaası*.
- Ülken, H.Z. (1951). Türkiye’de Köy Sosyolojisi [Rural Sociology in Turkey]. *Sosyoloji Dünyası* [Sociology World]. 1(1).
- Ülken, H.Z. (1954). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yüksek Makamına [To the Supreme Authority of the Ministry of National Education]. *Sosyoloji Dergisi* [Journal of Sociology]. 9.
- Üstünök, A.N. (1955, 1 June). Mahmut Makal ve Köy Sosyolojisi [Mahmut Makal and Rural Sociology]. *Forum*, 3(29).
- Wernick, A. (2006). Le Play, Pierre Guillaume Frédéric (1806–1882). In B. S. Turner (Ed.) *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Yalçın, A. (1955, 1 May). Kültür Değişirmemizin Temel Şartı [The Basic Requirement for our Cultural Change]. *Forum*, 3(27).
- Yalçın, A. (1956, 1 January). Köyü Kalkındırma Muamması [The Mystery of Rural Development]. *Forum*, 4(43).
- Yıldırım, S. (2017). *Politics and the Peasantry in Post-War Turkey: Social History, Culture and Modernization*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Zengin, M.F. (1997). Sosyal Yapı Açısından Genel Sosyoloji-Köy Sosyoloji İlişkileri [The Relation of General Sociology-Rural Sociology According to Social Structure]. *İstanbul, Turkey: İktisat Fakültesi Yayınları*.
- Zimmerman, C.C. & Sorokin, P. (1929). *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology*. New York: H. Holt.