

# ON PERCEPTION OF MODERNIZATION AND CULTURE/CIVILIZATION IN THE PROCESS OF TRANSITION FROM OTTOMAN STATE TO REPUBLICAN TURKEY

Asst. Prof. Dr. **Tunca ÖZGİŞİ**  
Yalova University - Turkey

## ABSTRACT

*Perception of culture and civilization has come at the beginning of discussion for Turkey's most important topics of the Turkish history of thought. There is a unique sociological structure of Turkish society. Because it is heritage of a great empire. At the same time, it serves as a bridge between West and East. However, this can sometimes lead to identity conflict. In this respect it is important the perceiving method of Turkish intellectual about West and East. Because, while some of intellectuals claim that culture and civilization of the West does not conform to the structure of Turkish society, others accept all Western Culture unconditionally. Among this wide range of attitude, some prefers a position that is the synthesis of East and West. This study evaluates the perceptions on civilization and culture from Empire to Republic.*

**Key words:** Modernization, Ottoman State, Turkey

## INTRODUCTION

The culture consist of information about substantial things in the world which was procured by mankind and work and behaviour were revealed on this information. The basic of culture is obtained information; work and behaviour are only reflections of this information. We can understand presence of culture by way of its behaviour and works revealed. In that case, behaviour and works are not culture; they are just manifestation of culture. For instance, a sling, a inlaid saddlebag, an architectural work, a machine and a book are works of culture. The people who made these reflect culture of society, which they live in (Oner, 1991: 2).

Two American anthropologists have compiled and argued in their anthology about culture that there are 164 different definitions belonging to concept of culture. A social scientist who criticized this compilation has given an opinion that if a scientific concept has so many definitions like this, we need to accept it is inexpressible. Culture is an intangible word which is used in anthropology language and anthropological works. Culture is cumulative civilization of a society or of all societies; is oneself of a particular community; is a combination of a number of social processes. Culture is a theory of human and society. If you assign much and various meaning to this word, it's normal and easy its becoming undefined or unrecognizable (Güvenç, 1979: 95).

Culture means all reality which in there is human and is revealed by people. Culture is style for humanization of nature, specific process for this humanization and its proceeds. Culture is creating of a world which provide for him to hear in his home. Culture includes everything revealed by people such as technical, economy, law, aesthetics, science, state and method. Organizations, associations, institutions, schools together with all things related to themselves are considered in culture (Uygur, 1996: 17).

An American anthropologist Margaret Mead adds everything to culture materially and spiritually which forms the life of a nation except for nature: "After a child was born, he gets the culture of the society which in they live, the people belonging to a nation internalize its culture, language, religion, pleasure, manners and customs. Culture is a presence which goes beyond people and formed them by giving style, direction and personality. Hegel identifies this "Objective Geist". Philosophers who came after him named as "culture" (Perin, 1982: 25).

Many definitions have been made concerning concept of culture and civilization up to the present. However, on the review of definitions and assessments were made, it can see that there is not any common point for identification of culture and civilization. Because, the boundaries of this concept could not clearly defined. So and so, while we encounter a matter of fact as a culture in an identification, in another case we can see it is an element of civilization.

The concept of culture and civilization were also used as modernization, westernization and rationalization by Turkish people. The main objective has been to reach the level of contemporary civilization. That's why, Turkey rustled to develop relations with Western World which was considered as the centre of civilization and young students have been

sent to Europe in order to understand that civilization closely and transfer what they have learned for Turkey. This case which had been started term of Mahmud II was continued until establishment of Republic.

In the first time Ziya Gökalp put the "Culture" word by translating as "hars" Ziya Gökalp tells about similarities and differences between culture and civilization: there are both common points and differences between culture and civilization. The common point is that both of them involve all social life. The social life includes these: spiritual life, moral life, juridical life, economic life, aesthetics life, scientific life and language. These are referred as a culture and also called civilization. If we talk about differences, primarily, the culture is national but civilization is international. Culture is just sum of a nation's lives which were mentioned above. Where the civilization is sum of many nations' social lives (Gökalp, 2006: 59-60).

### **Perception of culture and civilization in Ottoman Empire: Westernization-Modernization Axis**

Ottoman has realized superiority of West by her first defeat against them. However, ideological tensions which dating back to the Crusade hindered this realization. All westernization movement encountered a severe retrogression movement in XVII. and XIX. centuries. All innovation movements were made by emperor and viziers who upset because of failure of military and attribute this defeat to West's technical superiority. At the beginning of the 18th century, it was an important a matter for state that how we could bring Western military institutions and their armed force to empire. The opposed reactions which label all foreigner effects as "infidel novelties" and which want to imitate them accepting the superiority of West continued to term. So, a modernization result could not get radically. After modernization movement speeded in Selim III's term, it started to get some positive results in Mahmut II and Abdülmecit terms. While Imperial Edict of Gülhane was transferring modernization to Ottoman Empire with exact the lines, the opposed reactions continued (Ülken, 1979: 18).

At the beginning of XIX. century, the concept of culture in Ottoman Empire was severed two parts; major and minor tradition. These traditions were unable to integrate with each other. They were leading a life separated and remote from each other. Besides, these reforms have had no impact on Ottoman society (Mardin, 2000: 22). Because the State preferred to stay out of the changes such as Market Reform and Industrial Revolution which was occurred in West and lead to change the social structure. Whereas, movements or revolutions mentioned above, carried with new formation and classification social structurally in West. New markets were emerged, the people clusters replaced with each other due to use of machine and all these caused new social structuring (Mardin, 2000: 28).

The entrance of Western idea to Ottoman Empire was mentioned in thought of "Cameratism" which constitutes theory of political opinion and named "Enlightened Despotism" in West by Şerif Mardin. The first encounter of Ottoman with this thought happened in 1795 via diplomats visited the West. A relation was contacted between this thought and Ottoman Empire just kind of: In Cameralism thought there was a strong and problem-free bourgeoisie. The diplomats who witnessed this thought explained reasons for decline of Ottoman Empire. According to them, "Ottoman Empire couldn't keep society on a tight leash." This theory which submit the principles of State's restoration again answered to Ottoman statesman what they look for. Because, Cameralism was submitting principles that has both preventive and facilitator and strengthening features which provide keep in together. They thought that Ottoman Empire could not keep this link with society. This is because, the concept of Tanzimat was appeared in order to provide re-inspection of the Ottoman Empire with troubled society and need for solving the problems. New Ottomans Movement started in practical living space in Ottoman Empire which was affected by Western idea. Şinasi who was in this movement, found it necessary that development of impersonal relations for involvement and spreading of this thought. To that end, he published a newspaper named Tasvir-i Efkar (Mardin, 2000: 85).

The term from 1839 to 1876 which started the policies for Ottoman's taking West as a model and aiming to become like West, called "Tanzimat Reform Era" in Turkish historiography. Tanzimat word means "regulations" in Turkish and meets a term of Ottoman Empire when many political and social reforms were realized in Turkish history (Mardin, 1996: 9). Imperial Edict of Gülhane which was written by Minister of Foreign Affairs Mustafa Reşit Pasha and was declared on behalf of Abdülmecit who succeed to the throne after Mahmut II died in 1839, was read to a community which consist of Ottoman ruling class and foreigner diplomats in 1839. The announcement of the Imperial Edict means that Westernization has become official ideology of the state. Along with Tanzimat Reform, whilst Ottoman policies started which was taken as model the West, European bourgeois capitalism started to actualise their interests about Ottoman and then in this way, colonialism entered to the country which never had a chance to in state before. The interesting point in this evolvment, this process did not realize by internal dynamics, on the contrary, imposition of external powers caused (Zürcher, 1996: 49-50).

Initial reactions to innovation activities came from New Ottomans group, which their leaders were Cevdet Pasha, Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha. While Cevdet Pasha spoke of how it circumvents the Ottoman life, New Ottomans told that these innovations caused the social stratification between people. Besides, they remarked that in this term people

began to accept exploitation regime and sharia was forgotten and this was only superficial Westernization. They criticized Reformers could not understand liberal and parliamentary leanings of West (Mardin, 2000: 13).

The term between 1880-1900 represent a process which was live radical changes. Hereunder, some shocking happenings were occurred such as differentiation of property order, migration of millions Muslims who consist of various ethnical groups to Ottoman Empire, effectuating of modern education institutions to other layers of society, emergence of a new middle-class, consultation for new activities by new elite group instead of old elite group. These strides which changes social and political structure of the Ottomans differentiate the faith and identity of society and also tended awakening of people at the individual level (Karpas, 2002: 331).

According to Şerif Mardin, Abdülhamit II between Ottoman Sultans figured out the Westernization in the best in Westernization process. The reason for this, both rising of people who were educated in new schools and knew foreign language, and taking the West as a model by him. Abdülhamit II understood the Westernism as taking science, technique, administrative system and in particular military organization and education of West. Besides, he wanted to reinforcement pan-Islamism thought between people. Abdülhamit II didn't take West as model totally. According to him, if there is any aspect should taken from West, they are education and technology. In cultural terms, it is not necessary imitate West as a life style (Mardin, 2000:14).

At this point, it is need to mention about quality of pan-Islamism thought. We can entitle pan-Islamism movement as modern Islamic reviews. Pan-Islamism is not conservative, it is modernist movement. On the basis of this movement the military defeats cause embarrassments on the basis of this movement. Military defeat was understood as a loss of Islam against to nonbeliever people. Because, as the result of military defeats, Westerners defended that Islam is the reason for defeat of Islamic World against to Europe. The Islamists explained that the cause of this is not Islam, on the contrary, is the style for perception and interpretation of Islam. Although this depiction is not true, it is a political locution. If we accept this is as true, it seems that we agreed Islamic sciences retrograded. Islamists defend it is important to turn resources in other word the Qur'an and Sunnah. Was it realised in the modern time. It can spring to mind a question such as if it was realised, is the Islamic review suitable for spirit of sources or the demands of modern tendencies. If the reviews of the defender for Islamism are examined, it is understandable that Islam featured adaptation for demands instead of adaptation for sources. Islamist movement in modernization era shows the style of Islamic life in previous era as if passive and wants to draw an active Muslim type with new reviews. In this respect, although Islamic Movement which was shown up in 19<sup>th</sup> Century, gave importance to return of resources; it could said that it stayed away renewal. However, due to pursuit salvation, development and dominance; they preferred to look ahead instead of looking back (Ülken, 1979: 267-268).

Some intellectuals and administrators advised the Westernization for the solution of chaos in the face of West's dominant civilization. For instance, in this period of social disintegration Ziya Gökalp who was an ideologists and sociologists argued to be part of Western Civilization by developing some political and social recommendations within the framework of modernization. He realized his advocated reforms at first step between 1914-1916 in term of Union and Progress' power. With these reforms, western-style dress, regulation of the relationship between women and men, changing clock and calendar, implementation of secularism in religion and state relations (Ülken, 1979: 10).

There is no doubt that the impact of Union and Progress was felt intensely during the period of Young Turks. At the centre of the party and parliamentary debates in these years, there is a discussion that whichever a central or federal structure for state is suitable. Whilst the party defended the central, the liberalist put forward the federal structure. The main problem is different. The essential problem is about the essence of political asset and identity of citizen-subject (Davison, 2004: 138-142). Ziya Gökalp rebutted the thoughts of Ottomanism and Islamism in this period, propounded the concept of nation with Durkheim's approach, whilst he put forward the benefit of technical superiority without disturbing the national identity; he prepared the ideological field in transition from empire to republic. Gökalp who pioneered social thought, enabled to walk Islamic and Westernization process together by describing the Islam as a personal belief.

Gökalp indicated the objective of Turkism which was the popular movement thought of that period as: the task of Turkism is finding Turkish culture, indoctrinating the all West culture to national culture. Reformers strived to accommodate the Ottoman civilization with West civilization. However, the two opposite civilizations cannot live side by side. The Turkists wanted to take West civilization with all ways by means of conserving the Turkism and Islam. However, before the entering West civilization it is need to find our national culture and reveal it primarily (Gökalp, 2006: 31).

Besides all of this historical process, it is important how our actual intellectuals comment about mentioned period. The Westernization movement in term of Ottoman Empire is not result of comprehensive intellectual improvement; it came up a production of intellectual flow which comes from outside. That's why, it is hard to say that there was an enlightenment period like in the West. According to Mümtaz Turhan, the Westernization thesis substantially is process

of culture change. The reason is that; poverty of idea, ignorance, non-understanding the West civilization and missing the basic factors of it.

According to Murat Belge, the Westernization in Ottoman Empire is a result that a warrior society accepted the technical superiority of military competitor. The economic, politic and cultural reasons of technical superiority in military field prevented didn't compel the Ottoman thought for a long time. It could be seen that Ottoman intellectuals and statesmen wanted to protect especially their cultural and traditional identity, and moral values but they tried to keep the Westernization limited with material life and technology (Belge, 1983: 260)

Kemal Karpat evaluated the 19th century modernization process as follows: Ottoman modernization revolve around three main factors. First is the motive of centralization that reshaped the political structure and deepened the existing dilemma in relations between political elites and social groups. The administration and society was divided into organically. Second factor is the growing political influence of the European Powers. This obligated the government to open foreign institutions and commence new implementations, which opposed to Ottoman political culture and its traditional structure of society. The third factor is derived from first two and constitutes the ideological dimension of modernization. Modernization, which was known reform, westernization; changed both ideology and sources of powers of administrator elites (Karpat, 2002: 78).

The tension between people who defend the loss of integrity of religion reason for backwardness of Ottoman Empire against Europe and defend the religion factor for this backwardness, has continued today. At the same time, this is a process, which causes the discussion between intellectuals about civilization-religion relations. The dilemma between people who some of them defend that civilization and religion are different concept from each other and the others defend that religion is the most active factor in the formation process of civilizations, originate from the differences in the perception of the concept of civilization. The people who argued that the religion is the main obstacle for process, mostly influenced in the Enlightenment Era thoughts (Ülken, 1979: 9).

### **Dynamic of Change and Perception of Culture-Civilization in the Republic Era**

The weakness of state administration that emerge in the stagnation period and peaking in the decline period of ottoman state was trigger both divided the ottoman empire and get the good share by the colonialist nations. Already, Ottoman administration was became exasperated with difficult issue in terms of economic, technical and qualified manpower's inadequacy and it faced with dissolution in the end of Balkan and First World War which took place between in 1912-1918. Despite all of this inadequacy, it has been achieved great success on some fronts but the ottoman state was defaulted with the Armistice of Moundros and its territory had been invaded. After that, national forces in Anatolia were successfully organized and finally this struggle was successful.

From the debris of war a new society, in other words the difficulty in establishing of modern society, would be constitute with the bold and righteous of will that established the Republic of Turkey. As Emre Kongar stated that this new steps that called as "Atatürk Reforms" in the Turkey's intellectual and political life would underlie of the new Turkish society. The general qualification of these reforms shed light on the dialectic process of modernization of Turkish society. Therefore, it is necessary to determine the qualification. The first quality of Atatürk reforms, they are implemented to the general public by a "statist-elitist" group via top to bottom of stratum. This "statist elitist" group was the product of Ottoman tradition and seen as only social and political power in the first years of Republic. The second quality of reforms was being directed to create a western type of society. In other words, these reforms that inspired by the common model of society in the west have been enforced. Third quality was that all of reforms has implemented step by step, not in the same time. Forth quality was that it is based on "popular sovereignty" principle theoretically on the basis of all reforms (Kongar, 1999: 109). The new six principles that adopted in Republican People's Party Congress in 1931 and introduced into the Turkish Constitution in 1937 were underlie the building of new civilization. Republicanism, secularism, nationalism, reformism, populism and statism aim at create national culture with the opening of the Turkish Language Association, the Turkish Historical Association, Community houses and is intended to become a national state (Zürcher, 2001: 44). The main issue is that while the institution and opinion are become western style, avoid from losing the national identity. The ultimate target of all reforms is that placing contemporary and rational ideas to modernize Turkish society according to the needs of the day rather than traditionalist principles and traditions of society (Yetkin, 1983: 136).

The reforms that implemented together with Republic in contrast to tradition was not perform as a part of ottoman reformism by the Mustafa Kemal, unlike it entered into force as opposed to the imitator character of these. The underling idea of this new process that proposed by Mustafa Kemal are summarized in four items by the Mardin:

1. Transition from the sense of honour that based on the authority of people to the sense of honour that based on establishing rules and laws
2. Transition from religious to positive science in understanding of universal order.

3. Transition from “pleb and patrician” that based on separation of society to “populist” society.
4. Transition from ummah (the understanding of state religious based in Islamic) to nation state (Mardin, 2002: 177).

After the establishment of the Republican regime the Turkish society entered the rapid changes process. These changes have arisen from Atatürk's personal thought strong willingness changes to Turkish society as a modern society since his youth. To accomplish this, firstly a serious struggle was given for the national independence after that required study have been made for the national sovereignty. Establishing of a contemporary secular state and adopting of these reforms by the citizen may have been difficult in first time but this has been achieved. During the period of Republic political modernization was realized by the secular, national and a single authority instead of religious, traditional authority, the social modernization was realized with the transplantation and implementation of western community institutions and rules. The political life of west was not adopted and attitude of western community leaning toward colonist was criticized (Kocatürk, 1999: 86).

Niyazi Berkes emphasized the failure of the Ottoman Empire's modernization efforts and the originality of republican era modernization in the same time. Berkes defines that the republican reforms was foreseen some of new change in the way of modernization. These show a different feature than application of Ottoman period. According to him, the victory of nation state versus religious state was paved the way for next reforms in the way of modernization. These have been in the area of law, education and alphabet, language and change in the field of life and culture. These are described as republican reforms in the new perspective. Although there were still inactive opposition people, the environment compel the changes that's need a strong leadership. The most important feature that distinguishes this period from others, its based on principle of sovereignty and independence of nation instead of traditional Islamic-Ottoman basis. Changes of reform during the establishment of Republican are the main action to realize this instead of staying as a cliché or passion. Two dimensions of these efforts are destroying the traditionalism attitude, replacing these with suitable rules and institutions in accordance with this path; establishing a transition bridge between tradition and age with the educated the new generation in accordance with this path. From this point of view, the sum of the reforms in republican period was reform of a new tendency (Berkes, 2003: 512). This new tendency was show itself as a westernization that carried out with based on its roots.

One of the important elements of westernization in Republican period was desire of get free from the west. The best explanation of this case is “westernization despite the west”. Westernization and cultural changes in attitudes has caused to steady identity conflict about how the tradition and national factor will be evaluated. This conflict in other words is related with the realization of westernization despite the west. After the independence war which takes as an example from many east communities against European imperialism, attempting to create of Turkish national identity reveals a contradictory situation with the implementing of westernization reforms in the new Turkish Republic. New political formations that take as a model the western democracy and planned to become part of western world make war with the west for become western.

Another dimension of this case is the expression of “westernization despite public”. Ziya Gökalp said that in the principles of Turkism: the duty movement for the people is to bring them civilizations since the people are not civilized. The Elitist had the key of the civilization. Instead of bring them east civilization which ottoman is the part of this, they bring them western civilizations which explained following as a gift (Gökalp, 2006: 85).

So the formulation of for public against common will was legitimized. The first applicator of the social psychology in Turkey, Mümtaz Turhan who is writes this to large extent shaped by follow the Gökalp's footsteps implementation of reforms that painful period expressed that Turkish culture should be synthesise of western techniques by the elite and educated segments one again. According to Turhan, the only way to become westernized in front of Turkey is realizing the basic elements of Western civilization. These elements are science and scientific mentality; technic which is application of science, law and freedom which is the environment of the scientific mentality. Mümtaz Turhan indicates that the community has shifted their sphere of civilization this could not eliminated the previous culture for transplanted to hegemonic culture. When the two communities, two cultures confronted with each other, its not required to vanish either one of, synthesis inevitably occurs. There is no scientific base for lost religious identity and national values by westernization. However, turkey has not become westernization, because the human element has been ignored; only it has started live in as a western manner.

The leaving of old life style is not westernization. According to Turhan the intellectuals has a special role in the westernization of Turkey. “The staffs consist of first class expert” could westernize the Turkey. The staff expert who will be consisted with elite students that send away to the America and Europe will be provide to deploy of scientific mentality with establishing of science academy in Turkey after return. The establishment of this staff is the most important productive investment for Turkey. The reason for failing of the experience until today is romantic and “quasi intellectuals” (Deren, 2002: 382-427).

Atatürk indicated that the source of Turkish revaluation is the Turkish people. This revaluation encompasses both the political, social, cultural and economic value of Turkish society and universal values. It is not a revaluation like other ideology that discussed before by the social scientists, philosophers, thinkers. The people who draw the philosophy, bring to maturity, implementing for this area in successfully are the same group of persons. Atatürk not only start out to do limited thinking of economic, the measure of public value, labour and the hegemony of working groups but also mentioned from all cultural and community value (Altuğ, 1996: 437-438).

There are traces of rationalism and positivism at the heart of Turkish revolution. Wisdom and science has been the basis of Atatürk's ideology. The positivism of Atatürk's is not form followership of Comte; it has shown itself as a top of human thought. Also he said that "our true mentor in life is science" (Turan, 1999: 11-12).

In the light Atatürk words we understand better the phenomenon of modernization: "hometown will be absolutely civilized, contemporary and modern. This is the case of alive for us. All of our dedication is depend on the useful result of this. Turkey will be equipped with new ideas, honourable management or not. I have many contacts with the locals. This pure mass you cannot know how much is in favour of innovation. This obstacle will not come majority of community in our jobs that we made. People want to become prosperous, independent, rich; being poor is very heavy even though they know that the neighbours are rich. Reactionary idealists think that they can withstand a certain class. This is absolutely delusion, is a presumption. We crashed all people whoever standing against our development way. We will not stop in the path of development. The world develops unprecedented pace. Could we keep ourselves out of this on-going process? (Atatürk, 1997: 1972)

Under these circumstances, the modernization becomes a need for Turkish society after the war of independence. On the other hand, all word wanted to see and adopted the new Turkish state which proclaims its independence after Lausanne Treaty with its contemporary qualities (Kocaturk, 1985).

If we look at the Atatürk era, westernization is positive science learning and teaching rather than an imitation of the west. The path of development and modernization pass through from here. The only path is that each member of the nation must be equipped with knowledge. Sovereignty is the person who sovereign. Hence the society consists of individual, the modernization of community via contributions of these individuals. In the mean time we must focus of individuals and members of nation should be equipped with the necessary knowledge. There is individual and dignity of individual at the centre of novelty of Atatürk's era (Mardin, 2000: 118). The modernization activities are based on these points.

Şerif Mardin defines the Turkish modernisation and its complementing Kemalist modernization thought process as a fulfilling the requirement of contemporary civilization. Current activity for this purpose without any comparative, good-bad analogy is described as a "change/transformation" project. The comprehensive point of view of this find in the Mardin's research which is analysis, including the Atatürk's intellectual world, the establishment of Republic era. According to Mardin, the establishment of the Turkish Republic as "modernity project" keep going of relationship with the Ottoman Empire. That is, the past wasn't abandoned, there is not such a case starting all of thing over again. In these sense, Turkish modernization is regulation of the ruins of Empire in line with era requirements. Also, it's disengagement in life, because the difference between the Ottoman Empire and Republic of Turkey is not only the radicalism of the founder of the Republic of Turkey but also arise from the Conceptualisation of the Republic of Turkey as a nation state (Mardin, 2000a: 65).

According to Mardin, some of radical decisions have been taken in the re-organizing. Items are taken as basis in modernization was some of innovation that has been brought by the Republic. Sovereignty that belongs to the nation, an administrative system which is not based on individuals, based on democracy, public have rights participations were some of this innovations. In this context, the republic of Turkey was represented breaking point and find itself with struggle on following concepts; the modern nation, national identity, public will as if there were ever existed. According to Mardin, "reformist" and "utopic" Kemalism demonstrate itself by Atatürk's thoughts shaped by these postulates as a nation designing and conceptualizing modernity. Kemalism was both utopic and reformist. It was utopic, because it assumed that initial starting point is an image of society irrelevant to the reality. At the same time, it was reformist, due to define itself a social transformation from the assumption of imagined society to actualising them (Mardin, 2000a: 65).

The westernization process of Ottomans ends up with roughly existence of east and west side by side. But the program which is aiming to mould the Turkish society into a modern one against Europe, gave a rigid centralisation to official state policy. Instead of creating different utopia from each other like Ottoman period, the struggle of put together different segments of society in the around one utopia concreted the official characteristic of this modernization program sufficiently. The showcase of modernity was daily life of street for intellectuals of Republican era like Ottoman intellectuals. Nevertheless, the transition between street and daily life and transform of both has a more consistent policy in the Republican era. In order to create a modern Turkish society, primarily they were attempted to fit appearance in line with western style. Go out was meant exhibit his modern appearance to the Europe for the people

of Republic. In terms of external appearance, it's a transition modern society process to smooth-faced, remove its burqa and fez, with suit and tie for the administrators who fill the public office. An example form of clothing and behaviour (hence more colourless) replaced with the cosmopolitanism in the Ottoman by 1930. "Official populism has tried to adapt image of society of the 1930s European standards with removing the difference between the clothes of bureaucrats and of ordinary citizen (Deren, 2002: 296-300; Işın, 1987: 333-340).

With take into consideration of existing difference between west in the modernization process, for the realization of reform in a short time and transition to the democracy, the Turkish revelation establish a revolutionary system, laicism become a state policy unlike ideology in the scope of this system. Religious and religious rules and institutions were seen as means of threat and pressure for the social and political modernisation. Envisaging more powerful, more civilized turkey at all times, Turkish revolution is directed unity and solidarity of nation, peace and humanity. Due to these properties, it has the characteristic of both national and universal feature (Giritli, 1985: 339).

## CONCLUSION

Turkey has entered into a modernization adventure in the last century. Many intellectuals show understanding in favour of taking the western culture and civilization. The reason of this is the situation of in the state. Although the modernization movements in the Ottoman Empire has begun as emulate of structure of modern western nation, in essence the main aim was maintenance of state. "Progress" is an aim of ensuring maintenance of state rather than ipso facto aim. To keep the continuity of modern novelty in reform movement in transition process from Tanzimat reform era to Republic, its possible that to observe a continuity rather than break ups.

However, the perception of "progress for order" in Tanzimat period was replaced with "order for progress" in the period of the Republic. Especially when examining the policy of laicism, there was big breakup with tradition in the period of the Republic. Within these policies we can count as well as costumes and hat law changes, calendar, clock and measure the changes, letters revolution, and surname law, in the institutional basis Abolition of the Sultanate and Caliphate, closure of tekkes and zawiya as radical changes. Aim of these implementations is an effort of gaining western and secular identity to the new republic of Turkey. It is important that, at this point both a statesman and thinker, Atatürk, choose westernization or modernization a one of the one of main ideologies.

## REFERENCES

- Altuğ, Hikmet (1996), "Dünyada Son Yüzyıllar Devrimleri ve Atatürkçülük", Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, Uluslararası İkinci Atatürk Sempozyumu, 9-11 Eylül, 1991 Ankara, V.I, Ankara, 1996, pp.437-438.,
- Atatürk Mustafa Kemal (1997), Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri, V.III, Ankara, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları.
- Belge, Murat (1983), "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Batılılaşma", CDTA, C:I, İletişim Yayınları.
- Berkes, Niyazi (2003), Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma, İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Davidson, Roderic H. (2004), Kısa Türkiye Tarihi, (Çev:D. Mehmet Burak), Ankara, Babil Yayınları.
- Deren, Seçil (2002), "Kültürel Batılılaşma", Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Modernleşme ve Batıcılık, Cilt 3. İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2002, pp. 382-427.
- Giritli, İsmet (1985), "Atatürkçü Çağdaşlaşmanın Türk Toplumundaki Sonuçları", Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi, V.1., No.:2, Ankara.
- Gökalp, Ziya (2006), Türkçülüğün Esasları, İstanbul, Bordo-Siyah Yayınları.
- Güvenç Bozkurt (1979), İnsan ve Kültür, İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi.
- Işın, Ekrem (1987), "Abdullah Cevdet'in Cumhuriyet Adab-ı Muaşeretini", Tarih ve Toplum, No: 8, pp. 333-340.
- Karpat, Kemal H. (2002), "Ziya Gökalp'te Korporatifçilik, Millet-Milliyetçilik ve Çağdaş Medeniyet Kavramları Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler", Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce-Cumhuriyete Devreden Düşünce Mirası, Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyetin Birikimi, V.I, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Kocatürk, Utkan (1985), "Türk Toplumunda Çağdaşlaşma Gereği", Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi, V: I, No2.
- Kocatürk, Utkan (1999), Atatürk'ün Fikir ve Düşünceleri, Ankara, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi,
- Kongar, Emre (1999), Toplumsal Değişme Kuramları Ve Türkiye Gerçeği, İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi.
- Mardin, Şerif (1996), Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Mardin, Şerif (2000), Türk Modernleşmesi, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Mardin, Şerif (2000a), Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Mardin, Şerif (2002), Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Öner, Necati (1991), "Kültür", Felsefe Dünyası, Ankara, No:2.
- Perin, Cevdet (1982), Atatürk Kültür Devrimi, İstanbul, İnkılâp ve Aka Kitabevleri.

- Turan, Şerafettin (1999), Atatürk'ün Düşünce Yapısını Etkileyen Olaylar Düşünürler, Kitaplar, 3. Baskı, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1979), Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi, İstanbul, Ülken Yayınları..
- Uygur, Nermi (1996), Kültür Kuramı, İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Yetkin, Çetin (1983), Türkiye'de Tek Parti Yönetimi 1930-1945, İstanbul, Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi.
- Zürcher, Eric Jan (1996), Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Zürcher, Erik Jan (2001), "Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı Kaynakları", Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm, V. 2, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.