



## TÜRKİYE IN ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY: ROOTS FROM THE FOUNDATIONS OF OTTOMAN-TURKISH MODERNIZATION TO MODERNISM<sup>1</sup>

Gökhan AK<sup>2</sup> 

### Abstract

World modernization history and modern age has been the history and era of conflict, and clashes. All these are basically the contradiction between the “old” and the “new”; in other words, this history and era is the fight of the superstitious and fatalistic tradition and the contemporary. Because, it had been witnessed regularly that modernity would inevitably permeate every part of life. Therefore, religion-based tradition, sanctified tradition and traditionalized superstitions had been in direct conflict and conflict with modernity and modernization for centuries. The aim of this study is to reveal the main contexts of this modernism movement that reached the Turkish Republic, historically, socially and politically, by examining the foundations of Ottoman-Turkish modernization that started with the 1699 Treaty of Karlowitz. As a matter of fact, the modernization of Republican Türkiye means being contemporary, secular encircling secularism and modernity are its most significant, outstanding and distinctive features. For this reason, Ottoman-Turkish modernism has been a modernization movement open to development and progress from the very beginning, and had reached its highest point, the secular contemporary level, with the Republic of Türkiye and Atatürk’s Revolutions and reforms. As a matter of fact, it is highly likely to see these rationality and developmental impulses, which are the origins of Turkish modernization, in its desire to constantly anticipate and adopt a social life that includes the requirements of the age and a social, political, economic and cultural characteristics compatible with them. Within the scope of the research methodology, this study mainly has adopted the qualitative research methodology, based on the deductive approach, and accordingly benefited from scientific research methods such as document analysis, content analysis, discourse analysis, grouping and comparison.

### Research Article in English

#### Event History

Received: 01.05.2024

Accepted: 05.01.2025

#### Keywords

Türkiye, 100th  
Anniversary,  
Ottoman-Turkish  
modernization,  
Republic, modernism.

<sup>1</sup> This study is the revised and shortened version of the published book chapter tag as follows: “Gökhan AK (2023). Türk Modernleşmesinin Temelleri [Foundations of Turkish Modernization], Zeynep Banu Dalaman, Enver Emre Öcal, Suat Dönmez ve Gökhan Ak (Eds.), 100 Yıllık Cumhuriyet ve Türk Modernleşmesi [100 Years of Republic and Turkish Modernization], (16-46), İstanbul: İstanbul Topkapı University Pubs.”

<sup>2</sup> Assist. Prof. Dr., İstanbul Topkapı University, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Department of Political Science and International Relations (Eng.), İstanbul-Türkiye, gokhanak@topkapi.edu.tr.

*“Without deviation from the norm, progress is not possible.” Frank ZAPPA  
(The Tribun India, 2024)*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

“Modernization” is both a mentality and the act of deviating from the norm with this mentality. The root and key concept of the phenomenon of “modernization” is - naturally - the term “modern (contemporary, secular)”.<sup>1</sup> In this sense, modernization, conceptually and factually, directly embraces and supports the terminology of modernization, being up-to-date, being in tune with the times, and being open to development and progress. From this point of view, being modern (contemporary), which is the sociological result of the modernization process, expresses respect for humans, human mind, rational science, humanism, secularism, democracy, law, justice, nature and fundamental human rights and freedoms.

Therefore, individuals who can approach social developments with a modern, humanist mentality and attitude, and the contemporary social groups they form, can modernize; social, political, economic, legal, cultural etc. of the age. It is seen that it can keep up with modern developments such as all conditions, qualities, needs and requirements. For this reason, political culture is highly developed, mature and high in modern societies that respect human beings, human minds, rational science, anthropocentrism (humanism), secularism, democracy, law, justice, nature and basic human rights and freedoms. Thus, in these societies, the methods of finding solutions to all kinds of problems that concern citizens are much more successful and effective as a result of being more rational, pluralistic and contemporary.

In this sense, it is possible to recount that modernization actually means “contemporary” or “becoming contemporary”. Thus, modernization is the understanding and ability to keep up with the social, political, scientific, technological, economic,

legal and cultural developments and needs of the current era, and to adopt and apply the universal and global ones. However, societies and states that try to implement the opposite of this situation are, in today’s modern and secular (namely, contemporary) world, as societies that desire to live in the dark bigotry and darkness of the Middle Ages, one of the worst periodic examples of human history in the past ages, as if they are following the rules of things and nature. However, behaving contrary to that, they show an insistent and yet paradoxical resistance to modernization and a secular-contemporary life.

As a matter of fact, this persistent resistance against modernization is as contradictory and paradoxical as it is ironic and meaningful; because the political powers of the states in question are implementing policies that violate human rights and dignity by inflicting poverty, unemployment, injustice, lawlessness and many other injustices and sufferings on their citizens, standing against all the secular-democratic secular principles and principles of the Modern Age. As a result, they make their countries uninhabitable for their citizens. However, societies that are exposed to all these negativities still ignore the prosperity, wealth, job opportunities, sustainable development and democracy that modernization will bring, and in an ironic and paradoxical contradiction, reject a secular-modern human-centered social, political, economic and legal order. They -especially- prefer not to “modernise”. As a matter of fact, it is thought that this emphasized “anti-modernization” factor (among others) - in its place, in its homeland - was also very effective in the fact that cross-border irregular migration movements increased considerably in the 2000s and became one of the biggest problems of the international community.

However, when human history is examined, it is seen that no matter how reluctant and persistent-resistant the individual is on the path of modernization, and in the words of Althusser (2016: 50-51), no matter how influenced, directed and pressured by the ideological apparatus of the state,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In this study, the pair of terms such as “modernization=contemporization”; “modern=contemporary”; “secularization=contemporary” and “secular=contemporary” are accepted as synonyms.

<sup>2</sup> Contemporary French philosopher Louis Althusser (1918-1990) claims that the state has two basic apparatuses that it uses in line with its goals: “Ideological State Apparatuses” (ISAs) and

“Repressive State Apparatuses” (RAs). Although there is no clear-cut distinction between these two, it can be said that the main difference between them is the methods they use. Likewise, ISAs consist of the following elements: Religious ISA, Educational ISA (system of different private and state schools), Family ISA, Legal ISA, Political ISA (political system including different parties), Trade Union ISA, Communication ISA (press,

the human soul is essentially free, cannot be hindered in any way. As a matter of fact, human history is always full of evidence of this. For this reason, the human soul tends to develop and progress, in other words, to become modern, to keep up with the times, to adapt to the times. It had been like this throughout the ages. Therefore, in anti-modernist societies, there will inevitably be individuals and groups who will eventually demand their rights and freedoms. Because nothing, neither in space nor on earth, can be maintained forever contrary to nature and its universal laws.

In this context, modernism, as the main thrust of modernization, is a phenomenon that opens the way for the person to be an "individual" and "himself" in the "private" field, which is the first layer of social life, and the phenomenon of "democracy", freedom and freedom in the "public" field, which is the second social layer. It is the basic paradigm, in other words, an exemplary model, of the establishment of human values such as equality, basic human rights and freedoms in society. Therefore, the "political" area, which is the top layer of societies that can achieve this basic paradigm in private and public areas and includes the elected political representatives of the society, is also secular, rational, scientific, democratic, contemporary and pluralistic. For this reason, modernity is the development of a modern mentality, understanding and approach both in individuals and in society. In other words, just like secularism, modernity is also a matter of mentality. In this respect, modernity should be in essence, not in words, and that is exactly why it is a matter of mentality. As a matter of fact, societies in which this emphasized issue of understanding and mentality is not sufficiently developed continue to live a social life focused on the Medieval mentality in the Modern Age we are in - even in 2024, in other words, the Millennium Age - or, despite all the modern requirements of the age, they are trying to maintain the medieval understanding, attitude and behavior models with all their resistance.

---

radio-television, etc.), Cultural ISA (literature, fine arts, sports, etc.). Without straying too far from this framework, ISAs are; government, administration, army, law enforcement (including police, gendarmerie, etc.), courts and prisons (Althusser, 2016: 50-51). As Larrain (1995: 91) emphasizes in this context, ideological devices are objective and -definitely- a part of daily

Modernization is still a virtual phenomenon for many individuals and societies that seem modern-living today. The main reason for this is the contradiction and conflict of the phenomena of "modernism", "science", and "religion" in many societies. As a matter of fact, as can be seen in many so-called "modern" states today, especially in political regimes that have politicized science and religion and in communal societies that resist adaptation to the age; in other words, it is perceived and accepted as such that modernization under their conservative-reactionary-autocratic governments, modernism and rational scientificism are almost an anti-religion. Because for such communal societies that seem to lead contemporary lives today, modernization is ultimately a virtual-phenomenal phenomenon.

Hencewith, societies under the bigotry, oppression and influence of superstitious traditionalism, fatalism and communalism have difficulty understanding this phenomenal reality due to its virtual artificiality, in other words, its spiritual (celestial) relationship with the mind and mentality. Therefore, like "artificial intelligence", which is one of the most interesting and remarkable developments of today's advanced science, human history has seen and experienced "artificial modernizations" from past to present, and it is possible to say that these still exist in the international community in an artificial and virtual way. Because modernization and democratization should be in essence, not in words, so that social, political, economic, legal, scientific, religious and cultural phenomena do not mix with each other and become nominal and meaningless in a state that appears contemporary...

As a matter of fact, Ottoman-Turkish modernization experienced and was affected by all these issues emphasized above. For this reason, Ottoman-Turkish modernization had experienced all these conflicts, clashes and contradictions from past to present and still continues to exist. In this respect, it is likely to describe the Ottoman-Turkish modernization as one of the most "paradoxical" modernization movements in history. In this

life. They are not subjective and cannot be produced by any subject; however, they are structured phenomena that shape the subject and repeat themselves. In addition, since they have an objective and external structure, they also represent the objective face of society.

context, it is plausible to argue this contradictory and paradoxical situation of Ottoman-Turkish modernization with at least two basic factors.

The first of these is that, against the Ottoman-Turkish modernization, which has achieved and experienced a rising modernization momentum since the Ottoman Empire period and reached its highest level with the Atatürk Revolution and Reforms carried out in the early period of the Republic of Türkiye, even in the period when the Millennium Age has entered, it is a rigid mentality of resistance and anti-modernity that still exists. As a matter of fact, this socio-political mentality, which has evolved into such a contradictory and paradoxical structure that it has developed opposition and even hostility to the founding leader of modern Türkiye, Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, and the Republican political regime he excellently established together with the Turkish Nation, and constitutes a very interesting example in terms of political sociology. It has remained almost unchanged since 1950, when it became more visible, and had not lost sociological ground.

Secondly, since the concept of “modern” means modern, suitable for the times and times we live in, and because the Ottoman-Turkish modernization took place in an Islamic society for the first time in history, it is perhaps the most important and popular in the New Age, which started with 1453. However, it can also be seen as one of the paradoxical modernizations. For the first time in history, the Republic of Türkiye, whose social religion is Islam and whose political regime is a republic, has been able to achieve rational, scientific and laic-secular modernization and democratization. There is no other example of this kind of second modernization in history yet. As a matter of fact, in the words of Bernard Lewis (Tra. by Genim, 2021):

Turkey was both an interesting and encouraging example for us because of its extraordinary nature. He spread optimism around him. I think this is one of the reasons why I chose Turkey.

In this context, the general research outline of this study will be as follows: after briefly presenting the research methodology and literature review, what Turkish modernization is and where it came from and how it evolved will be examined; the foundations of Turkish modernization in line with the root factors and development will be analyzed

in the context of historical-conceptual relations and interactions, and in this context, the two basic concepts of Ottoman-Turkish modernization, namely Westernization (Europeanization) and Secularism, will be explored in detail; and eventually, the study will be concluded by emphasizing the important conclusions and findings from all the findings obtained in the context of the review.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Within the scope of the literature review of the research, which basically adopted qualitative research methodology, secondary data sources were mainly used in terms of resource usage within the framework of obtaining scientific data. In this context, scientific (e-)books, scientific (e-)articles, scientific (published e-)dissertations, scientific proceeding (e-)books, and scientific (e-)reports of international organizations, NGOs', think-tanks that were obtained from public and university libraries and/or virtual environments related to the subject had been given priority in terms of references, and accordingly included in the research as for the scientific data. Following obtaining, the afore-mentioned sources were scanned, found in related data-bases, and examined thoroughly. In this way, the main and secondary sources that would support the findings of the research were obtained properly and read entirely and accurately; then, the information in the sources was classified in accordance with the tentative outlines of the research; later, it was subjected to an analytical review and was included in the research in accordance with ethical publication rules.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

Regarding the scope of the methodology of the research, this study mainly adopted qualitative research methodology and was based on a deductive approach. In this study, while “descriptive” explaining the concepts and relationships and dealing with the subject within the conceptual framework of the research, “causal” trying to find the facts behind the events, “theoretical” that extracts principles from the events that have occurred, “historical” examining the effect of a past event and the effects of this situation today will be referred to; in this vein, accordingly, scientific research methods such as document analysis, content analysis, discourse

analysis, grouping and comparison were used in the study, and additionally, advanced research methods such as hermeneutics was also utilized in the secondary methodological context. Scientific studies based on information obtained from sources such as libraries, archives and the internet e-sources related to the problematic of the research.

### 3. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION:

#### MODERNISM FROM OTTOMAN-TURKISH MODERNIZATION TO THE REPUBLIC

World history of modernization and the modern age had been a history and age of social clashes and disputes. This conflict is essentially between the 'old' and the 'new'. In other words, this history and age is the battle between tradition - superstitious and fatalistic - and the contemporary. However, it is all the time witnessed that modernity will inevitably spread to every part of life. For this reason, especially religion-based tradition, sanctified tradition and traditionalized superstitions had been in direct conflict and collision with modernity and modernization for centuries. As a matter of fact, Ottoman-Turkish modernization had been a modernization movement open to development and progress from the very beginning. It reached its highest, secular contemporary level with the Revolutions and reforms of the Republic of Türkiye via Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's modernist approach. As a matter of fact, it is likely to see these rationality and modern development impulses, which are the roots of Turkish modernization, in its desire to constantly foresee and adopt the requirements of the age and a social life that includes social, political, economic and cultural qualities compatible with them.

The foundations of Turkish modernization, which started in the last 200 years of the Ottoman Empire, reached its peak with the Republic of Türkiye, and continues today - despite all the enemies of Atatürk and the Republic - are based both on the long centuries of modernization history of world societies and on this history. It lies within the enlightenment adventure of the human mind. Because modernization, as an "inevitable" development fact of human history, had continued - ironically - from the New Age, which started with the conquest of Istanbul by the Ottoman Turks in 1453 to the present day, in other words, including the Modern Age, which started in 1789. It stands before us as a global phenomenon until today's

Modern (Millennial) Age. Therefore, as science and technology develop and progress, it seems to be an inevitable reality that all societies will get a share from modernization in some way, and more importantly, even if they do not desire it. Turkish modernization is a "sui generis" manifestation of this reality experienced in world history, with its inevitable, yet very meaningful, unique and paradoxical qualities.

In this context, Ottoman-Turkish modernization was, in essence, contemporary, up-to-date, aiming to catch up with the times, purposeful and focused. More interestingly, it is likely to argue that it has been partially secular, contemporary and scientific since the Ottoman period. Likewise, this partiality in the Ottoman period comes from the strong influence of the Islamic religion on politics and social life at that time. Full secular, contemporary and rational scientific modernization will occur in and after 1923, in other words, with the Republic period, the 100th anniversary of which we celebrate currently. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that Ottoman-Turkish modernization could only gain its secular, scientific, democratic and contemporary character, which are the main sources and basic features of Western modernization, with the Republic of Türkiye. The main factor in this is Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's rational, secular (contemporary), democratic, scientific, human-oriented and law-abiding contemporary mentality. For this reason, Atatürk's period is indisputably obvious that the Republic century was the most successful period in many areas such as modernization, enlightenment, social progress, economic development, progress in education and science, as well as great successes in foreign policy and many more other areas of life. As a matter of fact, this period is a period in which Turkish modernization benefited from the Kemalist thought system and mentality at the highest level and made great strides in modernization.

The fact that it is the first and perhaps the last example of secular modernization in a state like the Republic of Türkiye, whose social religion is Islam and whose political regime is a republic, is the main factor that distinguishes it from its peers and makes sense of why this modernization is so popular and critical. Ottoman-Turkish modernization adds meaning, importance and privilege to the history of world modernization with these essential features; It crowns itself with its quality and reformist

richness and puts itself in a separate place within this intense and deep history of modernization. Likewise, Ottoman-Turkish modernization, especially after 1923, was Westernist, secular, rational scientific, humanist and logical; and it was established through a democratic modernization movement compatible with the current era and its requirements. Bernard Lewis (Cited in Genim, 2021) describes this situation as follows:

I personally witnessed every stage of Turkey's first election, the election in which the government was defeated. This sounds like a paradox, but the government's defeat was also its greatest victory; To have made a truly free choice! To be defeated and to accept defeat. To date, such an event has never occurred anywhere in the Islamic world except Türkiye. Turkey showed two great truths: first, it was very, very difficult to establish a real democracy in these lands, which have a tradition of command and submission for thousands of years. Secondly: yes it was difficult, but it was possible.

Therefore, the modernization of Republican Türkiye means being in compliance with modern rational science, reason, rationality, positivism, democracy, human-centeredness and basic human rights and freedoms, and secularism, scientificity are its most conspicuous and distinctive features. For this reason, Ottoman-Turkish modernization had been a modernization movement open to development and progress from the very beginning. It reached its highest point, namely its full secular-contemporary-scientific level, with the establishment of the Republic of Türkiye, and the subsequent modern revolutions and reforms carried out by Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. In this manner, the basic roots of the 20th century Turkish modernization, whose ultimate focus paradigms were the "Turkish Revolution", maybe so to speak a "Turkish Renaissance" in Anatolia (Akçam, 2009), carried out by the Founding Leader of the Turkish Republic, Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, and the most robust power he counted on, namely Turkish Nation, and all those rested on rationality, scientificity, secularism, humanism, democracy. and in conformity with the times (being contemporary, namely "secularism"). Thus, it is likely to sort out the impulses for development and progress in his desire to constantly foresee and adopt social life, which includes the requirements

of the age and the socio-political, economic-political and cultural qualities compatible with them.

### 3.1 TURKISH MODERNIZATION: FROM WHAT TO WHERE; FROM WHERE TO WHERE...

Turkish modernization had experienced a long-term and unique modernization process since the Ottoman Empire period. This is why modernization, resulting from the urge to catch up with the times, left its mark on the last 200 centuries of the Ottoman Empire. In this respect, Turkish modernization has always been modern and contemporary; and it is possible to argue that it always had this impulse. The main reason for this is that Turkish modernization is one of the modernization movements that has a special and unique position in history. As a matter of fact, Turkish modernization has managed to incorporate historical developments and phenomena such as (European) Enlightenment, Renaissance, Reformation, democratization and secularization movements, which mainly originate from Western civilization, successfully and with a wide social acceptance and harmony. In this context, Turkish modernization started with the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699 (Kocabaşoğlu, 2009), and the Republic of Türkiye, which had a modern, secular, democratic, social, parliamentary and constitutional political regime, became the national movement of recent history as a result of the Turkish National Struggle of Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his friends. It is a unique modernization movement that left its mark on the 20th century with its emergence on the stage of states. In this context, the modern and secular Republic of Türkiye is the last point reached by this modernization movement and will last forever. For this reason, the modern Republic of Türkiye, as Berkes (1965: 94) emphasizes

It is the modernization movement that has started for two centuries, finding its right path and turning towards it.

However, another important feature of Turkish modernization being one of the most unique, rare and popular modernization movements in history is that this movement was initiated and sustained in history in a society with Ottoman-Turkish citizen identity, social religious Islam, and finally realized in a contemporary way with the Republic of Türkiye in 1923. As a matter of fact, although it is

similar to many revolutionary modernization movements in history such as Russian modernization, Japanese modernization, Scottish modernization, Polish modernization, Turkish modernization is a unique movement in history with its revolutionary political, social, economic, legal and cultural reforms, as it took place in a religious Islamic society for the first time in the Modern Age. It constitutes one of the modernization movements in the last four centuries of the Western history. Because modernization is primarily a social and cultural phenomenon. Then, to the extent that the individual can modernize, that state also improves its politics, democracy, economy, law, justice, military, etc. It can keep up with the times with its administrative and public mechanisms. Therefore, it is not wrong to claim that Turkish modernization, similar to the modernization movements experienced in some European states, is an inevitable result - albeit late - of many socio-political, socio-economic and intellectual events and developments that have occurred especially in Europe in the last 500 years.

As a matter of fact, it is possible to argue that Turkish modernization is a necessity of the intellectual, political, scientific, technical, economic and geopolitical based events and developments that took place in the New Age that started with the conquest of Istanbul in 1453, the Modern Age that started with the French Revolution in 1789, and the Modern Age that started in the 20th century. Because the phenomenon known as history is a phenomenon that constantly progresses and develops in the triangle of time-space-events since the history is a cultural evolution of humanity. For this reason, the adaptation of all world societies to the age, in other words, modernity, which lives within the framework of interaction and common values with the global society, emerges as a historical necessity. It is not possible to stand in front of this movement, to be against this movement; because the ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus emphasized in this manner; "...in this change nothing remains constant, everything flows (Panta rei)." Based on the philosophical discourse of Heraclitus, the fact that life is in constant motion requires human communities to be in constant change. As a matter of fact, this has always happened from past to present, and throughout human history, no force or power has been able to

stand in the way of change and progress (İşçi, 2004: 46).

In this context, in accordance with the theory of "historical movement", which finds its meaning in Marx and Engels (1999: 105-110), human communities have been in a state of constant change and related development - throughout history - since their first grouping in the prehistoric period. This situation can be said to be just like the Turkish Revolution and Turkish modernization that started on May 19, 1919 and after Mustafa Kemal's understanding and thinking of a kind of "Anatolian Renaissance" (Akçam, 2009) in the Ottoman geography of that period, and took place in the period after October 29, 1923. Likewise, the Republic and the Atatürk Revolution are the last point of modernization reached by the Ottoman-Turkish modernization movement. Going on the path of modernization is only possible by sustaining this revolution with social continuity. Because what Mustafa Kemal achieved in the new Republic was a complete "revolution", and the name of this revolution was the Turkish Revolution. However, "The Turkish revolution means a change different from and broader than the meaning that the word first brings to mind." (Berkes, 1973: 469, 439, 441; 1984a: 91-99)

Hence, it can be argued that the situation in question is a synthesis arising from inevitable contradictions in the logic of social history, in other words, dialectics. This synthesis, whose thesis is Ottoman-Turkish modernization and whose anti-thesis is anti-modernization, is essentially one of the laws of social history. Because this is the dialectical law in the flow of historical events. According to Aydemir (1979: 14-15), conditions arising from the accumulation of contradictions in the structure of societies or social relations will create events. These events will also mutually affect the conditions. Conditions will always change, so it will go on and on. In the explosions or leaps of events resulting from these new conditions, there will be a struggle not only against the orders, beliefs and institutions of that universe and that day, but also against the beliefs, movements and remnants whose roots go back to antiquity. That's why every revolution has to reckon with these separately. Therefore, modernization appears to be a dialectical and revolutionary cycle. And the ultimate synthesis of

this cycle is a contemporary and secular social structure whose “modernism-science-religion” conflict seems to never end.

Turkish modernization, which had its share of this conflict, experienced one of its brightest synthesis years in 1933. As a matter of fact, in the 10th Anniversary Speech given by Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (Berkes, 1997: 99), who gave many intellectuals the wonderful celebration night of the 10th Anniversary of the Republic in Ankara in 1933, he said:

...We did things. The greatest of these works is the Republic of Turkey, whose foundation is Turkish heroism and high Turkish culture.

The young Republic, which he celebrated by saying (Çotuksöken, 1999: 53), is the culmination of a certain and effective modernization process in Ottoman-Turkish history. Because the historical events that took place from the beginning of the 18th century until the establishment of the Republic in 1923, show that Ottoman-Turkish modernization - necessarily - flowed in the direction of the arrival of a modern regime (Berkes, 1973: 9). Therefore, it can be claimed that the modern Republic of Türkiye is the result of the preconditions created by the social, economic-political changes and transformations that occurred in the approximately 220 years from the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699 to 1923.

The events and impulses behind these changes and advances are examined in detail in Niyazi Berkes's two-volume work titled *Turkish Economic History* (1972; 1975a). In this context, as commented by Yorgancıoğlu (2000: 93-94), Niyazi Berkes, in his critically important two-volume work, compares the Ottoman social structure with the Western social structure, and tries to reveal the significant differences between them. Accordingly, what is important in the Ottoman system is not evolution, but “balance”. On one side there is the folks, on the other side there is the Sultan, the representative of God on earth, and in the middle there is the service class consisting of bureaucrats. Political power is significant in this manner since the bureaucracy provides public power while the intellectuals

provide intellectual power, and accordingly, the army provides military power. However, innovation, also known as modernization, abolished the sultanate and enabled the transition to the “Republic” political regime and administration. Likewise, societies cannot escape tradition and evolve unless their consciousness reaches a certain level. In this sense, it can be said that the point that the Turkish society has reached in its thousands of years of history, especially after the 624-year Imperial Age, with the establishment of the Republican political regime in 1923, and even - at the time these lines were written - the effort and will it has shown to protect it for 100 years, shows the level of consciousness in question.

Therefore, in past modernization analyzes up to the level of secular modernization reached with the modern Republic, civilization, (national) culture, ideology, the phenomenon of religion (Islam), religion, etc., which had a direct impact on the Ottoman-Turkish modernization that could be initiated with the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699 (Kocabaşoğlu, 2009). The relative-abstract theoretical concepts of political theory such as world relations, secularism, rational traditionalism, development-modernization (secularization), Turkish Revolution (in other words, Republican Revolutions), Westernization, modernism, social progressive-revolutionaryism, democracy are an economic-political historical process. analysis is very important. As an undeniable reality, the modern Republic of Türkiye founded by Atatürk is the highest point of Ottoman-Turkish modernization (Berkes, 1964).<sup>1</sup> Again, according to Berkes (1984b: 156), the modern Republic of Türkiye emerged as the last phase and even the solution of the economic-political history of the last 200 years and the necessity of becoming a nation and its state that can live in the modern and civilized world. This conclusion was reached as a natural solution to the distorted direction of the history of the Ottoman Empire, reaching a line that does not fit the contemporary world.

In fact, Turkish modernization is directly related to the theoretical and practical development of

<sup>1</sup> For detail, see; (Eliçin, 1970; Zürcher, 2001; Ateş, 2001)



concepts such as democracy, contemporary law, laicism and secularism in the history of world political ideas, in the context of a praxis (Türkmen, 2014). Turkish modernization, which finds its roots in the context of these historical developments, can be revealed more clearly with the relational connection between the “universal trio” formed by secularism, modernization (secularization) and Atatürk’s Thought, which is open to change, transformation and development in every age of the civilization history. In this context, if we consider the Turkish Revolution and Atatürk’s Thought as the basis of Turkish modernization, the concept of “secularism” will form the framework of this contemporary structure in this manner. Naturally, some columns are needed to keep the roof on the foundation. In this regard, it is obvious that the first of the mentioned pillars will be modernization (secularization) and the others will be humanism, rational thought, revolutionism, scientificness, national sovereignty, territorial integrity, democracy, freedom and independence. Because the modernization structure will naturally require these, as required by its content.

In this respect, the concept of “democracy”, which includes multi-party political life, political participation, rule of law, separation of powers, free press, existence of opposition, free and fair political elections and similar principles and requirements in the classical literature, is actually an outcome of a modern-secular state. And it seems that it is directly related to the idea and understanding of management as well as the laic-secular social mentality is, in addition to the generally valid principles and demands in the literature, for a modern and good society - in the context of democracy by us. However, it is possible to argue that democracy dictates some basic principles such as goodwill, tolerance, empathy, love and respect - which are considered to be much more important requirements - in every aspect of social life, and thus provided the “good society” that philosophers have been pursuing for thousands of years. However, it seems that today’s good society is likely possible with modern, democratic and humanist democracy.

### 3.2 FOUNDATIONS OF TURKISH MODERNIZATION: HISTORICAL, CONCEPTUAL RELATIONSHIPS AND INTERACTIONS

In most of the research conducted during the Republican period, it has been argued that Turkish modernization was based on a number of economic-political developments and modernization movements that took place in the Western world and especially in the history of Western political thought. All of this seems true when viewed from a historical perspective, that is, from the perspective of the historical sequence of events and developments. However, this study prefers the methodology of analysis from a historical-sociological perspective. In this context, it would be appropriate to look at the foundations of Turkish modernization through the historical process, but within the framework of the relationships and interactions with various sociological concepts such as religion, world, civilization, ideology, ages, Islam and tradition. The methodology of researching the foundations of Turkish modernization adopted by this study will be shaped in this direction. Because the general methodology adopted in the studies on the foundations of Turkish modernization in the literature is that the political thought that has been developing in Eurasia, Africa, Europe and North America for approximately 3000 years, mixed with sociology, economics and culture, develops together, feeds each other, and ultimately - inevitably - it is the examination of Western civilization, Western enlightenment, Western secularism and Western modernization, which emerged through its change and transformation, through a series of historical events through their socio-political, military-political, economic-political and psycho-cultural effects on the Ottoman Empire.

However, of course, Western modernism, which had inevitable and sharp effects on the Ottoman-Turkish modernization, shaped, guided and developed it, especially in the last 200 years of the Empire, and caused it to reach its peak with the Republican modernism in 1923, was a political, social, economic, military as well as various historical events, theoretical-empirical

developments, phenomena and revolutions including financial, cultural, legal and commercial aspects that had been experienced and developed for centuries. Additionally, instead of treating these as consecutive historical events and revealing their possible effects on the Ottoman-Turkish modernization, this study, with a different perspective and methodological approach, examines the foundations of Turkish modernization as the historical process of Western modernism and continues today. It will be examined by taking into account that it lies in more historical and sociological conceptual relationships and interactions.

Turkish modernization is primarily historical, then sociological, intellectual, cultural and economic. In this context, Turkish modernization is a type of modernization that developed under the influence of some socio-political and socio-economic events, especially in the West, in the New Age that started in human history after 1453. The foundations of Turkish modernization lie in the intellectual, social, political, economic and ideological developments that took place in the West after 1453, such as geographical discoveries, revolutions, mercantilism, commercial revolution, industrial revolution, capitalism, liberalism, Enlightenment, Renaissance, Reformation and science. However, these are the main sections of the economic-political and intellectual history of the West, in other words, Europe. For this reason, the fact that the Ottoman Empire, as a neighbor of Europe, was included in these processes that Europe was going through, sometimes on time and sometimes quite late, caused the Empire to have to first lay the mortar of Westernization on the basis of the modernization process it inevitably entered. The most important point here, which should not be overlooked and which constitutes one of the basic mortars of today's modern Republic of Türkiye, is that this historical first mortar was an inevitable development for the Ottoman Empire; because throughout history, the Ottomans were an Empire that turned its face primarily and at every opportunity to the West, and in this context, the Turkish Nation is also a society that is prone and willing to modernize.

### 3.3 THE FIRST FOUNDATION OF OTTOMAN-TURKISH MODERNIZATION: WESTERNIZATION (EUROPEANIZATION)

The Ottoman Empire was one of the most important non-Western Eurasian states from the Middle Ages to modern times and played a vital role in European and world history (Quataert, 2005). The Osman Dynasty, which struggled to survive in the 18th century with its traditional-religious and Eastern-type despotic structure, at a time when Europe, with which it had interacted the most for centuries, was rapidly changing and transforming socially and developing in the economic-political field, tried to find solutions to its social, political and economic problems. These problems began to become more severe as the Ottoman Empire was gradually surrounded by an ever-expanding world economy centered in Western Europe (Ahmad, 1994).

The loss of territory and the eventual collapse of the Ottoman Empire were not only the result of external pressure, its interaction with the separatist nationalism developed by the empire's non-Muslim communities, defeats in wars, and inadequate military equipment (Zürcher, 2010). Thus, the component units or subsystems of the political system began to change as it evolved in response to both environmental change and forces originating from within the system itself. In the exchange of external developments and internal dynamics of the empire, the Western world, on the one hand, gained economic power against the Ottoman Empire in the international arena, and on the other hand, it had an influence on the change of the political system and intellectual thought through a new ideology such as nationalism. These two challenges, nationalism and the great economic-political and intellectual influence coming from the West, were the period when the Ottoman Empire experienced developments that it could not control in the international arena and was even forced to be a part of (Davison, 1981). One of these developments is the capitalist economy combined with imperialism, namely "to rule". Indeed, since the 1500s, if not before, the economic power of Europe has become equal to or even superior to that of any other region of the world, including the Ottoman Empire (Quataert, 2005: 67). In the 16th and 17th centuries,

with the gradual consolidation of military power, material wealth and scientific progress among European states, the Ottomans began to lose their military superiority over the West (Göçek, 1987). The Ottoman Empire, which entered stagnation and decline starting from the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699, sought to establish alliances with European states until the 16th century. However, starting from the 18th century, it realized its backwardness in economic, political and cultural parameters and started the process of Westernization (in other words, modernization) in the name of modernization tendencies (İnaç, 2004).

In order to better observe the birth of modern Türkiye and the foundations of Turkish modernization, the first step should be to search for the roots of modernization in the Ottoman Empire. There is no doubt about continuity in the history of civilization; however, critical points in social developments are at historical turning points. There are some dominant factors that are always critical historical moments for states (Ahmad, 2007). Many important developments occurred in European industries, technologies and armies in the 17th century. These developments are also related to new logistics and technological innovations in armies. The Ottoman Empire, which had a closed and isolated economic-political management system in its internal and external system, remained far away from all these technological and industrial developments, and it could not adapt to them. The main thrust of this is that not enough importance and value was given to science and technology, discoveries and inventions, and the development of political and intellectual thought in the Ottoman Empire since the 16th century.

Therefore, when we look at the origins of modernization in the Ottoman Empire, starting from the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699, the Empire turned its face to the science and technology of the West rather than turning its back and emulating it. In this regard, innovation initiatives primarily stand out in the military field; therefore, Westernization, modernization and change efforts in the 18th and 19th centuries can be easily seen. As a matter of fact, with the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699, the period of stagnation of the Ottoman Empire began. The first

cost of this period, in which the empire entered a period of stagnation, was the empire's first major land loss. This important influence increased even more with the 1718 Treaty of Passarowitz. The subsequent Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca in 1774 had another humiliating and humiliating effect on the Empire. The empire still survived for about 200 years after all these devastating and sharp international events. The most important reason why this situation continues is the strategic realities of the international system directly related to the balance of power between England, France and Russia in the 18th and 19th centuries. All these facts caused erosion in the authority of the Empire both inside and outside its borders. The Ottoman Imperial system is based entirely on conquest and expansion. Such internal dynamics are related to the military organization, tax system, and land tenure system of a system. With the tension in distribution, the entire system began to fail to meet the needs of the Empire (Lewis, 2007). Based on this chronicle, new ideas and acceptances emerged for the requirements of modernization in the Ottoman Empire. These are as follows:

- (a) First Reform Movements Period (1789-1839) (periods of Selim III and Mahmud II [in other words, "Period of Auspicious Events"]),
- (b) Tanzimat Period (1839-1876),
- (c) The First Constitutional Monarchy Period (1876-1878), the Second Constitutional Monarchy Period (1908-1918) and
- (d) The Republican Period (1923).

As seen clearly, it is likely to claim that these are four important milestones in Turkish modernization (Kuran, 1976; Görgün, 2014). In this context, Ottoman-Turkish modernization is actually the Europeanization of the Ottoman Empire in social, political, military, economic, fiscal-financial, legal, educational and cultural fields, in other words, it was an era of the efforts for the Ottomans to catch up and modernize (secularize) as the Age had dictated. Therefore, in reality, this situation was the Ottoman Empire's "primitive" secularization in all areas, especially in social and political areas. Because, within the scope of the Ottoman-Turkish modernization process, which began to take shape

with the first primitive intellectual-theoretical cores that were “inevitable” after the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699, in other words, which could not be resisted by the Age and the developments of the Age, the first reform (innovation) activities were carried out especially in the time of III. Selim and 18th century. When we look at the innovation and reform movements of the II. Mahmud’s period, it is possible to categorize these developments under the modernization pillar of practical and empirical Europeanization, contrary to what is defined at the theoretical level. Because Ottoman modernization (in other words, Ottoman Europeanization and secularization) was a form of modernization implemented under the concept of Westernization.

It is a fact that during the Ottoman modernization period there was a common European legal system that defined the complex structure of political powers in Europe and how they handled the problems at hand, and since justice was the basis of property, the Ottoman Empire was also influenced by this primitive European legal system. For the Ottomans, a certain degree of integration into this system was compatible with theoretical Europeanization. Moreover, Ottoman Europeanization, like the theoretical definition, was subject to a top-down approach. However, these similarities did not mean that Ottoman Europeanization was directly comparable to theoretical and practical Europeanization. Because the Ottoman Empire did not have a European past with its legal, economic, religious, ethnic and socio-cultural structure; nor was it a part of its past. It had no common historical heritage with Europe, neither culturally, ethnically nor geographically.

Therefore, Ottoman reform/modernization was implemented by modeling the existing European system of the period, rather than through policy implementation, as defined in theoretical Europeanization. As a matter of fact, the Ottoman Empire has been in close relations with Europe for centuries, and therefore, the modernization of the Ottoman Empire was carried out within the framework of Westernization (Erülker, 2015). While the empire was experiencing its heyday, Europeanization was never on the agenda of the political power. However, when the Empire could

not keep up with the socio-political, socio-economic, economic-political, scientific-technological, intellectual-intellectual and military developments and advances that started in Europe, especially since the 1500s, in other words, when it could not catch up with the times, it came to a halt, and had entered a period of decline with the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699. Therefore, in the post-1699 period, Westernization emerged as a necessity and an inevitable reality for the Empire and its ruling ruling classes. However, as the Empire began to decline and suffer major defeats, especially in the military field, the Europeanization (Westernization) reformation became an important internal understanding for the Ottoman Empire, both in the military field and in diplomatic services.

As a matter of fact, the concept and idea of “modern” derives from the Latin word “modernus”, which describes the difference between “new” Christians and “old” pagans. Technically, this term appears to be reused whenever there is a dialectical conflict between new and old in history. As a matter of fact, at the end of the 18th century, when the Enlightenment challenged religious universalism and highlighted positive sciences as old and new concepts, the “new” idea of Westerners emerged, arguing that the West was superior because it strengthened rationality and positive sciences over others. The reason why modernization is associated with the West is the essential, fundamental and radical transformation that took place in scientific and intellectual thought and social life in Western Europe and North America. This radical transformation has been further accelerated by technological innovations and geographical discoveries. In addition, the information collected until the 18th century was supported by education and positive sciences, and eventually factorization increased the speed of change and transformation (Metin, 2011: 23-25).

According to Black (1967), in the context of the modernization process, the Ottoman Empire was a country that was not directly affected by the outside. However, it is considered one of the societies that modernized under the influence of these previously modernized societies. Although

the countries classified under this heading have deep-rooted bureaucratic traditions, they are integrated with a state tradition. These have often been subjected to foreign aggression. However, again as Black (1989) emphasized that they were not fully occupied and/or colonized. In such political entities, modernization was used to change the state system and was carried out by a leader who came to power through traditional methods. Nevertheless, when political leaders and ruling ruling classes reach power and power, they cannot make an effort to continue reform and innovation despite the traditional methods that brought them to power, due to the impulse and idea of traditionalism and conservatism that resurface in their minds.

Ottoman modernization has similarities with this approach. First of all, the Ottoman Empire has very important and deep-rooted state traditions. As a matter of fact, although the Empire was at war with the West for centuries, it was not fully occupied until World War I. Secondly, the encouragement of change came from able sultans and their political elites. Moreover, the Ottoman Empire began to modernize only after the 1750s, with European-derived military-political tools such as military technologies, military tactics, and a system of foreign policy institutions based on reciprocity. Because the European continent and civilization is the only and closest example that started to modernize before the Ottoman Empire and caught up with the times; therefore, as emphasized in Black's (1967) approach, there is a military-political political entity for the Ottoman Empire that can be taken as a model or influenced in keeping up with the age, like Europe. For this reason, Europeanization, in other words Westernization, was the main route of modernization in the Ottoman Empire (Erülker, 2015).

Hencewith this situation, it seems more reasonable to consider the initial basis of Ottoman-Turkish modernization in the context of European Westernization. As a matter of fact, as a result of the increasing number of military defeats, the Ottoman army became the starting point of transformation and modernization. The army was the first institution to modernize in the Ottoman Empire.

Because countering the technological superiority of European armies in the 18th century was only possible with an army that used European warfare methods (Kuran, 1964; 1999). Thus, while Europe showed its own civilization as unique and superior with its technological progress, the Ottoman Empire began to modernize its army by taking Europe as a military-political model (Kolbaşı, 2014: 5). Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the first modernization and Westernization efforts, moves and initiatives in the Ottoman Empire in this context. However, the main reason for the Ottoman Army's defeats on the battlefields was not only Europe's advancement in military technology. Nevertheless, the ruling political and civil classes of the Ottoman Empire were not at the intellectual and educational level to understand this. Because the thought, education and intellectual world of the Empire could not see and catch up with the requirements and progress of the age. Since the 1600s in Europe, economic-political concepts such as democracy, secularism, popular sovereignty, equality, freedom, religion, freedom of thought and expression began to be considered, questioned and developed theoretically and empirically. However, in the Ottoman Empire, which had an Asian-type despotic Eastern social life (Weber, 2012), the first kernels of this intellectual, intellectual and economic-political progress began to be seen only after the 1750s. In this regard, Mardin (2012: 9-10) highlights the following points; "During the rise of the Ottoman Empire, it did not become a problem for the Ottomans to follow Europe as a "model" because they considered their own civilization superior. (...) As the Empire declines, the question of why the Empire decays is answered either by identifying the problem of corruption within the state or by recognizing the military superiority of the West."

In this context, the idea of 'the decline of the Ottoman Army compared to its European counterparts', which emerged after the devastating defeat in the Second Siege of Vienna in 1683, was the result of not only military modernization but also economic modernization as a result of the heavy military-political defeat received with the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699. Based on the feeling that political

and social change was needed, the “Westernization” initiative was born and this initiative became the starting point of the future definition of Turkish modernization (Kolbaşı, 2014: 6). A new world view emerged in the Ottoman Empire, which accepted the superiority of Europe while this new intellectual development was the first steps and seeds of modernization, in other words, a secular-contemporary style, in the Ottoman Empire. In this regard, Ottoman Sultans such as III. Selim and II. Mahmud could be considered as being the first progressive leaders of Ottoman modernization (Heper, 1973).

However, another important point in the Ottoman-Turkish modernization debate was the role of religion. Religious/traditional resistance against Ottoman modernization came to a “temporary” end after the “real and modern” modernization process of modernization, modernization, and ultimately secularization, which was entered into through the Republic declared in 1923 and the Atatürk reforms and revolutions carried out thereafter. However, this resistance, which always opposes modernization, modernization and secularism, in other words, an economic-political and social structuring in which human exploitation of another is minimized, and desires to realize this exploitation in the context of its own plans, has never ended; and it will not end forever... Therefore, the reform/religion axis became an important parameter and determining impulse in the Ottoman Empire, as in the early Republic period, which can be called dual institutionalism (Heper, 1973).

In this context, in the Ottoman Empire, since the second half of the 18th century, religious and secular-based institutions have coexisted with an education system such as madrasas and secular military engineering schools, which provide religious-based education. In this context, the Ottoman Army’s first reform/Europeanization attempts sought to legitimize Islamic institutions while borrowing new technologies from Europe (Heper, 1973). If borrowing from Europe is limited, Islamic institutions may allow reform of the military, because “...Sharia allowed Muslims to use the tricks of their enemies to defeat them.” (İnalçık, 1964: 49) This approach should not mean that the

army was previously a completely secular organization; but rather, the newly introduced reforms had a secular meaning. Moreover, “... as debt increased, even in the military, the limit of what Islamic traditions could tolerate was quickly reached.” (Heper, 1973)

Because, while borrowing money from Europe to develop the army, on the other hand, Europe’s military sciences, training methods and uniforms had to be borrowed, however, this contradicted the idea of Islamic superiority (Heper, 1973). However, challenging Islamic notions of superiority should be considered part of the military’s traditional side. Therefore, the modernization and reform of the Ottoman Empire was carried out by modeling the European system. This attempt to model the European system, which can also be described as Westernization, was initiated by the sultans and the Ottoman ruling elite in public institutions such as the army and the foreign affairs. In this manner, new Army, namely Nizam-ı Cedid, was the first modernization attempt in the military power, as the army was the main policy tool of the Ottoman state system. It was founded by III. Selim. In this way, it was believed that the army was westernized, and this incredible development was intended to be used as leverage to reform the entire state system. Since the army was the primary source of Ottoman foreign policy, the implementation of state policies also changed after the army was reformed. It was believed that these developments would eventually put an end to the decline of the Empire. Considering this fact, Ottoman modernization can be considered a top-down process (Erülker, 2015).

### **3.4 THE LAST FOUNDATION OF OTTOMAN-TURKISH MODERNIZATION: SECULARISM**

It is widely accepted that secularism advocates the separation of politics from religion - especially in the Turkish understanding of secularism. There are generally two types of distinctions in this context. The first defines separation by exclusion. For the latter, separating means creating distance or drawing certain boundaries between the two (Raz, 1986). The secular state is not anti-religious, but on the contrary, the state, which has adopted secularism, is against using religion for and in

politics. It is against the politicization of religion and the formation of a new exploitation order based on the state and political regime, as seen in ideologies such as liberalism, communism, socialism, conservatism, and capitalism, which is an economic-political phenomenon. As a matter of fact, in states where religion is politicized, all kinds of exploitation domination over citizens, especially social, economic, fiscal-financial, legal and cultural, is very easily established, and the middle-bourgeois class is eliminated with grassroots-based religious politics, creating an allegiant, grateful and obedient community culture, and it is seen that the mass of the population has emerged.

On the other hand, the most common definition of secularism is the separation of religion from state affairs and the state's lack of many important features of a religious government. In other words, secular states can never be religious states, like the Islamic State, the Christian State and so on. Because a secular state and its government are neutral towards all religions and religious beliefs. For this reason, the state cannot demand an official religion neither in its Constitution, nor in its government, nor in the state administration, and it does not protect one religion or religious belief at the expense of another. Likewise, all individuals are equal before the law, regardless of their religion or religious beliefs (Wing and Varol, 2005). Additionally, a secular regime requires that education and legal systems be tolerant of different religious orientations and at the same time do not contain laws based on a particular religion or religious belief. Therefore, a secular government requires absolute freedom of religion and conscience. Therefore, secularism does not require religion not to exist in society or the removal of religion from social life. On the contrary, it protects religion and religious beliefs against each other, and secures each other from all kinds of domination and hegemonic attitudes and initiatives - whether state-supported or not. In a secular state, individuals practice their religion, religious beliefs and religious rituals freely and as they wish, and the state supports them to the fullest. Therefore, in a secular state, individuals are free to express and demonstrate their religion and religious beliefs both

in private and public areas. A secular state cannot impose restrictions on the religious activities of its citizens. A secular regime is based on pluralism, which requires the government to respect all religions and religious beliefs (Burak, 2012). Therefore, secularism is not specific to Christianity alone, but is a universal socio-political and socio-economic phenomenon. Because secularism has no basis, foresight or idea of enmity or anti-religion while secularism prevents religion from being instrumentalized by politics and used for economic-political and social domination, hegemony and exploitation.

It is very important to note that these qualities of secularism define a perfect secular state, both theoretically and conceptually-practically. Likewise, the basis of a modern, secular social life in every aspect is a secular state and its secular administration. The phenomenon of secularism is directly related with the state, society, groups and individuals; quality of being a society, freedom, equality, social justice, wealth, being oneself, freedom of life, gender freedom, women's rights, social rights, rights, law, justice, democracy, sustainable development and social development, welfare, wealth and wealth, in short. It offers a good earthly life. Spiritual life and its aftermath are up to the individual. No one can interfere with it, including the laity, but on the contrary, secularism protects these rights and freedoms of the individual. Naturally, according to some, the secular state exists theoretically, however, it does not exist in practice (Bangstad, 2009).

At the same time, such claims and opinions do not reflect reality, and dictates that religion dominate political life. Ultimately, it envisages the state to be a religious state. On the contrary, secularism is against political religiousism in state affairs and the use of religion as a tool to seize political power. Because religion does the exact opposite, in other words, in every field, including private, public and political areas. Although it commands not to lie, not to violate others' rights, to govern justly, to be open, transparent and accountable, and to defend people's rights and laws to the end, it is obvious that religious belief has weakened since all these are

frequently seen in societies where religion is politicized.

In this context, it is possible to emphasize that the phenomenon of secularism is the basis of Western free thought, libertarianism, and therefore modernism. Therefore, secularism is a salvation from the Middle Ages (approximately 500-1500 AD) and the Dark Ages (approximately 476-900 AD) in the history of Western civilization, which were oppressive, monolithic, cruel, impoverishing, trampling on human dignity and involving tens of thousands of crimes against humanity. Beginning in the 17th century in Europe, thanks to rationalist, positivist, enlightenment, renaissance and reformist thinkers/philosophers and the strong progressive-transformative impulses of the British, American and French Revolutions, the phenomenon of secularism became a part of the West, the religion of Christianity (especially Catholicism, the Church and the Clergy).

It also provided great theoretical and empirical support to the world class trinity to get rid of the destructive effects of the Middle Ages and the Dark Ages. As a result, it put an end to the domination and hegemony of the Christian religion over social and individual life. Thus, political and economic institutions also got their share from this change and transformation, and thanks to secularism, the monarchy of the Kings in Europe was ended in politics, led to the flourishing of liberal-democratic Constitutional Republics, and led to the birth of liberal-capitalism in economic life (Holyoake, 1896).

As a matter of fact, with works such as John Locke's *A Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689) and John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty* (1859), many rationalist-enlightenment intellectuals advocated and encouraged religious tolerance in society and secularism in their writings. These and similar Enlightenment thinkers and philosophers emphasized their intense and strong opposition to the Church and the Clergy, which gave Europe the Middle Ages, in other words the Dark Ages, and intellectually attacked the Catholic Church. Except this, geographical discoveries, commercial revolution, mercantalism, revolutions, ideologies, industrialization, urbanization and the increasing

role of different economic class groups led to the weakening of the effects of religion on socio-political and socio-economic life and the secularization and laicization of politics and political regimes in line with the age, in other words, politics. It helped religion to emerge from its domination and hegemony, thus helping the development of secularism in the West (Holyoake, 1896).

However, the first intellectual roots of Western secularism lie in the thoughts of Middle Age philosopher Marsilius of Padua, also an Italian thinker and academic, who lived between 1270 and 1342, and who was also the Rector of the University of Paris in 1313, which were "unreasonable" for that period, so to speak, for the opponents of modernism. According to Marsilius of Padua, the secular government, as the bearer of coercive authority, should be politically superior to the priesthood. If the priests refuse to obey the government and its laws, then they must be forced to do so. It was due to the strong belief that such disobedience would threaten the unity of coercive authority without which society cannot live. The main idea on which Marsilius based his political theory was the idea of popular sovereignty. Ultimately, all power is in the hands of the people. The secular ruler exercises his political authority not because he receives it as a divine right, and also because he receives it from the citizens of the state. According to Marsilius, political authority in the state derives from the citizens. Only they, acting as a whole or through delegated authority, have the right to make laws for the state. To ensure peace in the state, it is necessary to have an institution of government, which can but need not be a hereditary monarchy. Such a head of state should be elected by the entire society. If the ruler acts contrary to the welfare or laws of the community, he can be deposed. As a result, Marsilius of Padua, a Christian thinker who made the most serious intellectual contributions to Protestantism and the Protestant reformation in history, saw and described the church of his time as one of the most powerful disruptors of social peace (Herbermann, 1913; Wellborn, 1962; Marsilius of Padua, 1967; Gewirth, 1967: 166; Garnett, 2006; Lee, 2008).



Therefore, today's secularism in the West has a very deep social, political, economic, religious and cultural history and foundations. Therefore, secularism has brought to the West endless respect for human fundamental rights and freedoms, a solid democracy and social structure, and most importantly, honest politics and justice-legal system. This enabled them to spread to the Western world from the 15th century, especially within the scope of the developments in the West after the Turks' conquest of Istanbul in 1453. That is why Western democracies are the most robust and well-functioning democracies today. Because secularism is also the basis of a solid and functional democracy. A solid and functioning democracy is the result of a justice and legal system of the same quality. In this context, it is possible to say that secularism is actually a justice and legal system that is solid and works equally for everyone and truly constitutes the basis of the state. Today's Western secular states are therefore the countries where the rule of law is most ensured in the world. Because the democracy concept of secularism is basically the freedom of thought, speech, life and belief as a requirement of a secular society. Therefore, the phenomenon of secularism is directly linked to the concept of democracy (Berkes, March 1979: 3).

Accordingly, secularism in the Western sense is actually and essentially a matter of "mentality". This issue of "mentality" issue is an enlightenment-progressive process that involves a chain reaction of a preliminary secular mentality that will lead to a secular mentality in the future. In other words, it is not just the liberation of the mind from the yoke of sanctified religious tradition, like secularism, which can be seen as a sub-concept of Western secularism. It is to ensure that the mind is both subjected to such liberation and can catch up with the principles of contemporary civilization. Therefore, if secularism, in other words, is the phenomenon of modernity, it means the modernized secular mentality, the secular mentality that has caught up with the times (Berkes, 1976). However, in a society with most of the "contemporary" tools of the "contemporary" world, there are still differences in the relationships between individuals, groups, ethnicities, belief groups, congregational communities, professional

groups and all the like that make up the society, or in the patterns of individual or group behavior within them. A "Middle-Age-mentality" can easily be observed in the 21st century, in other words, in the Millennium. The main reason for this is that Eastern societies take the substance, not the essence, of the secularism and secularism of Western civilization. Therefore, secularism and modernism are fundamentally a matter of mentality. Because if a person's mentality is corrupt, if he is bigoted, fatalistic and superstitious, secularism, in other words being contemporary, will be problematic and paradoxical.

Therefore, secularism takes place at every point, turn and corner of life, from politics to social life, from economy to education, from justice to law, from basic human rights and freedoms to a humane and autonomous life, in short, in every aspect of life, and thus, it affects and direct effects on individual, group, social and international relations. The Republic of Türkiye, which was founded in 1923, as a state that turned its face to the West and attempted to Westernize despite the West, adopted the concept of secularism, which the West gained after centuries of socio-political and socio-economic developments, with a rapid revolution and reform process, and in a short time, the state had adapted to the society. However, in the lines above, we emphasized that secularism and modernizm are matters of mentality. As a matter of fact, Adanır (2010: 220-221) draws attention to this interesting approach and understanding, and compares the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Türkiye to the silkworm turning into a butterfly in its cocoon, and states that the new contemporary social order established with the Republican Revolutions is of Western origin, but has become Turkish, in other words, it does not represent the essence of Western civilization. He points out that it is an embodied socio-political form.

Before moving on to the short history of the development of secularism in Türkiye since the Ottoman period and eventually taking its place in the Constitution as one of the basic founding elements of the state with the Republic, it is

important to understand the importance of Western secularism in terms of imperialism (global political hegemony and exploitation order) and capitalism (global economic hegemony and exploitation). Therefore, it is a likely-undeniable fact that it should not be forgotten that the civilized West also has an imperialist West face and that this face should be analyzed very well on the path to modernization. Because what Atatürk was against was not the civilized West, for which he fought all his life, but the imperialist West. That's why it fought with the imperialist West. However, it adopted the civilization and science of the West and contemporary civilization (Kavcar, 1985: 276, 279).

As a matter of fact, while Berkes, on the one hand, states that Türkiye's change in historical direction constitutes the prerequisites for the social revolution, on the other hand, he judges that some of the realities of Western civilization are not sufficiently understood (Kayalı, 1994: 22-23). In this context, according to Berkes (1975b: 186), one of the fundamental truths that the Turkish Nation should never forget is this; "...The biggest lesson [the War of Independence] taught was that it taught that the thing called the West had a side called imperialism. The Ottoman Empire, with its policy of Western [French, British, German] satelliteism, had set itself against the West in such a way that the West became the force called imperialism against it. This means that unless the Turkish society remains independent from the West, the West will definitely confront it in the form of imperialism. This is an economic necessity. The most dangerous aspect of this is that it loses the possibility of changing its own structure to suit modern civilization. No underdeveloped society that is not independent from the West can Westernize or progress; It cannot give itself a new order, either through reform or revolution; It drifts away like a straw caught in a flood..."

In this context, during the Ottoman Empire, especially in the face of Islamism, religiousism, caliphate and sharia, which increased with the political influence gained by the Shaykh al-Islams over the monarchical administration of the Sultans in the last 150 years of the Empire, III. Selim II. Mahmud, Sultan Abdulmecid. The Westernization

and modernization efforts and initiatives undertaken by Ottoman Sultans such as II. Abdulhamid in the political, social, economic, educational and legal fields, especially in the military, could neither gain a social revolutionary nor an enlightenment-progressive structure. All these initiatives could only constitute the basic-primitive steps of Turkish modernization until the Republic of Türkiye and could not go further than that. Because these Ottoman Sultans did not have enough of Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's enlightenment, reformist, positivist and rational mentality and thought, so to speak, nourished by the Renaissance and Reformationist Anatolian Humanism spirit; thus, frankly, they could not analyze the era as much as he did.

Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, on the other hand, made this analysis in the right place and time with a perfect analysis and made secularism one of the foundations of state policy, and as a result of the acceptance of the bill submitted by the Sultanate in 1922 and by Sheikh Saffet Efendi and his 53 friends on March 3, 1924, the Caliphate became the leader of the Ottoman Empire. It is the result of a process that started with the abolition of the Constitution (Öcal, 2020: 79), and resulted in the entry of secularism into the Constitution and thus the state system as a fundamental principle in 1937. Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's radical secularism policy has increased its effectiveness since 1922, and this revolutionary policy aimed to reduce the influence of the Islamic religion on the state to zero and significantly reduced the role of the Islamic religion, especially in the political and social fields (Kireev, 2007; Izmaylov et al., 2019). Because religion, religious belief, is a personal matter, decision and freedom. No institution, organization, structure or person, including the state, can force an individual who has been trained to act from his mind (of course, if the individual has been trained in this way) on any issue, including religion. Therefore, it should be noted that this step is quite important; because Islam should not be the only phenomenon that unites society, as it was in the Ottoman period. On the contrary, secularism, in short, should be democracy, in other words, it is a society and social structure consisting of fair, honest, moral, modern-

minded, respectful of everyone's rights and laws, well-intentioned, empathetic and tolerant individuals. Likewise, only laicism and secularism can transform a society from being a community, an ummah, into a modern society and make it livable. Otherwise, today we will see states that have not achieved contemporary, modern and democratic living conditions and their unhappy citizens who lack law, justice and social justice.

The secularism of the West expresses deep philosophical and even socio-political issues. It is a way of keeping ideology away from humanity, being human, being oneself. Because ideologies, like religions, contain dogmas and unchangeable provisions. For this reason, nothing that does not change and cannot be adapted to the conditions of life can bring humanity neither rational and healthy progress nor development in science, technology, social life, politics, economy, culture, education, law and many other social fields. Secularism, as being a honest human condition, enables the ability to empathize, show respect and love to other people, be tolerant and have good intentions. In fact, in today's interstate environment, in societies where secularism does not exist, the existence of both these characteristics and a sustainable economic-political economy is not possible. Therefore, although such states appear to be contemporary and modern, the political power is oppressive and authoritarian; social life is unfair, unequal, unlawful, conservative, reactionary; citizens are left behind, poor, unemployed, unhappy, hopeless and without a future. Thus, modern science, far from being rational and scientific, has evolved into a science of ignorance. The economy is weak, bad and fragile. This situation is best described by the following words of Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk on 30 August 1925: "...Know that, gentlemen and people; The Republic of Türkiye cannot be a country of sheikhs, dervishes, disciples and followers. The truest sect is the sect of civilization. Civilization has one condition - being human and that is enough..." (Cited in Tanfer, 1999: 46)

Therefore, secularism, as the umbrella revolutionary principle above all the principles and reforms of the Turkish Revolution as a whole, is both the guarantee and the basis of the Atatürk

Revolutions and the contemporary Republic of Türkiye. Because, thanks to secularism, the birth of a modern and contemporary state, instead of a theocratic Middle Age empire, was possible with the emergence of a mentality based on freedom of mind, science and conscience. Therefore, secularism is the basis of Turkish modernization. However, thanks to the rational, positivist and enlightenment-progressive revolutionary spirit of Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Republican Türkiye, as a country that adopted Western secularism for the first time in history (and still has no second example), is today as modern and Western as possible. Although it is a part of the Western world, a candidate member of the European Union, a member of NATO, and a state that has been able to integrate with the Western world under the maximum possible conditions and is a center of attraction for Asian, African and Arab societies, the Kemalist understanding of secularism is both authoritarian and anti-democratic. There are also many opinions in the literature that claim that Türkiye aims to completely eliminate religion from the social life of citizens or that, in the context of Türkiye, the state's interpretation and practice of secularism has negative effects on democracy (Karakas, 2007: 11; Şan, 2012; Burak, 2012).

As a matter of fact, the basic illusions of these views are the constitutional, ethnic, or religious-based approaches they advocate (Karakas, 2007), or the fact that Turkish secularism has chosen the mission of completely eliminating the Islamic religion from social life (Şan, 2012), or that Türkiye has not gone into arguments such as representing an example that sheds light on the dominant role of the state institution over religion in the secularism-democracy relationship (Burak, 2012), but especially in arguments such as "secularism", which is the fundamental socio-political phenomenon that leads to the full implementation of the Republic-democracy duo in the context of Western-style contemporary principles and principles. It is thought that the reason behind this lies in their failure to fully analyze the fact that secularism is the most effective socio-political medicine to prevent the politicization of the Islamic religion in Muslim societies and all kinds of

injustice, favoritism, incompetence, corruption, decay and decay that this will cause in the state administration. Because secularism, above all constitutional, ethnic, religious, sectarian, sexual, racial, ideological and similar abstract and relative facts and concepts, the human condition of being human, in other words, by internalizing love, respect, empathy, goodwill and tolerance, is truly free, equal and fair. It is a phenomenal notion that contributes the most to being honest, moral, rights-loving, rights-protecting, people-loving, nature-loving, animal-loving, plant-loving and essentially democratic.

Therefore, if a person, compromising on being human in the first place, recklessly and violently opposes “love, respect, empathy, good will and tolerance”, which in our opinion are the basic principles of democracy, then both himself, the society he lives in, and the country of which he is a citizen are free, equal, fair, honest, moral, rights-loving, rights-protecting, human-loving, nature-loving, animal-loving, plant-loving, in short, social peace, harmony, security, co-existence, respect for everyone’s rights in a pluralistic manner. It will see that it is moving away from being rich, modern and livable day by day, with care, attention and value. Secularism, as a matter of a superior and developed mentality, means respecting, loving, having good will, tolerance and empathy towards other people. To the extent that this can be fully adopted by the state and taught to all its citizens through modern normative education, constitutional, ethnic, religious, sectarian, sexual, racial, ideological and similar problems in that society are minimized. Secularism has never had, and cannot have, the aim or goal of completely removing religion from social life, because this is against the nature of things and also against the nature of man. It will be seen that the state does not have an institutional dominant role over religion in the secularism-democracy relationship, on the contrary, secularism is one of the most fundamental impulses in the democratization of a state.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

As a result, we had reached to some important and critical findings in this study that can be emphasized within the scope of the foundations of Ottoman-Turkish modernization as follows.

In this regard, the first important finding is that Turkish modernization is a movement to catch up with an era that started during the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, Turkish modernization should actually be evaluated as Ottoman-Turkish modernization. Because Turkish modernization, as a whole, is a process that started in the last 200 years of the Ottoman Empire, evolved into the Republic of Türkiye, and still continues.

The second important finding is that Ottoman-Turkish modernization is a movement of necessity. Since the mid-1600s, the Ottoman Army began to suffer defeats against its main enemies, the European and Russian armies, and the Empire began to lose territory. In short, the Empire’s feature of being an empire of conquest, world and age has begun to decline.

The third important finding is that the foundations of Ottoman-Turkish modernization lie in Europe, which has entered a development leap especially with the New Age. Because the aim of the Ottoman-Turkish modernization movement is to become European. However, this Europeanization is never about being like the Christian West, but only about catching up with its scientific and technological development in the military field. In other words, the impulse that forced the start of this movement was only the defeats of the Ottoman Army against the European armies. Therefore, this Europeanization was an understanding that was envisaged by the Ottoman Sultans to be implemented only in the military field, for religious, political, cultural and social reasons.

The fourth important finding is that the main impulses in the evolution of European civilization into modern Europe are secularism, democracy, Enlightenment, Renaissance and Reformation in religion. When humanism was added to these, Europe and later North America created a modernization model known as ‘Westernization’ for Eastern societies that were under the dark and

reactionary influence of superstitious, mystical, fatalistic traditionalism. The Ottoman Empire, as an Asian-type-despotic Eastern society, received its maximum share from Westernization, especially since the 1700s, due to its proximity to Europe and close interactions with Europeans. Therefore, the first main thrust of Ottoman-Turkish modernization is Westernization.

The fifth important detection is the most important issue that the Ottoman ruling classes could not actually foresee, contrary to what the Ottomans understood from this Europeanization. It is an inevitable reality that the relations and interactions between deep-rooted and ancient civilizations and societies cannot only catch up with the times in the military field. Additionally, these interactions will lead to increasing changes and transformations that will have an increasing impact on the Ottoman society, politics, army, economy, law and social culture. As a matter of fact, this phenomenon, which resulted in change and transformation in many social areas, is known as Westernization in the literature, and it can be said that this was accepted as inevitable and mandatory by the Ottoman ruling elites. Likewise, empires are multi-

national, multi-cultural, multi-religious political structures. In other words, the Ottoman Empire, by virtue of being an Empire, necessarily entered the path of Westernization.

After all these detections, the only point that can be emphasized in the last word is this: Despite all the superstitious traditionalism, fatalism, religiousism, reactionism, communalism, bigotry, and hostility towards Atatürk and the Republic, The Turkish Nation as a deep-rooted, ancient and modern nation, established the secular, democratic and Western Republic in 1923 under the leadership of Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his comrades will preserve forever. Because secularism, modernity and Western characteristics, nourished by social revolutionism and modernization, are ancient and original characteristics that have always existed in the noble veins of the Turkish Nation. The future foundations of Turkish modernization are the rational-scientific mentality of Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the Founding Leader and Great Leader of the Republic of Türkiye, that directs the modern future, and these noble characteristics that he always saw and believed in the Turkish Nation.

## REFERENCES

- Adanır, O. (2010). *Eski Dünyaya Yeni Bir Bakış: Baudrillard, Berkes, Mauss ve Ülgener Üzerinden Kuramsal bir Deneme*. Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Ahmad, F. (1994). *The Making of Modern Turkey*. Routledge.
- Ahmad, F. (2007). *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*, 6th ed. Kaynak.
- Akarçay, P., & Ak, G. (2017a). A Way to Democratic Quality for Women: 'Counterpartizm' Between Civil Society and Political Participation. *International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research (IJSSER)*, 2(10), 4919-4947, <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/3104965>
- Akarçay, P., ve Ak, G. (2017b). Anadolu Eğitim Aydınlanmasında Çağdaş Bir Meşale: Köy Enstitüleri Örneği Üzerine. *International Journal of Academic Value Studies*, 3(16), 130-140, DOI : 10.23929/ijavs.583
- Akarçay, P., & Ak, G. (2018a). 1940'lı Yıllarda Türkiye'de Entelijansiya, Basın ve Siyaset İlişkisi Üzerine. *Research Studies Anatolia Journal*, 1(2), 126-141, <https://doi.org/10.33723/rs.429262>
- Akarçay, P., & Ak, G. (2018b). Multi-Voiced Language in 'Society of Democracy': Harmony Far Beyond Being Human. *International Journal of Language Academy (IJLA)*, 6/3, 31-56, DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.18033/ijla.3962>
- Akarçay, P., & Ak, G. (2018c). 1940'ların Türkiye'sinde Amerikan Emperyalizmi ve 'Hami Arayışı' Adeti İlişkisi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 18(36), 265-293, <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ctad/issue/39883/473895>
- Akçam, A. (2009). *Anadolu Rönesansı Esas Duruşta!...* Arkadaş Yayınevi.
- Althusser, L. (2016). *İdeoloji ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları*. 5th ed. trans. A. Tümertekin. İthaki.
- Anayurt, Ö. (2020). *Anayasa Hukuku Genel Kısım (Temel İlkeler, Kavram ve Kurumlar)*. Seçkin.
- Ateş, T. (2001). Kemalizm ve Özgünlüğü. In A. İnel (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm*, Vol 2, (317-322). İletişim.
- Aydemir, Ş. S. (1979). *Kırmızı Mektuplar ve Son Yazıları*. Çağdaş.
- Bangstad, S. (2009). Contesting Secularism/s: Secularism and Islam in the Works of Talal Asad. *Anthropological Theory*, 9(2), 188-208.
- Berkes, N. (1964). *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. McGill University Press.
- Berkes, N. (1965). *İkiyüz Yıldır Neden Bocalıyoruz?*. 2nd ed. İstanbul Matbaası.
- Berkes, N. (1972). *100 Soruda Türkiye İktisat Tarihi (1. Cilt: Osmanlı Ekonomik Tarihinin Temelleri)*. 2nd ed. Gerçek.
- Berkes, N. (1973). *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*. Bilgi.
- Berkes, N. (1975a). *100 Soruda Türkiye İktisat Tarihi (2. Cilt: Osmanlı Devletinin Ekonomik Çöküşü)*. 2nd ed. Gerçek.
- Berkes, N. (1975b). *Türk Düşününde Batı Sorunu*. Bilgi.
- Berkes, N. (1976). *Asya Mektupları (Gezi, İzlenimler, Eleştiriler)*. Çağdaş.
- Berkes, N. (Mart 1979). Komşunun Kaz Boyutlu Tavuğu. *Sesimiz*, 116, 3-4.
- Berkes, N. (1984a). Teokrasi ve Feodalizm. In *Teokrasi ve Lâiklik*. (81-90). Adam.
- Berkes, N. (1984b). Anayasa Kaynağı Olarak Söylev. *Teokrasi ve Lâiklik*. (155-158). Adam.
- Berkes, N. (1997). *Unutulan Yıllar*. R. Sezer (Ed.). İletişim.
- Black, C. E. (1967). *The Dynamics of Modernization: A Study in Comparative History*. Harper & Row.
- Black, C. E. (1989). *Çağdaşlaşmanın İtici Güçleri*. trans. F. Gümüş. Verso.
- Brinton, C. (1965). *The Anatomy of Revolution*. Vintage Book.

- Burak, B. (2012). Can Secularism Hinder Democracy? The Turkish Experiment. *İnsan & Toplum*, 2(4), 65-82, <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/insanvetoplum/issue/69996/1120848>
- Çotuksöken, Y. (1999). *Atatürk Antolojisi*. 3rd ed. İnkılâp Kitabevi.
- Davison, R. H. (1981). *Turkey: A Short History*. Eothen Press.
- Eliçin, E. T. (1970). *Kemalist Devrim İdeolojisi*. Ant.
- Erülker, C. (2015). *Understanding the Reform Process of the Ottoman Diplomacy: A Case of Modernization?*. Published MBA Thesis. METU European Studies Program, Ankara.
- Garnett, G. (2006). *Marsilius of Padua and 'The Truth of History'*. Oxford University Press.
- Genim, S. (2021). "Bernard Lewis'in Sözleriyle Türkiye", 16 October, *Milliyet*, <https://www.milliyet.com.tr/yazarlar/sinan-genim/bernard-lewisin-sozleriyle-turkiye-6620392> (Accessed on: 02.08.2023).
- Gewirth, A. (1967). Marsilius of Padua. P. Edwards (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. 5. Macmillan.
- Göçek, F. M. (1987). *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford University Press.
- Görgün, M. (2014). *The Role of Turkish Theatre in the Process of Modernization in Turkey (1839-1946)*. Published Doctorate Thesis. Yeditepe University ISS, İstanbul.
- Herbermann, C. (Ed.). (1913). Marsilius of Padua. *Catholic Encyclopedia*. Robert Appleton Company.
- Heper, M. (1973). Osmanlı-Türk Devletinde Bürokrasinin Siyasal Rolü: Karşılaştırmalı Kamu Yönetimi Açısından Bazı Gözlemler. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 5(July), 29-40, [https://ammeidaresi.hacibayram.edu.tr/documents/article/1/6/2/3\\_heper.pdf](https://ammeidaresi.hacibayram.edu.tr/documents/article/1/6/2/3_heper.pdf)
- Holyoake, G. J. (1896). *The Origin and Nature of Secularism; Showing That Where Freethought Commonly Ends Secularism Begins*. Watts & Co.
- Izmaylov, R., Imamutdinova, A., & Mefodeva, M. (2019). Laicism in the Republic of Turkey in the 1920-1930s. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(5), 692-695, DOI:10.18510/hssr.2019.7584
- İnaç, H. (2004). Identity Problems of Turkey during the European Union Integration Process. *Journal of Economic and Social Research*, 6(2), 33-62, <https://katalog.marmara.edu.tr/veriler/yordambt/cokluortam/B/E/B/C/B/T0048274.pdf>
- İnalçık, H. (1964). The Nature of Traditional Society: Turkey. In E. Ward and D. A. Rustow (Eds.), *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey*. (42-63). Princeton University Press.
- İşçi, M. (2004). *Siyasi Düşünceler Tarihi*. Der.
- Karakas, C. (2007). *Turkey: Islam and Laicism Between the Interests of State, Politics, and Society (PRIF Reports No. 78)*. trans. K. Horn. Peace Research Institute Frankfurt Pubs.
- Kavcar, C. (1985). *Batılılaşma Açısından Servet-i Fünun Romanı*. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.
- Kayalı, K. (1994). *Türk Düşünce Dünyası Üzerine Sınırlı Değerlendirmeler I*. Ayyıldız.
- Kireev, N. D. (2007). *History of Turkey: The Twentieth Century*. Kraft+ IV RAS.
- Kocabaşoğlu, U. (Ed.). (2009). *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt-3: Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*. 5th ed. İletişim.
- Kolbaşı, A. (2014). XIX. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Yenileşmesi ve Değişimi Üzerine Kavramsal Yaklaşım. In M. A. Beyhan (Ed.), *Nizam-ı Cedid Başlangıcının 220. Yılı Münasebetiyle Tarih Boyunca Yenileşme Hareketleri*. (1-16). Kitabevi.
- Kuran, E. (1964). Türk Ordusu ve Batılılaşma. *Türk Kültürü*, II/22, 11-13.
- Kuran, E. (1976). Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Yenileşme Hareketleri. In *Türk Dünyası El Kitabı* (1003-1016). Ayyıldız Matbaası.

- Kuran, E. (1999). Osmanlı Türklerinin Batı'yı Algılamaları (1839'a Kadar). *Türk Yurdu*, 19-20(148-149), 37-40.
- Laclau, E. (1990). *New Reflections on Revolution of Our Times*. Verso.
- Larrain, J. (1995). *İdeoloji ve Kültürel Kimlik*. trans. N. N. Domaniç. Sarmal.
- Lee, H-Y. (2008). *Political Representation in the Later Middle Ages: Marsilius in Context*. Lang.
- Lewis, B. (2007). *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu*. 10th ed. Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Locke, J. (1689). *A Letter Concerning Toleration: Humbly Submitted*. Black Swan.
- Mardin, Ş. (2012). *Türk Modernleşmesi Makaleler*. M. Türköne and T. Önder (Eds.). İletişim.
- Marsilius of Padua (1967). *The Defender of Peace*. trans. A. Gewirth. Harper & Row.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1999). *Felsefe Metinleri*. trans. A. Kardam, A. Gelen, K. Somer, S. Belli, V. Erdoğan and Y. Fincancı. Sol.
- Metin, C. (2011). *Emperyalist Çağda Modernleşme: Türk Modernleşmesi ve İran (1800-1941)*. Phoenix.
- Mill, J. S. (1859). *On Liberty*. J. W. Parker and Son.
- Öcal, E. E. (2020). Uriel Heyd'in Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökleri Eseri Bağlamında Ziya Gökalp. S. Sönmez and A. Kara (Eds.), *Sosyal, Beşeri ve İdari Bilimler Alanında Güncel Araştırmalar*, Cilt-II, (61-97). Duvar.
- Raz, J. (1986). *The Morality of Freedom*. Clarendon Press.
- Şan, M. K. (2012). Baskıcı Bir Laiklik Modeli Olarak Türk Laikliğinin Anatomisi. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*, 7(2), 1-25, <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/akademikincelemeler/issue/1546/18984>
- Tanfer, M. V. (1999). Atatürk'ün Din Ve Lâiklik Anlayışı. *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, 15(43), 41-52, <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/aamd/issue/61068/903326>
- The Tribune India* (2024). Thought for the Day. Thursday, 18 April 2024. <https://www.tribuneindia.com/news/thought-for-the-day/without-deviation-from-the-norm-progress-is-not-possible-%E2%80%94frank-zappa-234622> (Accessed on: 19.04.2024).
- Trimberger, E. K. (1978). *Revolution from Above*. Transaction Books.
- Türkmen, S. (2014). Spinoza'da Sonsuzluk Sorunu ve Praksis. *Kayı (Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Felsefe Dergisi)*, 23(Güz), 117-127, <https://doi.org/10.20981/kuufefd.31704>
- Weber, M. (2012). *Ekonomi ve Toplum*, Cilt-1. trans. L. Boyacı. Yarın.
- Wellborn, C. (1962). Marsilius of Padua: A Modern Look. *Journal of Church and State*, 4(2) (November), 191-204.
- Wing, A., & Varol, O. (2005). Is Secularism Possible in a Majority-Muslim Country? The Turkish Example. *Texas International Law of Journal*, 42(1), 1-54, SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1130262>
- Quataert, D. (2005). *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yorgancıoğlu, O. M. (2000). Prof. Dr. Niyazi Berkes Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme 1908-1988. In İ. Bozkurt (Ed.). *İz Bırakmış Kıbrıslı Türkler 1. Sempozyumu: Niyazi Berkes: 21-23 Nisan 1999*. (85-96). DAÜ KAM.
- Zürcher, E-J. (2001). Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı Kaynakları. In A. İnel (Ed.). *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm*, Cilt 2. (44-55). İletişim.
- Zürcher, E-J. (2010). *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*. I. B. Tauris.

**To Cite**

Ak, G. (2025). Türkiye in its 100th Anniversary: Roots from the Foundations of Ottoman-Turkish Modernization To Modernism. *Journal of Sustainable Equity and Social Research (JSESER)*, 2(1), 06-29. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14602475>