

SOCIOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY, ORIENTALISM AND THE OTHER SOSYOLOJİ, ANTROPOLOJİ, ŞARKİYATÇILIK VE ÖTEKİ



Assoc. Prof. İsmail Coşkun

Istanbul University Faculty of Letters Department of Sociology

Abstract: In the most general sense, the subjects of study for sociology, anthropology and orientalism are human societies. However, each of these disciplines focuses on a different type of society historically and as differentiated in time, and have different fields of research. The three disciplines completed their processes of institutionalization in the 19th century and the borders between them and their respective fields of responsibility were defined in broad lines. The change in the West's relationship with its "other"s also brought about a transformation in the borders and relations between the disciplines. The post-World War II re-structuring of relations of dominance changed the expectations from border-disciplines positioned between disciplines. The new expectations engendered a change in the interests and areas of focus of the sciences, too. This article, revolving around the axis of the problem of the "other," focuses on the transformation sociology, anthropology and orientalism, which chose Eastern societies and civilisations as its field of research, underwent.

Key Words: Birth of social sciences, Sociology, Anthropology, Orientalism, other, new other, the established (old) other

Özet: Sosyoloji, antropoloji ve şarkiyatçılığın inceleme konuları en genel anlamıyla insan toplumlarıdır. Fakat tarihsel olarak ve zaman içinde farklılaşacak şekilde her biri, farklı bir toplum tipi üzerine odaklanmış ve ayrı çalışma sahalarına sahiptirler. Bu üç disiplin kurumlaşma süreçlerini 19. yüzyılda tamamlamışlar ve böylece aralarındaki sınırlar, sorumluluk alanları çok kalın çizgilerle belirlenmiştir. Bu süreçte her bir disiplinin kimliği ve konumu batı toplumlarının ötekiyle girdiği ilişkinin mahiyeti ile belirlenmektedir. Fakat klasik sömürge sisteminin sona erdiği ve farklı bir dünya sisteminin ortaya çıktığı II. Dünya Savaşı sonrasında bu sınırların ortadan kalktığı, her üç disiplinin aynı alanda birlikte çalışma sürecine girdiği görülmektedir. Zira Batının "öteki"leriyle ilişkilerinde yaşanan değişim, disiplinler arasındaki sınır ve ilişkileri de dönüştürmüş ve disiplinlerden beklentileri değiştirmiştir. Bu yazıda sosyoloji, antropoloji ve Doğu toplum ve uygarlıklarını kendisine inceleme alanı olarak seçen şarkiyatçılığın "öteki" sorunu ekseninde, geçirdikleri dönüşüm ele alınmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal bilimlerin doğuşu, Sosyoloji, antropoloji ve şarkiyatçılık, öteki

Along with the other members of the social sciences, sociology and anthropology are “attempts which belong to the modern world.”¹ Both their content and their fields of interest have been shaped in the context of the processes of change that created the modern world. The modern world emerged around the axis of a series of consecutive historical events. The first of these was the West encountering new communities and regions of civilization with the dawn of the early Modern Period. The second was the securing of the flow to the West of the sources of wealth in these regions. A third event which must be added to the first two is the change of borders between the established powers of the old world, or, in other words, the retreat of the borders of the West into inland Europe with the progress of the Ottoman Empire.

The historical and social context within which the social sciences were formed was determined first and foremost by these dynamics which began to develop from the 16th century on. The encounter with new regions of civilization, and especially the transfer of the raw and manufactured wealth in these regions to the West, gave rise to a comprehensive transformation. This transformation was crowned within a few centuries with political and social revolutions, and hence a new type of society, the modern society, emerged. Both the requirement for more precise knowledge on which the judgments of the modern states could be based², and the tremendous dynamism and social transformation created by the French Revolution of 1789 and the Industrial Revolution, the two great revolutions indicated by A. Giddens³, along with complex and interrelated social problems, determined the content of the social sciences in the West. Placed at the immediate edge of the social sciences, and with more of an excess prehistory than sociology and anthropology in comparison, orientalism also completed its process of institutionalization in the same era, the 19th century.

In the most formulaic sense, the research topic of sociology, anthropology and orientalism is human societies. Each of them focuses on a certain type of society and has a different field of study. With the completion of their process of institutionalization, the borders between them and their fields of responsibility

¹ Gülbenkian Komisyonu, *Sosyal Bilimleri Açın* (Çev. Şirin Tekeli), İstanbul: Metis, 1996, s.12

² ibid. p.15

³ Anthony Giddens, *Sosyoloji: Eleştirel Bir Giriş* (Çev. Ü. Yıldız), Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2001, s.4-5

were defined with very broad lines. In the aftermath of the Second World War, these borders seem to disappear and all three disciplines enter a common process of research in the same field. Sociology, anthropology⁴ and orientalism, all three disciplines are modern initiatives that belong to the West.⁵ Sociology focuses on social problems caused by political revolutions and the industrial revolution. It studies the “modern society,” the “industrial society” and Western societies defined as “advanced.” Anthropology, in contrast, confines its entire interest, studies and energy to the examination of non-Western communities. Non-western communities are the new communities the West came across in the early Modern period, during colonial expansion, they are the “new others.” Anthropology carries out its work in colonial lands where these “new others” with indigenous, tribal social structures live, which are also described as “simple” or “pre-writing” cultures. Finally, the field of orientalism is Eastern societies and civilizations which we could define as the old and “established other” of the West.

The change in the relationship between the West and its “others” brought about the transformation in the borders between disciplines and relations. This article will take up the transformation sociology, anthropology and as a discipline which chose Eastern societies and civilizations as its field of research, orientalism, around the axis of the problem of the “other.”

Disciplines, Borders and Fields of Duty: Historical Process and Content

From the 16th Century on, the scene in the West is composed of colonial expansion on the outside and dissolution and restructuring on the inside. Old institutions, the feudal system of relations and the church are dissolving. The king, the first among equals, is increasing his authority over other feudal lords and absolute monarchies are emerging. Geography takes on a new name and a new meaning, to take its place at the foundation of the modern state: the Iberian

⁴ I have preferred to use the term anthropology throughout the text. The term must be understood to include the terms Ethnology in the European tradition, Social Anthropology in England and Cultural Anthropology in the USA.

⁵ The emphasis on belonging here does not contain an implication of Weberian particularity and superiority.

Peninsula is in the process of becoming Spain, the Low Lands of the North, Holland and the island, England. The church is faced with protest, insurgence and divisions. The established classes of the old society are dissolving, new classes are rising and new economic relations and forms of production are appearing. As change is crowned with political and industrial processes, modern society is born along with many tensions and problems within its body. Sociology focuses on the fields of tension and conflict in society, on the social problem; it strives to both comprehend the social problem, to explain it and to influence it. During its period of foundation and institutionalization, the study field of sociology was modern societies, the West itself. In its effort to form the rational knowledge of the social field, sociology kept itself, its aim, analysis and proposals, its projects separate from the effort and experience of forming the knowledge of non-Western societies, from attempts to academicize accumulated knowledge, i.e., from anthropology.⁶

Anthropology studies societies that are unlike the West. These are the new communities the Western explorers, soldiers, tradesmen, travellers and missionaries came across during the colonial expansion process of the West. The explorations of the 16th century had revealed that there were people and societies on Earth who *didn't look like* the white-skinned, Christian European.⁷ The explorations had engendered new meetings, and the meetings had engendered new questions on the whys and hows of difference.⁸ Contemporary anthropology is the inheritor of these early meetings, experiences and attempts to gather and record the knowledge of the different. The focus on the difference and variety of human societies forms the departure point of anthropology. Setting forth from the variety of human beings and societies and the sources of this variety in history, anthropology focuses on that which is different and in

⁶ For an example of sociology's determination to remain separate despite the increasing attempts of establishing relations and collaboration among the social sciences see Dominique Schnapper, *Sosyoloji Düşüncesinin Özünde Öteki İle İlişki* (Çev. A. Sönmezay), İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005, s. 2-3, 7

⁷ See Bozkurt Güvenç, *İnsan ve Kültür*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1979, s.9

⁸ *ibid.* p.10

fact, anomalous to the Western and modern “us.”⁹ It is through this difference that the questions of anthropology are formed: “Why are human beings and societies alike? Why aren’t human beings and societies alike? Why and how do human beings and societies change?”¹⁰ A look at the curriculum for anthropological education, the fields of interest and content of classic works, the geographical field and communities where field work was carried out, reveals that the discipline first and foremost focused on non-Western societies.¹¹

Orientalism focuses on Eastern societies and civilizations, which we prefer to define as the “old” or “established” other, and assumes the production of knowledge on Eastern societies. In view of their fields of interest, approaches and aims, orientalism, sociology and anthropology have a long past. However, the primary content, institutionalization and production of orientalism were formed in the modern period. The encounter with Eastern societies, the known other lies at its source, rather than the exploration of remote lands and meeting the exotic. Ottoman progress in South-eastern Europe and the Mediterranean was a determining factor in the renewed interest in Eastern societies at the dawn of the Modern Period. The interest in the East during the Renaissance intensified parallel to this phenomenon. Old questions were revisited, and the question, “who are these Turks?” was updated with the answer that they were savages of Scythian origin.¹² The source of early interest, although focused on the nature and size of the danger, is mixed with admiration. Western nation states, growing in strength both politically and economically, turned their interest towards Eastern societies with the aim of gaining more effective positions in relations between societies. The interest in the East in the 19th century became a process of systematic knowledge production, with the aim of being effective, taking the upper hand, and dominating in reciprocal relations. The field of orientalism is the land of Eastern societies and civilization resisting

⁹ Anthropologist Calvin Wells states that anthropology “investigates foreign lands and locals who appear strange to us.” Calvin Wells, *Sosyal Antropoloji Açısından İnsan ve Dünyası* (Çev. B. Güvenç), İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1984, s.9

¹⁰ Güvenç, *İnsan ve Kültür*, s.61

¹¹ E. E. Pritchard, *Sosyal Antropoloji* (Çev. F. Aydın vd.), İstanbul: Birey Yayınları, 1998, s.21-22

¹² Maxime Rodinson, *Batıyı Büyüleyen İslam* (Çev. C. Meriç), İstanbul: Pınar Yayınları, 1983, s.41

the expansion of the West's economic and political dominance gained in the 19th century.

All three disciplines were institutionalized in the 19th century. They defined their independent identities, their terminology, method and tools, and completed their institutional organizations by taking their place either in the university system or by forming independent institutes. There is an intense exchange between the disciplines especially on the level of history, society, social institutions and the causality between them. Since its inception, sociology benefited greatly from the early work of anthropology and orientalism in its discussions on social models and classifications. Sociology often called upon data provided by anthropology to explain modern society and the roots of social institutions and behaviour.¹³ Sociology used orientalist studies to interpret the difference of modern societies from others or the superiority and uniqueness of the West.¹⁴ And when anthropology went beyond the accumulation of data to explain the societies it was studying, it turned to sociology.¹⁵ Social anthropology in particular is often mentioned along with sociology and sometimes considered a branch of sociology.¹⁶ Despite the intense exchange they developed, each science has its own language and method of explanation. Differentiation among the disciplines involves the fields of study and types of society. The borders of the fields of study often also include sub-borders that emerge in relation to the anthropologist's or orientalist's citizenship: the French anthropologist works in French dominions, the English anthropologist or orientalist in English colonies and the American cultural anthropologist works on North American tribal communities.

The borders between disciplines and differentiations concerning methods and fields of specialization were determined according to the concerns of the 19th century. In the effort to form a rational source of knowledge regarding society,

¹³ In Durkheim's works, and especially in *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, this link is utilized intensely.

¹⁴ The most typical example of this is the work of Max Weber.

¹⁵ Ethnology turned to sociology when it wanted to go beyond making inventories and produce analyses. It is possible to explain Durkheim's influence on English Social Anthropology in this manner. For Durkheim's influence on Social Anthropology see Pritchard, *Sosyal Antropoloji*, s.63, 65.

¹⁶ Güvenç, *İnsan ve Kültür*, s.64, 66

sociology chose to work on areas of tension and conflict and the problem of social integration. Anthropology, in turn, assumed the duty of producing a source of knowledge on local societies in colonies. Its primary method is collecting data in the field. Anthropologists personally participate in the life of the society they are working on to carry out their observations. While ethnology is more a breakdown of accumulated knowledge, ethnography is the depiction, reporting or publishing of accumulated knowledge.¹⁷ Anthropology is the systematization of the published information that has been accumulated, classified and recorded using a scientific language of interpretation. In this sense, it both contains and transcends ethnology and ethnography as a technique. As observation, field work and a technique ethnography is the indispensable method and tool of anthropology. Anthropology essentially owes its possibility of living together with, observing and recording the society it examines to Western dominance in the colonies. The researcher can continue working thanks to Western activity in the colony.¹⁸ Moreover, the colonial administration is well aware of the importance of anthropological information in regulating its relations with the local community¹⁹ and uses anthropologists.²⁰ The operational possibilities of anthropology in the field facilitated the development of different methods and techniques in the accumulation and analysis of information.

Orientalism forms the other and essential footing of producing knowledge on non-Western societies, and doesn't have the means of anthropology in its field of work. The single reason for this is the fact that the geography of anthropology and the geography of orientalism being the scenes of entirely different experiences. There are two different geographies, two different societies and two "other"s in question. The relation the West enters with each has a different nature. The American continent, Australia and the Oceanic

¹⁷ *ibid.* p.68

¹⁸ The support given to the researcher by the colonial administration, eventually led to the researcher's identification with colonialism. This is the reason why the newly formed nation-states, following post-1945 decolonization policies, deported anthropologists as secret agents as one of their first acts.

¹⁹ See Pritchard, *Sosyal Antropoloji*, s.128

²⁰ Training in anthropology was included in the basic formation of staff to be appointed at administrative levels in the colonies. Pritchard, *Sosyal Antropoloji*, p.124. For relations between colonial administrations and anthropology see also Güvenç, *İnsan ve Kültür*, s.318 et al.

islands are areas where the West established political and military dominance from dates as early as the 1500s. Western sovereignty prepared the conditions of research on the communities living in these areas. On the other hand, while it took a few centuries for Western sovereignty to spread in Asia, in some centres the colonial administration founded from the 19th century on did not prove permanent and met the resistance of Asian societies. Since Orientalism failed to find first-hand means of working in the field, different methods from anthropology were applied in the production of knowledge on Eastern societies. Since orientalism could not find the means for direct penetration and observation, it opted for assembling, classifying and analysing written texts in order to produce knowledge.²¹ Philological method and tools are as important to orientalism as field and observation were for anthropological research. Orientalism's knowledge of the East was formed through text analyses.²² Although the textual knowledge of orientalism does contain an interpretation and a classification, it is far from producing the contemporary knowledge of the political and social process. At the end of the 19th century and during the first quarter of the 20th century, when the West had established a relative supremacy over Eastern societies, orientalism, paradoxically, suffered a crisis at a time when it was enjoying its strongest period. This crisis was significantly laid bare in the post Second World War period during the reorganization of relations of sovereignty under the patronage of the United States of America.

Restructured Power Relations and the Transformation of Disciplines

In the aftermath of the Second World War, the West wanted to transcend problems, essentially inherited from the 19th century that it experienced both within itself and in its relations with the outside. These problems included class war within their own structure, and the race for colonization Western powers had entered in opposition to each other. Although class wars did not preserve the intensity they possessed in the 19th century, they continued to exist as an

²¹ İsmail Coşkun, "Öteki İle Karşılaşmalar: Gezi Edebiyatı ve Şarkiyatçılık", içinde *Uluslararası Oryantalizm Sempozyumu*, (Ed. Lütfi Sunar), İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür ve Sosyal İşler Daire Başkanlığı Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007, s.167-168

²² Ibid. p.168

active field of conflict in pre-1945 Europe. A third and central problem added to these two internal problems was the anti-Western insurgencies in the colonies. These uprisings, which first appeared on the eve of the First World War and continued to spread in the period between the wars, were putting pressure on colonial policies. The restructuring of both intra- and extra- Western relations in the aftermath of the Second World War aimed to overcome these problems. Thus, policies developed after the war absorbed areas of tension at home. Relations with non-Western societies were restructured with the politics of decolonization and non-Western societies becoming independent nation-states. The new formulations were supported with modernization, reconstruction and development programs, seeking the integration of non-Western societies to the system.

The restructuring of relations of sovereignty under the leadership of the United States of America was accompanied by a new role and content being ascribed to disciplines charged with knowledge production on the other. Sociology, anthropology and orientalism went through a transformation both in the lifting of traditional borders in their relations and in the relation they form with their own subject. Sociology, its subject matter the internal problems of the West, received its share of this transformation and took part in the efforts of knowledge production on non-Western societies in the periphery. While sociology on one hand expanded its universe limited to modern society by taking theories of modernization²³ to the periphery, on the other hand the anthropological perspective gained importance to become an essential dimension of sociological analysis.²⁴ Anthropology turned its attention from small-scale non-Western societies to Eastern societies, the traditional work and specialization field of Orientalism. Although Orientalism resisted these new tendencies that wanted to work in its own field of specialization²⁵, in a short period of time, it first had to share, and then lose, its monopoly of specialization and power.

²³ Modernization theories occupy a central position in post-war sociology and also witness the production of a lively and dense literature.

²⁴ Giddens, *Sosyoloji: Eleştirel Bir Giriş*, s.19

²⁵ Immanuel Wallerstein, "Soğuk Savaş Döneminde Alan Araştırmalarının Öngörülemez Sonuçları", içinde *Soğuk Savaş ve Üniversite* (ed. Noam Chomsky), Kızılirma Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 1998, s. 224 vdd

The components of the transformation the three disciplines have been through may be brought together under three headings:

1. The political and economic demands of the restructured relations of sovereignty
2. The great change experienced by communities which were the subject of anthropology
3. The placement of the "other" in metropolitan centres of modern society

The Political and Economic Demands of Restructured Relations of Sovereignty

In the aftermath of the Second World War the U.S.A. abandoned its traditional isolationist policies to move towards conducting world politics. The attempts in this direction began simultaneously with conferences organized by the allied powers, like Teheran (1943), Yalta (1945) and Potsdam (1945). In the early 1940s, both the formation of the "Social Sciences Research Council (SSRC)" with the participation of seven large American National Social Science Associations and the report titled "World Regions in the Social Sciences" prepared by the Committee on World Regions of the SSRC in 1943 presented both the orientations and the requirements of American policies in the new era.²⁶

"The war at hand has, more than ever, drawn attention to the world. The interest in foreign regions has increased. We have developed an acute interest in regions we previously showed little or no interest in. The immediate requirement for social scientists, who know the various regions of the world, comes only second to the requirement for military and navy officers who know the active and potential areas of conflict. ...As far as we can see, in the future, research, postgraduate study, graduate courses and basic education on world regions will be in high demand."²⁷

"War and the Armed Forces have impelled students to go back to studying geography and gain knowledge on the "strange people" of the world. We may encounter an unseen demand towards these topics in post-war curricula and must not

²⁶ *ibid.* s.209

²⁷ *ibid.* s.210

be surprised in an increase in the numeric rate of anthropology and geography lessons.”²⁸

The new position of the U.S.A. in power relations and the production of the knowledge required for field domination and administration made the restructuring of the social sciences necessary in post-war conditions in the West, and especially in the U.S.A. The key point in the restructuring of the social sciences was the regional research programs that appeared in the aftermath of the war.

“In eminent universities, almost suddenly, regional research programs aimed at increasing the knowledge of understanding of Americans on these countries and regions appeared. With the encouragement and support of large foundations, professors and students flocked to these countries hitherto seen as entirely alien and in a short period of time formed an amazing library on the political regimes and institutions of certain countries and regions.”²⁹

W.N. Fenton witnessed the birth of regional research and wrote the following in 1947:

“Regional programs met with violent resistance conducted by “departmental imperialism. Because these programs challenged the division of human sciences via disciplinary departments, each with its own methodology and research matter. However these were not the significant power lines. The state was interested in feeling the void of knowledge on a huge global hegemonic / contra-hegemonic field rather than the feudal field of the academy. What shaped regional research were therefore the capillaries of state power.”³⁰

The expansion of the field to intervene in and rule over meant a massive requirement of knowledge. Following the termination of traditional colonial politics, a huge change was foreseen for non-Western geographies. Policies of development, reconstruction and modernization were actually large-scale social transformation projects. Current borders between the sciences or the traditional

²⁸ ibid. s.213

²⁹ Samuel P. Huntington & Jorge I. Domínguez, *Siyasal Gelişme* (Çev. Ergun Özbudun), Siyasi İlimler Derneği Yayınları, Ankara, tarihsiz, s.1vd

³⁰ Bruce Cumings, “Sınır Kayması, Soğuk Savaş Döneminde ve sonrasında Bölge Araştırmaları ve Ulusal Araştırmalar”, içinde *Üniversiteler ve Amerikan İmparatorluğu: Soğuk Savaş Döneminde Sosyal Bilimlerde Para ve Siyaset* (Ed. Christopher Simpson), Kızılirma Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 2000, s.170-171

division of tasks and interests did not meet these new political demands. First, the traditional division of tasks and borders between the social sciences was removed. Social sciences like politics, economics and sociology within the body of modern society which had hitherto focused on political, economic and social problems were reoriented towards non-Western fields. These sciences played a central role especially in projects focused on social transformation. Sociology directed all its efforts and energy towards non-Western societies with modernization theories. Economics witnessed the birth of a sub-branch, development economics, whereas political science and political development research, its roots going back to the 1950s, became independent branches within politics. Orientalism and anthropology, two distinct disciplines which had undertaken research on non-Western societies, took on new roles in the restructuring process. Anthropology abandoned its traditional borders and was forced to take part in research on Eastern societies. It took to the field with more concrete and direct tasks.³¹ The shadow of military demands lurking in field management fell increasingly on anthropology:³² According to Richard Ohmann, "Anthropology was activated to produce knowledge on dependent (inferior) people and to secure their control, and at times was also used in suppressing insurgencies."³³ The politics of the period required contemporary knowledge of social, political and cultural processes in non-Western societies. Exactly at this point, the knowledge of the other orientalism had formed based on historical texts, had lost its meaning in terms of policies aimed at intervening in the present. Politics demanded live, functional information to be used immediately in implementation:

"Knowledge on the classic texts of dead civilizations did not really serve the American diplomats, officers and businessmen and the continuing relations in this area. Information on physical geography had little relevance, too. The contemporary

³¹ During the World War, social / cultural anthropology was used for military purposes. Yabancı Armies preparing for war in foreign lands collected information about cultures of alien societies under the label of "psychological war services", assessed this information and used it in war. Güvenç, *İnsan ve Kültür*, s.320

³² L. Nader states that the "Fifties militarized a large section of American science and an even larger section of anthropology as part of that science." Laura Nader, "Soğuk Savaş'ın Antropolojiye Etkisi", içinde *Soğuk Savaş ve Üniversite* (ed. Noam Chomsky), Kızılelma Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 1998, s.133

³³ Richard Ohmann, "İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı ve Soğuk Savaş", içinde *Soğuk Savaş ve Üniversite* (ed. Noam Chomsky), Kızılelma Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 1998, s.100-101

dynamics of the regions which were witnessing a process of change as comprehensive as the Western world was required.”³⁴

The Great Change Experienced by Communities That Formed the Subject of Anthropology

Political and economic demands created by new post-war hegemonic relations transformed the traditional borders, roles and missions between the social sciences. This pressure led anthropology to work in fields outside its traditional field of work. However, it was not only political pressure that led to this new direction. In the post-war period, anthropology witnessed the termination of communities which had been its traditional topics of research. The “simple,” “small-scale” and indigenous communities anthropology had focused on had suffered a huge transformation since the early periods they had encountered Western sovereignty. This transformation and particularly intensified and accelerated in the period after the second half of the 19th century when the colonization process reached its peak. The transformation has political, military and economic components. The intervention in traditional social structure in order to maximize economic exploitation and administration possibilities on one hand, and the use of colonial people as source of military troops in intra-Western conflicts such as class conflict and imperial wars, brought about an intense transformation of these communities. Under the pressure of these components, indigenous communities lost their mechanisms of reproduction, in other words, their social institutions, production methods, cultures of agriculture and nutrition and their administrative and religious structures. Indigenous communities were no longer neither indigenous nor different; they did not become Western, but something else. What remained was the language, method, tools and viewpoint of anthropological research, the result of a great accumulation of experience. In the aftermath of the Second World War, anthropology carried out research in its new fields of duty, and especially in Asian regions problematic in terms of Western sovereignty in the region. While Turkey and India were in orientalism’s field of interest until recently, in the

³⁴ Wallerstein, “Soğuk Savaş Döneminde Alan Araştırmalarının Öngörülemeyen Sonuçları”, s.213

post-war period they both became regions where anthropologists carried out intense research.³⁵

The Placement of the “Other” in the Metropolitan Centres of Modern Society

Another component which was determinative in the shifting of traditional borders between the social sciences and the birth of new relations and fields of cooperation, and especially in the relations between sociology and anthropology, was the inclusion of communities defined as other in social life in the metropolitan centres of the West. The heritage of the colonies had long taken their place in the body of modern society as workers or refugees. This phenomenon of the other, frequently experienced in contemporary modern society engendered an increase in the importance of the anthropological aspect of sociology.³⁶ Ultimately, the anthropological, in terms of sociology, is said to help us understand, “different forms of existence.”³⁷ Sociology has been interested in class, status or social division of labour within modern society or differentiations within the context of nation states. However, this differentiation is of a new type. There are belongings, cultures, life styles which came from the outside to be included in the body at the source of it. Sociology, claiming to cover the whole of the social process, changed its direction to investigate the new phenomena and fields of differentiation. Thus, countless sociological research projects are being carried out on groups who come from non-Western lands and begin to live in metropolitan centres. With the emergence of the

³⁵ For example, the modernization processes in Turkish villages and cities were adopted by anthropologists. See P. Stirling's, and the Helling couple's work on the Turkish village (on this topic see Recep Ertürk, Sosyoloji Ekollerinin Türkiye'de Köy Sorununa Bakışı, *Türk Yurdu*, Eylül 2005, Cilt 25, Sayı 217, s.69) and Hart's research in Zeytinburnu. Research on Iraqi Kurds can be presented as a very typical example of orientalism deserting its place in the area of work to anthropology. Until recently, orientalist like Minorsky and Nikitin had produced work on the communities living in the region, however today, anthropologists have become the sole authority on the subject, see Martin van Bruinessen (Bruinessen's doctoral thesis: *Ağa, Şeyh ve Devlet, Kürdistan'ın Sosyal ve Politik Örgütlenmesi*, -Ankara: Özge Yayınları, tarihsiz; and also his -, ayrıca *Kürdistan Üzerine Yazılar*, başlığını taşıyan kitabı, -İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1992, have been published in Turkish.).

³⁶ Giddens, *Sosyoloji: Eleştirel Bir Giriş*, s.19.

³⁷ ibid.

phenomena of the “other” on the inside of the system, the anthropological aspect gained importance in sociology.

Conclusion

Old borders, border trespasses, efforts to prove the worth of the discipline and concerns for justification, formed in the institutionalization period of the social sciences have today been left behind. The emphasis on this passing does not disclaim the fact that independent, different scientific languages, viewpoints, methods and tools were formed. The course of international relations in the aftermath of the Second World War, political and economic demands created by power relations or hegemonic processes led to the birth of disciplines with different languages, methods and topics. As in regional research, politics, economics, sociology, anthropology and orientalism began to work together in the field. The borders and exchange between sociology, anthropology and orientalism especially, and their content as independent disciplines went through a period of great transformation. Relations with the “other” were particularly important in determining this transformation.

Anthropology became the first to face the phenomenon of losing its topic with the transformation indigenous communities suffered to the extent of their termination. Conditions in the aftermath of the Second World War opened new fields of work and recruitment for anthropology where its knowledge and experience could be put to use. The deficiency caused by the shortcomings of the knowledge produced by orientalism on the “old other” to respond to the requirements of contemporary hegemonic politics was overcome by anthropology. Orientalism has been suffering a deep crisis since the Second World War in terms of mission, field of specialization and its mechanisms of reproduction.³⁸ However, Orientalism has not entirely become defunct despite the crises it has encountered in sustaining its traditional mission and authority.³⁹

³⁸ See A.L. Tibawi, E. Abdulmelik, H. Algar, *Krizdeki Oryantalizm: Eleştiriler*, İstanbul: Yöneliş Yayınları, 1998; Yücel Bulut, *Oryantalizmin Eleştirel Kısa Tarihi*, Yöneliş Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002

³⁹ In the 1950s, while the modernization projects in non-Western regions such as Asia and the Middle East were being realized, the important figures of orientalism assumed the duty of writing the history and modernization processes of regional people in line with the new policies. The work of Bernard Lewis, a

Sociology had to go beyond its traditional borders and manner on two levels. The first was its assumption of a new and central role, outside its traditional field of interest, in social transformation projects implemented in non-Western societies. In addition to its participation in efforts to form the contemporary knowledge of these societies, Sociology also provided the theoretical basis for the work carried out by politics and economics in these regions by providing conceptual analysis tools such as “structure, function, input-output, feedback and system.” On the second level, sociology was forced to make use of the methods and viewpoints of disciplines related to the “other” in the analysis of the problems at the heart of modern society itself.

To summarize, the three disciplines focused on three different types of societies, and developed different languages and methods. However, phenomena such as the restructuring of power relations and the reorganization of relations with the other in the aftermath of the Second World War; the great transformation indigenous communities went through within the colonial experience and communities defined as other themselves beginning to live within the body of modern society, meant the transformation of these sciences in terms of borders, fields and forms and methods of explanation. The relationship with the other occupies the centre of this transformation. The unjust nature of relations between societies, the social and intellectual crisis of modernity places new bifurcations and the search for alternatives on the agenda. The signs are that this central position the other has formed as a field of occupation in the social sciences will continue to grow in stature.

well-known, frequently referenced and central figure in the orientalist tradition, comes to mind. A far more recent example is the work of a pioneering orientalist conducted a few months after September 11 to carry out interviews with various social sections in the Arab world. See Gilles Kepel, *Bir Şark Savaşı Güncesi* (Çev. H. Bayrı), İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2002.