


T.C.

ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

# THE ADVENTURE OF TURKISH MODERNIZATION AND CONSERVATISM: AHMET HAMDİ TANPINAR

MASTER THESIS

SERTAÇ YÜRÜK

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Ankara, 2023

T.C.

ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

# THE ADVENTURE OF TURKISH MODERNIZATION AND CONSERVATISM: AHMET HAMDİ TANPINAR

**MASTER THESIS**

**SERTAÇ YÜRÜK**

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

Prof. Dr. Yılmaz Bingöl

SUPERVISOR

Ankara. 2023

# APPROVAL PAGE

The thesis study titled as **" The Adventure Of Turkish Modernization And Conservatism: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpinar "** prepared by **Sertaç Yürük** was unanimously approved by the following jury as a Master's thesis in Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University Social Sciences Institute, in the program of Political Science and Public Administration.

| Title Name Surname | | Institution | Signature |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prof. Dr. Yılmaz BİNGÖL | | Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University | |
| Accept ☒ | Reject ☐ | | |
| Prof.Dr. Aytaç YILDIZ | | Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University | |
| Accept ☒ | Reject ☐ | | |
| Doç. Dr. Mustafa Cüneyt ÖZŞAHİN | | Necmettin Erbakan University | |
| Accept ☒ | Reject ☐ | | |

Thesis Defense Date: 04.05.2023

I certify that this thesis fulfills all the requirements to be deemed a master thesis at Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration.

Director of Graduate School of Social Sciences Title Name Surname

# STATEMENT

I hereby affirm that the information offered in this thesis conforms to academic regulations and ethical standards. I further confirm that I have appropriately cited any external sources and results, as required by these rules and ethical practices. I assume all legal responsibility for non-compliance with the stated rules and actions.

Sertaç YÜRÜK

May 2023

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Çok değerli hocam, tez danışmanım Prof. Dr. Yılmaz Bingöl'e tüm yardımları ve yol göstermeleri için teşekkür ederim.

Öğrenmeye devam etmem hususunda beni sürekli teşvik eden ve destekleyen sevgili babama ve akademik çalışmalar konusunda beni yeniden teşvik eden değerli hocam Dr. Sami Bayrakcı'ya teşekkür ederim.

Bu süreçte beni destekleyen sevgili eşime ve tez yazarken oyun vakitlerinden çaldığım kızlarım Meryem ile Asiye'ye de teşekkür ederim.

# ABSTRACT


## THE ADVENTURE OF TURKİSH MODERNİZATİON AND CONSERVATİSM: AHMET HAMDİ TANPINAR

Ottoman society, which is accepted to have entered the process of westernization and modernization with the Tanzimat, also entered literary genres that were not in its own tradition, such as theatre and novels, during this process. With these translation activities, the world of culture and thought of the period was shaken by new concepts and ideas. The Young Turk movement started to shape Ottoman literary life in the 1890s, and it became possible for young people to somehow understand what was going on in Europe by reading articles in the foreign press. In the first quarter of the 20th century, perspectives criticizing modernism from within the West emerged in European political thought. One of these critics, Bergson, advocated continuity in change by using the concepts of reason versus intuition and time versus duration with his views outside the central axis of Western thought. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, who was affected by this situation, also wrote articles against the radical transformations of the Turkish Republic in his literary writings—referring to the necessity of living in peace with the past, maintaining the historical heritage, and protecting the values that makeup society, Tanpınar believes in the correctness of continuing by changing and transforming by continuing. Tanpınar has emphasized in almost all his works that modernization divides the minds of Turkish society into two and that this division creates a duality problem in the lives of individuals. This shift in civilization, as well as being trapped between the East and the West, has resulted in mental hybridity and depression in the individual. Reading and evaluating Tanpınar's works in this way will be instrumental in a better understanding of Turkish society. Therefore, it would be proper understanding to accept Tanpınar as a "thinker" beyond or blended with his artist/poet personality.



**Keywords:** Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Novel, Modernization, Westernization, Turkish Modernization, Conservatism

# ÖZET


## TÜRK MODERNLEŞMESİ VE MUHAFAZAKÂRLIĞI SERÜVENİ: AHMET HAMDİ TANPINAR

Tanzimat'la birlikte batılılaşma ve modernleşme sürecine girdiği kabul edilen Osmanlı toplumuna, bu süreçte çevirilerle tiyatro ve roman gibi kendi geleneğinde bulunmayan edebiyat türleri de giriş yapmıştır. İlk çevirmenler aynı zamanda ilk roman yazarları olarak öne çıkmışlardır. Bu çeviri faaliyetleri ile dönemin kültür ve düşünce dünyası yeni kavram ve düşüncelerle sarsılmıştır. Tanzimat dönemi yazar ve düşünürleri Fransız diline, devrim ve aydınlanma filozoflarına büyük ilgi duymuşlardır. Jön Türk hareketi, 1890'lardan itibaren Osmanlı edebi hayatını şekillendirmeye başlamış ve gençlerin, bir şekilde yabancı basında yer alan yazıları okuması ile Avrupa'da olan biteni anlaması mümkün hale gelmiştir. 20. yüzyılın ilk çeyreğinde Avrupa siyasal düşüncesinde modernizmi Batı içinden eleştiren bakış açıları ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu eleştirmenlerden biri olan Bergson, batı düşüncesinin ana ekseni dışında kalan düşünceleri ile akla karşı sezgi, zamana karşı süre kavramlarını kullanmış ve değişimde sürekliliği savunmuştur. Mustafa Şekip Tunç tarafından kaleme alınan Bergsoncu yazılar özellikle pozitivist ve ilimcilik cereyanlarına karşı Batı'da yükselen karşı-fikir hareketlerinin Türkiye'ye taşınmasında önemli bir rol oynamıştır. Bu durumdan etkilenen Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar da edebi yazıları ile cumhuriyetin radikal dönüştürmelerine karşı yazılar kaleme almıştır. Mazi ile barışık yaşamanın, tarihsel mirasın sürdürülmesinin ve cemiyeti oluşturan değerlerin korunması gerekliliğine değinen Tanpınar, değişerek devam etmenin, devam ederek dönüşmenin doğruluğuna inanmaktadır. Tanpınar, modernleşmenin Türk toplumunun zihnini ikiye böldüğünü ve bu bölünmüşlüğün bireylerin yaşantısında bir ikilik problemi çıkardığını neredeyse tüm eserlerinde vurgulamıştır. Bu medeniyet değiştirmesi ve Doğu ile Batı arasında kalmışlık, beraberinde fertte zihinsel bir melezliğe ve buhrana sebebiyet vermiştir. Tanpınar'ın eserlerinin bu minvalde okunup değerlendirilmesi Türk toplumunun daha iyi anlaşılmasına vesile olacaktır. Dolayısıyla Tanpınar'ın sanatçı/şair kişiliğinin ötesinde ya da onunla yoğrulmuş olarak bir "düşünür" sıfatıyla kabullenilmesi yerinde bir anlayış olacaktır.



**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Tanpınar, Roman, Modernleşme, Batılılaşma, Türk Modernleşmesi, Muhafazakarlık

# CONTENTS

**ABSTRACT** ..... **i**

**ÖZET** ..... **ii**

**CONTENTS** ..... **iii**

**1. INTRODUCTION** ..... **1**

**1.1. Methodology** ..... 5

**1.2. Aim Of Study** ..... 6

**1.3. Research Question** ..... 6

**1.4. Limitations of the Study** ..... 7

**1.5. Organization of the Chapters** ..... 7

**2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK** ..... **8**

**2.1. Modernity** ..... 8

**2.2. Modernization** ..... 11

**2.3. Conservatism** ..... 14

**3. TURKISH MODERNIZATION PROGRESS** ..... **17**

**3.1. Early Stage of Westernization** ..... 18

**3.2. The Tanzimat Era** ..... 22

**3.3. Positivism and Its Effect on Ottoman and Turkish Society** ..... 26

**3.4. The Adventure of Modernization in the Late Ottoman Period and New Turkey** ..... 35

**4. REACTIONS TO RADICAL MODERNIZATION: CONSERVATISM** ..... **43**

**4.1. Conservative Reaction in France** ..... 43

**4.2. Conservative Reaction in Turkey** ..... 45

**4.3. Bergson and His Thought in Turkey** ..... 51

**4.4. A Conservative Response to Modernization with Literature and the Novel** ..... 57

**5. AHMET HAMDI TANPINAR ..... 62**

**5.1. Short Biography of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar** ..... 62

**5.2. People who Affect Tanpınar** ..... 65

**5.3. The Modernization Problems for Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar** ..... 69

**5.4. The Conflicts of Turkish Modernization and Tanpınar's Criticism of the Tanzimat** ..... 72

**5.5. Tanpınar's Mental Hybridity: Eastern or Western** ..... 76

**5.6. Tanpınar's Concepts** ..... 79

**5.6.1. Time and Reality** ..... 79

**5.6.2. Longing and Melancholy** ..... 81

**5.6.3. Cultural Duality** ..... 85

**5.6.4. Transformation, Change and Continuity** ..... 88

**CONCLUSION ..... 92**

**REFERENCES ..... 96**

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This study is a modest awareness-raising effort to understand the Ottoman-Turkish society's adventure of keeping up with the changing and transforming world. It was thought that getting to know Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar would provide a different perspective to understand the Turkish modernization and westernization process, which was a long and painful period. The period when Tanpınar was born is a period in which social changes were experienced most intensely. The developments in the world and Turkey enabled him to see the periods when the course of history changed. Again, the environment in which Tanpınar grew up and his life adventure corresponded to the period when social depression, turmoil, change, revolution, and depression were experienced. As a human being, Tanpınar has conveyed these processes in his books in the most humane way. With this aspect, it seems possible to understand the processes experienced with more objective and human elements. Tanpınar's life adventure and the events he witnessed enabled him to produce excellent works. When the poet, writer, and intellectual and emotional aspects are combined with what he has seen, it is important to investigate Tanpınar. Tanpınar also has very favourable features for multi-disciplinary research. Fields such as history, sociology, literature, language, anthropology, and political science will all find a deep field of research at Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar.

Tanpınar provides data in Turkey and almost the whole world, which is of interest to all segments. In addition, he says a lot not only about the period he lived in but also about today's post-modern period. In today's world, where social changes and transformations are experienced very rapidly, there is a need for Tanpınar to be recognized and understood. With this aspect, Tanpınar is a thinker beyond his age. To call Tanpınar only a writer or poet is to under-describe him. He is a thinker and intellectual who is sensitive to the society he lives in and knows the society. At the same time, Tanpınar is a thinker who knows the world. The fact that he knew Europe, which was the centre of the world during his lifetime, also strengthened his intellectual side. It is necessary and meaningful for this thesis to examine the modernization and conservatism adventure that started in the world and in the Ottoman Empire, as well as the stimulating aspects of learning Turkish Modernization and Conservatism through Tanpınar.

It is very important to understand the concepts of modernity and modernization to understand the past and present of Turkish society since the 17th century and to prepare for the future. To better understand the historical origins and effects of modernity, we need to look at its source. In the second part of this thesis, the concepts of Modernity, Modernization, and Conservatism that emerged in response to them are explained to understand the conceptual framework and to make chronological progress. While explaining these concepts, generally accepted definitions are included. The meanings of these concepts have changed in different geographies and at other times. Definitions have changed over time, and each society has made its definitions. The concepts of modernity and modernization have been interpreted as saviours and praised in some cases, while in some cases, they have been interpreted as demonic. The natural demand for change and transformation in society will ensure the success of modernization. However, all segments of society will not accept the modernization process, which is only imitated in another society and does not appear in its natural cycle. Modernization processes must be specific to each society and develop naturally. Otherwise, modernization processes will not be adopted sufficiently and cause societies to undergo various crises. The adventure of modernity, which emerged in different geographies of Europe, generally succeeded. With the enrichment of European countries and they're guiding the world, the idea that these achievements were achieved through modernization became dominant. Technological developments, achievements in the military field, and the increase in colonial areas paved the way for the importation of the modernity process that emerged in Europe. Many countries that import modernity still need to understand its content adequately. Simple and imitative modernization processes have yet to be as successful in other countries as in Europe. In addition, the countries that imported modernity sometimes wanted to change with radical moves. These changes have led to shelving the processes that societies are accustomed to. The desire to suddenly eliminate societies' traditional, customary, and religious habits and the idea of preserving the tradition has revealed the conservative view. Conservatism has also been interpreted in different ways in different countries and times. What should be defended for a society is determined by the people living in that society. The conservative view has been widely accepted to protect the form of government, tradition, religion, and other social values.

The Ottoman state also first felt deficiencies in terms of military. Initially, military transformation and improvement efforts became a total modernization adventure in the Ottoman Empire. Whatever was on the showcase of the modernizing West, the Ottoman

Empire took them first. For example, sultans changed their clothes and updated their way of eating according to the West. However, these changes did not bring the Ottoman Empire back to its former influential periods. The reasons why the conjuncture favours Western countries and why they are on the rise need to be better understood. Therefore, the adventure of modernization has yet to be successfully implemented. The fact that the Ottoman Empire was settled in a vast geography consisting of many different nations and did not have colonies from which to obtain capital made it difficult to implement modern practices. The dominance of a religion that is different from the West and whose rules are lived in life in the Ottoman Empire also distinguishes it from other states. Islamic religion; It is a religion that is involved in almost all areas of individuals, society, and the state. The religion of Islam is involved in the way people dress, how they eat, and even their daily behaviour . In short, *halal* or *haram* is the major factor determining people's behaviour in an Islamic country. Although the people living in such a society and state are not religious, the tradition formed in the society has guided them. More or fewer secularization processes must also be experienced for modernization to be implemented. Without secularism, it will not be possible to live and maintain Humanism, the religion of modernization.

The processes that would lead the Ottomans, who accepted modernization, to the Tanzimat had also begun. It was a legal reform requested from the Ottoman Empire by the Western States that non-Muslim subjects should have equal rights with Muslims. With the Tanzimat, a series of reforms were made, and the Ottoman Empire officially approached the West. The Westernization process, which started with the idea of backwardness in the military field, was initiated in almost every area. Moreover, this process legitimized even the capitulations given to foreign states. With the Tanzimat, cultural changes began to occur in the Ottoman Empire. Theatre, novels, and other cultural elements of the West started to find a response in the Ottoman Empire. In addition, Ottoman bureaucrats were also affected by these processes and tried to transform the state. With the Tanzimat, the transformation began to be felt in almost every field, and students were sent from the Ottoman Empire to the West. These students then started to carry the "goodness" they saw in Europe to the Ottoman Empire. Students who were educated in Europe at a young age during the Tanzimat period took part in various state levels after their return. First of all, this student group, who agreed on the need to be scientific in education, put into practice an objective and scientific education model. These bureaucratic elites, influenced by positivism, abandoned the

traditional education model of the Ottoman Empire and put into practice a new and scientific education model.

Positivism has been on the agenda of European countries for a long time and has affected societies. The positivist philosophy, which attracted attention and was practised especially in France, was later accepted in many different countries. The philosophy of positivism accepted things that can be perceived with the five senses as real and did not accept things that could not be scientifically proven. In this sense, this understanding, which rejects metaphysics, rejects the human spirit, emotions, and feelings. Positivism also saw societies as a laboratory and revealed the science of sociology. Positivism tried to see social sciences as positive sciences. In this way, it has produced solutions consisting of black or white with rules and no grey areas. Positivism also sought to replace the religion of humanity. At that time, reactions to positivism, which suddenly changed the Ottoman education system, began to come from all parts of society. The administrators and bureaucrats, looking for various ways to save an empire that was about to collapse, tried to try every saving way. This situation even led to a change in the Ottoman administrative system. Rapid and radical transformations increased towards the end of the 19th century. Conservative reactions began to be given to modernist and positivist practices before it was too late.

The country that the Ottoman ruling elite was most affected by was France. So much so that even conservative responses were imported from France. Bergson, who reacted to the positivist and mechanical modernization process prevailing in France, became a thinker whose views were adopted in Ottoman and Republican Turkey. Bergson, who opposed positivist thought, drew attention to the human spirit and its metaphysical aspects. Bergson's philosophy, which is more like eastern ideas, states that there could be no single truth for people and society, and at the same time, the same formula cannot be applied to everyone. His thoughts of Bergson later found a response in the intellectual community in Turkey. Bergsonian ideas were frequently included in various magazines in literary works, which we can define as the social media of the period. Bergsonian thought was disseminated by using imported communication tools.

Media organs such as novels, theatres, newspapers, and magazines have turned into devices that propagate ideology to a large extent. While some authors made propaganda supporting change and transformation using these devices, some published texts criticized

the modernization processes. The formations that affected Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar also emerged during this time. Bergsonian writings, written by Mustafa Şekip Tunç, played an essential role in conveying the rising counter-idea movements in the West against the positivist and scientific movements in Turkey. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, who was affected by this situation, also wrote articles against the radical transformations of the republic with his literary writings. Referring to the necessity of living in peace with the past, maintaining the historical heritage, and protecting the values that make up the society, Tanpınar believes in the correctness of continuing by changing and transforming by continuing. Tanpınar has emphasized in almost all his works that modernization divides the minds of Turkish society into two, and this division creates a duality problem in the lives of individuals. This change in civilization and being stuck between the East and the West has led to mental hybridity and depression in the individual.

## 1.1.Methodology

In this study, a literature review was conducted based on the qualitative research method, and after this literature review, the data obtained from primary and secondary sources related to the thesis were analyzed. Primary sources mostly consist of the works of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. Other primary sources were used for process descriptions and explanations of concepts. The works cited as sources in this study are generally the main sources. In addition, books, theses, articles and other studies that evaluate Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar more as a thinker were also examined.

In this study, both English and Turkish works were scanned. English works are generally obtained from digital media libraries. Turkish works were obtained from libraries, books and web sites that publish articles.

While conveying the expressions of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, the translation was made as faithful to the original Turkish as possible. Thus, Tanpınar's poetic and literary expression was tried to be reflected in the thesis.

This study has been prepared in a holistic structure. With a chronological method, organic ties between events and people were tried to be established. In addition, participatory

and interpretive aspects are also included. In this study, the relations between the subjects were tried to be given in a clear and understandable way.

In the introduction to almost every chapter, the basic starting points about why that chapter was written are included. On the other hand, the main texts were generally obtained by citation.

## 1.2.Aim Of Study

This study has three main aims. The first is to make Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar more visible in political science literature. It is emphasized in this thesis that Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar is not only a poet and a man of letters, but in a broader definition, he is a philosopher beyond his time. It is mentioned in this thesis that Tanpınar's philosopher side can also produce solutions for today's post-modern world.

The second important aim is Tanpınar's conservatism. Tanpınar can see modernization in many stages of his thesis. In fact, the dominant and early-period conservatism view in Turkey does not take a stance against secularization – modernization as it is understood. Conservatism in Turkey is more of a stance against the methods of making revolutions. Turkish conservatives did not show serious reactions to positivism in education. Or conservatives did not defend the institution of the sultanate. This thesis gives an idea about the general position of Tanpınar and other conservatives.

The third important aim is the necessity of evaluating the media organs of the period from a broader perspective. It has been revealed that publications such as novels, theatre, poetry and newspapers, which were transferred to the Ottoman Empire during the Tanzimat period, did not only have artistic concerns. These publications, which are mostly used as ideology dissemination devices, have been quite effective. Examining these works will open many doors for understanding recent history.

## 1.3.Research Question

This study seeks answers to the following questions: How did modernity and conservatism emerge in the West, and what were their effects? Why did the Ottoman Empire need modernization? How did the modernization process of the Ottoman Empire take place,

and what was its social response? While the modernization process was taking place, how did the elite common classes of society meet these situations? How did Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar include all these processes in his works? How did Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar evaluate the modernization of the Ottoman and Turkish Republic, and what did he suggest?

## 1.4. Limitations of the Study

In this study, I encountered some problems because I do not know the French language. During the Ottoman and Turkish Modernization process, France was heavily influenced. The motives that cause this effect have not been adequately explained.

On the other hand, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's variable mood and multidisciplinary perspective made it difficult to make some evaluations.

## 1.5. Organization of the Chapters

There are strong connections between the chapters of this thesis, both conceptually and chronologically. The second part is completed with basic and conceptual descriptions to understand the rest of the thesis and the main messages. In the third part, the last periods of the Ottoman Empire and the modernization adventure of the newly established Republic of Turkey are included. In the fourth chapter, the reactions to the changes experienced with the adventure of modernization are given. The first emergence of conservatism in Turkey is also discussed in this section. Again in this section, the communication and propaganda tools of the modern world of that day are also included. In the fifth and last part, it is given how all these processes are evaluated from the eyes of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. Information about Tanpınar's short biography, the people he was influenced by, his philosophy and his works are given. In this section, the conceptual framework that corresponds to Tanpınar is also included.

# 2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

## 2.1. Modernity

It has always been challenging to determine when the concept of Modernity emerged and to put forward a definition of the concept with a precise definition; the concept of Modernity, such as many concepts used in the field of social sciences, has been interpreted differently by the relevant thinkers. Modernity, with its generally accepted and brief definition, refers to the forms of social life and organization that started in Europe in the 17th century and then influenced almost the whole world (Giddens, 2010). Rene Descartes (1596 – 1650) and Francis Bacon (1561 – 1626) are encountered in the philosophical background of Modernity, which is accepted to have emerged in the 17th century and emerged as a reaction to the dark age of Europe (Poyraz, 2008). The philosophy of Modernity, which settled and consolidated with Descartes in England and Bacon in France, creates a new and secular sense of history and makes man the subject of this philosophy. As a result of this unique and secular sense of history, the modern philosophy of the 17th century is a subject-based philosophy that opens a brand new and white page in thought and starts from a tabula rasa by denying the past and destroying tradition (Cevizci, 2011).

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) and René Descartes (1596-1650) were two of the most influential thinkers of the "modern" era (1596-1650). Bacon: "Axioms established by reasoning," like the great logical and deductive treatises of Aristotle and Aquinas, were inapplicable to the "finding of new works." Bacon: "Matter rather than forms should be the focus of our attention, including its configurations and changes in configuration, as well as basic activity and the rule of action or motion." Bacon: "As the servant and interpreter of nature, man can accomplish and comprehend just as much as he has witnessed in reality or in thought the path of nature; beyond this, he neither knows nor can do anything." Descartes' dictum, "I think, therefore I am", places the individual perceiver at the heart of comprehension and, hence, reality (Ketcham, 2021, pp. 31-32).

Modernity includes the gradual differentiation of the political, economic, family life, religious, and art parts of social life. Modernity cannot be used to express a society that wants to organize itself and take action by a divine revelation or a national essence, nor is it simply a series of changes or events (Touraine, 2002). During the European Renaissance of the 15th

and 16th centuries, the revival of classical learning with its emphasis on political community combined with Christian thought with its emphasis on individual conscience (even before the Protestant Reformation) contributed to the development of a worldview and ideology that ushered in the first cycle of modernity. The essence of this first version of modernity, in its various incarnations over the past five hundred years, is a kind of secular individualism, taking classical secularism or mundaneness from the ancient world and, as a result, weakening medieval spirituality while sustaining the individual faith and orientation of Judeo-Christianity (and Islam) in a way that diluted classical assumptions about polity. This is coming together of ideas, along with the growth of capitalism and Europe's access to the East and the New World, marked the start of the modern era, which gave rise to new ideas about self-government, leadership, and being a good citizen (Ketcham, 2021).

"Modernity" is a subjective concept that allows for various opposing interpretations. A fundamental challenge is determining when the roots of modernity occurred. The answer to this question relies heavily on the individual's interests. For those primarily concerned with politics, modernity starts with the appearance from the middle to the end of the 17th century. Those who have, especially in contrast, economic interests believe modernity began a century later with the commencement of the industrial revolution in England. Modernity started roughly at the same period for individuals with significant sociological interests like Habermas, notably with the formulation of Enlightenment principles by Kant about ethics and politics during the French and American revolutions. However, for those who emphasize the pre-eminence of science in the contemporary period, the beginnings of modernity may be traced to the work of Isaac Newton in the 1630s. Toulmin believes we must return to the 1630s, and the efforts of Galileo and Descartes established contemporary scientific knowledge. Ideas as "reasonable" according to one understanding. After a generation, this interpretation generalized to the domain of politics. Thus, when Toulmin discusses "the traditional explanation of modernity," he is concerned the origins of The 1630s and 1640s were characterized by modernism. (McCormick, 2020) In addition to its historical antecedents, it is vital to acknowledge that modernity has evolved at different times and in various ways. Modernity is characterized by ambiguity, hesitation, and duality. Understanding modernity through these forms will enhance one's comprehension of it.

Aside from society, environment, and humankind, it is difficult to identify a notion with a higher degree and broader scope than modernity. This continuous interest is

predictable, given that several prominent social scientists, such as Habermas, Lyotard, Giddens, Therborn, Hall, Appadurai, Beck, Bauman, and Chakrabarty, have written about modernity and its related terminology throughout the past two decades. The waves continue to spread, and the secondary literature and discussion narratives continue to expand. Habermas' portrayal of Foucault and Derrida as young conservatives accelerated a debate over the worth of the modern and the emerging postmodern (Featherstone, 2007).

The project of Modernity is seen as the result of the Enlightenment. Enlightenment, on the other hand, is based on trusting the mind and the uniqueness of man. It is believed that the human mind can comprehend the functioning of the social order and determine the best for itself. For this reason, the destiny of man and society is taken from the hand of the divine and handed over to humans. One of the essential aspects of Modernity is that it has built individuals who have been saved from traditional social bonds, whose capacities are increased, whose commitment to a particular culture has decreased, who can update themselves, change places, and who are fluid in the course of history (Tekeli, 2007). Just as modernity has changed people, it has also changed the human world. Mainly these changes have been experienced in scientific, economic, political, and social fields. Three major factors affecting the existence of Modernity are mentioned.

The first component of the conventional conception of modernity is that "the political, economic, social, and intellectual circumstances of Western Europe changed dramatically after 1600, in ways that stimulated the formation of new political institutions and more rational techniques of inquiry." The premise of this argument was that a confluence of events led to the creation of a secular civilization. This secular culture flourished throughout the 1630s intellectual and methodological revolution defined by Galileo's theories. The second aspect of the traditional explanation was the notion that "after 1600, the burden of religion was lighter than before" and "ecclesiastical limitations and regulations were loosened in the 17th century" The third factor was the notion that the actual scientific and philosophical breakthroughs of the 17th century were both revolutionary and liberating (McCormick, 2020, pp. 12-14).

Although it is true that the modern world first became aware of itself in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it would be incorrect to claim that modernity, as we know it today, began at that time, just as it would be wrong to claim that human life begins when one first becomes aware of oneself. Hobbes, Descartes, Bacon, and Galileo did not invent modernity

from scratch. However, over time and as a result of many people's efforts, it developed. Several instances involving numerous people. One of the primary characteristics of modernity is its tendency to see itself as radical, novel, and unheard-of. This is the outcome of understanding human potential and how human being change through time, which is particularly contemporary. If this Modern self-awareness is correct, there are good reasons to doubt it. We must thus look into the early, "preconscious" genesis of the modern world over the three hundred years that passed between the fall of the growth of modernism and the medieval age to understand its character (Gillespie, 2008).

## 2.2.Modernization

Modernity emerged due to Europe's internal dynamics and later became globalized for political and economic reasons (Kahraman & Keyman, 1998). In the rest of the world outside Europe, which was not involved in the formation process of modernity, modernity became an ideal. The exact process tried to be experienced in non-Western societies under the name of modernization or be sustained by European countries. Although modernization and modernity are interwoven concepts, modernization differs from modernity. While modernity is a project, modernization refers to the institutional and structural transformation that will make this project possible. In this sense, modernization includes industrialization, the formation of market systems, the scientific revolution, technological progress, and the development of nation-states (Çiğdem, 2008). In other words, modernization is the process of change that non-Western societies undergo by taking the West as a model (Türköne, 2006).

The term "modernization" refers to the broad range of social, economic, political, and cultural developments that have defined the last 200 years and are currently sweeping the globe. Such changes resulted from the two revolutions that occurred in the second half of the eighteenth century: the economic-social revolution and the political-cultural revolution, which took different forms in France and America and were both accompanied by the systematic introduction of industry and the growth of the global market. It has to do with a series of adjustments that occurred over many centuries (according to some scholars, beginning with the bankers' proto-capitalist system in the twelfth century, according to others, beginning with the great maritime explorers of the fifteenth century, and according

to still others, beginning with the great scientific discoveries of the seventeenth century) and that culminated in the revolutionary eighteenth-century processes (Martinelli, 2005).

Modernization is frequently associated with Westernization in the sense that Western culture has become world civilization. However, the concept of modernization has been defined differently because its effects are far-reaching and long-lasting. Although there are different views on the definition of the concept, the roots of the modernization theories were based on the progressive - Western-centric ideas of the Enlightenment philosophy, were reinforced in the positivist era of the 19th century, and reached the dominant social science paradigm after the Second World War (Mollaer, 2014). Modernization requires a decision and will after seeing the result of modernity. If modernity is a process, modernization is more of a project. Western society, which is modern with its internal, social, and class dynamics, experienced modernity as an outcome. In communities where modernity is a goal rather than a consequence, modernization begins with the awareness that it is not modern and generally moves from the political to the social (Dellaloğlu, 2016). In logic and etymology, modernisation refers to a process of long-term cultural and social change viewed as constructive, unavoidable, or on balance, desirable by members of the evolving society. Modernization conflicts with any concept of human history as flowing in periodic cycles from perfection to decay and regeneration, as a constant fall, or as a situation that can only be escaped in the afterlife (Robert E. Ward, 1964).

Despite being based on the historical experience of Western countries in Europe and North America, the concept of modernization can also be applied to the rest of the world (the Rest versus the West), taking into account the diversity of time periods, the sequences of their development, and the uniqueness of their institutions.

Modernization as a historical concept is not limited to the industrialization of the economy and the secularization of ideas. It involves increased geographic and social mobility, a proliferation of secular, scientific, and technical education, a transition from assigned to acquired status, a rise in material standards of living, and an abundance of related and secondary phenomena. The essential component of modernity as a historical phenomenon may be man's rapidly developing power over the forces of nature or somewhat society's control since it is not gained by any one in isolation but rather by men through a complex division of labour. Consequently, as control over the physical world grows, so does

social reliance. Man becomes the master of nature and the servant of humankind. (Robert E. Ward, 1964).

In terms of economic and social organization, political relations, and cultural characteristics, Western countries display the biggest distinctions and contrast with earlier societies; as a result, they have become the icon of modernity. Modernization tends to associate with Westernization in the sense that Western society transforms into a global civilisation. Modernization is the precise sum of the large-scale social, economic, political, and cultural changes that have characterized world history over the past two centuries and that stem from the multifaceted (economic, social, political, and cultural) revolution of the second half of the eighteenth century. It is a process that tends to be global in two ways: it impacts all elements of the participating societies, and it spreads from its origin in Western Europe to the rest of the globe. Therefore, modernization refers to a process, or more precisely, a collection of well-defined processes, and indicates modernity. Nonetheless, it differs from modernity, which refers to the particular modes of social life and culture that emerge as a result of this process. Despite being based on the historical experience of Western countries in Europe and North America, the concept of modernization can also be applied to the rest of the world, taking into account the diversity of time periods, the sequences of their development, and the uniqueness of their institutions (Martinelli, 2005).

On the other hand, modernisation has several sorts of effects on countries. The question of the modernisation effort in Turkey, for example, has become a forum for intense disagreements and clashes among intellectuals. Their alternative interpretations of Turkish history, which are informed by their perspectives regarding Islamism, secularism, and the current political system in Turkey, challenge Turkey's official history in order to analyse and explain the numerous sociological shifts of contemporary Turkey. Because different institutional and ideological patterns constitute different forms of modernity and modernization in Turkey, a number of topics, including traditionalism, conservatism, political Islam, ethnic identities, and secular nationalism, are examined to determine their position and role in modernization in Turkey. By reviewing these intellectuals' conceptions of modernity, one might discern their ideological or political alliances and oppositions. Scholars such as Nilüfer Göle and E. Fuat Keyman take an important role with their writings. Göle critiques the current public space for ignoring religious rituals. Moreover, Keyman believes that "Islamic identity" does not represent a danger to the contemporary concept;

instead, it only wants acknowledgement within modernity. In addition, he asserts that there has been a "shift in the essence of Turkish modernity" that makes it difficult to think of Turkish secularism as unchallenged and Turkish modernity without considering Islam (Kaya, 2019).

In conclusion, Max Weber's thesis on modernization and traditionalism may be seen as the origin of modernization as a theory of development. The beliefs of the Age of Enlightenment, in which "progress" was modelled after Newton's physics, were part of Weber's own worldview. Newton's physics, with its scientific method and steady progression, was meant to serve as a strong basis for a paradigm of knowledge in general. This vision served as the foundation for the conclusion that the contemporary era will be able to transcend the old and inherited "superstitions, biases, and mistakes" with the help of this new scientifically acquired knowledge and that this modernization process would also involve moral advancement. We all know all too well that this did not occur everywhere, and even in those few instances where it did, such as in the most developed Western nations, scientific advancement did not result in universal moral advancement or material advancement. Instead, secularization undercut the foundation for such moral advancement, and the same self-interest that these ideas were based on in the Age of Enlightenment conspired against the prospect of a moral system that was humanistic and inclusive (Nabudere, 1997).

## 2.3. Conservatism

Conservatism is a distinct political term that is 130 years of age, coming into general usage after the great reform act of 1832 in Great Britain. The word generally meant opposition to reform. Conservatives typically wish to preserve present or past values rather than create or adopt new ones. (Shannon, 1962)

Conservatism was born in Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries as a reaction to the alterations that emerged as a result of the development of Enlightenment thought and the effects of the industrial revolution, and it made a name for itself, especially with the French Revolution. The French modernists characterized themselves as progressive and revolutionary, but the conservatives as bigots and reactionaries (Güngörmez, 2004).

Conservatism emerged as an ideology embodied by criticism of the philosophical and intellectual values that prepared the French Revolution and the criticism of the philosophers of the Enlightenment. The French Revolution was carried out to free people from the past's oppression and build a new future across Europe by promising them the values of "freedom, fraternity, equality". The French Revolution found a response in England, as it did everywhere else in Europe, and voices advocating the need for revolution became louder. Therefore, associations were founded, and sermons were preached. Meanwhile, a counter voice was raised against the intellectuals of the period, and Edmund Burke considered the founder of conservatism in his book Reflections on the Revolution in France, propounded a criticism condemning the revolution (Heywood, 2013).

Ambrose Bierce's definition of conservatism in the 'Devils Dictionary': 'A conservative is a statesman with a passion for existing evils; in this respect, he differs from a liberal who wants to replace existing evils with other evils.' With a gentle expression, the conservative has roots in the past and seeks continuity. On the other hand, the liberal takes pride in his vision of the future and advocates change (Kirk, 2005).

Since the French Revolution, the opposition between conservatism and radicalism has been perpetuated as a result of the particularities of the dual self-definition of the conservatives' and revolutionaries' rationales. Conservatives have always accused their opponents of overt or covert radicalism, the subversion of the social order, the destruction of a social organization ensuring the balance of quality elements, the promotion of an attitude determined by sheer numbers, and the power lust of a self-centred and unrestrained minority. The radicals have also been eager to label anyone who disagrees with them as benefactors of the old regime and reactionaries by labelling them as conservatives (Beckstein, 2016).

Burke's opposition to the French Revolution was primarily motivated by his opinion that it weakened the manners that supported property, law, trade, and freedom across Europe, not just in France. Similarly, Eliot's complaint against Harold Laski's 'new civilization' is epistemological, based on the relativity and diversity of significant values that Laski has ignored: "we are not justified in concluding, with regard to his or any other proposed changes in the social framework, that the 'new civilization' is desirable." As Eliot noted, it is equally essential that any change principle be constructive and not only the unwillingness to act. There is danger in both inaction and action, and the change principle must be worded in a

way that respects the conservative's desire to detect and confront major issues (O'Hara, 2016, p. 425).

Conservatism requires more than a profound regard for a people's traditional practices. It is also founded on a philosophical rejection of the hubris commonly associated with the Enlightenment's last decades. Conservatism is characterized by a widespread sense of modesty over the capacity of unassisted reason to comprehend the moral cosmos and construct suitable social arrangements. At its core, conservatism is determined by an epistemological position that accepts traditionalism, not out of a fanatical love of the past but out of severe doubt regarding man's capacity to comprehend complex social systems. As Edmund Burke stated, it is with extreme prudence that any man should risk demolishing a structure that has served the common functions of society to a bearable degree for centuries or rebuilding it without having models and patterns of proven utility before his eyes. Moreover, nearly all conservatives see moderate scepticism as a fundamental component of intellectual conservatism (Shain, 2002).

History is the finest guide for understanding the present and planning for the future, according to conservatives, since it reveals which political arrangements are likely to improve or degrade the quality of life. Instead of these alternatives, conservatives then turn to history. Not to history in general, though, but to their history, which is theirs since it is a storehouse of formative effects on how they live today and how they are likely to wish to live in the future. However, their attitude is not one of unquestioning support for the political systems that have grown customary in their culture. They seek to preserve old political systems, but only those that are favourable to decent lives. Conservatives look to their past not merely for the opportunities that make life worthwhile but also for the constraints that such lives must respect. They consider their history to determine what merits their loyalty and what is detrimental to a healthy society. To preserve excellent political arrangements and avoid undesirable ones, it is frequently necessary to adjust conventional structures to new conditions. Therefore, conservatism does not entail tight adherence to a rigid pattern but rather a flexible reordering of the relative importance of the pieces that comprise such complex entities as political structures (Kekes, 1997).

# 3. TURKISH MODERNIZATION PROGRESS

Every state and society has its own modernization adventure. The difficulties experienced while defining modernity are due to the fact that modernization processes manifest in different ways at different times and places. The state structure of the Ottoman state, consisting of different nations and sociological structures in a very wide geography, makes the Ottoman and Turkish modernization adventures unique. Even in countries with similar histories, the revival-modernity movement against the church, which has a monopoly on religion and a distorted religion, produced different results in Europe. Almost every nation has experienced its modernization adventure with its own unique processes. Many managers and executive elites have reinterpreted modernity in their way and put it into practice in different ways. It is possible to see western-type modernization processes in different parts of the world, sometimes with total and sometimes partial applications. The philosophy of modernity, which emerged in Europe out of necessity with its natural adventure and historical flow, has succeeded in many ways. For example, to end church oppression, society and ruling elites collaborated with the people, relieving pressure on the church and accelerating religious reform movements. In this way, the way of secularization against the distorted religion has been paved, and this transformation process has not caused great wounds in society. The modernization processes that emerged according to needs were able to solve even deep-rooted social problems. Solving problems and gaining some cyclical advantages raised the standards of modernizing countries in political, military, cultural, and social fields.

Thus, the achievements of the modernizing countries began to be taken as an example by other states. These processes, however, have frequently been untested and imitative. In the states where modernization processes are imitated, the dynamics of society have not been sufficiently taken into account and have caused a wide variety of social reactions. The reform processes that started with partial modernization in the Ottoman Empire were followed by more inclusive and radical methods over time. The Ottoman Empire's formation of various nationalities across a vast geography resulted in periodic and regional modernization experiences. With the First World War and the establishment of the Turkish Republic, radical changes have occurred from both international and national perspectives. These transformation and change processes have resulted in a wide range of reactions. In this section, the modernization adventure in the Ottoman state and the newly established

Republic of Turkey are described. To better understand the sociological changes caused by modernization, the adventure of westernization should also be well understood.

## 3.1.Early Stage of Westernization

The adventure of Westernization, which began with the end of the rise of the Ottoman Empire and gained new aspects in Republican Turkey, first emerged with the idea and determination of military backwardness compared to the West. The Ottoman Empire always maintained relations and interactions with Europe. However, the efforts to emulate the military establishments of the West as an example expedited starting from the middle of the 18th century, and the Ottoman foreign affairs officials who were sent to the West increased diplomatic relations with Europe and started the period that prepared the Tanzimat, with the thought that the West should be a model for the Ottoman Empire (Mardin, 2013).

In addition, though, restorative reformers also used European technological advancements. They imported and copied superior models of artillery pieces, new varieties of small guns, and more potent gunpowder. In the shipbuilding and the engineering skills of fortification and siege, they developed new techniques. As imitators and importers, however, the Ottomans fell behind their European rivals in the adoption of new technologies. During the seventeenth century, as the rate of technical development in the West quickened, this disparity widened (Levy, 1982).

Similar to modern European governments, the Ottoman military reform was inspired and moulded by a combination of external and internal influences. Beginning in the second part of the seventeenth century, foreign threats were increasingly dangerous. Multiple military disasters resulting in lasting territory losses highlighted the inadequacy of Ottoman armies against expansionist European foes. To have any chance of survival, the Ottoman Empire had to immediately improve its military forces. Concurrently, considerable internal incentives for military reform existed. Ottoman society was comprised of several overlapping, self-governing groups, including religious communities (millets) and brotherhoods with their state-wide hierarchies, local guilds, and urban and rural parishes (Levy, 1982).

The 18th century was a period of significant social and administrative changes for the Ottoman Empire. In this era of change, the state and society had to deal with establishing a

modern and centralized army, a new model of taxation and financial organization, the rising consumption, and the religious reactions it would generate (Ortaylı, 2011).

Ottoman modernization did not begin as a mere military modernization. Undoubtedly, the most crucial need for the state and society was seen as the need for military renewal; still, since the beginning of the 19th century, the unnamed modernization project manifested itself in different fields, some of which were accepted and some of which were not when no results were obtained. The Ottoman modernization project was not a process applied by the ruling elite within a program. The modernization process could not involve all areas of society and could not be implemented decisively. This state of indecision among the ruling elite caused contradictions in some starting points, and decision-makers lived in the heart of the old and the tradition while at the same time trying to catch up with the new and the modern in their way by groping (Koçak, 2011).

To exemplify this through a symbol, we can use the coat of arms inherited from Mahmud II to Abdulhamid. Heraldry was one of the most conspicuous emblems of the late nineteenth century's increasing emphasis on royal power and ceremony. The coat of arms of the House of Osman represented the Sublime State (Devlet-i Aliyye). Mahmud II had commissioned the design from an Italian artist. In 1905, when Sultan Abdulhamid II (r. 1876-1909) requested a full explanation of its contents, Eventually, it was unearthed, and its contents described. The Sultan was informed in a lengthy note that the Ottoman coat of arms had ancient and new Turkish and Islamic characteristics, such as weapons and other significant things. The major feature of the shield was "the glorious crown of the Sultans," topped with the ruler's seal or Tugra. This was flanked by two huge tomes, one representing Islamic law (şeriat) and the other representing contemporary legal systems. This was followed by a pair of scales signifying justice. The core motif was ringed and flanked by symbolic armaments, the old balancing the new: an arrow and quiver and an infantry rifle and bayonet, an old-style muzzle-loading cannon and a contemporary field artillery piece, a classic scimitar and a modern cavalry sabre, etc. The coat of arms also featured typical Islamic-Ottoman emblems, such as a vase filled with blooming flowers and incense, symbolising the state's grandeur. The overall design was bordered on the right by a cluster of red banners and on the left by a cluster of green banners representing the Sultanic-Ottoman and Islamic character of the Caliphate, respectively. Underneath the entire motif was an assortment of Ottoman ornaments. The fundamental motifs of the Ottoman coat of arms

centred on the continuity of the old and the new, the traditional and the modern; yet, it was a created tradition borne of the Ottomans' desire to stress that they were a great power compared to all others. The fact that the Imperial coat of arms bristled with weapons is symptomatic of the state's relative inferiority vis-à-vis its rivals. Therefore, the sign of the Ottoman Empire represents "the utilization of historical resources to create invented traditions of a novel sort for quite innovative goals." It was also a concise articulation of the "myth-symbol complex" of the Ottoman Empire. In the same way that the Ottomans wanted to highlight pre-existing traditions by incorporating them into the state sign, they also worked to limit the dissemination of what they deemed rival symbols (Deringil, 1993).

In the early stages of Westernization, the long-term adoption of the view that partial reforms could solve problems related to the state led to the late realization that there was an integrated value and thought system behind Western thought. This situation forced the proponents of Westernization to deal with a conflict between new institutions and old values and the problems caused by this conflict throughout the 19th century. It can be said that the effort to reconcile the old values with the new institutions in a satisfying way was an essential factor determining the Westernization movements until the last quarter of the 19th century (Toker & Tekin , 2012).

The 'moderate' approach of the Tanzimat, which proposed Westernization as a method to solve particular problems related to the state, the army, and the administrative system, was replaced by a more radical and total Westernization movement from the end of the 19th century. The idea of seeing the West as a whole and that Westernization should be carried out stems not from Christianity and the cultural traditions of the West but from the fact that Westernization acts with a universalizable principle, reason. Thus, the understanding that societies that do not share the same past with the West can also establish a political and social order similar to Western societies through reason is accepted; and the process of establishing modernity in the West can be seen as a move of 'breaking away from tradition.' (Toker & Tekin , 2012).

The 1839 Gülhane edict was less of a Westernizing move than previously believed. It did call for reforms in taxes, military recruiting, and legal procedures to establish a just system. It extended life, honour, and property protections to all subjects, Muslim and non-Muslim alike. 1856's Reform decree (Islahat Ferman) enacted new legislation to fulfil these pledges. By the early 1860s, non-Muslim groups had established communal "constitutions"

and new quasi-parliamentary organizations. The 1876 Ottoman constitution was a reasonable reaction to the international climate of the moment. It demonstrated the degree to which concepts such as the rule of law, fundamental rights, and equality had become ingrained in Ottoman thought. Following the reform acts of 1839, 1856, and 1876, it was part of a wave of legislation. The majority of its mass and impetus consisted of Napoleon Bonaparte-influenced new codes. The Mechelle (1870–1877) is the most prominent illustration of a significant component of the new corpus of law formed from the sharia. In the 1860s, a network of Nizami courts was established to adjudicate matters according to the new regulations. In practice, the participation of ulema as judges mitigated reforms that would have otherwise been sharply secularizing. The disparity between the goal of a "law state" and authoritarianism may have been the Ottoman Empire's worst challenge. During the Tanzimat, many Ottomans believed they witnessed this sort of authority abuse at the Sublime Porte. The proliferation of new ministries and agencies was the clearest sign of the development of the central government (Findley, 2010).

The junctures of late Ottoman history illustrate the negotiated nature of imperial consolidation. In this sense, the decentralized eighteenth century and the reign of Abdulhamid II (1876-1909) were credited for maintaining ideological cohesion and intensive negotiations between the central government and the local elite. The Tanzimat and Young Turks eras represented the other side of the coin, as top-down reform, centralization, and Turkish nationalism disrupted the centre-periphery symbiosis by reversing the course of negotiation. From a post-structural viewpoint, imperial legitimacy, political stability, and federative state creation finally crumbled when the Ottoman bureaucratic elite, with its modernist and orientalist ideology, seized control of the political arena and exacerbated the empire's decline (Emrence, 2007). Reformers fashioned administrative, anthropological, and archaeological spaces to express Ottoman modernity.

The Arab regions of the Ottoman Empire were significant testing grounds for Ottoman modernism, especially after the Balkan provinces declared independence from Ottoman rule in 1878 and 1913. Ottoman reformers considered their Arab provinces as territories to be Ottomanized but not yet Ottoman, as territories whose spatial integration into imperial Ottomanism formed the foundation for a modernized empire. The rise of Ottoman Orientalism can only be comprehended as a fundamental break with prior concepts of time and imperial organization that characterized the pre-reform Ottoman Empire. After the

nineteenth century, Ottoman reformers endeavoured to nationalize (Ottomanize) the empire and incorporate its peripheries into a uniform Ottoman modernity (Makdisi, 2002).

## 3.2.The Tanzimat Era

The word Tanzimat means "regulations" in Turkish. It refers to a period of Turkish history (1839 - 1876) in which many Western-inspired political and social reforms were carried out in the Ottoman Empire. (Mardin, 2015) The Tanzimat Edict is not a law or a constitution but a type of document of the charter (deed, Carta in Latin) that promises to make changes in the relations between the rulers' authorities and the rights of the people in Europe. Based on this document, a written constitution could be established, or new laws could be prepared. The direction of the Tanzimat was the latter (Berkes, 2013).

During the Tanzimat, or "reorganization phase," the Ottoman Empire engaged in a discourse on development and modernity, rebuilding its economic and social life around ostensible European achievements. The Tanzimat, largely fashioned after the Enlightenment, guaranteed all Ottoman subjects life, honour, and property rights. The state implemented more equal types of taxation, invested in infrastructure and education, and changed its relationship with its subjects in general. Recognizing that the economic and political survival of the empire hinged on its capacity to manage its borders, the Tanzimat was also an effort to reinstall stricter administrative and budgetary control over provinces that had been placed in the hands of local elites and bureaucrats for generations. (Carroll, 2008).

After 1860, the relationship between the emergence of the intelligentsia and ideology, as well as their reliance on communication as a form of political socialization and mass indoctrination emerged as the new features of Ottoman modernization. Indeed, communication began to play a pivotal role in the change process. It started with the installation of the postal system (1834), telegraph (1855-64), and railroads (1866), primarily due to the government's efforts to communicate with its field representatives and quickly convey its soldiers. With the creation of modern newspapers, particularly Ceride-i Havadis and Tercüman-ı Ahval (in 1860), the full effect of contemporary communications became apparent. Thus, the stage was set for a new phase of transition that might mobilize many people in the modernizing process (Karpat, 1972).

Tanzimat stands for Westernization, which started as military and technical, taking a political-legal form. The fact that modernization has also started at the institutional level, and large loans taken from western states to cover the incurred expenses to prepare institutions for the modernization process caused the state to grant capitulations to the major states that borrowed money; these states pressured the Sublime Porte under the pretext of protecting Turkey's Christian subjects. As a result of these pressures, the modernization process not only consisted of reforming the army and taking the necessary technical measures but also manifested itself in the cultural-political sphere (Ülken, 2013).

When Western technology entered the country, some of the conditions of thought required by it also entered, and the Eastern spirit had a dispute with modern techniques. These conflicts, which prepared the renewal of the state mentality, emerged with the entrance of modern sciences and western literature into the country and, more importantly, with the pressures of Western imperialists. The necessity to protect the rights of minorities pressured the Porte, and the idea that the laws should be revised occurred. Another area of pressure was exerted by bureaucrats who visited Western countries and proposed changes in the laws following the ideas of liberty, equality, and human rights that awakened in the West. The combination of these two pressure devices led to the recitation of the Tanzimat Edict prepared by Reşit Pasha during the reign of Abdülmecit (Ülken, 2013).

The Tanzimat Era, which began on November 3, 1839, with the recitation of the Gülhane Edict in the Gülhane Garden of Topkapı Palace, is often examined in two sub-periods. The Imperial Reform Edict proclaimed in 1856 divides the Tanzimat Era into two periods, and according to the consensus, these periods ended in 1876. In the Tanzimat Edict, the problems the state faced were listed with their causes, and needed actions were specified. As a fundamental principle, the Tanzimat was Western-oriented, and the Tanzimat Edict decreed that all citizens should be equal under the law. In addition, the main outlines of the Tanzimat Edict include ensuring the security of life and property, the military service of all citizens, the observance of the principle of equity in military recruitment, no discrimination based on religion or sect, the abolishment of the taxation system, ensuring fairness in taxation and the equality of all before the law(Çakır, 2004).

During the Tanzimat Period from 1839 to 1876, the modernizing upper-level bureaucrats resorted to personal control, making all crucial decisions independently. This was contrary to the Ottoman tradition (which linked the state with established ideals, not

with the reigning sovereign). In addition to establishing modern institutions to educate officials and officers, Sultan Abdulhamit II exerted solid personal authority at the close of the 19th century. In his inner circle, he prioritized loyalty over merit. Although the Ottomans could not totally detach the state from the sultan, the state was always an essential component of Ottoman political culture. In Ottoman thought, society's welfare depended on the state's health. Thus, the Ottomans embraced a cyclical conception of justice in which a just government contributed to public well-being, which in turn provided the state with the resources required to preserve power (Heper, 2000).

Tanzimat is not just the fundamental law but also about new capitalism. Numerous historical events undoubtedly influenced the choice to adopt the Tanzimat. At the time, the pressure was building from Europe's development and capitalist competition, with European countries seeking new markets and spheres of influence, necessitating changes enabling such capitalist growth, such as the passage of commercial laws. The local elites of the Ottoman Empire, including ambassadors, ministers, and intellectuals, were becoming more conscious of the need for reform to save and fortify the state by embracing what they perceived to be the components of Western affluence and power (Kawtharani, 2018).

Various stakeholders in the Ottoman Empire interpreted the Tanzimat's reforms and its concept of modernization in different ways. These changes represented a facilitation of commercial interchange, an extension of the capitalist market, and the capacity to safeguard foreign communities and their local trade agents for European capitalist forces. Enlightened Ottoman elites viewed modernization as a means to nullify any potential justification for intervention through implementing public representation and guaranteeing Ottoman citizenship rights. For Ottoman communities (millets), mainly non-Muslims, these policies were interpreted as an application of the right to equality, whilst non-Turkish ethnicities viewed them as a chance to acquire a degree of involvement. This was the case before the emergence of separatist aspirations inside the Ottoman Empire (Kawtharani, 2018).

The principles mentioned in the Tanzimat Edict created ambiguities in some areas; they led to conflicts between the Sharia and the new laws, between Muslim and non-Muslim subjects, and between the ruler and the government. As the ambiguities of the Tanzimat declaration appeared, the major states became the controllers for implementing the Tanzimat principles. They ensured the Reform Edict's proclamation in 1856 to fulfil the promises. With this new edict, repeating, clarifying, and expanding the Tanzimat rules, concrete

reforms were to be enumerated; a budget was to be made, a bank was to be established, European funds and experts were to be invited for economic development, and mixed courts were to be established. In a memorandum submitted to the Sultan, Reşit Pasha stating that the Edict of Reform had been prepared in a closed commission with European ambassadors without being discussed in a council of consultation, indicated that this second document granted unnecessary, excessive, and nonsovereign privileges and that it would cause the reforms to become an international issue because it was mentioned in the text of The Treaty of Paris. The Edict of Reform began the constitutional development of non-Muslim nations and became a manifesto of their aspirations for national independence (Berkes, 2013).

The seemingly intended goal of the Reform Edict, the desire for the unity of Muslim and non-Muslim subjects, was reversed. It became apparent that the legal opportunities granted to non-Muslims and foreigners left Muslim issues behind. Most of the later Turkish thinkers considered this difference in development as the result of concessions made with the West (Mardin, 2013).

At the same time, the Young Ottomans criticized the practices of Tanzimat supporters such as Ali Pasha, which minimized the scope of the Sharia. They pointed to fiqh as 'an inexhaustible and inexcusable source' for parliamentarians (Mardin, 2013).

The theoretical manifestation of the notion of representation in Ottoman Tanzimat is chiefly found in the writings of the so-called "New Ottomans" or "Young Ottomans," both of whom preceded the "Young Turks." This movement resulted in the formation of Turkish, Arab, and mixed parties and organizations, most of which members considered Ottomanism a "collective belonging" and political allegiance for all Ottomans. Some even expressed Ottoman belonging through terms such as homeland and nationalism, a throwback to the romantic nationalism that dominated the culture of European elites at the time; the Turkish poet Namik Kemal was the most prominent intellectual to use the term "Ottoman Homeland" in his writings (Kawtharani, 2018).

On the other hand, according to Conrad (2012), In the 1830s, throughout the Ottoman Empire, references to Enlightenment principles were an integral part of political discourse. Young Ottomans such as Namik Kemal (1840-1888) used the newly translated works of Locke, Rousseau, and Montesquieu to legitimate their cause after the midpoint of the century. In 1903, the Ottoman journalist Ebüzziyya Revfik referred to Kemal as the

"Voltaire... of our people." However, Kemal drew on a range of intellectual resources in his pursuit of social and political transformation. His reaction to Ernest Renan's critique of Islamic religion in 1893 made it abundantly evident that his version of Enlightenment was not a bad replica of French discussions in the eighteenth century but rather a unique perspective responding to the needs of Ottoman society in the late nineteenth century (Conrad, 2012).

The Ottoman society, considered to have entered the process of "Westernization" with the Tanzimat, was first introduced to literary genres that were not in its tradition, such as the theatre and novels through translations. The first translators were also distinguished as the first novelists. With these translation activities, new concepts and ideas shook the cultural and intellectual world of the period. Writers and thinkers of the Tanzimat Era had a great interest in the French language and the philosophers of the revolution and Enlightenment. This interest also influenced Ottoman readers, as a result of which readers were introduced to thinkers such as Voltaire, Rousseau, Fenelon, Fontelle, and Montesquieu (Alatlı, 2010).

New literary genres, such as novels and contemporary theatre, have proliferated worldwide. Novels were frequently first published as newspaper serials. Awareness that others were eagerly awaiting the next chapter of the same narrative contributed to strengthening the imagined national community. With the additional notion that this community occupied a certain region and was entitled to sovereignty over it, "print capitalism" became a metaphor for a reality in which politics, society, and culture were intertwined. Anderson's concept of print capitalism is useful in clarifying the relationships between several significant late Ottoman occurrences. (Findley, 2010).

## 3.3.Positivism and Its Effect on Ottoman and Turkish Society

Understanding the emergence and reflections of positivist philosophy will pave the way for a better understanding of Ottoman-Turkish modernization. The westernization process, which started in the last period of the Ottoman Empire and continued with the Republic of Turkey, is directly related to positivist philosophy. The modernization processes, which were initiated to compensate for military backwardness, later changed the axis and turned into an epistemological and total transfer process. In adapting positivism to Ottoman-Turkish society, the origins of this philosophy were not fully adhered to. However,

to understand positivism and the counter-ideologies against it, the emergence of positivist philosophy is included at the beginning of this section. The import process of positivism is then discussed, and how it affected the Ottoman-Turkish modernization adventure. In addition to the positivist understanding, it has also caused significant changes in literature, art, the press, education, bureaucracy, and many other fields. Works such as magazines, novels, theatre, and poetry began to be ideological and turned into propaganda tools. To understand the new Turkish Republic to be established after the Ottoman Empire, it is necessary to understand the positivist ideology. In order to understand the effects of this ideology, it is necessary to know the propaganda devices and thinkers of the period.

In the first half of the 19th century, the birth of positivism occurred in Europe, and its homeland was France. The philosophy of positivism, which replaced the obscurantist teachings of spiritualism during the Restoration period in France, was initially associated with Auguste Comte (1798-1857) but later became a movement of bourgeois philosophy (Narski, 2013).

According to Comte, born in Montpellier in 1798, the human mind has three stages of thinking or philosophizing: the theological state, the metaphysical state, and the positive state. In the theological state, cosmic phenomena are directed not by laws but by human-like wills. In the metaphysical state, phenomena are no longer controlled by conscious wills but by abstract power. The metaphysical state, having traces of the theological mentality, continued to dominate until the end of the Middle Ages. Then, with the appearance of New Age thought, progress in the research revealed a more significant number of immutable laws, and the positive explanation of phenomena gradually replaced the theological and metaphysical explanation (Weber, 1998).

For example, Aristotle was a theologian in astronomy, Copernicus and Kepler were metaphysicians, and the positive state began with Newton. Chemistry transformed from alchemy to a positive state in the 18th century with Lavoisier, but sociology had not yet crossed the border separating the metaphysical state from the positive state in the 18th century. Although Hobbes and Spinoza attempted political positivism, many thinkers, such as De Maistre and De Bonald, did not even go beyond the theological state. The 18th century and the revolution prepared positive social science but could not establish it; positivism claimed to establish positive social science (Weber, 1998).

Comte, who studied engineering, was inspired by his profession and compared society to a machine with two aspects, static and dynamic, and called the static aspect 'ordre' (order) and the dynamic aspect 'progress' (progress). According to him, France and the world needed a new social order and social-moral norms in the light of scientific data. Providing this order would be the responsibility of sociologists, as social engineers work with scientific methods (Comte, 2001).

Positivism aims to enhance social science to the level of positive science and to make philosophy, characterized as the totality of the sciences, a positive science. In this way, the synthesis of human knowledge will be systematically organized. The fundamental aim is to organize all human knowledge, to make the sciences philosophical, and to make philosophy scientific. Metaphysics fulfilled its historical duty and provided a basis for positive science by destroying religions. The history of the sciences is a constant progress; what is once achieved remains achieved, whereas, in metaphysics, everything is in continual conflict and endless disruption (Weber, 1998).

For Comte, the data obtained by metaphysicians due to their interest in internal phenomena is controversial. With the method implemented for introspection, the more observers there are, the more theories will emerge. The contributions psychologists have brought to human knowledge have come from abandoning the intrinsic method and replacing it with the positive approach (Hartung, 2013).

Comte revealed a new political system as a result of 'social physics,' As a peaceful revolutionary, he characterized it as a 'necessary positive revolution.' The function of the science of sociology, founded by Comte, has been to change society. In his view, after understanding the benefits of the positivist approach, people will first reform their traditions and then the established rules of society. In Eastern countries, for social transformation to occur, one or two generations mustass (Laberenne, 2013).

By the 1850s, Positivism ceased to be a purely philosophical system of thought, shifted to an ideological level, and began to intervene in religious fields by being presented as a belief system. During this period, Comte tried to develop relations with politicians on the one hand and laid the foundations of the religion of humanity on the other (Kabakcı, 2008).

Positivism contributed to 19th-century Western societies, but it also provided a scientific justification for fighting the promises of the French Revolution and negating the

cultural development implied in the philosophy of the French Enlightenment. In fact, the origins of Positivist sociology are based on a conservative and reactionary mission (Hartung, 2013).

On the other hand, Maurras, the successor of Bonald and Maistre, who responded to the French Revolution with the stance of counter-revolution, integrated pure positivism and nationalism into his conservative philosophy and declared that he embraced the traditional monarchy for the benefit of the homeland. Comte himself was also influenced by conservative thought. Maurras, as did Bonald, practised historical sociology but separated it from its religious aspect. Maurras' analysis is purely positive and rational and tends to prove the necessity of monarchy by the laws of social physics (Beneton, 2016).

In the view of Burke, the founder of conservatism, the abstract principles of the French Revolution had elements that would damage the social order, and this criticism later found its correspondence in the 'order' principle of positivism. The positivist Comte followed conservative principles when it was a matter of order but followed the principles of the Enlightenment when it was a matter of progress (Mollaer, 2014).

A similar reaction to this situation will be shown by the Committee of Union and Progress in Turkey, and 'freedom' will be suspended for a while for the homeland, and an oppressive regime will be implemented. Some 20th-century thinkers, deeply concerned over the changes in Western thought and culture, spoke of ideas that would replace positivism.

To disperse the crisis caused by the new social and state order that emerged due to the industrial revolution in Europe and to make social determinations, the science of sociology came to the fore and found a response, particularly in France. French social scientists alleged that social events would have causes and consequences just like positive sciences; therefore, social events could be treated as a positive science and examined with a deterministic mentality (Gündüz, 2008).

Comte was keenly aware that his universal plan required global support, so he sent letters to Nicolas I and former Grand Vizier Mustafa Reşid Paşa. The "positive" philosophy of Comte would unite East and West. He believed Constantinople, not Paris, to be the proper capital of positivism, a prediction influenced by his fascination with the Orient as a counter-model to the West, which he viewed as characterized by avarice, greed, and spiritual

dehydration, and by his admiration of "pure," "practical," and "reasonable" Islam. (Fillafer, Feichtinger, & Surman, 2018).

Through the propaganda of Comte and his students after his death, the idea of positivism spread rapidly beyond France, and religious positivism especially had a massive impact in Latin America. The basic principle of positivism, 'Order and Progress,' appeared on the Brazilian flag as “Ordem e Progresso”. Comte attached great importance to the spread of positivism in the East, especially in the Ottoman Empire. Comte, who continued his spreading activities in the letters he sent to Mustafa Reşit Pasha, one of the grand viziers of the Tanzimat Era, communicated positivism, the religion of humanity, to Reşit Pasha and underlined that the transition of Muslim societies to positivism would be smoother (Kabakcı, 2008).

M. Sait Özervarlı is committed to the Ottoman Empire's Young Turkish version of Comtean philosophy and Durkheimian sociology. Ozervarlı's champions supported Comtean positivism as a scientific and educational system that would foster social cohesion, unify the shaky empire under Turkish rule, and thwart Western imperial ambitions. Ozervarlı indicates that the Young Turks attempted to combine Islamic religion with scientific advancement. Accompanying this convergence was an assimilationist political agenda. Resistance to the Young Turk program attacked these goals independently or rejected the full package, rallying regional, national, and religious allegiances to achieve this objective. (Fillafer, Feichtinger, & Surman, 2018).

During the Second Constitutional Era, Ottoman/Turkish Modernization became prevalent on the social plane, and it tended to transform mentalities by changing its characteristics. In this period, a new ethical order, a new choice of life, a new educational system, and new state and society relations were addressed at the highest level. New-identified individuals were exposed to a total change for a new project of society (Gündüz, 2008).

Ottoman missions realized that the West's supremacy was due to their utilization of science and technology; thus, Ottoman statesmen established engineering, medical, military, and civil service institutions with secular and positivist curricula to bring the new program back to their nation. Shortly afterwards, the Tanzimat, or reform of the Ottoman Empire, started. The establishment of a military medical school in 1827, a military school in 1836,

and a faculty of administrative sciences in 1859 were the earliest examples of the new secular system. Although the objective of these institutions was to absorb just the tangible features of Western civilization, the Western's positivist concepts and cultural values quickly spread, particularly among the new social strata formed by the Empire's secular educational system. In these new institutions, foreign teachers played a crucial role, and knowledge of a Western language was required for admission. Especially in the army medical school, studying modern medicine, biology, and physics almost undoubtedly induced a rationalist and positivist mentality in the students. The army medical school produced many reformist intellectuals, writers, and activists in the latter half of the century. Creating bureaucratic and military classes with secular and materialist beliefs meant that the reforms of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were carried out by these groups, not by society as a whole. In the second part of the nineteenth century, numerous Western laws and customs were implemented, despite the modernization effort initially being conceived as a short-term solution to rescue the Empire. (Bozdaloğlu, 2008).

Positivism entered our country through movements of literature, positive science courses in schools, francophone schools, students sent to Europe, foreign teachers, some associations, and translations. Especially realism and naturalism, which emerged from the effects of positivism, started to take an essential place through translations. Some associations play the second important role in the entrance of positivism into our country, especially the New Ottomans (Young Turks) (Korlaelçi, 2014).

Established in 1894, during the reign of Abdul Hamid II, Servet-i Fünun, representing the new literary intellectual movement, initially published only Western science and physical science. However, in time it turned into a literary movement. In the first volume, there were articles about Ernest Renan, the French chemist Pasteur, who founded microbiology, and the physician Charcot. In 1896, the literary atmosphere of the magazine was enriched, and the magazine began to describe “decadisme”, one of the new literary movements, and positivism in the philosophy of art. Hüseyin Cahit, Mehmet Rauf, Ahmet Şuayip, and Yakup Kadri were the intellectuals raised by Servet-i Fünun. To give an example, one of the writings of Hüseyin Cahit from the magazine: "One of the most important discoveries of the 19th-century civilization is the public act that an event in both the material and spiritual worlds does not occur incidentally, but is the necessary result of some pre-existing hidden or explicit causes. If we want to live, it is necessary to take science and wisdom from Europe and infuse

them into the inexhaustible essence of our nation and to raise a new social mentality..."(Ülken, 2013).

First calling themselves the Young Ottomans and later taking on the nickname Young Turks, adapted from the French, the intellectual community educated in France and witnessed the social changes. Ottoman intellectuals who experienced positivism in France reached different interpretations of this movement from their perspectives during this period. In Europe, positivism was far from a monolithic perception than it had the appearance of a religion divided into different sects (Çubukçu, 2013).

The Young Turk movement began to shape Ottoman literary life from the 1890s onwards, and it became possible for young people to read the foreign press and understand what was happening in Europe. Meanwhile, the general trend in Europe was not in favour of 'liberty,' and, especially in France, the scandals of the Third Republic in the 1890s alienated many thinkers from parliamentary democracy. The thinkers of the Committee of Union and Progress, aware of these European developments, saw the Ottoman Empire as outdated. At the same time, the Young Turks studying at the Military Medical School and Harbiye thought they knew their professions better than those already working (Mardin, 2013).

The Committee of Union and Progress was founded in May 1889 at the Military Medical School under the name of Committee of the Ottoman Union *(İttihad-ı Osmani)* and was renamed Committee of Union and Progress *(İttihad ve Terakki)* in 1894. The community was represented by different ideologies and leaders from time to time, but behind all these ideologies, the idea of saving the Ottoman State has laid. Until 1905, seeing itself as the heir to Namik Kemal's ideas of 'freedom,' the society weakened in 1897 when some of its administrators who collaborated with the sultan fled abroad, and strengthened after 1905, becoming a group headed by Dr Bahaeddin Şakir and Dr Nazim, who worked in a more disciplined manner. The 19th-century biological materialism that dominated the Military Medical School influenced the community's intellectual roots. Based on the lessons taught to the students, the view of life as a consequence of physiological and biological processes rather than a creation of God's will was conveyed to the students by Dr Bahaeddin Şakir, a teacher at the Military Medical School (Mardin, 2013).

The Young Turks strongly objected to the interference of European states in the country's internal affairs, the Tanzimat supporters' policy of giving too many concessions to the West, and the Sublime Porte's stance on the equality of Christian and Muslim subjects. Being patriots in the modern sense, the Young Turks differed from the Tanzimat supporters in this aspect and represented a break from the traditional Ottoman ideology. This concept represents the entrance of modern political understanding based on the principle of citizenship that emerged from the French Revolution into Ottoman/Turkish society. Inspiring the Committee of Union and Progress *(İttihat ve Terakki)* that would come after them, this movement later faced Abdülhamit II, the heir of the Tanzimatists (Koray, 2005).

Young Turk writers such as Ahmet Rıza, Abdullah Cevdet, Ziya Gökalp, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, and Yusuf Akçura, who witnessed the events in the Ottoman Empire and the world in the later 19th century and the first quarter of the 20th century, their ideas were shaped in a period when conflicting great ideas emerged in the world. In a rapidly changing country and world agenda, these thinkers, who were fed by many sources from the French Revolution to Bolshevism, from nationalist movements in Europe to Islam, even if they took different views to the centre or periphery, could not leave the orbit of positivism that established complete dominance in the intellectual and scientific field in the West (Çubukçu, 2013).

Ziya Gokalp, for instance, views the distant goal of Turkism as combining the Oghuzs, Tatars, Kyrgyz, Uzbeks, and Yakuts under the name Turan in language, literature, and culture. Hilmi Ziya Ülken attempted to convince the Turanites that this goal was unattainable. He added that Turks and Mongols' linguistic, historical, and racial links had not been an issue for a very long time. Your nation holds those who adhere to the Turanic ideal accountable for the difficulties of nations that do not follow their traditions, religion, and customs. According to Ülken, Ziya Gokalp's thoughts, which supported the concept of Turanism, are far from reflecting the fact. Ülken believes that Gokalp constructed these borders in tandem with the political movement of the Union and Progress in order to unite Islamism with Westernism and create an ideology suited to the Empire's demands. In addition, he finds it a flaw that the root of Gokalp's thoughts was the French positivism represented by A. Comte and E. Durkheim rather than the old pen, fiqh, or mysticism (Bingöl & Pakiş , 2016).

At the same time, Therefore, in creating the language policy in Turkey, we must differentiate between three groups of independent actors: the modernist Kemalists, the

traditionalist Turkists, and the Islamists. In actuality, the formulation and construction of language policy and the determination of political behaviour in this regard have been influenced by the norms and identity views of these various elite groups, not the rational objectives of the Turkish state. Whether the decisions and actions taken or to be taken regarding language policy was adopted, the degree to which they coincided with each group's own ideas of identity, or the degree to which each group cared about the concept of identity, differed.

The “Ulum-i İktisadiye ve İçtimaiye Mecmuası” founded by a group of writers in the early period of the Second Constitutional Era, became the first philosophical movement established systematically in Turkey. In this period, the Young Turks took part in political life as Unionists and seized power in 1908 with the dethronement of Abdülhamit. The Freedom and Accord Party confronting the Committee of Union and Progress, seized power in the first election and remained in power until the raid on the Sublime Porte by the Unionists in 1913. After this raid, the Unionists continued to rule with an authoritarian regime and parted ways with the Islamists, Westernists, Ottomanists and Turkists with whom they had been in consensus at the beginning of the Constitutional Era. At this time, the idea of a new social reform emerged in Turkey. Ahmet Şuayip, Mehmet Cavit, and Rıza Tevfik, who founded the Ulum-i İktisadiye ve İçtimaiye Mecmuası, set Auguste Comte's 'physique sociale' (hikmeti içtimaiye) and Le Play's science sociale (ilm-i cemiyet) as the program of the magazine (Ülken, 2013).

This repressive regime of the Committee of Union and Progress then transformed itself into a positivist-oriented populism and began to dominate politics and social organization. The idea that saving the state and improving society should be based on rational/scientific principles was implemented by the state, and it led to the strengthening and increasing centralization of the state. Indeed the Republican period showed no difference in mentality between the Kemalist positivists and the Ottoman positivists (Özlem, 2002).

Young Turks inflamed the libertarian fight against Abdul Hamid's autocracy and preferred the constitutional monarchy to his absolutist regime. Yet their contact with the West caused the spreading of authoritarian and elitist political thoughts, incompatible with the ideas of independence and equality of the enlightenment. There may even be a regression compared to the New Ottoman thought in terms of principled commitment to the idea of representation (Söğütlü, 2011, p. 168). For example, for Namık Kemal, one of the most

prominent figures of the Neo-Ottomans, Western Civilization should be followed through England and London in particular (Gencer, 2014). Young Turks who followed the New Ottomans, on the other hand, followed France and specifically Paris as a model, and Turkish political thought came under the influence of the positivist, rationalist, holistic, and authoritarian French tradition instead of the empirical, evolutionist, and individualist British thought (Özipek, 2006).

From the Republican period to the mid-1950s, it is possible to see French positivism in every field, from political doctrine to scientific understanding and even in education. In England, the positivist perspective, which was liberal in social theory and decentralist in political theory, was represented in Turkey by Prince Sabahattin. In contrast, in the French model, the centralist/supremacist authoritarian structure in political theory was represented by Ahmet Rıza. Therefore, the founders of the Republic were followers of Ahmet Rıza, not Prince Sabahattin, and they chose a centralist, authoritarian, bureaucratic, elitist, laicist, and supremacist method following Comte's positivist political system (Özlem, 2002).

Consequently, as hermeneutic understandings, which focus on the method of knowledge against the way of explanation and law-making of the positivist doctrine, found a response in the social sciences, the idea that history has iron laws and is heading to a final stage was considered as reductionist and problematic, and criticisms of positivism began. The positivist conception of progress based on laws could have been the outcome of a particular cultural and historical world by offering a universalist perception of singularity and historicity. In contrast, the idea of Western civilization is not the only meaningful civilization and does not express the ultimate phase to reach. However, a civilization is a significant set of values that objects to this (Mollaer, 2014).

## 3.4. The Adventure of Modernization in the Late Ottoman Period and New Turkey

With the huge losses and disappointments of the Ottoman Empire's last decades, the consensus among intellectuals on many subjects vanished, and divisions grew. As the Tanzimat transitioned to the Westernization process, the perspectives of the New Ottomans and Young Turks came to prevail at the highest echelons of the state. These ruptures, which controlled the course of westernization, also formed the intellectual groundwork for the

newly established Republic of Turkey. The republican revolution was shaped by the most common view, which was influenced by France, as well as by positivist ideas.

Since the eighteenth century, Ottoman society has responded more vigorously to the expansionary impacts of modernisation. In this process, from reform to Westernization, Turkish modernization emerged as a result of the effort to achieve the goal of "rising to the level of contemporary civilization," which began during the Selim III. the period continued during the Mahmut II. and İttihat and Terakki periods and accelerated during the Republican period. (Duman, 2011:203) The second half of the nineteenth century, particularly under the reign of Hamid II (I876-I909), exhibits a synthesis of earlier structural alterations. It was a time of economic expansion, distinction, and ideological revolution. Turkish nationalism supplanted Ottoman nationalism.

A multiplicity of interpretations characterizes contemporary perspectives on modernity and modernization in Turkey. Multiple researchers with differing ideologies and political perspectives have contributed to the Multiple Modernities debates in their own publications. Although some discourses on modernization in Turkey continue to use the terms and concepts of modernization and Westernization interchangeably, others, such as some intellectuals of the Meşrutiyet (or Constitutionalism; it refers to the period in the Ottoman Empire that signifies the constitutional monarchy in the Ottoman Empire), no longer do so. Meşrutiyet occurred twice in Ottoman history; the first time was in 1876, and the second time was in 1908 in the Ottoman Empire, do not view "the West" as "some monolithic entity but one from which multiple and contradictory discourses arise (Kandiyoti, 1988).

The political situation had reached a pivotal point for the Sultan, the intelligentsia, and the military. Even though Sultan Abdulhamid's rule (1876-1908) was nominally prolonged for an additional year, he was effectively dethroned in I908 as a result of a fight between or alliance between these three key factions. In truth, these events paved the way for the Republic's foundation, the monarchy's fall to the Caliphate in 1922 (Karpat, 1972).

Throughout the Period of Decline, the Janissary Corps endeavoured to maintain its dominance over all parts of the Ruling Institutions. Later in that same period, Scribal Services attempted to accomplish the same. With the introduction of Westernization, those members of the elite who gained knowledge of the West believed themselves to be more qualified than others to lead the country. The Young Turks saw Riza's positivist sociology

as a quasi-revealed source of authority on social, religious, moral, and political issues. The Young Turks, rooted in the hegemonic centre, failed to recognize the significance of peripheral structures to individuals of the periphery. The Ottoman aristocracy had little interest in mercantilism and did not utilize tariffs to collect income (Heper, 2000).

The Young Turk generation exemplifies a conscious and complete rejection of their fathers' beliefs, rules, and mentalities. Generally, generational politics cannot be separated from societal reforms and changes. New cultures of politics and contemporary social, political, and philosophical cosmologies arose due to the restructuring of class systems and the export of new ideas. In the context of late Ottoman society, one may claim that social and political revolutions followed a mental revolution. The new Young Turk generation was culturally radical and positioned themselves in contrast to the Tanzimat generation and elite, who were culturally aristocratic and traditional. The Young Turk generation developed a distinctive mental framework. As the progeny of the materialistic European thinking of the very late nineteenth century, they rejected the conservative value system of their forefathers and promoted a radical new agenda. It is possible that their radicalism consisted of three components: nationalization, secularization, and modernisation. They were proud offspring of the Enlightenment and its secular and rational ideas, but their anti-western, anti-liberal, and anti-rational tendencies contributed to their anti-elitist rhetoric (Gürpınar, 2013).

Within the Ottoman-Muslim culture, the Young Ottomans, particularly Namik Kemal, established the notions of the fatherland (vatan), political identity, and state allegiance. These were the psychological basis of the emerging Turkish nationalism and the political culture of the new generation of intellectuals. This nationalism shifted from a defensive to a dynamic state by incorporating economic and social elements, scientific philosophy, and a secular perspective of man and society. The teaching of natural sciences in schools, the fast changes in society, the progress in specialization, and the total degree of complexity required a secular, philosophical perspective on life and society (Karpat, 1972).

The Ottomans attempted to improve their public bureaucracy and later their military, the Janissary Corps, by imitating their European equivalents. The Westernizing reformers encountered severe opposition from Islamist traditionalists, and their success was limited. With the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, Westernizing reformers seized control of the nation. Therefore, in the 1920s and 1930s, the founders of the Republic initiated a radical cultural reform to replace Islamic orthodoxy with informed logic. This

period was followed by political reforms in the mid-1940s when multiparty democracy was introduced (Heper, 2000).

The Young Turk Revolution of 1908 was the product of the collaboration of army leaders, local notables, and their educated sons. It was the precursor to the profound social, economic, and political shifts that, together with the empire's military defeat in I918, brought the empire to an end. The period from I908 to I8 was the final era of the Ottoman state. It was also the penultimate step in which the essential prerequisites for the creation of a national secular Turkish state were established (Karpat, 1972).

After the formation of the Republic, Mustafa Kemal undertook dramatic cultural and institutional changes that had a profound effect not only on the state's socioeconomic makeup but also on Turkey's ideological construction. (Ter-Matevosyan, 2019) The heart of the Kemalist reforms may be explained by the choice to elevate the Turkish nation-state to the level of the world's advanced states. These reforms were primarily aimed at establishing the new central authority, developing the nation, secularizing the Turkish state and society, achieving political participation, and altering the nation's socioeconomic structure. All of these changes were permeated by Turkish nationalism since the Kemalists were essentially nationalists and modernizers (Kili, 1980).

The Committee of Union and Progress initiated a series of changes in 1913 that cleared the way for the total abandonment of sharia and placed Islamic courts under the jurisdiction of secular courts. In 1915, the Ministry of Justice assumed power over sharia courts. They were eliminating the ulema and bringing Islam under governmental rule. The Islamic foundations' properties were handed to the Ministry of Finance. In 1924, the Caliphate was overthrown, the Directory of Religious Matters was established as a governmental institution to handle Islamic religious affairs, and the Ministry of Education took charge of Islamic schools (madrassas). With the exception of religious concerns, the Islamic lunar and solar calendar system was abandoned. The groundwork was laid for the secularization that Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, the creator of the new Turkish republic, would bring about. By organizing resistance against the invading Greek armies backed by Western countries, the Turks, under Ataturk, achieved autonomy over eastern Trace and Anatolia in 1923 and converted the nation into the Republic of Turkey (Ebaugh, 2010).

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk based his new national republic on a vehement rejection of the Ottoman past, according to the narratives in the few texts written explicitly on the politics of

Ottoman history. He denounced the Ottoman sultans as alien invaders, accusing them of encouraging religious fanaticism, repressing the Turkish identity of their people, and working cowardly with European powers. Atatürk provided his people with a fabricated and glorious history of Central Asian Turks to serve as the foundation for their national pride, completely ignoring the Ottoman past. Then, beginning in the 1990s, a newly devout and newly democratic Turkey "reconnected" with its Ottoman "roots," embracing the national heritage Atatürk had denied them. This tendency resulted in today's full-blown, Islamically-rooted Ottoman nostalgia, not to mention Ottomania (Danforth, 2014).

The historiography of Kemalism has produced several interpretations and methods, points of view, and thoughts. Kemalism discussions evolved either around its fundamental ideas and supporting elements or its ideological and practical relevance. Tradition interprets Kemalism in accordance with its "Six arrows" (Alt Ok) or guiding principles: nationalism, secularism, populism, republicanism, revolutionism, and étatism (Ter-Matevosyan, 2019).

Noting the rationalist foundation of Kemalist politics, renowned academics of Turkish politics have seen Kemalism as the late-Enlightenment drive to modernity in a Muslim context. Kemalism was seen as an intellectual framework representing Turkish influences from significant modern traditions, particularly positivism, which became the dominant western philosophy of progress in the nineteenth century. Some of the most prominent Turkish political intellectuals, such as Şerif Mardin, Metin Heper, and Ergun Ozbudun, who are favourable to the modernization school, have portrayed the positivist and rationalist ideological landscape of Kemalism. As a local ideology of progress, the achievements and failures of revolutionary Kemalist politics, which developed along modernist-constructivist lines as a non-European will to civilization, have been analyzed to demonstrate how they reflected the intellectual framework of European modernity in their local context (İrem, 2004).

Ataturk's primary objective was to build a course radically different from that of the Ottoman Empire, particularly the establishment of a secular and nationalist state governed without the influence of Islam on politics. The new republican elite, with Ataturk as its leader and spokesman, sought full modernization, which they viewed as an escape from backwardness and manifested through their hate and mistrust of anything linked with the former government and the old ways of life. Religion and institutions were viewed as questionable and hostile to modern culture. (Ebaugh, 2010).

Turkey placed religious education and mosques under complete state control and liquidated all other organizations, including Sufi brotherhoods. As with Kemalism's other tenets (republicanism, nationalism, étatism, populism, and revolution-ism), secularism strengthened the new leadership's grip on the populace, advancing the Ottoman reform's goal of state empowerment. What it did not want was separation from Islam. As a result, it produced a contradiction that continues to engender political tension: the state nationalized the religion, yet Islam defines the nation's identity, rendering the name "Christian Turk" an oxymoron (Anscombe, 2010).

Belief in science and scientific procedures was a central tenet of Kemalism, as evidenced by one of Atatürk's most frequently cited quotes: *"Hayatta en hakiki mürşit ilimdir"* (science, the purest guide to life). This idea manifested itself in the utmost priority Kemalists placed on education. It was believed that a logical, patriotic, modern, and progressive educational system would alter the very fabric of Turkish society (Kili, 1980).

Ataturk and his Kemalist supporters intended to replace the multiethnic, multireligious, and Islam-centered principles of the Ottoman Empire with a new Turkish nation-state rooted expressly in ethnic nationalism. Ataturk, as a politician, gradually launched his changes and utilized Islam to unify and organize the population, particularly against the invading European army. In 1924, he claimed that Turkish nationalism, not Islam, would be the primary unifying force for the Turkish people. The state utilized the military, schools, and media to strengthen Turkish national identity and distance itself from Islam and Ottoman history. To do this and diminish the influence of Islam, he shut down the dervish lodges and Sufi groups, prohibited their rituals and liturgy, and outlawed their attire. He condemned the fez as the headwear of a backward culture and the veil as a symbol of women's subservient status. The prayer call, ezan, was to be repeated in Turkish instead of Arabic, while the Qur'an was translated into Turkish and written in Latin. He changed the Arabic script with the Latin alphabet and embraced the Gregorian calendar to become more westernized and modern. (Ebaugh, 2010).

Law reform was a vital component of Turkish modernization. During the years of state and nation-building, a series of reforms were initiated to create a 'civilized' society. Pursuing the Western model was perceived to be the only possible way to secure modernization. Kemalists sought to displace the Islamic Weltanschauung, introducing nationalism and secularism as the cultural bases of the new society. Relying principally on linguistic and

cultural reform, the Turkish revolution sought to formulate a nationalist identity. The social-engineering process that aimed to create a Westernized society involved the denial of the political and social characteristics of Islam. The modernizing cadres of Turkish society aimed to create a top-to-bottom Westernized and secular model. Reforms included the abolition of the office of the Caliphate and the disestablishment of a state religion. The new legal system was designed to ensure that it would be value-neutral and pass no judgement on the latest legal codes. Kemalists sought to create a lawful procedure that would prioritize formal rationality and ensure that legal professionals would be concerned only with the logical coherence of legal propositions.

The primary aim pursued by Kemalists was Westernization/secularization rather than an immediate effort to promote capitalist development. Turkish law reform was one of Middle Eastern history's most significant developments since Islam's acceptance. The new government set about finding a substitute for 'Mecelle' (as the Ottoman Legal Code was known). Reforms led to extensive legislative activity, giving rise to a series of radical law reforms. The Code of Obligations and Code of Commerce came into force in 1924, erasing the Islamic legacy (Ozman, 2010).

Historiographers have identified two main approaches in the history of Kemalism for some time. The first concentrates on the reforms and successes of the Atatürk era (1919–1938) and defines it as a fresh start, a departure from the Ottoman past. This approach dominated until the 1960s when it was contested by Turkish politicians and later adopted by foreign intellectuals. The second perspective views the Atatürk era more generally and attributes transformative features to it. This method contextualizes Kemalism into a broader history spanning at least two centuries, emphasizing the continuity between current Turkey and its Ottoman ancestor (Ter-Matevosyan, 2019) Since 1923, Turkey has experienced a very rapid change process, and this shift has accelerated in recent years. During the analysis of this tidal-filled period of Turkey's modern history, two fundamental principles serve as a point of reference. The first is "rupture", whereas the second is "continuity" In rupture-based views, Turkey's modern history is the nation-state-based modernization process that has been ongoing since 1923. According to the continuity-based view, this history is a top-down, state-centered, authoritarian, and military modernization process with origins in the late Ottoman Empire. (Keyman, 2010).

Turkey is a significant illustration of hybrid and eclectic modernization. This predicament is also reflected in the variety of modernization models produced for the Ottoman and Turkish empires. In Turkey, the phrases "Westernization" and "modernization" are frequently used interchangeably and as synonyms in academic research and ordinary conversation. The usage of the notions of secularization and secularism in the same meaning exacerbates the existing conceptual muddle. Moreover, individuals who utilize these ideas presume that they reflect a single modernity, secularism, a monolithic "West," and a single modernity.

# 4. REACTIONS TO RADICAL MODERNIZATION: CONSERVATISM

## 4.1. Conservative Reaction in France

Turkish administrators and intellectuals were greatly influenced by France in the modernization process. While reacting to the modernization processes, they were also influenced by French thinkers. Conservatism, which first emerged in England, attracted much attention to the French revolution in France. Conservative views, which emerged in different forms in France, found a response in the world over time. Thinking that conservative reactions to the Turkish Modernization process are original will reveal a wrong and incomplete understanding. Likewise, it would be wrong point of view to think that every conservative reaction in Turkey is aimed at defending the religion of Islam. Understanding the conservative processes emerging in France and Turkey will remove conceptual confusion.

The British and French counter-revolution have been the sources of a conservative tradition. These two sources have in common their respect for the legacy of history and their hostility toward democracy. That which separates them is, first and foremost, history itself. The English continuity contrasts with the rapid leaps of French history. While British conservatism was a liberal conservatism, in France, liberals and conservatives were opposed to each other. While the liberals leaned toward the revolution, the conservatives dedicated their power to condemning any liberal organization (Beneton, 2016).

As the origin of conservatism in England, the character of the ideology focused on 'continuity' or gradual change instead of innovation, passive rationalism instead of rationalist rationalism, and the preservation of traditions as the basis of social life. On the other hand, in French conservatism, the mentioned parameters do not entirely appear, and it represents a break from classical conservatism (Mollaer, 2008).

Alexis de Tocqueville (1805 - 1859), a distinguished French nobleman in literature and politics, stated that Edmund Burke addressed the French in the following way. "You wanted to correct the excesses of your government, but why make a new one? Why do not you stick to your old traditions? Why are you not satisfied with your old candour? Or, if it

is impossible for you to find the obliterated physiognomy of the structure your ancestors built, why do not you turn your glance in our direction? There you would find the old European common law (Alatlı, 2010, p. 12)".

The contrast between the British and the rest of Europe's conservative traditions arose in part because Britain was not as directly influenced by the French Revolution and the ensuing Napoleonic wars, which spread revolutionary ideas and armaments over the majority of Europe. In England, Burke was able to criticize the French Revolution while defending and praising the mixed English constitution formed by the Glorious Revolution of 1688, which he believed offered the finest protection for order and liberty. However, French conservatives were presented with a considerably more drastic rupture with the past than in England, where the 1688 reforms were relatively small and left the monarchy, the Church, and the nobility intact. Conservatives in France were split about how to respond to the seeming destruction of the main institutions of the old system by a revolution. Even after the Restoration, conservatives fought over whether, as Guizot advocated, they should accept the effects of the Revolution and preserve its results or whether, as De Maistre advocated, they should reject the Revolution and all its works and attempt to restore the golden age of the ancien régime. The recurrent government changes in nineteenth-century France compelled individuals on the right to address this subject repeatedly, resulting in a growing schism among conservatives (Layton-Henry, 1982).

It is difficult to identify the substance of French conservatism due to its very contentious nature. The ideology of the Right (of conservatism) is abstract and rational, radical and full of vigour. Due to its historical association with Ultramontane Catholicism, it is also proclaimed in a profoundly spiritual manner. Thus, initially, its critique of the defining characteristics of modernism - democracy, positivistic science, and even capitalism - was more severe than in most other contexts (Suvanto, 1997).

Vicomte de Bonald (1754- 1840) and Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821) have been described as the leading Catholic ideologists of the restoration era. De Bonald has been regarded as the foremost proponent of a Church-State union and the principal ideologist of the Ultras (extreme conservatives) and Legitimists (those advocating the return of the monarchy). His championing of order and authoritarianism in the face of individuality and critical nationalism is viewed as a clear return to the past. According to de Bonald's detractors, he was unfamiliar with contemporary ideas and based his findings only on

metaphysics and religion. The tradition was nonetheless de Bonald's most compelling argument.

Citing historical evidence, he believed monarchy to be natural. He considered human existence a harmonious unity in which God alone was supreme. Under the monarch's guidance, this authority was assigned to the family, the Church, and the State. Each has its distinct responsibilities and norms of power. (Suvanto, 1997).

With his idealization of French Absolutism and Catholicism, De Maistre, on the other hand, could be considered an advocate of a reactionary philosophy. Because he rejects the current sociopolitical system, the reactionary may actually become a revolutionary who forcefully strives to reestablish a different previous form of society (Dunk, 1982).

Maistre employs the not-so-novel notion of a nation's genuine and enduring genius as the basis of his fight for control over the French past. If no man is or was ever born before society, then no convention could have established it; thus, the genesis of society is not the product of men but of God. All peoples with origin tales attribute their genesis to a deity. The concept of divine genesis is universal; it is not a myth. This allows Maistre to create sovereignty without risking it becoming the people's property. Burke accomplished this through the dispersion of sovereignty in the English hybrid Constitution. Maistre accomplishes the same objective by incorporating sovereignty within the original community (Greifer, 1961).

## 4.2. Conservative Reaction in Turkey

In Turkey, conservative and reactionary movements have grown as a general response to the radical modernization processes. But this opposition wasn't against modernization in general. Instead, there was a stance against the ways that modernization and radical changes were being put into place. Not only religious people but also thinkers influenced by eastern mysticism were involved in the modernization of Turkey. So, it would be wrong to only look at the religious side of Turkish conservatism. Turkish conservatism is mostly against the way that modernization is done, not modernization itself.

The examples of Edmund Burke in England, Joseph De Maistre in France, Vincenzo Cuoco in Italy and Friedrich Gentz in Germany show that the conservative reactions

emerging in these countries owe their raison d'être (reason of being) to the French Revolution. Likewise, the conservative reactions in Turkey occurred during the transitional period to the Republic, when the break with the Ottoman Empire was experienced in social, political, cultural, and ideological fields (Çiğdem, 2006). Although Western concepts and ideas entered the Ottoman Empire with the Tanzimat, conservative thought did not appear in the Ottoman Empire during that period. Since the class conflicts in Europe that led to revolutionary ideologies did not exist in the Ottoman Empire, the Tanzimat intellectuals regarded the Enlightenment and the French Revolution as an opposition to the Middle Ages. Instead of revolution, they preferred changing in the areas the state needed. Otherwise, the main concern of the Tanzimat intellectuals, who did not know the West sufficiently, was to save the state from collapse, to civilize by resembling the West, and to ensure the state's survival by treating social defects (Aktaşlı, 2011).

Conservatives have made the liberal tradition of modernity, which seeks to interfere in society in order to build a more rational social structure within the framework of scientific truths, the primary target of criticism in contemporary political discourse. According to this point of view, the intervention in question brings about a separation between a person's material existence and spiritual life, and contemporary cultures exist in a state of contradiction between technology and culture. An imitative conception of civilization, according to these academics, will inevitably lead to a crisis in the value system, which in turn will bring feelings of estrangement and rootlessness.

Since the Tanzimat, conservative circles believed that Bergsonism would rescue the Turkish notion of modernization from the "mentalism" trap. The pioneer-follower policy based on positivist-scientific thought was causing cultural divides. To save culture from the damaging effects of logical and scientific politics, it was necessary to intervene. Regarding this, Hilmi Ziya Ülken stated (2013, p. 65), "Experimental reason, faith, and conscience, which gave rise to it, went so far as to repudiate the human-human integrity upon which it is based."

Conservative environmental positivism and the understanding of politics based on it emphasize the differences between nations against the claim of universality and advocate a culture-centred understanding of modernization. The basic concepts they used for a culture-centred modernization project; are personality, tradition, culturalism, romanticism, virtue, freedom, creativity, authority, and duty (Öztaş, 2003).

However, in the details, the finding of a reformist thread led to a double-movement cyclical perspective of late Ottoman history. When the Ottoman state was advancing toward progress and civilization at full speed, a reactionary backlash would occur. Every significant westernizing change would be met with a conservative response. The first reformist, Selim III, was assassinated by a "crowd" opposed to his new methods; the Tanzimat period was succeeded by the rule of absolute monarch Abdulhamid II, and an Islamic uprising in the capital city challenged the Second Constitutional period (1908-1918). The first wave of authors presented late Ottoman history as a conflict between westernizing reformers and conservative forces, and they were entirely on board with the reformers' objective. It was the wide goal of westernization/modernization that was the most significant historical development in late Ottoman history. To establish the argument for the convergence of the imperial experience with the trajectory of the West, several state-initiated changes in higher education, the military, and the legal domain were depicted as top-down, growing, and bureaucratic in nature. As a result, the grand narrative of late Ottoman history became a sequence of steps toward achieving state-led modernity, emphasizing the secularization of education, the modernization of bureaucracy, and the westernization of public life. (Emrence, 2007).

Even though the Second Constitutional Era's dynamic world of ideas and debates prepared a proper environment for the formation of conservatism, after the Committee of Union and Progress seized power, they were inspired by the thinkers of the French Revolution and followed them without critical analysis. That hindered the implementation of conservative policies such as gradual change, the maintenance of traditional institutions, and the avoidance of the radical. In any case, they did not have the acquis, patience, or time to know these conservative policies (Özipek, 2006).

During the last periods of the Ottoman Empire, the ulama, who were against the modernization mentality, did not question the reforms that were regarded as a tool to save the country and the state. The purpose was not to rebuild the state by transforming it with a new identity and spirit but to cure it and restore it to its former health. However, during this process, the concept of reform lost its actual meaning and transformed into modernization, and 'reformism' wrongly transformed into modernism (Gencer, 2012).

Highlighting and trying to conserve local and traditional factors to localize the modernization project can be distinctly observed in the Ottoman modernization experience.

The desire of modernists to restrain the elements they regarded as "degenerate and excessive" that would cause cultural degeneration led to the emergence of conservative attitudes in the Ottoman Empire. While conservatism in Turkey accompanied the adventure of modernization, no conservative thought explicitly opposed this adventure. In fact, the legitimacy of conservative tendencies in Turkey has been possible due to the smooth relations with modernity (Bora & Burak , 2006).

In the period of transition to the Republic, against the social engineering mentality that the elitist and radical modernist intellectuals, whom Enlightenment influenced thought and positivist ideology and wanted to put this mentality into practice, there was a conflict of anxious and uneasy mentality that looked at modernization with suspicion and uneasiness, but still found modernization necessary and thought that this process should continue based on tradition (Güngörmez, 2004).

The transformation of reform and improvement efforts before the Republican era into revolution and a policy of transforming society via the state in the Republican era had characteristics that would have horrified British and American conservatism. Influenced by the statist, nationalist and centralist ideas that were a successor to the Unionist approach, the new Jacobin political elites gained power and, in Burke's words, began to see their society as citizens of a "conquered country" (Özipek, 2009).

Turkish modernization, taking the West as a model but aiming to overcome and compete with it, has had to criticize the model to a certain level and attach its own motifs to it to achieve this goal. Criticizing this model devolved on conservatives, and conservatives took their critique references from the perspectives of European political thought that questioned modernism from within the West in the first quarter of the 20th century. After the First World War, the criticism of modernism that emerged from the West found its most radical and enthusiastic response in Germany. However, German thinkers such as Spengler, Jünger, Schmitt, Van Der Bruck, etc., found almost no reaction in Turkey (Bora & Burak , 2006).

The synthesist conservative intellectuals of the Republican period acted together with the founders of the Republic. They mostly supported them, continued their intellectual existence in the republican institutions, and some even took part in the parliament as deputies of the new regime. But they generally stayed away from politics, focusing on cultural matters

without conflicting with the Kemalist project, and in some cases, they opposed impliedly. Accordingly, it can be determined that the primary function of this conservative approach in the early Republican period was stabilization or refrainment (Çağlıyan, 2006). Kemalist politics may be found in the theoretical, ideological, literary, and scientific writings of a handful of eminent writers, scholars, and politicians from the new republic. İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu (1886–1978) was a prominent academician, Republican politician, and the founder of traditionalism. Peyami Safa (1899–1961) was a conservative man of letters. Ahmed Ağaoglu (1869–1939) was a Turkish politician and academician. Hilmi Ziya Ülken (1901–1974) was an academician renowned for his moralist and culturalist political orientations. Mustafa Şekip Tunc¸ (1886–1958) was a disciple of Henri Bergson in the Turkish academe. These intellectuals were members of the new Republican cultural elites and were recognized for their self-described "conservative" stance on cultural issues and "modernism" in politics as enthusiastic defenders of the Kemalist Republic's formal ideals (İrem, 2002).

With the proclamation of the Republic in 1923, the Turkish Revolution, whose objectives became apparent, established the parliamentary regime and the modern national economic system, which are the political and economic structures of Western modernity, and transformed the imperial state structure inherited from the Ottoman Empire into a nation-state structure. Besides, new political, economic and cultural fields were created for the new citizens, and the radical limits of Kemalist reforms were tried to be defined (İrem, 2006).

In contrast, secularization is the practical political purpose of Turkish laicism. Laicism, which has been part of the constitution since 1937, is defined by the constitutional court as "a civilized way of life that forms the basis for an understanding of freedom and democracy, for independence, national sovereignty, and the humanist ideal, which have developed as a result of overcoming medieval dogmatism in favour of reason and enlightened sciences." Under addition, the court decided that “in a laicist system, religion is depoliticized, rejected as a tool of power, and accorded its due and honourable position in the citizens' conscience.” (Rumpf, 1999).

Kemalism not only instituted radical changes in the political, economic, and cultural fields but also adopted a new style of politics that would ensure the latest preservation. Kemalism propounded Republican Conservatism, independent of the old ideologies such as Ottomanism and Islamism that developed around Ottoman problems. During the War of

Independence, spiritualism, romanticism, Bergsonism, and irrationalism, which were politicized with the independence ideology, defined themselves as Republican Conservatism against Kemalism, which tried to theorize around liberal and socialist theses in the 1930s, and took its place in political debates as a new interpretation of Kemalism. In this aspect, Republican Conservatism became a new political debate among Kemalist elites as the first historical criticism of Turkish Modernity was addressed from within this movement. (İrem, 2006).

Thus, the objective of Turkish laicism is the secularization and modernisation of the state and society and the depoliticization of religion. The Kemalist system has two major structural flaws: the merging of religion and nation and the simultaneous co-optation of Islam. The Turkish road to secularization is a combination of religion, nationalism, and laicism that is unprecedented not just among Islamic civilizations but globally. This combination is known as the "Kemalist tripod." The merging of nation and religion is a consequence of the Turkish War of Independence (1919–1922) and the transition of the multiethnic Ottoman Empire into a nation-state with European characteristics. As in the situations of Serbia and Greece, Atatürk was captivated by the uniting potential of religion in nation-building. Since he was relying on the allegiance of the Anatolian peoples, he did not explain which meaning he meant by the concepts of nation and popular movement. (Karakas, 2007).

In Turkey, conservatism embodies a methodological problem that is difficult to solve. This problem originates from the positivist methods of modernization theories and refers to the negative meaning that radical modernization gives to tradition (Mollaer, 2014).

As Coleridge determined, a healthy society has the elements of continuity and progress. A conservative is careful to reconcile the demands of continuity and progress and rejects the abstract cult of 'progress', which assumes that everything new is absolutely better than everything old. Conservatives believe sudden changes in the traditions and culture rooted in society are hazardous and that if it is to occur, it should be through the voluntary work of citizens and institutions (Kirk, 2005).

Continuity refers to the absence of gaps or spaces. Classical philosophers advocated the idea of evolution without revolution or the idea that there would be no leaps and breaks in the natural continuum. Without a process in societies, evolution will not be possible.

Evolution continues through revolutions. This means that social phenomena do not change only due to increase or decrease, but decrease and increase leap at a particular point. The quantitative change transforms into a qualitative change (Hançerlioğlu, 2010). As mentioned earlier, under conservatism, people with conservative thoughts tend to make the required reforms for the state and society without severing their ties with the past. They do not resist improvements and developments for progress.

## 4.3.Bergson and His Thought in Turkey

Henri Bergson's philosophy is complex and multifaceted, with a number of underlying concepts. Bergson's concept of time, which he termed "duration" (duree), is one of the most significant facets of his philosophy. Bergson proposed that our lived experience of time is continuous and undivided, as opposed to viewing time as a series of discrete moments or events, as it is typically understood in a scientific or mathematical context. This subjective, ephemeral conception of time contrasts with the spatialized conception of time that is measured by a clock. This was part of his larger critique of the scientific approach to comprehending the world, which, he argued, frequently ignored the qualitative aspects of reality in favor of quantitative measurements and analyses.

Bergson's philosophy of consciousness also diverged from the prevalent thought of his time. Bergson regarded the mind and body as intimately interconnected, whereas many of his contemporaries saw them as separate entities. He proposed that our physiological experiences profoundly shape our perception of the world. Bergson believed that the mind and body are deeply intertwined, implying that they should not be studied as separate entities but as a unified whole.

The idea of creative evolution is another important concept in Bergson's philosophy. Bergson argued, contrary to the prevalent deterministic theories of evolution at the time, that life is an unpredictable, creative process. According to him, life does not follow a predetermined path but rather creates new forms in response to shifting circumstances. This concept embodies his larger philosophy, which prioritizes process, change, and originality over fixed, deterministic laws.

Bergson's philosophy emphasizes the significance of intuition and subjective experience in the comprehension of reality. This contrasts with the objective and mechanistic perspectives typically affiliated with scientific investigation. He argued that although scientific analysis is necessary for manipulating the world and making practical advancements, it frequently falls short of capturing the qualitative essence of reality, which can only be comprehended through intuitive, lived experience.

In summary, Bergson's philosophical endeavor challenges numerous scientific worldview assumptions and emphasizes the significance of intuition, subjective experience, and ongoing creative processes. His work, though entrenched in the concerns of the early 20th century, remains influential in contemporary philosophical debates, especially in the areas of metaphysics, philosophy of mind, and philosophy of science.

Henri Bergson lived between 1859 - 1941 and is known as the representative in France of the idealist philosophy of life, which emerged and developed in Germany. He is one of the important pioneers of the revolt against reason that developed in the 20th century and one of the representatives of process philosophy (Cevizci, 2011).

Bergson considered the scientific understanding of time measured by a clock as a spatialized conception of time. By investigating man's consciousness of his inner self, he demonstrated that psychological facts are qualitatively distinct from all others, accusing psychologists in particular of distorting the facts by attempting to measure and quantify them. Particularly attacked was Fechner's Law, which purported to create a calculable relationship between stimulus strength and corresponding feeling intensity. As soon as the misunderstandings that conflated duration and extension, succession and simultaneity, and quality and quantity were resolved, he argued that the scientific determinism-based arguments for human freedom were without merit (Britannica, 2022).

In his book published in 1896, Matter and Memory (Matiere et Memoire), Bergson claimed the reality of spirit and matter and attempted to reveal the relationship between these two through memory. In this book, he dealt with the issues of matter, image, pure perception, and pure memory. His 1900-published book Laughter (Le Rire) supplements Bergson's body and soul philosophy. His book Creative Evolution (L'Evolution creatrice), published in 1907 and read by a vast audience, made Bergson famous worldwide. This book explains what

creative evolution refers to in Bergson's thought. According to this conception of evolution, it is impossible to speak of determinism in life, of life having a determined purpose. The life move is free and creative. Life is continually creating its forms according to changing conditions. In 1919, Bergson published his work Mind-Energy (L'Energie Sprituelle) and gathered his writings between 1900 and 1914 in this book. Among these writings are 'Life and Consciousness,' 'Soul and Body,' 'Brain and Thought,' and 'Effort of the Mind.' In his work Duration and Simultaneity (Duree et Simultaneity), published in 1922, Bergson focused on the meaning and consequences of Einstein's theory of relativity. Thus he claimed that there is simultaneity in things and only duration in the soul (Bayraktar, 2015).

Bergson argues in L'ivolution Crgatrice (Bergson, 1907). For a conscious being to exist is to change, to change is to mature, and to mature is to form oneself forever. Based on this paradigm, Bergson's entire philosophy of nature is constructed. Bergson's theory of consciousness, or his idea of the relationship between mind and body, is that of an indeterminate self. He contends that we feel duration-change, mobility, and extensibility and that individuals construct and distinguish their own bodies first, followed by other biological and inanimate bodies. Bergson says that the body's primary purpose is to "limit the life of the spirit" and that the body, nerves, and brain are pictures. The idealistic nature of this teaching is unmistakable. Based on the continuity between inorganic, biological, and psychic events, Bergson concludes that "objects share in the character of our experience" (Calkins, 1912).

The one that achieves the highest level of growth in science is analytical, spatializing, and conceptualizing, and it tends to view objects as solid and discontinuous. The other is a global, instantaneous perception that reaches a thing's heart through compassion. The first is beneficial for getting things done and acting on the world. However, it fails to capture the core truth of things because it excludes duration and its constant flux, which are inexpressible and can only be comprehended intuitively. The entirety of Bergson's oeuvre may be viewed as an investigation into the significance and ramifications of his intuition that duration is the fundamental truth of all things (Britannica, 2022).

Bergson contends that matter consists of briefly conscious creatures, as opposed to constantly conscious entities. There is neither memory nor will, only the instant that continually dies and is reborn. The final of these sentences conceptualizes matter in contrast to life as though it has a contradictory personality. This is the most basic of Bergson's denials:

his uncompromising rejection of absolutism. Bergson's detractors commit the cardinal mistake of focusing exclusively on the finality of change and freedom. Bergson argues that the persisting, evolving self is crucial to time, freedom, and evolution (Calkins, 1912).

The need to adjust the idea of the human mind to the mechanical interpretations of reality supplied by modern science is central to Bergson's entire philosophical project, without dismissing scientific findings and succumbing to the Cartesian separation of reality from the thinking self. Bergson desires to liberate the subject from the realm of mechanism. Unlike Lewis, he does this by establishing the oneness of the subject and the perceptual world and then by saying that the sole existence of time, and hence reality, is in lived, subjective experience, which he terms duree. Although mechanical rules establish physical reality, the subject is a non-spatial entity, not the result of mechanical laws but rather a supernatural force generating its law (Ayers, 1992).

With his thoughts outside the central axis of western thought, Bergson used the concepts of intuition against reason and duration against time. According to Dellaloğlu (2016, p. 35), “Being modern is a duration, and while the West has built modernity as its own duration, this progress seemed to non-Western societies at a time. In the late 19th century, Henri Bergson maintained a stance against positivism in his philosophy lectures at Sorbonne University. Bergson refutes the positivist idea that there is no reality other than what the five sense organs perceive. He claims that there are at least two realities'; the first is a physical reality, which he agrees with the positivists, and the second is a metaphysical reality, which cannot be perceived by the senses” (Türkislamoğlu, 2015).

Bergson regards life as a wave that originates from a centre and states that it continues with the diffusion of this wave. Bergson conceptualizes this circumstance as the élan vital. Nurettin Topçu, in his work Bergson, expresses the “life momentum” through the metaphor of the exploding cannonball; for the “life momentum” not to lose itself in emptiness, there is an obstacle that it depends on, and this obstacle is matter. That is similar to that resistance is required for a cannonball to explode (Topçu, 2002).

Bergsonism was first advocated systematically in Turkey by a young coterie of professors and writers as a reaction to the positivism and mechanical evolutionism that had dominated from 1905 to 1918. This clique issued the journal Dergâh in response to Ziya Gökalp's sociological philosophy and grounded their views on anti-intellectualism in

opposition to the new evolutionism and rationalism. The clique also had a pluralist approach towards a mechanism. Young Turkish thinkers did not share the same view with this new movement in all aspects, and their common front was only their stance against positivism (Ülken, 2013).

It was said that Bergson's philosophy, which was important in Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's world of thought, came about as a reaction to positivism. Ziya Gökalp is the most important person in Turkey when it comes to the spread of positivism. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar said that Ziya Gökalp became the "chief of the Turkism movement" after he joined the journal Genç Kalemler, which was first published in Thessaloniki in 1904. Genç Kalemler was started in 1904. He led the Turkism movement, which began to grow among Turkish intellectuals after they studied Turkology in Europe in the early years of the Tanzimat. Gökalp started the sociology and metaphysics departments at Darülfünun and wrote the first sociology books in Turkey. The French sociologist Emile Durkheim had a big impact on Gokalp's interest in social philosophy. He talked a lot about "individuality" and "personality" and the changes that needed to be made in society. In the ideas he worked on until the middle of the 1920s, he tried to combine an understanding of astronomy with an understanding of culture (Türkislamoğlu, 2015).

When the Ottoman literati first encountered Bergson and his writings on the brink of World War I, significant intellectual breakthroughs took place in Europe. New scientific achievements challenged conventional mechanistic–deterministic European philosophies of science and spawned a new intellectual environment that questioned the hopeful, progressive, evolutionary notions of nineteenth-century liberalism. The First World War profoundly affected European intellectuals by evoking a profound sense of remorse for the widespread destruction committed by European nations. The Western concept of civilization, which promised wealth and development via the worldwide adoption of its principles, resulted in one of humanity's most horrific destructions (İrem, 2002).

In Europe and the Ottoman Empire, the war signified the end of the West's dream of a rational society. The pro-modernist and Westernist Ottoman literati were concerned about modern Western civilisation's dystopian possibilities and imperialist aims. After the war, Ottoman literature, which had viewed the West as a civilizing model for over half a century, began to voice their loss of trust in the West. In addition to a general sense of despair, the Ottoman literati engaged in passionate debates regarding the empire's future, which, as a

German ally, was vanquished in the war. This cynical intellectual and political atmosphere fostered the growth of Bergsonian thought (İrem, 2002).

At the end of the First World War, on the debris of the collapsed empire, the idea that it was required to rely on inner strength and a quasi-mystical spiritual impetus against material impossibilities and defeat also implied adopting the concept of Bergson's metaphysics (Ülken, 2013).

'Dergâh', issued between April 15, 1921, and January 5, 1923, when the War of Independence was ongoing and Istanbul was under occupation, was published for 42 issues with a predominant 'Anatolianism' aspect. The core members of this group consisted of Darülfünunun professors and students, and the essential names of the group composed of; Yahya Kemal, Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu, Mustafa Şekip Tunç, Fuat Köprülü, Halil Vedat, Kadri Yörükoğlu, and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. (Karadişoğulları, 2005).

Dergâh was a journal that published literature, poetry, and articles supporting the national struggle. Bergsonism was also one of the leading anti-mentalist movements that emerged in Europe in the early 20th century. Mustafa Şekip Tunç's Bergsonian writings played a vital role in bringing the rising intellectual movements in the West, especially against the positivist and scientism movements, to Turkey. Observing the devastation caused by the First World War in Europe and his own country, Mustafa Şekip argued that the positivist perspective based on the liberal western idea was the cause of these devastations (İrem, 2006).

From the beginning of the 1920s, Mustafa Şekip participated in an intellectual circle that politicized Bergsonian thought by integrating its spiritualist and romantic motifs with the objectives of the national liberation struggle (İrem, 2006). Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, in his book The Secret of the Jewels, states, "One day Yahya Kemal said to Şekip Bey: Şekip, we are all Bergsonists now" and then says: "Bergson did not reach us only through the teachers who conveyed his philosophy. He had entered our literature through the influence of the writers who were raised around every great philosopher" (Tanpınar, 2002, s. 36).

## 4.4. A Conservative Response to Modernization with Literature and the Novel

The influence of the French Revolution and the European wars of 1793–1815 impacted not only the viewpoints of the Romantic movement but also the subject matter of historical fiction from Balzac to Tolstoy and Galdós. The 1914–18 conflict demonstrated the deadly potential of contemporary technologies. In addition, it occurred against the loss of confidence in revealed religion, scepticism of the alleged omniscience of science, and investigation of the irrational. Modernism, a self-consciously'modern' literary movement, repudiated inherited ideas and structures. This was mixed with acknowledging the realities of modern combat and the tremendous loss of life. Modernism was infused with a feeling of unresolvable turmoil. The ideals of Hellenism, romantic and patriotic heroism, and a stable, rational order of the nineteenth century were destroyed. The war experience produced despondent and solitary individuals, shattered former warriors, and a pervasive numbness across society due to the magnitude of human death and psychological trauma (Hamnett, 2012).

Discussion of the nature of fiction between the 1880s and 1930s resulted in the reshaping of the novel, with the Modernist movement serving as its vanguard. Several authors attempted to transcend realism by utilizing myth and symbolism, as well as the psychological findings of their time, which emphasized the significance of the subconscious. (Hamnett, 2012).

The emergence of the historical novel coincided with the novel's emergence as a main method of communication. Books that were not planned as historical novels took on historical features in their narrative development. In addition, by the 1890s and 1900s, historical fiction itself had a notable history. This heritage allowed the historical novel sufficient power to adapt to the new methodological and thematic difficulties, despite the shortcomings identified. None of the new media could match the novel's psychological and character depth, its depiction of intimacy and sexuality, its blend of sarcasm and humour, and its capacity to exploit erroneous preconceptions. The novel remains the primary medium for forming symbolism or myth through continuous storytelling in its depictions of reality (Hamnett, 2011).

Almost a century and a half ago, some reformist Ottoman intellectuals sought to alter their society by creating social fiction. Ahmed Midhat Efendi (1844–1912) stands out among Ottoman writers in this quest because of his widespread popularity, great production, and purposeful efforts to transform storytelling into a tool for social change. Reformists of the Ottoman Empire, such as Şinasi (1826–71) and Namık Kemal (1840–88), utilized literature to transmit social and political ideas to the people. The most notable example of this phenomenon's direct societal influence is the 1873 outbreak of patriotic rallies following the premiere of Namık Kemal's nationalistic drama Vatan Yahut Silistre (Homeland or Silistra) (Kılınçoğlu, 2020).

The Turkish literary tradition is inextricably linked to the country's modernization and Westernization efforts and acts as a tool to root and disseminate new changes. This literature looks to be devoted to growth and change, drawing inspiration from current reforms based on solid ideas. Since the middle of the 20th century, when the reform movement extended into cultural domains and a more significant number of intellectuals got exposed to Western ideas, the defining characteristic of Turkish writing has been a preoccupation with the plight of society. The finest literary figures of this age were known more for their political and social opinions regarding the fate of society than for the literary merit of their writings (Karpat, 1960).

The novel and short story were created and evolved in the Ottoman Empire throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. In 1851, the first Ottoman novels, penned by two Istanbul-based Armenian intellectuals, were published. In 1870, Ottoman prose writing reached a turning point as a result of Ahmed Midhat Efendi's quick ascent with five stories in his Letaif-i Rivayat series. One of them, Firkat, according to some critics, was a book rather than a lengthy narrative. In the 1880s and notably the 1890s, more Ottoman authors appeared and contributed to the genre's growth with varied subjects and approaches. According to Kemal Karpat, throughout the late Ottoman Empire, "writing acted as a political and social laboratory where new ideas were tried out in practice (Kılınçoğlu, 2020)."

According to Jale Parla, the epistemic foundation of the early Ottoman novel was formed by "a priori, idealist, and communitarian" aspects. According to Parla, the parental authority of the sultan and the state was losing its ability to safeguard the old cultural and political framework against the influence of the West, leaving the Ottoman society without a symbolic father figure. Consequently, early authors assumed the position of a paternalistic

guardian and educator whose duty was to educate and guide the masses toward social transformation in an era of uncertain Islamic traditionalism and Westernization (Parla, 1990).

For instance, the poems and plays of Namik Kemal, Ziya Pasa, and Abdulhak Hamit directly resulted from this modernization, either as a critique of it or as a call for a broader adaptation to the new socio-political concepts that accompanied the adoption of Western administrative and political institutions. Ziya Gokalp, the founder of Turkish nationalism and of the later accepted notions of modernization in the Republic, originally articulated his thoughts in the form of poetry and promoted the use of literature to convey the ideas of nationalism and promote the modernization of society. Despite their divergent opinions, Tevfik Fikret, Mehmet Akif, and Mehmet Emin were poets more concerned with social and political ideals than poetic art growth. Social issues have increasingly supplanted political topics, which appeared to be the primary inspiration for writing until around the mid-1940s. Accelerated economic growth and the rise of new groups of intellectuals of peasant and lower middle-class descent have demanded a reassessment and adjustment of social ideals in Turkey to reflect the new social dimension brought about by modernization. (Karpat, 1960) Nurettin Topcu (1909-1975) frequently argued for the significance of human history to community cohesion. Due to these intellectual works, the Turkish nationalist movement progressively internalized the Ottoman legacy as a defining characteristic of being a Turk.

The entry of western society into the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century primarily undermined the palace and religious literature; the publication of newspapers exposed large numbers of people to new ideas, and the translations of Western works by Ibrahim Şinasi Efendi and Ahmet Vefik Pasa contributed to the dissemination of information about the West and its ways of thinking. The French influence was preponderant in many areas of literature; theatre or book writing throughout the nineteenth century and the first few decades of the twentieth century closely followed French patterns. Some works were direct copies of the original. Despite the political power of the English in the nineteenth century, it may have been due to the dogmatic nature of French philosophy, which suited the Ottoman mentality, that the French rather than the English offered the most significant literary impact. In addition, the newly-emerging Ottoman intelligentsia fell quickly under the spell of French romanticism, not only because romanticism was in vogue but also because, through its

departure from reality and its volatile emotionalism, romanticism mirrored the spirit of Ottoman literature, in which these intellectuals had been raised (Karpat, 1960).

The idea of progress and the emphasis on efficiency and production that went along with it were strongly tied to the envisioned Ottoman society that the top thinkers were attempting to create. Each person, who was now a part of the community, had to put in much effort and conserve time for the district to "progress," as if it were possible to add up the minutes saved by working efficiently and subtract them from the accumulated temporal distance between the Europeans and the Ottomans. The most prolific writer of the time, Ahmed Midhat, was the first to translate this idea into writing utilizing a form of literature that Ottoman Turkish audiences were unfamiliar with: the novel. Benedict Anderson argues that the novel as a genre allowed readers to follow simultaneous actions performed by various figures who may not be aware of each other but was nevertheless connected to each other as members of the same society in his famous discussion of the relations between print capitalism, time, and the formation of "imagined" national communities. According to Anderson, the concept of a "sociological organism moving calendrically through homogeneous, empty time" is "exactly analogous to the concept of the country, which is similarly seen as a solid community going steadily down (or up) history." Ahmed Midhat and other Ottoman writers' sheer embrace of the novel was, in this sense, suggestive and constitutive of new understandings of time. Many of these books were also published in newspapers as serials, precisely like The Time Regulation Institute would a few decades later. The new style of literary expression was based on new methods of regularized timekeeping, which in turn helped to create new social norms (Wishnitzer, 2015).

After the three-year War of Independence (1919–1922) against foreign occupation in Anatolia, modernist–Westernist elites sought a fundamental reform of old Ottoman Islamic social, economic, and political systems by establishing the Turkish Republic in 1923. The Westernist elites adopted capitalism as the new financial foundation of society, the nation-state and parliamentary democracy as its political framework, and secularization as its cultural process as part of their transformational modernist mission. On June 28, 1929, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoglu coined the word "Kemalism" to describe the new nation- and state-building philosophy that established the appropriate political lexicon containing the fundamental principles and values of the Turkish route to modernity (İrem, 2002).

Ottomanism or memory has been inert and constituted in conservative-nationalist discourse until recently. Publication of literature was essential to preserving and transmitting the Ottoman Empire's history. Due to the Kemalist regime's silencing of its opponents and suppression of alternative intellectual development pathways, the nation's corpus of literature became the surrogate womb for preserving, updating, and propagating the Ottoman legacy. Yahya Kemal Beyatli (1884-1958) was a poet who provided an alternate interpretation of Turkism, anchored in and inspired by the Ottoman tradition. He was not anti-nationalist but opposed the Kemalist idea of creating a country devoid of its historical (Ottoman) and symbolic (Islamic) components. Yahya Kemal emphasized the significance of a particular aesthetic in the nation-building process. In contrast to Kemalist positivism, which viewed culture as a tool for nation-building, he insisted that the nation's ideal is, first and foremost, a traditional and historical aesthetic truth (Yavuz, 2016).

# 5. AHMET HAMDI TANPINAR

## 5.1.Short Biography of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, who was born on June 23, 1901, in Şehzadebaşı, Istanbul, lived in various cities during his childhood as a result of his father's occupation. In Istanbul, where he came for his higher education in 1918, he stayed for a year as a boarder student at the veterinary school and the following year, while hesitating to enter History, Philosophy. Literature departments of the Darülfünun Faculty of Literature; he enrolled in the Literature department when he learned that Yahya Kemal, whom he had known from his poems as a high school student, was teaching Literature. In this department, he continued to attend classes taught by professors such as Yahya Kemal, Fuat Köprülü, Cenap Şahabeddin, Ömer Ferid Kam, and Babanzade Ahmed Naim. He worked as a professor at Erzurum, Konya, Ankara, and Istanbul Kadıköy high schools and Ankara Gazi Institute of Education and lectured aesthetic mythology at the Academy of Fine Arts. In 1939, Tanpınar was assigned as a professor to the 19th Century Turkish Literature chair established for the 100th year of Tanzimat. Between 1943 and 1946, he served as a deputy from Maraş and then as a secondary education inspector in the Ministry of National Education.

In 1949, Tanpınar returned to his lectureship at the Faculty of Literature, struggled with various health problems in the last years of his life, and died of a heart attack on January 23, 1962. After the funeral prayer at the Süleymaniye Mosque, he was buried beside his beloved teacher Yahya Kemal. Two lines from one of his poems are engraved on his tombstone. "I am neither inside time / Nor completely outside it" (Akay, 2013). Born in 1901, he witnessed significant historical events such as the fall of the Ottoman Empire, the British occupation of Istanbul, the Independence War, the replacement of the Sultan with the Republic, and a succession of dramatic changes in all facets of life.

In his youth, Tanpınar encountered the poetry of Ahmet Haşim and later met Yahya Kemal, with whom from the beginning he had a teacher-student relationship and remained a friend throughout his life. With his suggestion, he discovered Paul Valery and Marcel Proust. Under the education and discipline of these four figures, Tanpınar made poetry, which he met at an early age, an indispensable affair of his life and presented what he wanted to say in his essays, stories, and novels written with the aesthetics of poetry (Uçman, 2006). His first poems were published in the famed poet and Tanpinar's tutor Yahya Kemal's literary

journal Dergâh. Political and intellectual discussions at the time focussed on cultural modernism and integrating then-recent material and innovations with Turkish and Islamic heritage. There was no simple response for Tanpinar; he was conscious of the ambiguity of in-betweenness and accepted it as the fundamental condition of his life. This oscillation between two universes became crucial to his works without giving way to dogmatic uniqueness or simple, uncomplicated synthesis (Dolcerocca, 2015).

Besides his personality as a writer and poet, Tanpınar considered his writings on his thoughts to be more significant. This can also be seen in the approaches that permeated the fabric of his novels. Furthermore, Tanpınar worked for years to establish a " scientist" identity at the Faculty of Literature of Istanbul University and the Academy of Fine Arts. Therefore, accepting Tanpınar as a "thinker" beyond his artist/poet persona, or mixed with it, is not a very incoherent approach (Kahraman, 2000).

Nothing in the world can be seen by running. Alain states, " In order to think, one must stop." Philosophers and artists stop, they think, and they deepen their thoughts. Tanpınar, too, has a depth that reflects all the intricacies and structures of his thoughts and feelings. According to Tanpınar, the ones who lead the world to catastrophe are "men of action"; in other words, shallow people who do not contemplate deeply. These shallow people pursue stereotypical opinions, little interests, and slogans. Hence, they address everything with its essential, practical, and simple side. Tanpınar is a man of scrutiny in this respect. He is convinced that the profound meaning of life and society can only be reached via rigorous and continuous thought, patience, and culture (Kaplan, 2015).

Tanpınar was a passionate storyteller with an exceptional talent for portraying emotional and moral nuances and a sensitive observer of the paradoxes and ills of the social environment he inhabited. These accomplishments earned him a prominent place among the foremost authors of his day. He was a novelist in an academic setting where social and political issues were argued and battled on the battlefield of writing. However, unlike many of his contemporaries, he was not a political preacher. He was adamantly opposed to the deliberate and instrumental use of art for ideological and instructional goals. This does not imply, however, that Tanpınar was an aesthete, a believer in art for art's sake, or an escapist devoid of civic sensibility. Throughout his life, he was engaged in cultural and political debates, particularly the fierce battles between the new Republic's conservatives and followers of the West (Sezer, 2010).

Much of the discussion surrounding Tanpınar focuses on his political views. While some have labelled him "progressive" or "modern," others have labelled him "traditional." claimed to be "conservative" or "reactionary," and others intended that he was a "conservative modern" or a "modern conservative (Wishnitzer, 2015)."

His major works were preoccupied with the most pressing political and cultural issues of his generation's authors and intellectuals. However, his detachment and reluctance to subject his intellectual independence to the requirements of ideological thought alienated him from both radicals and conservatives. His cautious optimism, humanism, sceptical irony, disdain for intolerant conservatism and authoritarianism, and determination to avoid simple social and political formulas irritated some of his readers who craved dogmatic certainty and looked to writers for strict ideological guidance. Tanpınar's ambiguous moderation and his willingness to resist magnetization by either opposing force are most evident in his articles, whose underlying topics are the East-West split and its effects on Turkish culture (Sezer, 2010).

In the 1930s, Tanpınar created symbolist-modernist literature decades ahead of its time. Since Europeanization began in the mid-nineteenth century, Turkish culture has experienced critical literary movements. His work represents an academic stream that is highly distinct from these trends. Until the 1970s, Turkish literature had social-transformative aims and might be broadly classified as a combination of romanticism and social realism that sought social critique, teaching, change, and popularity. Tanpınar's work dovetailed with the French-inspired symbolism of Ahmet Haşim (1885-1933) and, to a lesser extent, Yahya Kemal (1884-1958) and gave this slight aestheticist tendency its currently identifiable, fully-fledged modernist shape. Today, we may thus refer to Tanpınar as a writer who established a modernist aesthetic that is only slightly behind that of his contemporaries in Europe and abroad but which is, notably in prose fiction, much ahead of its time in Turkey. His extensive studies of Poe, Baudelaire, Verlaine, Mallarme, Valery, Gide, Proust, Rilke, Joyce, and T. S. Eliot contributed to Tanpınar's identification with modernist aesthetics and their results (Oğuzertem, 1990).

“Eventually, they will undoubtedly turn to me. But when?" Tanpınar inquired on March 4, 1961, in a journal post. Tanpınar rightly foresaw his work's eventual rediscovery in Turkey, having considered the neglect of his publications by both the political right and the political left. It is reasonable to conclude that he did not expect to become a global writer

after his death. "The reality is," he added, "I am relatively new to Turkish. However, I am not new to the world." He recalled with regret that he had first visited Europe at the age of 53: "Those with a passing interest in Russian literature understand what this implies." Tanpınar believed that his historically and existentially late arrival in Europe had precluded the dissemination of his work outside of Turkey. However, it was precisely these pangs of unoriginality and the peculiar authenticity they suggested that made his works appealing to "world literature" at the turn of the twenty-first century (Ertürk, 2017).

The decisive and abrupt turning point that emerged with the Westernization efforts, which initially appeared for military and economic purposes, accelerated even more after the Tanzimat Edict, causing a case of "civilizational change" or "civilization crisis" in Turkish society. The process of duality experienced during the transition from the sphere of civilization in which we have lived for centuries to another, according to Tanpınar, initially "began in public life, and finally changed its process and established itself inside us as individuals" (Uçman, 2006).

## 5.2.People who Affect Tanpınar

In almost all of his works, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar emphasized that modernization divided the minds of Turkish society into two, and this division caused a duality problem in individuals' lives. This change in civilization and division between the East and the West caused mental hybridity and crisis in the individual. "...the reason for this crisis is the duality caused by the transition from one civilization to another. Initially, this duality appeared in public life. It divided our society into two terms of mentality, and finally, it deepened and changed its operation and penetrated us as individuals (Tanpınar, 2000, p. 35)."

According to Tanpınar, this duality problem is not directly the blame of Turkish Modernization but the result of the contradictions and problems caused by modernity in general. At this point, Tanpınar maintained a stance against positivism by supporting Bergson's philosophy, which emerged as a reaction against modernity within modernism. Bergson differentiated the time of consciousness from mechanical time. Mechanical time is the time between two points.

On the other hand, in the time of consciousness, categories of time, such as past and future, disappear. Bergson proposed the following metaphor about consciousness:

consciousness expands as the records of consciousness increase, but inside this expansion, there are past, present, and future. In other words, all times are hidden in the present. The clue of what will be in the future is in the present. Tanpınar's image of the tree, consciousness developing branches like a seed, reminds us of this (Şahin, 2012).

Figures such as Tanpınar and his contemporaries Şekip Tunç and Yahya Kemal accepted mysticism based on intuition. Finding in mysticism and Bergson a modern/western interpretation of their traditions, they espoused a non-progressive, circular, and profound Furthermore, Tanpınar, by following Bergson's path, determined that humans and life do not proceed in a rational line and that there are ups and downs (Şahin, 2012). "If you examine the books, if you listen to them, the main quality of humans is the mind. Through it, humans are distinguished from other animals. They dominate life with wise words. But if you observe their lives individually, you will not find the slightest intervention of this constructive element. All their considerations, all their particular attachments, deny the existence of this mind (Tanpınar, 2017, s. 67)."

Also, the word search means a lot to Tanpınar. Tanpınar is not a man who finds; the finding is Tanpınar's state of constant searching. That is an understanding that Tanpınar partly learned from Yahya Kemal but mostly from Bergson; despite all of Tanpınar's connections with Bergson, Bergson's name is rarely mentioned in his intellectual works. In the index of As I Live, Bergson's name is mentioned twice, and in his Essays on Literature, Bergson's name is also mentioned twice. He admitted that he had barely read Bergson.

Nevertheless, to utilize a concept that he would use in many of his writings and which is fundamental to Bergson, Tanpınar is in a state of becoming (Kahraman & Keyman, 1998). Additionally, it is essential to recognize that the philosophical and political implications of Tanpınar's works of the 1940s and 1950s reach back to the hermeneutics tradition of the early twentieth century and, more importantly, simultaneously anticipate trends in contemporary philosophical hermeneutics and European thought that are of great significance. Despite the fact that Tanpınar has never used the term "hermeneutics," this seems to be a reasonable inference from his ideas (Sezer, 2010).

In 1921, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and a group of his friends gathered around Yahya Kemal to publish Dergâh, one of the most prominent journals of the period. Dergâh, a

medium for Tanpınar to publish his poems, also expanded his social circle. During this period, he had the opportunity to meet Ahmet Haşim and Yakup Kadri.

Each great civilization selects heroes who lived in previous eras and espouses the philosophers on whom its dialectic is based. That is Bergson's concept of seeing the past through the light of the present (Meriç ve Karışman, 2006).

According to Öztürk (2021), Tanpınar cites Albert Thibaudet as having a more substantial effect on him than his instructors, personal friends, and relatively apparent inspirations Yahya Kemal and Fuat Koprülü. Other than his instructors, Tanpınar does not name any other critics or thinkers who had naturally impacted him with their works, literary histories, and articles. Instead, he only names Thibaudet, which helps to demonstrate how much this "interesting guy" and "agile mind" impact him.

“I believe that attentiveness is paramount in art and science. I am unaware of a comparable magical term. Yahya Kemal and Fuat Koprülü were our professors. Y. Kemal taught me how to enjoy history and the discipline to read a full author's work. Prof. Koprülü, who at the time was rather young, also taught me a great deal. Albert Thibaudet, a French critic, had a key influence. This intriguing individual is now nearly forgotten. He possessed one of the sharpest brains of his day. Even now, no serious work on technique or criticism does not reference or reply to him. I am confident that he will return to fashion one day. He is the subject of published works. The wide linkages and "generations theory" of Thibaudet suited me quite well (Tanpınar, 2000, p. 164).”

Tanpinar is not the only concern for the crisis of the time. In 1928, when Walter Benjamin set out to write the history of the Parisian arcades, he made a similar attempt to connect with the Paris of the nineteenth century, which is now only visible in ruins. Benjamin sees a shift in temporal perception, which he refers to as "the Copernican revolution in historical perception". For Benjamin, we no longer have access to "what is closest, tritest, and most obvious," and only via a revolutionary form of remembering that he refers to as awakening can we access an unconscious awareness of what has been. Modernity, according to Benjamin, is in part about the destructive modifications of social form and its associated urban phenomena: the crowd, the transfigured urban scenery, the alienating impact of industry and machine culture, the cataclysmic changes in the name of history - wars,

demolitions, ruins - these were all fossilized in the remains of everyday city life. (Dolcerocca, 2015).

Tanpınar does not necessarily view modernity as a monster because he subscribes to a universal reason that he links with the West. The fact that the past stays just a cultural value in his works and does not provide a basis for the future, as he hopes, is a product of the liminal position he believes he occupies. This tension between, on the one hand, subscribing to the republican progressive ideology and, on the other, viewing the Ottoman heritage as something to be preserved, if only partially, compels Tanpınar to adopt an orientalist stance in his reworking of the Ottoman heritage into modern Turkish culture (Hemmat, 2017).

Tanpınar, like many other authors, creates characters in his stories based on his life experiences and aspirations. *Aydaki Kadın* was perhaps his most autobiographical work, as it covers various occasions that Tanpınar truly experienced. Therefore, even for drafting Tanpınar's biography, one may refer to Aydaki Kadın; the diary entries undoubtedly give insight into the novel's characters and events. Selim, the primary character, is constantly burdened by his history and battles loneliness and poverty. His dreams are always "complex" since his emotions influence them. Tanpınar's expertise is quite comparable to Selim's. Selim studies French and reads Baudelaire, Hugo, Vigny, and Racine. Selim is familiar with Haşim, Yahya Kemal, and Şeyh Galib and has long been influenced by Joyce's Ulysses (Tanpınar, 2009).

Tanpınar was influenced by such writers, as evidenced by multiple references in the journal. Tanpınar, for example, said on 23 October 1960 about Joyce and Ulysses, "After reading Zola, now James Joyce; dismantle the usual understanding of reality." After reading James Joyce, I fit poetry into this concrete reality and capture time in a new and more profound way. He was making time for psychology" (Enginün & Kerman, 2007).

When thinking about Tanpınar’s poetry, there is a philosophy, of course. If one attempts to appreciate a poet's work, the subject of philosophical influences is of minor importance. Nonetheless, when certain intellectual connections are established, this may lead to unexpected ideas and discoveries inside the poem's creative world. This link presents a unique difficulty for Tanpınar, as it is nearly impossible to separate his poems from his philosophical formation. In a letter, he says that Baudelaire, Mallarme, and Verlaine were highly influential in forming his creative sensitivities and that the Bergsonian idea of time

plays an essential role in his poetic and aesthetic sense. Therefore, revisiting his poetry containing references to these names would unearth more hidden connotations and refresh their view (Birlik, 2007).

“I have decided to focus on 'Raks' in a Bergsonian spirit; hence, this study extensively draws on Bergson's writings and Tanpınar's poetry to bring the reader through a more in-depth investigation of the poem (Karışman, 2000).”

## 5.3. The Modernization Problems for Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar

The founders of the Republic considered rupturing all ties with the Ottoman heritage necessary for constructing a "national identity." The annihilation of institutions such as the caliphate, madrassas, and foundations, and the more radical revolutions of the alphabet and language triggered various reactions in the society, which was intended to acquire a new identity, and the culture expelled from state institutions organized itself in social spheres outside the institutions (Ayvazoğlu, 2006).

Niyazi Berkes, in his book Modernization in Turkey, notes that in the eyes of the pro-Westernists in Turkish intellectual life, it is his humanism that makes the West superior to the East (Berkes, 2013). This understanding, which Tanpınar thinks in parallel with those who support Westernization, is to look at people from a non-religious perspective. From Tanpınar's point of view, the value given to human beings in Turkish society and in Islamic societies, in general, revolves around religious rules and discourse. There are servants who are acceptable or not in terms of religion. In the West, after the Renaissance, Reformation, and Enlightenment Revolution, there is an individual, unlike a servant, and his rights, freedom, and dignity are now the main focus of society. However, Tanpınar's social and political thoughts are not entirely individual-oriented. Because although he looks at the individual with a non-religious understanding, the main focus for him is society. In his article titled "Human and Society", he sees society as a "transcendent" entity for humans. Because there is no death in society, and it depends on the chain of continuity. In contrast, human beings are not complete, but the tragedy of human destiny is lessened by the existence of society. For this reason, as long as he stays away from the consciousness of society, a person is a "total of weaknesses" (Türkislamoğlu, 2015).

The author that best describes the tragedy of Turkey's modernity is Tanpınar. In actuality, though, all modernization schemes are sad. Modernists do not take Tanpınar's text seriously for the same reason that "conservatives" accept it. This is because he has a very understanding relationship with the past, tradition, religion, and, in general, society. Tanpınar, despite his CHP parliamentary rank and his lifestyle, is not the hero of the modernization movement; yet, he is also not the hero of the conservative world. We might also be viewed as having self-awareness or even "overindulgence." Tanpınar's hesitancy is often highlighted in the literature and is typically interpreted as a weakness. Even Tanpinar saw it this way the majority of the time. Actually, hesitation is a representation of the self. In a community where everyone freely chooses to be a part of it, reluctance is a sign of strength, not weakness. We will refer to this as "internalization" or "experience." Tanpınar's experience is true; the possibility of "Turkey" arises from this (Dellaloğlu, 2014).

Tanpınar realized these predicaments that the country faced and stated that national life was only possible via "continuity" and that the ruptures and fractures experienced by the society would cause the emergence of freaks of nature; he believed that the essential thing was "to change by continuing, to continue by changing." A healthy continuity should not be experienced as a ceaseless repetition of specific life and art styles but also as a period of change (Ayvazoğlu, 2006).

Yahya Kemal's student Ahmet Hamdi Tanpinar (1902-1962) likewise emphasized the principles of Ottoman continuity. Tanpinar questioned the forced modernization process and the dehistoricized identity of the Turks by analyzing the tragic results of the new nation's efforts to eradicate all Ottoman sensibility, art, and language. One of the most critical reform initiatives of the modernizing elite was to purge the Turkish language of all Arabic and Persian forms of Ottoman nouns. Tanpinar resisted by incorporating Ottoman terms into his writing, which made him unpopular among modernist-secularist authors. As he focused on bits of the past that defined Ottoman culture, he was regarded as a conservative and reactionary.

Tanpinar emphasized the continuation of tradition by filtering the essence of modernity via the shared vernacular practices of Ottoman culture rather than opposing the westernization changes. The Turkish people were frequently evoked in his works between modernism and tradition, between the West and the East. They did not exclusively reside in

one location but concurrently in two. The Kemalist elite, dedicated to westernization, rebuked his work (Yavuz, 2016).

Trying to choose between Western and Ottoman/Turkish ideals and institutions, according to Tanpınar, is just a lack of thinking ability. He does not investigate the modern in terms of dichotomies such as West and East, present and past, or forward and backwards. Tanpınar's critique of modernity in *The Time Regulation Institute* contributes to critical studies on modernity by demonstrating that modernity is worldwide and multiple, with no ruling core. Tanpınar's critique of modernity also provincializes Western discourse on modernity by "thinking through and against its self-understanding (Gaonkar, 1999).

Many of his characters, particularly the protagonists of his first novel Mahur Beste (Song in Mahur, 1944) and his most recent novel, The Time Regulation Institute, have ties to the dispossessed sons of the first Turkish novels. Their conflicted relationships with goods that allure, control, and even endanger them exemplify their personality crises caused by economic and cultural disinheritance. Tanpınar's narratives do not replicate the early novels' cautions against the materialism connected with Westernist modernization and their anguish over the loss of cultural defences against it. However, they continue to relate the attempts and failures to inherit, accumulate, and dominate items to give them personal and cultural significance to conflicts between the past and the present (Irzık, 2017).

At the same time, Tanpınar's (2017) explanation of Aunty Zarife in "The Time Regulation Institute" compels us to consider socio-historical and cultural shifts, as well as gender patterns, within the frameworks of socio-cultural undertakings such as modernism in war/postwar eras. We suppose that Aunt Zarife witnessed World War I (1914–1918) and the Turkish War of Independence (1919–1923), followed by Atatürk's reforms. Thus, Aunty Zarife represents the changes the Turkish Republic brought about regarding women's social status and functions. Therefore, she comes to embody the new Republic at moments throughout the narrative, as previously detailed in detail. Thus, according to Tanpınar, the pursuit of a cultural synthesis between the past and the present, the East and the West, or the ancient and the modern lies at the heart of Turkish modernization, and the Turkish people should neither completely reject their deeply rooted cultural heritage nor rely solely on foreign cultures. The tale illustrates how modernization takes time and requires tenacity to assimilate all the things it brings. Appropriately, this is also demonstrated with the aid of Aunty Zarife's character; she transforms from an old, mumbling ghost-like woman to an

independent, energetic, and active woman, both physically and psychologically, by combining her old cultural heritage with the opportunities of modernization, which is also reflected in her perspectives in certain scenes of the novel. Conclusion: Aunty Zarife and the Turkish Republic appear to have risen from the ashes (Kalpaklı, 2021).

## 5.4. The Conflicts of Turkish Modernization and Tanpınar's Criticism of the Tanzimat

Alexis de Tocqueville (1805 - 1859) was a distinguished French nobleman in literature and politics. In his literary works, he addressed the societal consequences of the French Revolution and the issues caused by the revolution. He stated about the French Revolution: "It indeed seized the world unexpectedly; in addition, it is the complement of the longest endeavour, the abrupt and severe end of a piece of work that ten generations of humans had worked. If it had not occurred, the outdated societal structure would not have stopped crumbling and disintegrating everywhere, here earlier, there later; it would have continued to collapse piece by piece instead of just falling all at once. The Revolution has accomplished suddenly, without any transition, without any precautions, with no regard to anything, what would be completed gradually and spontaneously over a long period of time by a forced and suffering effort. That is what it did." (Tocquivelle, 2004, p. 43).

In his book History of Turkish Literature in the Nineteenth Century, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar groups the ideas of the Tanzimat period under three categories: civilization and civilizationism, Ottomanism, and Islamism. At the beginning of this time, civilizationism was the most popular idea. After the Reform Edict, however, Ottomanism and Islamism began to be accepted. A big part of the time was how newspapers were used in everyday life. This brought social and political issues to the "agora" in a way that had never been done before. Then came the "efkar- ummiye," which kept a close eye on what was going on in the country. Tanpınar calls the change in question a "change of horizons" and talks about how new ideas and values are beginning to drag society along. Because of these changes in the way, people think, the way the state and intellectuals work together has changed. Schools, pens, and newspapers in Tanzimat have to take action against the people they raised. Now, the power to guide changes is in the hands of young people, most of whom are small or large civil servant elites (Türkislamoğlu, 2015).

The state, which used to lead innovation movements, now acts as a balance and protection, trying to slow down the spread of ideas it wants to spread. This fight between “Aydın” and the government has made it one of the most difficult parts of Turkey's move toward the West. Because on the one hand, the leaders of the state know that they need to change with the times to keep the state alive, but on the other hand, they worry that every step in this direction brings the state closer to falling apart.

Since the Tanzimat, Tanpınar viewed the innovative movements carried out in accordance with the struggle for survival against the West to be tardy and insufficient. In Tanpınar's (2011) diaries, Tanpınar described the history of Turkey following the Tanzimat as "the imbalance between requirements and impossibilities." Due to the nearly two-hundred-year separation between the West and Turkey. In the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire began to experience the effects of the Enlightenment and Industrial Revolutions. However, this period corresponded with the beginning of the empire's decline and the onset of social and economic collapse. The Ottoman Empire remained distant from Western technology and prosperity. On the other side, implementing reforms to prevent this disintegration was regarded vital. The process of Westernization in Turkey began in such a stalemate. Those in charge of the state are unable to do the necessary tasks due to a lack of resources.

The Westernization/Modernization efforts, which started more explicitly in the Ottoman Empire with the Tanzimat, had continued after the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, with the accompanying tensions and controversies. The process that begins with the Tanzimat is replacing the existing style of social life and organization with a different style of social life and organization, which is called modernity. The Modernization process, which was tried to be applied to a society that was technologically, politically, and culturally distant from modernity, caused the dual character and tensions of this process to appear in another image, and its effects and consequences to be experienced many times more (Öztaş, 2003).

With the Tanzimat, the harmony of the "individual" and "community" layers that sustained the Ottoman order was replaced with a process of dissociation, and the concept of "community shaped the dynamics of modern life." "There is no mortality for the community as for the individual. It has continuity." Stating this, Tanpınar considers that the community represents the historical consciousness, the experience, the sense of rootedness, and

belonging. For Tanpınar, the integrity of the existence of the individual and the community is history itself. History speaks for the community and invites the individual to this communal life (Işın, 2003).

Tanpınar, whose relevance in comprehending Turkey of tomorrow is based on his knowledge of the late Ottoman history. Tanpınar's focus on the psychological effects of the Kemalist cultural revolution of the 1920s and 1930s, his recognition of the persistence of an Ottoman Islamic cultural legacy, and his portrayal of the individual alienated and divided by modernization make his works essential reading for anyone interested in modern Turkish society. His books, articles, and critical essays offer insights into the paradoxical features of a culture that has been undergoing a "civilizational change" since the Tanzimat. Tanpınar's work has grown in importance as Turkey enters the twenty-first century, seeks EU membership, and promotes itself as the paradigm of a "secular Muslim country (Göknar, 2003) ." "If I dared, I would have said that since the Tanzimat, we have been living somewhat Oedipus complex, the complex of the man who unwittingly murdered his father (Tanpınar, 2000, p. 154)".

As Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar states in the preface of Beş Şehir (2021) (Five Cities), "This internal strife is not strange considering that not only nations and societies but also personalities have their original sense and identity, their core is made by what is called historicity. The past is always existing; to live as ourselves, we have to face it and negotiate with it at any moment." The modernization began with the Tanzimat, and the transformation introduced by it split the outer shell of social life and followed a path that threatened the historical existence of the human being at the centre (Işın, 2003).

Tanpınar's perspective will become evident if we compare him to the generation of authors and intellectuals who came before him. In general, that group of nationalist authors saw an Ottoman state whose frantic "Tanzimat style" Westernization led to semi-colonial status. In reaction, they aided in the formation of a new sociocultural narrative that anticipated what may emerge from the Ottoman Empire's demise: an independent Turkish nation-state. This meant abandoning Ottoman-Islamic historiography and forging a new identity based on Enlightenment values. To establish this secular identity, the new "Westernizing" Turkish Republic's golden period would be "pre-Islamic," taking place in Turkic Central Asia (Göknar, 2003).

The idea of continuity and unity identified with Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar expresses its greatest reflection through the Tanzimat. In his book As I Live (Tanpınar, 2000), Tanpınar, after chronologically listing the chain of continuity from the Seljuks to Tanzimat, describes the issue of continuity and unity in the following sentences: “In short, ideas and faiths were ramifying from the same roots, just as a large family heritage expands through the generations. Life was continuing as one and whole, together with its people. Therefore, a piece of stone placed in the ground would become a building after two or three generations, and the personality it gained by entering the time of man would be accepted around it. We lost this idea of continuity and unity in the years after the Tanzimat (Tanpınar, 2000, pp. 76-77).”

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar analyzes the reflections of Tanzimat and its societal outcomes by expressing them through literature and poetry. While examining the literature of his period, Tanpınar mentions that the literature of that period appeared as a consequence of a changing civilization. The crisis of changing society began in 1826 with the abolition of the Janissaries and lasted until the post-Republican era. As a result of all these events, Modern Turkish Literature not only shaped various ideologies but would sometimes remain under the effects of those ideologies (Tanpınar, 1998).

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, our literature dramatically disengaged from our historical sources. The generation following the Tanzimat era adopted European literature as a basis and remained firmly attached to it. This adherence to European literature and poetry took the point of departure of our own to distant places. That is why the dichotomy, the conflict between the old and the new, which Tanpınar was uncomfortable with, appeared (Tanpınar, 1998). Our shift of direction to the West with the Tanzimat revealed that we needed a new reference in literature. In Tanpınar's opinion, this need could not be satisfied either by the old world, whose noble and exquisite aspects we are proudly bound to or by an identical replica of the West. The things we would receive from the West – just as anything from outside - could have been a lesson for us. We could have admired and welcomed those that belonged to the West, but we could not originate from them (Tanpınar, 1998).

## 5.5. Tanpınar's Mental Hybridity: Eastern or Western

While Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar was in favour of the West and Westernization until the end of the 1930s, after this date, he started to be more interested in the Eastern culture and the Ottoman past. This interest led him to be accepted as a conservative name both during his lifetime and later on. However, it is seen that Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's ideas diverge in parallel with the political and social changes Turkey has experienced and their consequences.

In one of the letters he sent to his student and assistant Mehmet Kaplan in 1958, he expresses his relationship with the transformations Turkey went through as follows: "I saw four eras in my short life: the era of freedom, the era of the Armistice, the era of the republic, and the era of Democracy. If we add the periods of time, there will be six periods. I know more or less how things started in our holy country and how they ended by slackening".

In fact, it is possible to see the traces of this transition period in Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, as well as many other writers and thinkers of the period who witnessed the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the founding period of the Republic. The state of being in-between, peculiar to the transition periods in which societies lived, frequently appears both in Tanpınar's personal life and thoughts, as well as in his literary works (Türkislamoğlu, 2015).

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar does not regard nativism or the old as alternatives to the West. In one of his opinion pieces, Tanpınar wrote: "What do we have to offer against the West, a Süleymaniye and two or three songs." According to Dellaloğlu, (Dellaloğlu, 2012, s. 42) the discourse that Tanpınar was a conservative is; "one of the greatest myths of the national modernization story. Tanpınar is a modern writer and intellectual. Contrary to common belief, being modern does not include rejecting history, traditions, and experiences but reckoning with them and constructing the present, namely the modern, on their basis.

On the other hand, Tanpınar maintains his perspective on the past through Republican ideology. While defending the understanding that we could join the West by altering ourselves without abandoning ourselves, he continues to negate the old as cosmopolitan. He perceives westernization as an obligatory preference originating from necessities (Aydın, 2013). In response to all these debates, Tanpınar said, "Strangely enough, they read my writings superficially, and each side judges on that basis. According to the rightists, I am

shifting to the left in contravention of my engagements -Huzur and Five Cities. I support the left. But according to the leftists, I am on the rightists' side, if not on the racists' side, since I mention oppression, Turkish music, and our history." "The Orient is the land of sitting and waiting; with a little patience, everything comes to you" (Tanpınar, 2013).” “What is Orient anyway? A word. Let words die” (Tanpınar, 2016).

The modernization journey, as Tanpınar perceived, is full of surprises. Modernization is not a conception that can be applied immediately and with a prepared synthesis. The requirement for change should originate from life itself. The Republican ideology's search for a new identity after the Ottoman heritage, which the Republic denied as the other, is regarded by Tanpınar as an effort not to remain orphaned and without a past. In SAE, he criticized this tragicomic attempt to acquire a new past as follows; “…we always complain about the past; we are all occupied with it. We want to change it from the inside. What is the meaning of this? Is it not a paternal complex? Are we not all occupied with it, young and old? What is our fondness for the Hittites, the Phrygians (Tanpınar, 2017, s. 122)”

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpinar has substantially influenced our knowledge of modern Turkish literature. He addresses the modernity of time and proposes that the greatest problem of his period is how we should relate to the past. "We are all of a crisis of awareness [şuur] and identity [benlik]," "being tugged between being and not being more painful of Hamlet" (Beşşehir p.235). Although Tanpinar frequently associates concern with "connecting to the past" as a desire to bridge the cultural chasm between the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey, this concern may also be seen as a fear of the future (Dolcerocca, 2015).

Tanpınar explains why he admires the classic poetry: no other verbal art had been as simply and fully an "art of form" as Ottoman court poetry; not "what was said" but "how it was stated" had been the guiding principle of this art. Thus, Tanpınar had clearly distinguished himself from the Islamic value system. As a modernist (notice the emphasis on form and the "how" something is expressed), he built coalitions in cultural politics with the secular-minded intellectuals of the day. Not only did his modern-ism not stem from an "authentic" Turkish experience, but he owes his current appreciation of Ottoman court poetry to the time when he turned away from those "authentic" sources and learned from Euro-pean aesthetes how to appreciate the "distilled" cultural products of the past (Oğuzertem, 1990).

Tanpınar denied being an instrument for "social engineering" by depicting good Western personalities in opposition to religious Ottoman culture or the past. He utilized his

writing to remind society of what it had been asked to forget: the Ottoman language, social sensibility, and memories that are important to one's sense of self. This work by Tanpinar articulates the profound existential pain connected with renouncing Ottoman and Islamic traditions in order to build a new Turk who would be turned into a Western secular image in Istanbul. This narrative explores in depth the psychological effects of fragmented identities and cultures and the existential crises imposed on society and people. Individuals do not belong to a single region but strive to identify with the East and the West. Mumtaz, the protagonist of A Mind at Peace, listens to traditional Ottoman composers Itri and Dede Efendi while appreciating Beethoven's music. (Yavuz, 2016).

In a questionnaire applied by Yaşar Nabi Nayır for the Varlık magazine in 1951, Tanpınar said, "Until 1932, I was a strict Westernist; I was rejecting the Orient entirely. After 1932, I lived in an Orient that I interpreted for myself." (Pelvanoğlu, 2006) Tanpınar has two writings that attempt to prove the ontological and epistemological distinctions between the East and the West: the first is "Orient and Occident" (1934), and the second is "The Fundamental Differences Between Orient and Occident" (1961).

Tanpınar commences his first writing by defining the East and the West. Stating that the East and the West do not display analogical integrity in themselves, Tanpınar explains his insistence on this nomenclature by noting that he sees the East as the "other" of an assemblage of mentalities and civilizations that is a significant other of European society. In the first section of this article, which was published in two sections, Tanpınar distinguishes the difference between "Western civilization" and "Eastern mentality"; as the first considers "individual happiness" as a secondary problem and strives and proceeds in this context, while the second considers "individual happiness" as the purpose of life and becomes as static as possible. He mentions that while the Occident civilization centres the individual with humanism and invests in his every improvement, the Orient tries to negate the individual as much as possible. According to Tanpınar, the fundamental mistake of the Tanzimat was the attempt to combine these two separate worlds; the Tanzimat intellectuals recognized European thought at the final stage. Yet Europe had been different from the East long before the French Revolution. The most prominent characteristic that differentiates Europe from the East is its "ability to give birth" and its inherent dynamism (Pelvanoğlu, 2006).

"First of all, uniting people. Let the standard of living between them still be different, but let them have the same necessities. Let them be not one a debris of the old civilization

and the other a newly moved tenant of a new civilization. A fusion between the two is necessary (Tanpınar, 2016, p. 66)."

## 5.6. Tanpınar's Concepts

### 5.6.1. Time and Reality

In the 18th century, there was a rupture in the conception of time and space. Kant proposed the concept of modernity after critically evaluating Descartes' rationalism and Hume's empiricism. Temporal culture refers to a historically formed system of time-related behaviours, customs, and values that organize and provide significance to the temporal component of social interaction. To temporally manage social life, societies calculate time differently, grasp its essence in certain ways, assign it distinct meanings, and adopt diverse norms. Since telling time is always dependent on authoritative knowledge, temporal cultures are always about hegemony, yet different social groupings may have their varieties, customs, and secular practices. In the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire, hegemonic temporal culture was anchored in the patrimonial power structure of the empire and formed by contemporaneous cosmological conceptions. Time was a component of a divinely sanctioned world order and, as such, could only be marked by the motion of celestial bodies. In other words, actual time was sanctioned by God. Real-time was a component of a bigger, divine reality that could not be controlled or altered. People could only attempt to identify it and arrange themselves accordingly. Such was the function of the muvakkit. On a practical level, the muvakkit was responsible for arranging the hours for prayer and fasting. However, on a more basic one, his function was to maintain "synchrony with the skies," as described by David King (Wishnitzer, 2015).

A feature of Tanpınar's poetry is an awareness of the contrast between the material and the intuitive (Demiralp, 1993). This awareness leads the person to a dualistic conception of the soul. Thus, Tanpınar represents two distinct realities: one based on clock time and the other on intuitive time in the extra spatial realm. He is not concerned with the passage of time but rather with traversing back and forth into another realm of intensity, therefore liberating himself from conventional reality and time. In such a framework, his poetry transforms into a trip from personal awareness to an impersonal consciousness in which the ego, in the Freudian meaning of the term, dissolves into the collective unconscious. A trip

from the verbal to the non-verbal (from the Symbolic to the Real) in the Lacanian sense (Birlik, 2007).

The Muslim Turkish people's relationship with time is defined by a close harmony between their daily routines and spiritual life: "The ticktock they heard had nearly the same evocative power as the water running at the fountain for ablutions in a mosque courtyard, and echoed the voice of sublime and eternal beliefs. The ticktocks had unique qualities that extended to both dimensions of existence. While it organized your everyday business and tasks, it also opened the spotless and smooth routes that lead to the ultimate happiness that one was seeking" (Tanpınar, 2017, s. 89).

This text may be examined in light of both the Sufi notion of time and Bergson's conceptualization of time as a transcendental mode of experience that is not limited by mathematical and homogeneous time. As previously stated, Bergsonian and Sufi conceptions of time, expressed in terms of durée and intuition, impacted Tanpınar's understanding of personal and intuitive time. The phrases "evocative," "echo," "sublime," "eternal," "immaculate," and "bliss" in the statement above, in particular, reveal his concept of time as length. All of these words are associated with pure intuitive time because, like pure time, they provide a transcendental way of experiencing time, challenging the liberal heritage of modernity's conventional view of time and its universalist claims (Kaya, 2018). As a result, because it values plurality and variety above uniformity and standardization, pure time allows for a culturally distinct conception of the contemporary.

Although Tanpınar's intuitive experience reminds the reader of the Sufis, Kaplan (2001) argues that it differs from theirs because the speaker in Tanpınar's instance does not sever all links to the mundane world. According to him, Tanpınar's experience might be described as "floating in a superior environment transcending space, lived location, and time" while simultaneously being aware of both the "practical" and "the beyond." In contrast to the Sufis, Tanpınar is poised between. Tanpınar is more aligned with idealist philosophy and spiritualism in the Western sense than with Sufi mysticism. As he "eternalizes his emotional side on an individual basis," Tanpınar is diametrically opposed to the Sufis, who advocate "death before physical death (Çetin, 2002)."

Tanpınar considers the modernization efforts of both the Ottoman and Turkish states as a cultural rupture, a sudden shift of society in order to accomplish a universal civilizing

aim, and he prioritizes continuity and duration above drastic break with tradition (Dolcerocca, 2017).

Tanpınar expresses his dissatisfaction with Turkey's modernisation process in *The Time Regulation Institute* by depicting a fictitious entity, *The Time Regulation Institute*, that imposes its definition of time and mathematical time and intrudes on and governs individuals' lives. The time-regulation institution's idea of time right is regarded as mathematical time, upon which Turkey's modernisation effort was built (Kaya, 2018).

This temporal conceptualization operates based on an economic logic known as instrumental rationality, which views humans as a means to an end. From this vantage point, *Halit* the Regulator says that their work is critical in that it is a social obligation because they "educate people that having a relationship with time and hours is the very consciousness of time." This is why our institute was founded. We are involved in a social issue. "We are here to provide a service (Tanpınar, 2017)."

On the other hand, According to Tanpınar, as we see in his novel called "Peace", for a real intellectual to reach integrity in his own personality is the condition for approaching his own reality and the realities of the outside world objectively. Tanpınar, who draws a line between time and eternity, separates them from each other, and has a dualistic worldview or philosophy of life, emphasizes that as he believes in the unity and integrity of the universe consisting of plurality, man must resemble it in order to understand this whole. Rejecting the abundance of possibilities in time and space, Tanpınar, as a modernist writer, believed that all issues in time and space could be solved with the mind. However, it states that the truth or ultimate truth is accessible to those who exceed the limits of scientific findings (Kantarcıoğlu, 2004 ).

### 5.6.2. Longing and Melancholy

The melancholy tone of the Turkish post-imperial novel is characterized by the memory or image of the empire as both a lost object and a lost history, which serves as a frame of reference for retrospection and longing.

The term "Ottoman Myth" refers to a wide range of different retrospective narratives, all of which have the same overarching theme of "(post-)imperial sorrow." On the one hand, sadness is a concept that is tied to the loss of a specific political, cultural, and symbolic order

that is retroactively and literary recalled or imagined as Ottoman lifeworlds. This order was present under the Ottoman Empire. On the other side, the "Empire", or what is evoked as such, frequently serves as a prism through which authors or their narrators and protagonists explain what is regarded as the evils of contemporary society, such as modernization, westernization, or nationalism. Therefore, melancholy is inextricably linked to what is known as the *Doğu-Batı Meselesi* (East-West Topic) in Turkish literature, as well as links to more general questions such as modernization and progress, which are also brought up in Central European discourses from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It shows how the Ottoman Myth has developed and changed throughout the history of modern Turkish literature by using illustrative literary texts written by authors such as Ahmet Mithat, Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem, Peyami Safa, Halide Edib Adıvar and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (Chovanec, 2021).

History and memory are interconnected, yet they cannot be merged into a single entity. Memory is of a more personal nature, and as it implies a shared interpretation of the past, it becomes codified and cemented within the context of the present. Memory, more than history, connects to the search for identity in that individuals and societies attempt to comprehend the past in order to influence the present and the future. More than its history, the Ottoman past is being reconstructed through the film industry, media, modern architecture, art, music, and literature inside new opportunity spaces. The need to articulate these memories, which represent the substance of neo-Ottomanism, manifests itself occasionally in "fashion-plate, historicist" cultural creations and literary expressions that indicate "the desperate attempt to reclaim a missing past (Yavuz, 2016)."

Tanpınar investigates the ways in which the collective imagination is connected to various points in history. Early philosophers of the twentieth century were preoccupied with this subject because of the aesthetic, social, cultural, and philosophical reverberations it produced. The uneasiness that is characteristic of this period can be seen in people's preoccupation with their connections to the past. He examines the collective's historical experience by dissecting it into its component parts through the use of questions. Tanpınar's attention on daüssla (homesickness), the "second time," artık (residue), hüzn (melancholy), and haste (nostalgia), as well as urban decay, resonates in a number of ways, including wish imagery, collective awakening, the flash of recognition, and the usage of theological concepts (Dolcerocca, 2015).

In the introduction to Beşşehir, Tanpinar emphasizes the "problem" of duality and comparison. He claims that his motivation in this work is reconciliation with the Seljuk-Ottoman past in order to resolve the issue of modern Turkish identity on both an individual and a social level. In his own words, he writes as "a man of the heart" rather than an "engineer" and as a person dedicated to allowing "the second time" of the past to speak. "There is another time right next to the one in which we live, laugh, enjoy ourselves, work, and make love," he says. "It is a time that is vastly different, much deeper, and unrelated to the calendar and the clock (Ertürk, 2008)."

In Ankara, the first of the title's five locations, the famed Ottoman travel writer Evliya Çelebi of the seventeenth century comes to life and joins Tanpinar on a modern city walk. In Istanbul, the memory of an elderly neighbour from Tanpinar's youth returns as a tableau vivant (she repeats the names of Istanbul's springs deliriously in an attempt to cure herself). In the Ottoman capital Bursa, Tanpınar recalls the establishment of the empire in the fourteenth century (Ertürk, 2008).

In Tanpınar's teleology, which transforms the mythical historicism of official nationalism, the Seljuk past is likened to the Gothic period of Europe. In contrast, the Ottoman period is a type of golden age, the Turkish Renaissance. The focus of Beş şehir gradually shifts from time and memory to language, from what is remembered to how it is remembered in a language undergoing profound change. In Istanbul, Tanpinar writes: *"*I am searching for a lost world; I am running from mirage to mirage. Every spring I run toward, mysterious faces reach out to me; lips I do not recognize and voices I do not recognize speak ceaselessly to me in a language I do not comprehend. When my soul departs their lips, I realize nothing has changed. Perhaps they are describing... their struggles. "We were similar to you," they say. "You will not discover the answers to your inquiries. The only reality is the yearning within you." They make me hear the overture of Ferahfeza... or see the cypress groves of Karacaahmed to stoke this flame of longing. They provide me with a stack of names resembling the shattered marble pieces of erefabad's pools, forms I can fill with my ongoing (Tanpınar, 2021, s. 56-57).*"*

The fact that "Neither am I inside time" by Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar has retained its uniqueness for decades demonstrates Tanpınar's fascination with time, which is also important to his prose.

"I am neither within time,

Nor entirely beyond it;

But in the fragmented flux

Of an all-embracing, indivisible moment”.

Tanpınar himself portrayed this event as the whole of humanity and the world (cosmos). Let us read Tanpınar's opinion on Neither am I inside Time: Neither am I inside Time. "Time represents the manner of poetry, the fusion of cosmos and humanity, which is a form of meditation and dream state. This has nothing to do with the variables and quirks of an actual dream. In any event, for my poetic sensibilities, the emotion accompanying certain dreams is more important than the dream itself. This emotion is crucial (Tanpınar, 2013, p. 45)."

The lost past is also a big part of the writings of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1901–1962), a writer and literary scholar who lived through both imperial and national times. Tanpınar shows Istanbul as a doorway to the Ottoman past and as a place where a Turkish "nation" and national identity must begin. In his works, one of Tanpınar's central questions is how much the legacy of the Ottoman Empire can or should be a part of Turkey's national identity. In Tanpınar's novel Huzur (Tanpınar, 2013), the main character, Mümtaz, wanders through Istanbul's streets and bazaars or takes the ferry to the islands and thinks about the lost link between the city's imperial past and the national present. Mümtaz worries about the present and loses himself in the Ottoman Empire's past. His sadness is not just about the imperial history of Istanbul; it is also about his lover Nuran, whom he is afraid to lose even though they are still together. Nuran and Istanbul seem to be linked in Mümtaz's mind. They both remind him of the past and have a beauty he can never fully understand or own. Maybe this is why Istanbul is the focus of Tanpınar's collection of essays, Beş Şehir (Tanpınar, 2021), in which he writes the most about the Ottoman capital. Many paragraphs start with the words "in old Istanbul". Istanbul used to be a pompous imperial capital city, but Tanpınar has seen it change into a place of looking back, remembering, and longing. He often uses the words "daüssıla" (nostalgia, longing), "hasret" (longing and yearning), and "sıla hasreti"(homesickness) to describe a sad mood caused by an Istanbul that has lost its original character. It is interesting that Tanpınar also talks about feeling hüzün when he looks at Istanbul's landscape. This idea of collective melancholy can be seen in Tanpınar's books.

Unlike Tanpınar's previous book, Huzur, which envisioned a synthesis of the imperial past and the national present, "the Ottoman past that Tanpınar had hoped to rescue for his goal of synthesis appears in The Time Regulation Institute as a plaything of frauds and charlatans". According to Mishra (2013), "the tone is nostalgic": Hayri Irdal's joyful childhood, isolated from the principles of modern society, is melancholy juxtaposed with the "individual liberations offered by the modern state." The stringent time control and fragmentation reflect the current concept of efficiency and the credo of not wasting time. Tanpınar demonstrates that no practical tasks can be completed in the "saved" time. However, Ottoman lifeworlds are irretrievably lost due to the Kemalist project's break with the supposedly backward Ottoman past and replacement with manufactured traditions and personalities. Tanpınar's Institute, like the new nation-building narratives in Turkey, need connections to the past while developing a different form of self in the present. Past phenomena that do not fit with this new self-conception, such as Nuri Efendi, are eliminated from the narrative, making room (or creating the demand) for fabrication (Chovanec, 2021).

### 5.6.3. Cultural Duality

With the implementation of the drastic Westernization/modernization initiative in 1923, when the conventional social and political order was shattered, the problem of cultural dualism, which had been encountered since the Tanzimat, became much more pronounced. The Kemalist modernization project comprised an increase in social assistance, a new industrialization policy, a modernization centred on capitalism, and, most crucially, the secularization of all aspects of social life. Consequently, Kemalism, progressivism, secularism, nationalism, solidarity, positivism, and scientism would serve as the ideal structure's foundations. The Kemalist constructivist political style was based on Enlightenment beliefs that a new society might be built through the application of reason and science (Öztaş, 2003).

Turan Alptekin makes us feel that Tanpınar has reached an important interpretation on the subject of "duality". The following information is noteworthy in Tanpınar's lecture notes:

“Tanzimat is a movement to take something from the West. Namık Kemal brings some literary forms, Hamid romance, Servet-i Fünûn a sensitivity. In this period, we are always in the middle of a duality. It comes from our inability to handle our own issues. Servet-i Fünûn became theatrical because it did not adopt its place. This behavior ends with Yahya Kemal.

It is the Turkish people being European. He is the man who ended the Orient and Western duality" (Alptekin, 2001, s. 83).

At the centre of Ahmet Hamdi's thought is Turkey's transition from the old to the new, its change of civilization, and the evolution of its social/cultural identity. The changes since the 19th century resulted in a revolution in the political, cultural, and social fields after the establishment of the Republic. Each process has introduced radical changes and detachment from the past. The French Revolution also aimed to put distance between the past and reconstitute everything. These changes are paradigm shifts and can alter traditions that are considered the most permanent (Demiralp, 2012).

Tanpınar's legacy as a writer and critic has been moulded mostly by the critical arguments concerning Ottoman Islamic cultural heritage in the newly created Republic of Turkey, a duality easily converted into a "clash of civilizations" narrative (Dolcerocca, 2017).

Tanpınar aimed to create a continuity between the past and the present because he believed that new literature would require historical foundations. The ideology of the Turkish Republican Party was intent on severing its ties to Ottoman culture, choosing instead for legendary origins. A European perspective on the emerging Turkish country. This philosophy benefited from Tanpınar's efforts, as he sought to embrace the nation's history and future, strengthening its literature by encasing it in a tradition (Hemmat, 2017).

In other significant ways, though, Tanpınar continues the political heritage of European modernity. Tanpınar's perspective on cultural tradition cannot be seen as a form of aggressive political nationalism that may be exploited as a tool for social and political mobilization or as epistemic essentialism about the concept of culture and tradition. Nonetheless, some of Tanpınar's most significant ideas and writings have, with some justification, been seen as expressing yet another romanticized form of conservatism or traditionalism. Many critics, including his supporters and detractors, have emphasised this duality in Tanpınar's work (Sezer, 2010).

Tanpınar's relationship with tradition, the past, and religion has caused both the exclusion and rejection of these traits, which are the characteristics of Turkey's modernization mentality. As a result, right-wingers and left-wing extremists have characterized him as conservative and right-wing. However, his objective is to bring Turkey into the modern era. He considers his connection to the past to be a means of enhancing his

life in the here and now. This position was institutionalized and expanded with the invention of the printing press, which has been remembering the forgotten past from the year 1500. When examined from the perspective of a modernist mentality, the Renaissance and Reformation movements are seen as reactionary activities. It did not act in the West with an ideology that categorically refutes the past, just as it did not act in Turkey with such an idea. Additionally, while looking forward, I did not forget to look back by checking the history. Despite the fact that this is precisely what Tanpınar did, it caused him to have a conservative appearance for many years (Dellaloğlu, 2016).

On the Other hand, instead of going deep right into the texts and the specific problems they deal with, some critics have tended to focus on things that have nothing to do with the way the works were made, like the effects of Turkey's westernization on the main characters in Tanpınar's work. So, only weak connections have been made between how Turkish society is made up of two different cultures and how the characters are divided within themselves. Modern Turkish literature shows and talks about Turkey's move from a premodern to a modern social environment (whether one wants to characterize this in terms of an East-West conflict or not). The specific inner dynamics of Tanpınar's story, on the other hand, are somewhere else, so this problem is not a good way to understand him. Tanpınar wanted to change the rules of how to write prose in Turkey at the time because he had a modernist view of art. He wanted to be "global" and "lasting" instead of "local" and "temporary." So, it would be a contradiction to say that Tanpınar wrote "modern" and "literary" works but that his work hasn't been defined in terms of how it relates to Turkey's social and cultural issues. Tanpınar made "self-contained" and "self-sufficient" works because his modernist philosophy pushed people to separate themselves from "the demands of the day and life (Oğuzertem, 1990)."

His connection with the past confines it to a magical realm beyond the grasp of reason and is only available to the observer as a source of enjoyment. This preoccupation with the past is the result of an attitude inherited by Tanpınar from the Republican ideology, which views the European intellectual as a privileged subject capable of logical and scientific activities. This approach demonstrates a self-orientalizing rationalism, in which contact with the past or the East happens as if they were foreign, irrational, and hence incapable of intellectual discourse (Hemmat, 2017).

There were two Hamdies with the definition of Hilmi Ziya Ülken. One who lives the inexpressible and sees reality like an engineer. He was a poet in one and a reasoner in the other. When he passed on to the second, he would see the events with clarity and judge like a judge. When two poets and scholars shared these two people, we could easily follow them. But sometimes, these two people would come together and fight. In the same story, in the same prose, two worldviews and two styles chase each other, and the transition from poet to reasoner surprises us. Sometimes a third Hamdi would appear: the poet, disturbed by the rigidity of the events, would suppress his bitter scalpel to his daily existence and mockery of the world. He used all kinds of it, from soft jokes to satire. But there were also two Hamdi in social life: one scruffy and the other stylish, one shabby, the other neat, one contented, the other charitable, one self-indulgent, the other extremely hardworking, one weak and weak, the other strong and strong-willed. These two Hamdi lived side by side, fighting with each other as if they were body and soul, and they could never come into harmony. The same duality could be seen between Hamdi, who was extremely devoted, loyal, and responsible to his relatives, and Hamdi, who was indifferent and indifferent even to himself (Akay, 2012).

### 5.6.4. Transformation, Change and Continuity

Tanpınar examined the terrible results of the new nation-building effort, which had aimed to eradicate all Ottoman sensibility, art, and language, to critique the forced modernizing process and the dehistoricisation of the Turkish identity. One of the most important reform initiatives of the modernizing elite was to purge the Turkish language of all Arabic and Persian forms of Ottoman nouns. Tanpınar resisted by incorporating Ottoman terms into his writing, which made him unpopular among modernist-secularist authors. As he focused on bits of the past that articulated Ottoman culture, he was regarded as a conservative and reactionary. Tanpınar emphasized the continuity of tradition by filtering the essence of modernity via the shared vernacular practices of Ottoman culture rather than rejecting the westernization changes. Between modernism and tradition, between the West and the East, the Turkish people were frequently invoked in his works. Simply, they did not exclusively reside in one location but rather simultaneously in two. The westernization-committed Kemalist elite harshly criticized his work (Yavuz, 2016).

In his essays, Tanpınar criticizes a mixture of nationalism and cultural conservatism. Tanpınar was a man of possibilities. The central tenet of Tanpınar's perspective is reconciling European principles with a revived cultural legacy and historical continuity. In several significant ways, Tanpınar does criticize the positivistic and atomistic moral and political viewpoints of some of modernity's proponents. This strand of Tanpınar's philosophy is made abundantly evident when he conveys the existential implications of his key concepts, such as 'continuity' and 'tradition (Sezer, 2010).

The Turkish modernization project is marked by "break," "rupture," and "crisis," and his concept of terkip can be viewed as a solution to the challenges caused by the Turkish modernization effort. Tanpınar interprets modernity through the lens of Bergsonian and Sufi ideas. In Tanpınar's novel, the distinction between categories such as the traditional, the past, and the East and the modern, the present, and the West dissolves as a result of his use of Sufi music and a Bergsonian understanding of pure time. According to Tanpınar, Turkish modernity can be attained through terkip, which means "to change by continuing and to continue by changing (Kaya, 2018).”

The concept of "continuity in change," or the coexistence of evolution and preservation of the past traditions (terkip), and a formulation of time that is comparable to Bergson's "pure time" or "durée" are foundational to Tanpınar's novels, which are informed by a sense of discontent and a critique of the modernization project in Turkey. Tanpınar's novels present a vision of the modern that is influenced by this critique. Because Tanpınar's problematization and criticism of the idea of the time advocated by the modernization project carried out in Turkey seem to be founded on a Bergsonian conceptualization of time, Tanpınar's fiction lends itself to a Bergsonian analysis. This is because of Tanpınar's problematization and criticism of the idea of the time advocated by the modernization project carried out in Turkey. Additionally, in Tanpınar's works, a tradition is considered a source of cultural creativity, and its participation in "the process of coming to terms with the past" is emphasized (Göle, 2017). Tanpınar contends that "Turkish reality" is influenced by events of the past, and in this way, history itself can be understood as a ghost that needs to be faced. Because it cannot be contained within the confines of either spatial or temporal boundaries, the Bergsonian conception of "pure time" enables him to bring about, in his fiction, the process of making amends with the past. This is made possible by the "pure time" concept. In addition, Tanpınar, whose thoughts in his fiction are in agreement with the perspective

supplied by the Multiple Modernities approaches, searches for ways to synchronize the regional and traditional particularities of culture with the contemporary (Kaya, 2018).

Tanpınar's conviction in continuity has always been seen as his strongest link to the past, as well as his connection to the Ottomans and Seljuks. Tanpınar has one of Huzur's primary characters, İhsan, remark about the necessity of continuity: “And we are grateful to be here before the sea, at this spring hour, at this restaurant. Later, we will endeavour to construct a New Life that is unique to us and appropriate for our language. Life is ours to shape in whatever way we see fit. And as it takes shape, it will sing its melody. Nevertheless, we will not interfere with art or ideas in any way! We will let them go because they seek ultimate independence. A myth does not appear out of thin air just because we desire it. No, it arises through social interactions. But to sever connections with the past and isolate ourselves from the West! Never, who do you believe we are? We are the epitome of flavour and joy in the East. Everything wishes for our perseverance and continuation (Tanpınar, 2013, p. 50).”

The past, according to Tanpınar (2000), "Stands right beside us, sometimes like a victim, sometimes as a lost paradise—as it's a treasure that ensures our wholeness of spirit; and at the slightest uncertainty the past opens before us with the glimmer of an oasis; it calls to us, and when it doesn't, it makes us doubt our lives, [causing] hesitation and a kind of guilty conscience. Tanpınar's ideas of synthesis and continuity include the past as a crucial element; this view runs against the national core narrative and the Kemalist Cultural Revolution. When the concept of society is established, the sadness of fate is diminished since, unlike the individual, society does not experience death. There is continuity there. The chain will endure for all eternity. As individuals, that is, when people depart from the collective awareness, they are nothing but a collection of flaws. As they enter and embrace society's lifestyle, these deficits are overcome. Only society and its historical embodiment, the country, can resist the passage of time and the ravages of fate (Tanpınar, 2000).

In conclusion, Dellaloğlu (2011, p. 15) in his article “Gelenek Meselesi”, says: We have absolutely no interest in what Tanpınar refers to as "continuing while changing, changing while continuing." We disregard Hegel's well-known concept of "Aufhebung," which might be regarded as one of the essential characteristics of the West and modernity and, in essence, signifies the same thing. In reality, Tanpınar's phrase resembles Hegel's. We do not believe that the concept is roughly equivalent. Because we believe that transformation

and continuity are opposites, we interpret them as actions. We consider a change to be the cessation of continuing and the absence of all continuance. We equate the notion of tradition to simple continuation. In actuality, tradition is a concept that "changes while it continues, persists as it changes." Tradition is already amenable to change. Tradition resembles the flow of gifts from the past to the present in that it changes and persists. Man is an institution. Perhaps since he was able to continue by altering, he was able to continue by altering. But dinosaurs are no longer considered a tradition. Perhaps it's because others cannot accomplish what they can. Tradition can only persist through undergoing change, transformation, and adaptation. To continue to exist as an absolute self is in humans.

# CONCLUSION

The thesis asserts that in the postmodern world of today, a singular directive or strategy cannot effectively address the complexities and nuances of societal issues. The advent of the quantum era and advances in technology have disclosed that reality is not restricted to binary distinctions of 0 and 1. Rather, an infinite number of variables exist between these two extremes. The transition from Newtonian to quantum physics has made it exceedingly difficult to define social phenomena and establish distinct boundaries. Therefore, it is evident that a comprehensive comprehension of complex social issues necessitates a nuanced and multifaceted approach.

In addition, the thesis emphasizes that humans are inherently complex and that objective and scientific analyses alone cannot encompass the entirety of the human experience. Recognizing the limitations of data-driven decision-making alone, the thesis emphasizes the importance of incorporating emotions, cultural factors, and historical context in order to comprehend societies. Societies may be becoming more similar as a result of capitalism's dominance, but the concept of "soul" remains prominent. Geographical location, language, and shared history continue to disseminate as an intangible yet influential spirit between societies. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar understood the significance of recognizing and preserving this spirit in societal analysis, as it contains valuable insights that cannot be documented by objective data alone.

On the other hand, the thesis casts light on the process of positivism's arrival in Turkey and the resulting changes. With its emphasis on empirical observation and measurable phenomena, positivism attempted to analyze social events in a laboratory setting. It restricted reality to what could be directly perceived, disregarding the significance of intangibles. However, the thesis challenges this reductionist viewpoint and contends for the necessity of applying scientific theories to social transformations while taking into account the larger sociocultural context. It emphasizes that successful implementation of scientific theories necessitates comprehension of the essence and significance of the transferred project. Otherwise, only superficial aspects of the project can be imported, while its fundamental principles and values are disregarded.

In conclusion, the purpose of this thesis is to contribute to the literature in the field of political science by providing a deeper comprehension of the Ottoman-Turkish modernization process and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's perspective within that context. Through an examination of Tanpınar's writings and responses to the societal transformations of his time, this thesis intends to inspire additional research and analysis. In addition to emphasizing the need to consider emotions, cultural factors, and historical context when attempting to comprehend societies, the thesis argues against a data-driven and deterministic approach. By embracing complexity and adopting a multidimensional perspective, it is possible to gain a deeper comprehension of societal issues and transformations.

The literary personality of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar has been emphasized in the majority of studies on him. There are very few studies that see Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar as a philosopher. Bringing Tanpınar to the forefront with this aspect will provide a better understanding of him. In our country, a sufficient linkage has not been established between the literature and political science disciplines. However, throughout history, there have always been poets and men of letters who directed the rulers or satirized them. Folk poets played an important role in our history before western publications like novels and theatre arrived. These poets have done great things to transmit oral culture and announce issues that concern society. Various publications, propaganda, and announcement organs have always attracted attention in every period of history after the transition to settled life. Fairs, oral cultural events with saz, and various shows have been held. It would be wrong to see these events as just entertainment. These are the areas where political, social, and economic evaluations are made. The Ottoman Empire's poetry, literature, and public performances often contained political content. Modernized Ottoman society also innovated in the means of broadcasting and propaganda and imported novels and theatre from the West.

The same is true for the Russians, who started modernization before the Ottoman Empire. Perhaps the country's political traumas make Russian literature so powerful. This thesis analysed the Ottoman-Turkish modernization adventure and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's reactions to this process. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar has not been dealt with in the whole thesis. The atmosphere that reveals Tanpınar and his points of view has been attempted to explain. Therefore, it has been possible to see that the revolutions made during the establishment of the Republic of Turkey did not occur in a day. There is a long history behind most of the decisions taken in the Republican period. It is also stated in this thesis, with its reasons and

results, that it would be wrong to attribute all transformations and revolutions only to Atatürk.

Islam, the distinctive identity of Ottoman and Turkish society, has profoundly transformed the ideologies that have come to this society. The association of conservatism with Islam is an example of this. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar is not a conservative, as seen throughout the thesis. Tanpınar is a pro-modern thinker. In this thesis, Tanpınar's personal life and his changing feelings are also included. In our opinion, societies and history cannot be understood without emotions. A chronological understanding of history can give a general idea but cannot convey everything. Therefore, societies have feelings and emotions just as individuals do. If these characteristics are ignored and policymakers make deterministic decisions based on data alone, the margin of error will be great. This is the case even in today's societies where capitalism is dominant and people are increasingly similar. Even though societies are becoming more and more similar, the concept of the "soul" still remains prominent. The geography where people live, the language they speak, and their common history circulate among societies as an imaginary spirit. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar has worked to ensure that the existence of this spirit is not ignored. This thesis also mentions the process of the arrival of positivism in Turkey and the changes and transformations it caused. Positivism also tried to examine social events in the laboratory. According to positivism, things that exist are only what we can perceive. The rest are just assumptions.

The main thing in social transformations is applying the theories scientists produce in societies. The main goal of social transformations is to apply science to theories. The first thesis wants to give is that in today's post-modern world, it is no longer possible to talk about a single directive. In this period, when we experience the quantum age, everything is not just 1 or 0. Today's technology also says that there is an infinite variable between 0 and 1. It is extremely difficult to define or draw the boundaries of a social issue in the recent transition from Newtonian to quantum physics. Almost 60 years after Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's death, it is recognized that objective and scientific analyses of human beings are impossible. The second important message is: A project that has been successful in one society may fail in another society, even if the same conditions are created. Adaptation is as important as transfer in modernization processes. Understanding the meaning of the project to be transferred is also very important. Otherwise, only the showcased part of the project will be imported, and its essence will not be understood. The "hat" or "gymnastics" law enacted in

Turkey is an example of this. Modernity is a philosophy. It is the only duty of an intellectual to understand this philosophy and not to glorify it. It won't help to ignore or eliminate the things a society builds up over time.

In conclusion, I would like this thesis to contribute to the literature in the field of political science. I hope that this modest study will be useful to those who follow the Ottoman-Turkish modernization process and those interested in the history of conservatism in Turkey. In addition, better recognition of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's re-reading of his works, especially by political scientists and sociologists, will pave the way for new research. Examining not only Tanpınar but also other thinkers who lived in the same period as Tanpınar will provide great gains for the history of the Turkish Revolution.

## REFERENCES


Akay, M. O. (2012). *Bir Hülya Adamının Romanı Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar* . İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları .

Akay, M. O. (2013). Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar . In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 567 - 570). Ankara : Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları .

Aktaşlı, H. U. (2011). Türk Muhafazakarlığı ve Kemalizm: Diyalektik Bir İlişki . *Doğu Batı* , 147-163.

Alatlı, A. (2010). *Batıya Yön Veren Metinler IV - Moderniteye Doğru Kaotik Modern Dünya* -. İstanbul: Everest.

Alatlı, A. (2010). *Batıya Yön Veren Metinler, Kökler / Orta Çağlar* . İstanbul : İlke Eğitim ve Sağlık Vakfı Kapadokya Meslek Yüksek Okulu .

Alptekin, T. (2001). *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Bir Kültür, Bir İnsan.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Anscombe, F. E. (2010). Islam And The Age Of Ottoman Reform. *Past & Present*, 159-189.

Aydın, M. (2013). *Kayıp Zamanın İzinde Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar.* İstanbul: Doğu Batı Yayınları .

Ayers, D. (1992). *Wyndham Lewis.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ayvazoğlu, B. (2006). Türk Muhafazakârlığının Kültürel Kuruluşu . In M. G. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce* (p. 509). İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları .

Bayraktar, L. (2015). Henri Bergson. In B. A. Çetinkaya, & Ş. Öçal , *Doğu'dan Batı'ya Düşüncenin Serüveni* (Vol. 4, pp. 223-267). İstanbul : İnsan Yayınları .

Beckstein, M. (2016). Conservatism. In I. Z. Dénes, *Conservative Ideology in the Making* (pp. 333-335). The Monist .

Beneton, P. (2016). *Muhafazakarlık.* (C. Akalın, Trans.) İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bergson, H. (1907). *L'ivolution Crgatrice.* Paris : Puf .

Berkes, N. (2013). *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma.* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Bingöl, Y. (2004). Kimlik Tartışmaları Işığında Türk Dil Politikaları. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 59*(1).

Bingöl, Y., & Pakiş , A. (2016). Milliyetçiliğin Anadolucu Söylemde Yeniden Üretimi. *Amme idaresi Dergisi* , 1-27.

Birlik, N. (2007). Tanpınar's Attempts to go beyond the Temporal Reality: ‘The Dance’, a Bergsonian Analysis. *Middle Eastern Literatures, 10*(2), 175-183.

Bora, T., & Burak , O. (2006). Nostalji ve Muhafazakârlık. In M. G. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 5, Muhafazakârlık* (pp. 234-261). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bozdaloğlu, Y. (2008). Modernity, Identity and Turkey's Foreign Policy. *Insight Turkey*, 55-75.

Britannica, T. E. (2022, October 14). *Henri Bergson. Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com: https://www.britannica.com/biography/Henri-Bergson

Calkins, M. W. (1912). Henri Bergson: Personalist. *The Philosophical Review, 21*(6), 666-675.

Carroll, L. (2008). Sowing the Seeds of Modernity on the Ottoman Frontier: Agricultural Investment and the Formation of Large Farms in Nineteenth-Century Transjordan. *Archaeologies, 4*(2), 233-249.

Cevizci, A. (2011). *Thales' ten Baudrillard'a Felsefe Tarihi.* İstanbul: Say Yayınları .

Chovanec, J. (2021). The Ottoman Myth in Turkish Literature; Identity in Times of Nationalism: Post-imperial Melancholy in the Turkish Novel . In J. Chovanec, & O. Heilo , *Narrated Empires Perceptions of Late Habsburg and Ottoman Multinationalism.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Comte, A. (2001). *Pozitif Felsefef Kursları.* (E. Ataçay, Trans.) Sosyal Yayınlar.

Conrad, S. (2012). Enlightenment in Global History: A Historiographical Critique. *The American Historical Review, 117*(4), 999-1027.

Çağlıyan, Z. (2006). Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Sentezci Muhafazakarlığında "Değişim": Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Türk Modernleşmesi . *Muhafazakar Düşünce Dergisi*, 79-100.

Çakır, C. (2004). Türk Aydınının Tanzimatla İmtihanı: Tanzimat ve Tanzimat Dönemi Siyasi Tarihi Üzerine Yapılan Çalışmalar . *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* , 9-69 .

Çetin, N. (2002). Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın Şiiri (Poetry of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar). *Hece, 6*(61), 39-56.

Çiğdem, A. (2006). Sunuş. In T. Bora, & M. Gütekin , *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce* (Vol. 5, pp. 13-19). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Çiğdem, A. (2008). *Akıl ve toplumun özgürleşimi: Jürgen Habermas ve eleştirel epistemoloji üzerine bir çalışma.* İletişim Yayınları .

Çubukçu, A. (2013). Türkiye'de Rejim ve Pozitivizm . In O. Geridönmez, *Bilim ve Düşünce Kitap Dizisi, 3.* (p. 16). Evrensel Basım Yayın .

Danforth, N. (2014). Multi-Purpose Empire: Ottoman History in Republican Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies, 50*(4), 655-678.

Dellaloglu", B. F. (2011). Gelenek Meselesi. *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 43-46.

Dellaloğlu, B. F. (2012). Tanpınar'ın muhafazakarlığı meselesi . In H. İnci, *Tanpınar Zamanı Son Bakışlar* (p. 85). İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları.

Dellaloğlu, B. F. (2014). Muhafazakarlıkla Modernleşmeciliğin Kavşağında Türkiye: Tanpınar ve Narmanlı Han . *Muhafazakar Düşünce* , 114-127.

Dellaloğlu, B. F. (2016). *Modernleşmenin Zihniyet Dünyası: Bir Tanpınar Fetişizmi [Mentality Realm of Modernization: A Tanpınar Fetishism].* İstanbul: Kadim Yayınları.

Demiralp, O. (1993). *Kutup Noktası* . İstanbul : Yapı Kredi Yayınları .

Demiralp, O. (2012). Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar . In U. Kocabaşoğlu, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cit 3, Modernleşme ve Batıcılık* (pp. 24-36). İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları .

Deringil, S. (1993). The Invention of Tradition as Public Image in the Late Ottoman Empire, 1808 to 1908. *Comparative Studies in Society and History, 35*(1), 3-29.

Dolcerocca, Ö. N. (2015). Chronometrics in the Modern Metropolis: the City, the Past and Collective Memory inA.H. Tanpınar. *MLN, Comparative Literature Issue: Practices of the Ordinary, 130*(5), 1150-1178.

Dolcerocca, Ö. N. (2017). “Free spirited clocks”: modernism, temporality and The Time Regulation Institute. *Middle Eastern Literatures, 20*(2), 177-197.

Dunk, H. v. (1982). Conservatism in the Netherlands. In Z. Layton-Henry, *Conservatıve Politics in Western Europe* (pp. 182-203). London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Ebaugh, H. (2010). Islam and the State Throughout Turkish History. In *The Gülen Movement.* Springer, Dordrecht.

Emrence, C. (2007). Three Waves of Late Ottoman Historiography. *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin*, 137-151.

Enginün, İ., & Kerman, Z. (2007). *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar’la Başbaşa, İstanbul.* İstanbul : Dergah Yayınları.

Ertürk, N. (2008). Modernity and Its Fallen Languages: Tanpınar's "Hasret", Benjamin's Melancholy. *Modern Language Association, 123*(1), 41-56.

Ertürk, N. (2017). Tanpınar’s Futures, in English. *Middle Eastern Literatures*, 264-265.

Featherstone, M. (2007). Modernıty and Culture: Orıgıns, Varıetıes and Trajectorıes. In V. Schmidt, *Modernity at the Beginning of the 21st Century* (p. 115). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Fillafer, F. L., Feichtinger, J., & Surman, J. (2018). *Introduction: Particularizing Positivism.* Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Findley, C. V. (2010). *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity: A History.* Yale University Press.

Gaonkar, D. P. (1999). On Alternative Modernities. *Public Culture, 11*(1), 98-112.

Gencer, B. (2012). *İslam'da Modernleşme 1839 - 1939.* Doğu Batı Yayınları .

Gencer, B. (2014). *İslamda Modernleşme .* Ankara : Doğu Batı Yayınları.

Giddens, A. (2010). *Modernite ve Bireysel-Kimlik - Geç Modern Çağda Benlik ve Toplum.* İstanbul: Say Yayınları.

Gillespie, M. A. (2008). *The Theological Origins of Modernity.* University of Chicago Press.

Göknar, E. (2003). Ottoman Past and Turkish Future: Ambivalence in A. H. Tanpinar's Those outside the Scene. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 647-661.

Göle, N. (2017). Snapshots of Islamic modernities. In Multiple Modernities . *Routledge* , 91-118.

Greifer, E. (1961). Joseph de Maistre and the Reaction Against the Eighteenth Century. *The American Political Science Review, 55*(3), 591-598.

Gündüz, M. (2008). ll. Meşrutiyet İdeolojilerinde Sosyoloji ve Geleceğin Toplum Tasavvuru. *Doğu Batı*(45), 149-173.

Güngörmez, B. (2004). Muhafazakar Paradigma: Dogma ve Önyargı. *Muhafazakâr Düşünce Dergisi , 1(1),*, 11-30.

Gürpınar, D. (2013). The Reinvention of Kemalism: Between Elitism, Anti-Elitism and Anti-Intellectualism. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 454-476.

Hamnett, B. (2011). *The Historical Novel in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Representations of Reality in History and Fiction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hamnett, B. (2012). Modernism and Beyond . In B. Hamnett, *The Historical Novel in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Representations of Reality in History and Fiction* (pp. 285-302). Oxford : Oxford Academic.

Hançerlioğlu, O. (2010). *Felsefe Sözlüğü .* Remzi Kitabevi .

Hartung, F. H. (2013). Pozitivizmin Sosyolojisi. In O. Geridönmez, *Bilim ve Düşünce Kitap Dizisi, 3.* (p. 200). Evrensel Basım Yayın .

Hemmat, A. O. (2017). The Past as an Object: Orientalist Fantasies. *Middle Eastern Literatures, 20*(2), 232-251.

Heper, M. (2000). The Ottoman Legacy and Turkish Politics. *Journal of International Affairs*, 63-82.

Heywood, A. (2013). *Siyaset.* (B. Ş. Çev. BB Özipek, Trans.) İstanbul: Adres Yayınları.

İrem, N. (2002). Turkish Conservative Modernism: Birth of a National Quest for Cultural Renewal. *Int. J. Middle East Studies*, 87-112.

İrem, N. (2004). Undercurrents of European Modernity and the Foundations of Modern Turkish. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 79-112.

İrem, N. (2006). Bir Değişim Siyaseti Olarak Türkiye'de Cumhuriyetçi Muhafazakarlık: Temel Kavramlar Üzerine Değerlendirmeler. In M. G. Tanıl Bora, *Modern*

*Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 5 Muhafazakarlık* (pp. 105-118). İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları .

Irzık, S. (2017). What if one day things go mad?: the unruly objects of Tanpınar's modernism. *Middle Eastern Literatures*, 198-214.

Işın, E. (2003). *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar* . İstanbul : Yapı Kredi Yayınları .

Kabakcı, E. (2008). Pozitivizmin Türkiye'ye Girişi ve Türk Sosyolojisine Etkisi. *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi, 6*(11), 41-60.

Kahraman, H. B. (2000). Yitirilmemiş Zamanın Ardında: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Muhafazakar Modernliğin Estetik Düzlemi. *Doğu Batı* , 9-45.

Kahraman, H. B. (2000). Yitirilmemiş Zamanın Ardında: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Muhafazakar Modernliğin Estetik Düzlemi . *Doğu Batı Dergisi, sayı:11 Türk Düşünce Serüveni Araftakiler* , 10-43.

Kahraman, H. B., & Keyman, E. F. (1998). Kemalizm, Oryantalizm ve Modernite. *Doğu Batı*, 81-87.

Kalpaklı, F. (2021). Aunty Zarife As A Cultural Fıgure Of Tradıtıon And Transformatıon: Reconstructıon Of Modern Lıfe In Turkey As Reflected In Hamdi Tanpınar's The Tıme Regulatıon Instıtute. *Çukurova Araştırmaları Dergisi* , 407-421.

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with Patriarchy. *Gender and Society*.

Kantarcıoğlu, S. (2004 ). *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Yapıbozumcu ve Semiotik Yaklaşımlar Işığında Tanpınar Hikayeleri* . Ankara : Akçağ Yayınları.

Kaplan, M. (2001). *Tanpınar'ın Şiir Dünyası.* İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Kaplan, M. (2015). *Yavaş Yavaş Aydınlanan Tanpınar* . İstanbul : Dergâh Yayınları .

Karadişoğulları, E. (2005). Dergah Mecmuası'nın Türk Edebiyatı ile Milli Mücadeledeki Yeri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi, 11*(27), 219-226.

Karakas, C. (2007). *Islam and Laicism Between the Interests of State, Politics, and Society.* Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute Frankfurt.

Karışman, S. Ü. (2000). *Ebediyetin Huzurunda Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar.* İstanbul: Ufuk Yayınları.

Karpat, K. H. (1960). Social Themes in Contemporary Turkish Literature: Part I. *Middle East Journal, 14*(1), 29-44.

Karpat, K. H. (1972). The Transformation of the Ottoman State, 1789-1908. *International Journal of Middle East Studies, 3*(3), 243-281.

Kawtharani, W. (2018). The Ottoman Tanzimat and the Constitution. *AlMuntaqa*, 51-65.

Kaya, H. (2018). The Modern in Huxley's Brave New World and Tanpinar's The Time Regulation Institute. *Agathos, 9*(1), 99-114.

Kaya, H. (2019). The Multiple Modernities in Turkish Literature: A. H. Tanpınar’s Liminality or Terkip. *Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Letters*, 282-292.

Kekes, J. (1997). What Is Conservatism? *Philosophy*, 351-374.

Kennedy, E. (1980). Bergson's Philosophy and French Political Doctrines: Sorel, Maurras, Péguy and de Gaulle. *Government and Opposition*, 75-91.

Ketcham, R. (2021). The First Era of Modern Thought, ca. 1600–1750. In R. Ketcham, *The Idea of Democracy in the Modern Era* (pp. 30-39). University Press of Kansas.

Keyman, E. F. (2010). Modernization, Globalization and Democratizationin Turkey: The AKP Experience and its Limits. *Constellations Volume 17*, 312-327.

Kili, S. (1980). Kemalism in Contemporary Turkey. *International Political Science Review / Revue Internationale de Science Politique, 1*(3), 381-404.

Kılınçoğlu, D. T. (2020). Changing Reality through Fiction: A Cognitive. *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association, 7*(1), 205-226.

Kirk, R. (2005). Süreklilik ve Değişim. *Muhafazakar Düşünce, 1 (4)*, 11-26.

Koçak, C. (2011). Yeni Osmanlılar ve Birinci Meşrutiyet. In M. Alkan, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi* (pp. 73-82). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları .

Koray, S. (2005). Tanzimatçılığa Karşı Yeni Osmanlılar. *Bilim ve Ütopya*(132), 16-31.

Korlaelçi, M. (2014). Pozitivizmin Türkiye'ye Girişi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 3*(2), 209-220.

Laberenne, P. (2013). Marksizmin ve Pozitivizmin Sosyal ve Politik Etkileri . In O. Geridönmez, *Pozitivizm* (p. 176). Evrensel Basım Yayın .

Lash, S. (1993). Modernite mi, Modernizm mi? Weber ve Günümüz Toplumsal Teorisi,. In M. Küçük, *Modernite Versus Postmodernite* (p. 133). İstanbul: Vadi Yayınları .

Layton-Henry, Z. (1982). Conservatism and Conservative Politics. In Z. Layton-Henry, *Conservative Politics in Europe* (pp. 2-20). London: The Macmillan Press Ltd. .

Levy, A. (1982). Military Reform and the Problem of Centralization in the Ottoman Empire in the. *Middle Eastern Studies, 18*(3), 227-249.

Makdisi, U. (2002). Ottoman Orientalism. *The American Historical Review*, 768-796.

Mardin, Ş. (2013). *Türk Modernleşmesi* . İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 22.

Mardin, Ş. (2015). *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu.* İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları.

Martinelli, A. (2005). *Global Modernization: Rethinking the Project of Modernity.* SAGE Publications Ltd.

McCormick, P. (2020). *Modernities : Historie Beliefs and Values. Traugott Bautz.* American Psychological Assoc. .

McCormick, P. (2020). *Modernities : Historie Beliefs and Values. Traugott Bautz.* Traugott Bautz.

Meriç ve Karışman, Ü. v. (2006). *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Ebediyetin Huzurunda.* İstanbul: Etkileşim Yayınları.

Mishra, P. (2013). Introduction. In A. H. Tanpınar, *The Time Regulation Institute* (M. Freely, Trans., pp. 6-14). London: Penguin.

Mollaer, F. (2008). *Türkiye'de Liberal Muhafazakarlık ve Nurettin Topçu .* İstanbul : Dergah Yayınları .

Mollaer, F. (2014). *Muhafazakarlığın İki Yüzü.* İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Nabudere, D. W. (1997). Beyond Modernization and Development, or Why the Poor Reject Development. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography, 79*(4), 203-215.

Narski, S. (2013). Pozitivizmin Ortaya Çıkışı ve Gelişimi. In O. Geridönmez, *Bilim ve Düşünce (Kitap Dizisi 3) Pozitivizm.* İstanbul: Evrensel Basım Yayın.

O'Hara, K. (2016). Conservatism, Epistemology, and Value. *The Monist*(99), 423-440.

Oğuzertem, S. (1990). Fictions of Narcissism: Metaphysical and Psychosexual Conflicts in the Stories of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin, 14*(2), 223-233.

Ortaylı, İ. (2011). Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İdari Modernleşme Ve Mahalli İdare Alanındaki Gelişmeler. *İdare Hukuku ve İlimleri Dergisi, 3*(1), 137-148.

Ozman, A. (2010). Law, Ideology and Modernization in Turkey: Kemalist Legal Reforms in Perspective. *Social & Legal Studies, 19*(1), 67-84.

Özipek, B. B. (2006). Muhafazakarlık, Devrim ve Türkiye . In M. G. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce* (pp. 66-85). İstabul : İletişim Yayınları .

Özipek, B. B. (2009). Anglo-Sakson ve Fransız Siyasi Modelleri Arasında Osmanlı ve Cumhuriyet Modernleşmesi . In M. G. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Dönemler ve Zihniyetler* (p. 972). İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları.

Özlem, D. (2002). Türkiye'de Pozitivizm ve Siyase. In T. Bora, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce Modernleşme ve Batıcılık* (pp. 452-464). İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları.

Öztaş, Z. (2003). Türk Modernleşmesi ve Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.

Öztürk, V. (2021). Method in XIX. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Albert Thibaudet's Influence on Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. *Bilig*, 163-180.

Parla, J. (1990). *Babalar Ve Oğullar:Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Pelvanoğlu, E. (2006, Temmuz). Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın Şiir Eleştirisinde Avrupa Merkezlilik. Ankara .

Poyraz, H. (2008). Modernitenin İki Efendisi: Descartes ve Bacon. *Modernizmden Postmodernizme Hece Dergisi Özel Sayısı*, 17-25.

Robert E. Ward, &. D. (1964). Modernization and Politics. In &. D. Robert E. Ward, *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* .

Rumpf, C. (1999). Laizismus, Fundamentalismus und Religionsfreiheit in der Türkei in Verfassung, Recht und Praxis. *Verfassung und Recht in Übersee/Law and Politics in Africa, Asia and Latin America,*, 164-190.

Sezer, D. (2010). The anxiety of cultural authenticity in Turkish communitarian thought: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Peyami Safa on Europe and modernity. *History of European Ideas, 4*(36), 427-437.

Shain, B. A. (2002). Varieties of Conservatism. *Modern Age 44 (1)*, 48-50.

Shannon, J. B. (1962). Conservatism. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 13-24.

Söğütlü, İ. (2011). Tarihsel ve Toplumsal Bağlamı İçinde Kemalizm, Aydınlanma, Muhafazakarlık ilişkisi Üzerine Bir Derkenar. *Doğu Batı* , 163-191.

Suvanto, P. (1997). *Conservatism from the French Revolution to the 1990s.* (J. Campling, Ed., & R. Fletcher, Trans.) London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Şahin, İ. (2012). *Haz ve Günah, Bir Tanpınar Yorumu* . İstanbul : Kapı Yayınları .

Tanpınar, A. H. (1998). *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler.* (Z. Kerman, Ed.) İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Tanpınar, A. H. (2000). *Yaşadığım Gibi.* İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.

Tanpınar, A. H. (2002). *Mücevherlerin Sırrı; Derlenmiş Yazılar Anket ve Röportajlar* . Yapı Kredi Yayınları .

Tanpınar, A. H. (2009). *Aydaki Kadın* . İstanbul : Dergah Yayınları .

Tanpınar, A. H. (2011). *On Dokuzuncu Asır Edebiyat Tarihi.* İstanbul : Dergah Yayınları .

Tanpınar, A. H. (2013). *Huzur.* İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Tanpınar, A. H. (2016). *Mahur Beste.* Dergah Yayınları.

Tanpınar, A. H. (2017). *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü.* Dergah Yayınları .

Tanpınar, A. H. (2021). *Beş Şehir.* İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Tekeli, İ. (2007). *Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşüncenin Gelişimi Konusunda Bir Üst Anlatı* (Vol. 3). (M. G. Tanıl Bora, Ed.) İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları .

Ter-Matevosyan, V. (2019). *Turkey, Kemalism and the Soviet Union.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Tocquivelle, A. d. (2004). *Eski Rejim ve Devrim.* (T. Ilgaz, Trans.) İstanbul: İmge Kitapevi Yayınları.

Toker, N., & Tekin , S. (2012). Batıcı Siyasi Düşüncenin Karakteristikleri ve Evreleri. In T. Bora, & M. Gültekingil , *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Modernleşme ve Batıcılık* (pp. 82-88). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Topçu, N. (2002). *Bergson* . İstanbul : Dergah Yayınları .

Touraine, A. (2002). *& Modernliğin Eleştirisi.* Yapı Kredi Yayınları .

Türkislamoğlu, E. (2015). *Türk Düşünce Dünyasında Tanpınar. "güzel"den yana bir aydın.* Hece Yayınları .

Türköne, M. E. (2006). *Siyaset.* Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Uçman, A. (2006). Değişen Değerler Karşısında Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar . *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi, Cilt 4, Sayı 7* , 479-509.

Ülken, H. Z. (2013). *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi.* İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Vaughan, M. (2007). Henri Bergson's "Creative Evolution". *SubStance,* 7-24.

Weber, A. (1998). *Felsefe Tarihi.* (V. Eralp, Trans.) Ankara: Remzi Kitabevi.

Wishnitzer, A. (2015). Modern Turkey, Real Time, and Other Functional Fabrications in Tanpınar's The Time Regulation Institute. *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association, 2*(2), 379-400.

Yavuz, M. H. (2016). Social and Intellectual Origins of Neo-Ottomanism: Searching for a Post-National Vision. *Die Welt des Islams, 56*(4), 438-465.