

## PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: A Postcolonial Reading on Eurocentrism, Otherization and Orientalist Discourse in Sociological Thought and Its Criticism

AUTHORS: Irfan KAYA

PAGES: 163-188

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/518192>

## A Postcolonial Reading on Eurocentrism, Otherization and Orientalist Discourse in Sociological Thought and Its Criticism\*

İrfan Kaya \*\*

### ABSTRACT

Modernity has long been a dominant paradigm in producing knowledge and in determining theoretical framework of the disciplines although it is in connivance with a Eurocentric ideology and conflict of paradoxes in itself. The other participant of the crime, committed with Eurocentric ideology, is sociology as an observation method of modernity's self and developed with it. They also display a tautological view with each other. Compatibility of paradoxes in modernity makes the othering notions of rejection, negation etc. inevitable. Otherization in sociological literature has been a reference point in historiography that is developed with the claim that historical process experienced throughout Europe is the only straight and universal one with an essentialist perspective, in the Orientalist discourse that is established in parallelism with colonial activities and generating ideal tips. This article aims to criticize the framework and the narrative in modernity and sociology as they contain Eurocentric discourse according to post-colonial theory. While chasing a non-othering paradigm inquiring troubles and dilemmas that post-colonial theory faced will also

\* This article has been published previously in Turkish: Kaya, İrfan. "Sosyolojik Düşüncede Avrupa-merkezcilik, Ötekileştirme ve Oryantalist Söylem Üzerine Post-kolonyal Bir Okuma ve Eleştirisi". *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi-Cumhuriyet Theology Journal* 21/3 (December 2017): 1973-2008. doi: 10.18505/cuid.346780.

\*\* Assistant Professor, Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Theology, Department of Sociology of Religion, Sivas, TURKEY  
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Anabilim Dalı  
[ikaya@cumhuriyet.edu.tr](mailto:ikaya@cumhuriyet.edu.tr) orcid.org/0000-0002-8761-7489

**Article Types / Makale Türü:** Translated Article / Çeviri

**Received / Geliş Tarihi:** 1805.2018

**Accepted / Kabul Tarihi:** 30.07.2018

**Published / Yayın Tarihi:** 31.08.2018

**Cite as / Atıf:** Kaya, İrfan. "A Postcolonial Reading on Eurocentrism, Otherization and Orientalist Discourse in Sociological Thought and Its Criticism". *ULUM* 1/1 (July 2018): 163-188. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1488711>

be the other aim of this study. This paper aims to be authentic by determining the problems of post-colonial theory that criticizes the dominant paradigm through orientalist discourse yet falls into clutches of self-orientalism.

## KEYWORDS

Sociology of Religion, Orientalism, Euro-centrism, Otherization, Culturalism, Post-colonialism

## Sosyolojik Düşüncede Avrupa-merkezcilik, Ötekileştirme ve Oryantalist Söylem Üzerine Post-kolonyal bir Okuma ve Eleştirisi

### ÖZ

Modernite, uzun bir zamandır tüm dünyada, Avrupa-merkezci bir ideolojiyle suç ortaklığı yapmasına ve özünde barındırdığı çelişkilerin bağdaşmazlığına rağmen, bilgi üretimi ve disiplinlerin teorik çerçevesini belirlemede hâkim paradigma olmayı sürdürmektedir. Avrupa-merkezci ideolojiyle girilen suçun iştirakçilerinden bir diğeri de, modernliğin kendi kendini gözleme tarzı olarak ve onunla birlikte gelişen, aralarında totolojik bir görünüm sergileyen sosyolojidir. Modernitenin özünde barındırdığı çelişkilerin bağdaşmazlığı, yadsıma, inkâr vs. ötekileştirme nosyonunu kaçınılmaz kılar. Sosyolojik literatürde ötekileştirme, özcü bir yaklaşımla Batıda yaşanan tarihsel sürecin tek doğru ve evrensel olduğu iddiasıyla geliştirilen tarih yazımında, sömürgeleştirme faaliyetlerine koşut olarak geliştirilen oryantalist söylemde, ideal tiplerin oluşturulması gibi konularda referans noktası olmuştur. Bu makale, modernite ve sosyolojideki teorik çerçeve ve anlatının Avrupa-merkezci bir söylem barındırmasından hareketle post-kolonyal teoriye göreceleştirisini yapmayı amaçlamaktadır. Ötekileştirmeyen bir paradigmanın izini sürerken post-kolonyal teorinin karşılaştığı zorluklar ve açmazları ortaya koymak da bu çalışmanın bir diğer amacı olacaktır. Çalışma, post-kolonyal teorinin sosyolojideki oryantalist söylem üzerinden hâkim paradigmayı eleştirirken self-oryantalizmin ağına düştüğü hususları belirtmek suretiyle özgün olmayı hedeflemektedir.

### ANAHTAR KELİMELEER

Din Sosyolojisi, Oryantalizm, Avrupa-merkezcilik, Ötekileştirme, Kültürelcilik, Post-kolonyalizm

### INTRODUCTION

This study revolves around the assumption that the (classical) sociological tradition, which has a tautological character, remains incapable of elucidating, conceptually and theoretically, postmodern and post-colonial societal alterations such as modern-day post-industrial society, consummative, risk or information society by its depiction of modern society and its modernization theory, and is rather problematic.

Developments experienced in social sciences, particularly within post-structural and postmodern frame, have been more favored by postcolonial non-Western societies. It is essential to notice that the allocation of sociology as a discipline only to the West so that it could examine its own society has played a significant part in this appropriation. As a matter of fact, according to this narrative of classical period, the West, in its own opinion, has already left the civilization period behind and by accomplishing its evolutionary process, has claimed its place in history. Thanks to sociology, the West has also announced them to the world by legislating historical process of civilization by means of determining them in a self-directed manner and recording them through sociology. However, the field which non-Western societies have been deemed worthy is anthropology, known otherwise as the science of primitive societies and understood to have been invented in order to colonize mentioned societies.<sup>1</sup>

The relationship between sociological and anthropological societies has been somehow characterized as master-slave relation. Such exploitative hierarchical relationship even largely coheres with segregationist nature of modern paradigm, which shatters the truth and which has been made into a rule with science. Thus, I will be offering in this article to unriddle the exploitative structure of European sociology based on the argument that although colonialism has been determinative in the West's enrichment, colonial confrontations and exploitative activities are not mentioned in the tradition of sociology. In fact, modernity has shaped in flesh and bones and strengthened thanks to these colonial confrontations. From the perspective of postcolonial theory, sociology is coordinated with imperialistic culture and even contributes to it. Thus postcolonial theory<sup>2</sup> is in fact a criticism to sociology. It helps to reveal, above all, sociology's elements such

---

<sup>1</sup> The famous anthropologist, Talal Asad, on the other hand, rejects the limiting of the study field of anthropology with local cultures. In the *Genealogies of Religion*, he argues that the Western culture has a significant role – either in a positive or a negative way- in the formation of the modern world and thus, analysis of this history should be one of the key issues of anthropology. See Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion, Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*, translated by Ayet Aram Tekin (Istanbul: Metis Pub., 2015), 11 for his stimulating evaluations. For this reason, he subjects the *Formations of the Secular* to an anthropological reading. See Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular, Christianity, Islam and Modernity*, translated by Ferit Burak Aydar (Istanbul: Metis Pub., 2007).

<sup>2</sup> The affinity we have established, through this article, with the post-colonial theory (The post-colonial theory is defined as; the generally consistent structure of the written texts and thoughts which criticize the European colonialism and the supporting elements of its heritage and which aim for the transformation of these. See Julian Go, "For a postcolonial sociology", *Theory and Society* 42, no. 1 (January 2013):29) arises from the critical nature of the theory. We believe that, the functionality of the Frankfurt School comes from its critical nature, just like the Marxist tradition. Although it is not recognized in our country, it is possible to state that there a large literature on the post-colonial theory is being formed around the world. Particularly in the USA, it has become a trend among the academicians to write about this theory. See Julian Go, "For a Postcolonial sociology", 25. His ideas are theoretically based on Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* and Edward Said's *Orientalism*. Gramsci's analysis on hegemony and Foucault's analysis on power/knowledge are his main reference points. See Merve Kavakçı, "Questioning Turkey's Role Model Status: A Critical Examination of the Social and Political Implications of the Headscarf Ban in Turkey" (Doctoral thesis, Howard University, 2007), 31-32. For the postcolonial definition and relationship of the term, see Robert J. Young, *Post-colonialism: An Historical Introduction*, translated by Burcu Toksabay Köprülü-Sertaç Şen 8Ankara: Matbu Pub., 2016), 77 and see Robert J. Young, *Post-colonialism: An Historical Introduction*, 223-242 for its relationship with Marxism. For a critical review of the theory's relationship with global capitalism, see Arif Dirlik, *The*

as orientalism, Eurocentric universality, imperial repression and illuminative scientism.<sup>3</sup> Then the breakage of organic bond between modern empires and sociology may bring the mind the annihilation of sociology as it is.<sup>4</sup>

I will be developing my analyses in this article through the basic postulate suggesting Western thought makes the notion of *otherization* derived from its nature, which tears down the reality, unavoidable by means of producing dichotomies. Partial reality conception containing divisions between which a hierarchical order is established such as subject-object, mind-body, West-East, center-sphere or fact-value pertains to modern Western thinking initiated by Descartes. The relationship modernity established with nature, human, history and society was established to dominate.

As method, this study has adopted discourse analysis. As a matter of fact, analysis of orientalism set forth by Edward Said, who was inspired by Foucault, is discourse analysis functioning with philosophical tradition in social sciences. Anti-positivist discourse analysis, which positions itself against explicative and descriptive content analysis and which articulates itself to natural sciences and pretending to universality, generalizability and objectivity, reveals how discourse is shaped by power and ideology, and how influential it is in the formation of social identity, social relations and knowledge-belief systems. Content analysis, however, claims the feature of objectivity. Accordingly, information earns the feature of being scientific when it is objective. Scientific reality is only possible when it is given in an unbiased manner. What examines, explains, interprets is the subject itself and it speaks in certain historical and sociocultural context. There is no such thing as absolute reality; the reality is comprised of subjective and unique interpretations.

To this end, in the article, Oriental discourse relating specifically to Islam and generally to perception of East will be analyzed through two concepts that lay the ground for this discourse: Euro-centrism and Otherization. In fact, Euro-centrism is a broader concept that also includes orientalism. It spawned Otherization in itself. The West first defined itself over the East and then identified the East over itself. Therefore, we picked a reading form evolving from general sociology into sociology of religion.

---

*Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism*, translated by Galip Doğduaslan (Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Pub., 2010). For the criticisms arguing that reproduction is needed when criticizing the dominant paradigm, see Vivek Chibber, *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*, translated by Afife Yasemin Yılmaz (Istanbul: İletişim Pub., 2016), 42-51. For a postcolonial study criticizing the history of modernity and the postcolonial theory with Euro-centric sociology, see Gurminder K Bhambra, *Rethinking Modernity, Post-colonialism and the Social Imagination*, translated by Özlem İlyas (Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Pub., 2015) and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Can the Subaltern Speak?*, translated by Dilek Hattatoğlu-Gökçen Ertuğrul-Emre Koyuncu (Ankara: Dipnot Publ., 2016) produced within the scope of the Sub-alternity Studies Project centered in India, which is the most popular representative of the postcolonial studies. Toplumbilim Journal's Special Edition on the Postcolonial Thought, can be given as an example from our country.

<sup>3</sup> Julian Go, “For a Postcolonial Sociology”, 32.

<sup>4</sup> Sanjay Seth, “Historical Sociology and Postcolonial Theory: Two Strategies for Challenging Eurocentrism”, *International Political Sociology* 3, no. 3 (September 2009): 338.

## 1. HISTORIOGRAPHY IN SOCIOLOGY

"I detest these castrated somatic desires of the history, and those who rigidly clings to austere ideal; I detest these flamboyant sepulchers producing life; I detest these exhausted and weak-willed creatures wrapping themselves up in the guise of sage and pretend they feature an objective view." *Nietzsche, Genealogy of Morals*<sup>5</sup>

As stated by Foucault, history in modern sense, took shape in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe.<sup>6</sup> The West has imposed its superiority upon entire world by initiating *the end of history* with a Eurocentric history writing. Therefore, there could be nothing more natural than that postcolonial theory would start with the restoration of history perception in terms of opposing exploitation and oppression and of a viable struggle.<sup>7</sup> Yet today's (which forces the writing of its own history) post-poststructuralist, multicultural, historical and sociological conditions should be mentioned over this naturalness. And another reference must be made to the historicalness of elements such as Euro-centrism, which declares itself universal and has been made up of the tradition long-established on the orbit of the West that leads to the following question asked by Gyan Prakash: "How does the world write its own history?"<sup>8</sup> Because a historian, as Edward Carr pointed out, is a product of the history before he begins to write history. And history is not a retrospective knowledge, but today's people's perception on the past. Historical knowledge is not therefore rooted in the past, but in today.<sup>9</sup>

It is possible to approach to the problems caused by historicalness over the disputes between history and sociology –from the point of both Eurocentric history writing and subaltern's aspiration to write his/her own history-. Edward Carr, in his study named *What is History?*, befittingly clarifies common and harsh methodological arguments between historians and sociologists about connection and boundaries of both disciplines by saying "Sociologist's leaning upon history and historian's toward sociology would work both ways. The boundary between these two should be open for bidirectional traffic."<sup>10</sup> Philip Abrams, however, argues

---

<sup>5</sup> Quoted by Michel Foucault, Nietzsche, Soykütük, Tarih, (In *İktidar ve Özne V*, translated by Işık Ergüden (İstanbul: Ayrıntı Pub., 2011), 247-248.

<sup>6</sup> Foucault, *İktidar ve Özne*, 248.

<sup>7</sup> The things we have experienced in the past century prove the capability of Euro-centric historicist thoughts or texts indicating a certain integrity and direction to history under a certain philosophy, to create violence. This progressive historical understanding was the source of the philosophical basis of the fascist, socialist, in short, modernist totalitarian regimes we have experienced in the past century. Therefore, we found it appropriate to start our "Euro-centric discourse" analysis with history writing in sociology.

<sup>8</sup> Gyan Prakash, "Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 32, 2 (April 1990): 383. For the comment regarding world subalterns' efforts of history writing as "making efforts to reach the end of the history", see Yasin Aktay, *Tarih Bozumu, Tarih Sosyolojisi Denemeleri Essays* (İstanbul: Açılım Pub., 2010), 63.

<sup>9</sup> Aktay, *Tarih Bozumu*, 49.

<sup>10</sup> Edward H. Carr, *What is History?*, translated by Misket Gizem Gürtürk (İstanbul: İletişim Pub., 2016), 122.

in his influential work, *Historical Sociology*, that history and sociology amount to the same thing, which he bases on the argument that sociological explanation is already historical in itself.<sup>11</sup> This contestation between history and sociology is somewhat caused by the fact that historiography has remained under the pressure of a puissant objectivity. Accordingly, decent historiography is predicated on the supposition that it is only possible when carried out in an objective and unbiased manner, without being influenced by its own historical, political and ideological position. Nietzsche denominates those who claim history can be written independent of all kinds of political or ideological impressions as “lustful eunuchs of the history”.<sup>12</sup> Consequently, when it comes to history, objectivity is an illusion. It is therefore unverifiable and unfalsifiable, which is contrary to what science requires.

Classical sociological tradition has been shaped by the narrative of what societies went through and of the stages they faced in their historical process. Comte contributed to this narrative by arguing that history and societies have got through theological, metaphysical and positive phases, while Durkheim contributed by resorting to a dichotomy such as mechanical and organic solidarity. Marx contributed by putting primitive-communal, slaver, feudal, capitalist and social communities to an evolutionary line, while Weber contributed by setting forth a traditional and rational society conceptualization. Without any exception, all theoreticians of sociological tradition’s classical period believed that history was passing through a great transformation and sought to understand how this transformation had begun and to shape how it would end. This effort to theorize the societies, or rather, to put them in line, is based on the principle that history progresses through stages and each new stage is somehow more advanced than the previous one. And existing societies were qualified on this linear and progressive historical line as “advanced”, “rudimentary” or “primitive” and all societies have been expected to advance primarily on this line. One of the figures who pioneered the formation of this notion accrediting history with certain direction and integrity was undoubtedly Hegel. Having considered history as the extension of the soul, Hegel determined history as a condition for being state. After Hegel put the best state –inspired by Prussia- into the field of history and paved the way for reading of human history along with an evolutionary process. Thus, the state portrayed as the incarnate walk of the God or Absolute Mind has been ensured to represent the ultimate point of history with its quality of being the best state. Another precursor figure to contribute this metaphysical history perception is Marx. His thesis declaring the history to be nothing but class conflicts is a product of a teleological approach suggesting that history purposefully proceeds in a direction. What led Marx to remark that “if primitive societies want to see their past, they should look on India, and if Indians want to see their tomorrow, let them look on England” is the belief that all peoples could only become what Europe now is after living through the stages Europeans experienced. In this direction, the end of history thesis demonstrating how history can be built as a discursive instrument of social engineering effort reflects the desire of liberal West’s hegemony to become eternal.<sup>13</sup> The end of history is an eschatological discourse in substance the same as other finite discourses, –the end of fascism, the end of ideologies, the end of humanity- and hence

---

<sup>11</sup> Philip Abrams, *Historical Sociology* (New York: Cornell University, 1982), 5.

<sup>12</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, *Ahlakın Soykütüğü*, translated by Orhan Tuncay (İstanbul: Gün Pub., 2005), 139.

<sup>13</sup> Aktay, *Tarih Bozumu*, 19, 59. Also for the discussions on the famous text of Francis Fukuyama, *Tarihin Sonu mu?* see Francis Fukuyama, edited by Mustafa Aydın-Ertan Özensel (Ankara: Vadi Pub., 2002).

is a religious discourse. The fact that eschatological discourse regarding earthly paradise, which enlightenment has imposed and promised to entire humanity from its very beginning, is coming true can be understood through Fukuyama's declaration of the end of history with a heralding religious rhetoric. It can be seen here that modern episteme was not able to break away from religion when developing its discourse about the end of the world.<sup>14</sup> As a matter of fact, not only the Jewish narrative that time would be in their favor as they are "the chosen tribe", but also the Christian faith in the return of the Messiah have become a reference point in the determination of modern eschatological discourse. Therefore, the starting point in the Eurocentric historiography, which aims to base the future on the past, has been determined according to the end. Such a linear history writing, from primitive to modern, from simple to intricate, has been drawn according to the writer's final state. The West has fortified its hegemony on the subordinate masses, which it had marked as "the ones without history", "the ones who tries to take part in history" and "the ones who are late for history" by "writing history". In the literature, its own development is explained through the primitiveness of the other, which it otherized. It would not have happened either way if the heaven it created had not been the hell of others because the legitimacy of the universal character of the *Gesellschaft* in the sense of modern society can only be realized through creating the reflection of the non-modern in the mirror.<sup>15</sup> As a result, the manipulation of the sense of time in Judaism and Christianity through "history" has become one of the greatest discoveries of the 19th century.<sup>16</sup>

Indeed, Hegelian or Marxist history readings, which attributes a direction and integrity to history, have developed based on the assumption that a model of Europe-centered social development is an "ideal-model" for the whole world and on the point of view regarding societies those not following this model as abnormal. It has also been the main reason that urged Max Weber to ask the original question "Why did not capitalism come out of Europe?" In his analysis developed based production relations, Marx, ranked societies hierarchically and labelled Asiatic societies as deviations. The statement "they do not know how to govern, they need to be governed", which he made about the "eastern" societies showing signs of deviation has been favored as a motto for the colonialism and acted upon.

Envisagement, which attributes direction and integrity to history, is the natural reflex of the West's motive to control, to rule and to have everything. At this point, by following Nietzsche, Foucault emphasizes persistently on the point of not spending any singular event in the grand narrative of history by breaking it from its own special circumstances, and against the totalitarian hazards of analyzing the history with grand theories.<sup>17</sup>

In the classic sociological tradition, the dual conceptualizations of Comte's *static and dynamic*, Durkheim's *mechanical and organic*, Tönnies' *Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft*, Weber's *traditional-rational*, Marx's

<sup>14</sup> Aktay, *Tarih Bozumu*, 75.

<sup>15</sup> Fuat Keyman, "“Edward Said ve Bir Modernite Eleştirisi Olarak Oryantalizm”, *Uluslararası Oryantalizm Sempozyumu* (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Müdürlüğü Pub., 2007), 124.

<sup>16</sup> Aktay, *Tarih Bozumu*, 61.

<sup>17</sup> Foucault, Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, 243-244.

*feudal-capital*, Simmel's *rural-urban* can be given as examples for the structure of the modern episteme that disintegrates the truth. These binary categorizations, which describe the historical development of societies, have been established according to a hierarchical scheme. Here, while “new and present” -by definition of modern- is identified with what is “superior”, the “subordinate” is identified with what is “bygone and thus become obsolete”. Now, whatever belongs to past has lost its validity in the face of the modern. However, the West ideationally bases its ancestry on ancient Greece.<sup>18</sup> Weber, for example, gives a central position to ancient Greek city states in his analysis of the historical development of the city.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, the Greek myth was manufactured to meet the needs of the founding of the modern West. At the same time, the Greek experience, which is believed to have originated from the uniqueness of modernity, has also been unique.<sup>20</sup> This contradictory state of the modern episteme, which overrule whatever is of old, can only be explained by “the compulsory belief in God, ultimate causes and teleology.”<sup>21</sup> The search for the origin is a manifestation of having an objective viewpoint as a necessity of being scientific by acting on the assumption that it has deteriorated over time due to different factors. The necessity of being objective is to get to the basis. As a matter of fact, the basic research field of the sociology of religion constitutes the theories that have been produced about the origins of religion as a requirement of positivism. In *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Durkheim tried to reveal the origin of religion's first, pure and unspoiled state. His aim was to catch what was universal with the result that will come from it. His study on the Aborigines is a typical example of reaching a universal sociological law based on historical data. However, we certainly know that universality is an illusion when it comes to social sciences, just as objectivity is an illusion when history is concerned. There is an essentialist and fundamentalist approach in the background of these kind of studies. According to traditional or linear history writing, the origin of something is its best moment. He believes that one thing's reality lies in the very basis of it.<sup>22</sup> According to Foucault, traditional history is dependent on traditional metaphysics and searches for the origin of the thing it has written. It describes the history as

<sup>18</sup> For the assumption of Ancient Greece as a myth, see Martin Bernal, *Kara Athena*, translated by Özcan Buze (Istanbul: Kaynak Pub., 2016).

<sup>19</sup> Max Weber, *The Agrarian Sociology of Ancient Civilizations*, translated by Richard I. Frank (London: Verso Books, 1988), 69-75. Another importance of Greek cities for Weber is that, they reveal out the foundations of capitalism. Monetary economy became valid in Ancient Greek cities, which had an important role on this. See Lütfi Sunar, “Weber’in Tarihsel Şehir Sosyolojisi: Modern Toplumun Temeli Olarak Şehir”, *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 3, 22 (2011): 432.

<sup>20</sup> Lütfi Sunar, “Şarkiyatçılığı Niçin Yeniden Tartışmalıyız?” (Why should we re-discuss orientalism?) *International Orientalism Symposium* (Istanbul: Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality Directorate General for Culture Pub., 2007), 34,36.

<sup>21</sup> Foucault, *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History*, 247.

<sup>22</sup> A similar approach was developed in Islamism for the Golden Age. For a critique of the seek for origins in Islamism, see İrfan Kaya, “Klasik Sosyolojide Nostaljik Paradigma ve İslamcılıkta Asr-I Saadet Dönemi”, *Cumhuriyet Theology Journal* 21, 1 (June, 2017): 97-102.

a linear development, and assumes that what is written in history is moving in one direction, preserving its meaning in this developmental process:<sup>23</sup>

"We tend to think that this is the moment of their greatest perfection, when they emerged dazzling from the hands of a creator or in the shadeless light of a first morning. The origin of something always precedes its fall on earth. It comes before the body, before the world and time. It is associated with the gods, and telling its story always means singing a tune of theogony... Origin is the place of truth."<sup>24</sup>

In contrast, Foucault suggests genealogy as a method<sup>25</sup>. "As a counter-memory, genealogy rejects fixed essences and assumes that there may be different identities. Instead of trying to find the root of a given identity, it aims to resolve it. Genealogy denies the constant accuracy of the thing whose history it writes. Above all, genealogy claims that the thing, whose history it writes, does not follow a continuity which preserves its meaning after its emergence; on the contrary, there are many external interventions, deviations, mistakes and accidents in this process, thereby demonstrating that the process involves conflicts between different powers, and the resulting point is a consequence of these factors and the struggle. So neither the origin is unique and perfect nor the point reached is obligatory. For this reason, the ontology developed to show that the identities and boundaries imposed upon us at the time we are in history are not compulsory and can be overcome, must follow not traditional history method but genealogy. Genealogy is the methodological tool for rejecting the identities given to us."<sup>26</sup>

So far, we have tried to show that the writing of linear history is conducted by sociology as a means of exploitation to fortify the modern paradigm. As a modern invention, historical essentialism is consistent with the nature of the modern episteme with its foundational characteristics. The objection of post-colonial theory to (Eurocentric) historiography's claim of universality is obvious. However, the question "How does the Third World write its own history?" seems too naive, at the first glance because, this is a question which can be asked only by starting from the preconception of the East-West discrimination that shaped the historiography. The question seems hazardous concerning the position it has received, let alone answering the question. This formulation based on the East-West discrimination, transforms the writers of the Third World into "local whistleblowers" in Prakash's words. In brief, the idea of the third world writing its own history smells essentialism.<sup>27</sup> At the very least, it is obvious that speaking about a fixed place like the Third World will be problematic in today's post-modern culture conditions where places are consumed. Besides,

<sup>23</sup> Ferda Keskin, *Sunuş: Özne ve İktidar*, Michel Foucault, *Özne ve İktidar, Felsefe Sahnesi 2* translated by Işık Ergüden-Osman Akınhay (İstanbul: Ayrıntı Pub., 2016), in 22.

<sup>24</sup> Foucault, Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, 233-234.

<sup>25</sup> We decided it would be appropriate to refer to Foucault's genealogy, as it revealed out the bottlenecks of graphical history writing.

<sup>26</sup> Keskin, *Özne ve İktidar*, 22-23.

<sup>27</sup> Prakash, "Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World", 383. Also for the rough criticism of the term 'third world' made by Aijaz Ahmad over Fredric Jameson, see Aijaz Ahmad, *In "Teoride Sınıf, Ulus, Edebiyat, Jameson, Salman Rüşdi, Edward Said Eleştirisi"* translated by Ahmet Fethi (İstanbul: Alan Pub., 1995), 112-141.

placing emphasis on the localism in the face of universality and on the plurality in the face of singularity is to fall into the trap of essentialism, when criticizing the West being essentialist.<sup>28</sup>

In the last instance, history has come to speak of a new domination over the world with the other social sciences systematized in the 19th century. This history is no longer the history of examples serving the present by presenting a mirror of the past. But it is a history that takes the world as a whole with all its aspects and all societies as its domain and aims to explain them in order to adjust and classify them systematically and in a monistic way. History is ultimately the most basic space of Eurocentrism.<sup>29</sup>

## 2. FROM EUROCENTRISM TO CULTURALISM<sup>30</sup>

The separating and compelling wording of the West has also been decisive in the emergence of social sciences qua science. The development of disciplinary techniques and scientific disciplines, as Foucault points out, has been largely synchronic and related while the West updated itself with Renaissance. Western thinking based on the science and the positive-mind has also transformed the foundational principles observed in nature sciences into practice to understand the social life of human being and revealed the conclusions it found from its own society, in the name of all humanity. Thus, it has developed a Eurocentric understanding of social sciences that claims universality with a discourse that positions itself in the center and marginalizes the other. As Wallerstein says, this understanding of social sciences manifests itself in five ways: historiography, the universality of these sciences being narrow-minded, the assumptions of Western civilization, being Orientalist, and the imposition of the theory of progress.<sup>31</sup> The social sciences and studies that we are standing on today have been emerged largely due to the unique problems of the West, and therefore, they belong to the West with all their color and scent.<sup>32</sup> This mind-set, which is essentially called Eurocentrism, manifests itself in all the practices of the West. With a quotation from Arif Dirlik, whom we know thanks to his criticisms of the postcolonial period and the theory, "Eurocentrism is the product of an

<sup>28</sup> Bobby Sayyid, For Azmeh, criticizing Islamism for being centrist, see Aziz Al-Azmeh, *İslamlar ve Moderniteler*, translated by Elçin Gen (İstanbul: İletişim Pub., 2014) He thinks it serves for the empowerment of the Western hegemony and argues, based on the idea that each criticism of centrism should also be based on the criticism of globalism, that, each claim of globalism is a product of a certain hegemony. According to Sayyid, each hegemony aims to globalize a partiality and make it transparent, to keep all partialities away in order to become global. See Bobby S. Sayyid, “Kötü Niyet: Anti-Özcülük, Evrensellik ve İslamcılık” translated by Nuh Yılmaz, *Tezkire* IX, 18, (2000): 86.

<sup>29</sup> Arif Dirlik, *Kriz, Kimlik ve Siyaset, Küreselleşme Yazıları (Crisis, Identify and Politics, Globalization essays)*, translated by Sami Oğuz (İstanbul: İletişim Pub., 2009), 341.

<sup>30</sup> I would like to thank to Nesibe Şahin for her contribution to the preparation of the section “From Eurocentrism to Culturalism”.

<sup>31</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein, “Eurocentrism and Its Avatars: The Dilemmas of Social Science”, *New Left Review* 226, (November-December 1997): 94, trans. by Gurminder K. Bhambra, *Rethinking Modernity*, 4.

<sup>32</sup> Mustafa Gündüz, “Kültür ve Medeniyet Bağlamında Batı Merkezci Eğitim ve Eleştirisi” (Western-centric education and criticism within the scope of culture and civilization), *İnsan & Toplum* 3, 6 (2014): 225.

unprecedented desire and endeavor to organize the information about the world in a single systematic whole."<sup>33</sup>

According to Bhambra, the term Eurocentrism with its disputed definition in the academic area, "is the belief, implicit or otherwise, in the world historical significance of events believed to have developed endogenously within the cultural-geographical sphere of Europe."<sup>34</sup> Amin, on the other hand, defines the Eurocentrism as a cultural paradigm, not an ordinary ethnocentrism, but a sign of a limited view that no people living on our planet can fully emancipate.<sup>35</sup> Yet those who tend to legitimize Eurocentrism claim that Eurocentrism is also a kind of ethnocentrism.<sup>36</sup> According to Amin, Eurocentrism is both a world theory and a world politics plan linked to it.<sup>37</sup> The way of thinking of the Western mind that disintegrates the reality has manifested itself in sociologists by distinguishing societies as pre-modern and post-modern. Accordingly, all human societies must follow the course of Europe's past, pass through the stages it has taken, and thus achieve the goal of being "modern". Theoreticians, considered the father of classical sociology, advocated the existence of a linear and unidirectional progression, in which history gradually progresses and each stage is regarded as development according to the previous one, in their analysis of how and where the exclusive transformation of the West began. For them, the ultimate destination of this progression must be Western modernity. Other societies, which imitate the West and desperately seek to capture it to achieve this goal, are placed at various points behind the West.<sup>38</sup> In this context, sociology can be regarded as an information system that both harmonized with (Western) history and brought to the body in that very history.<sup>39</sup> And of course in this "history", elements such as colonial activities and slave trade are always ignored. Besides, sociological analyses do not show the colonial practices of the western. Despite the acceptance of the presence of colonialism, the Eurocentric view that we have seen even in Marx's critique is an example to this.

The fact that modernity does not pay attention to differences but has a uniform paradigm manifests itself in its structural description of societies in coordinated sociology. This approach reveals how sociology looks at differences. In this respect, sociological history does not mention the interactions between non-Western societies and the West.

---

<sup>33</sup> Dirlik, Kriz, *Kimlik ve Siyaset (Crisis, Identity and Politics)*, 342.

<sup>34</sup> Bhambra, *Moderniteyi Yeniden Düşünmek (Rethinking Modernity)*, 5.

<sup>35</sup> Samir Amin, *Avrupa-merkezcilik, Bir İdeolojinin Eleştirisi* translated by Mehmet Sert (Istanbul: Chiviyazıları, 2007), 15-16.

<sup>36</sup> Bobby S. Sayyid, *Fundamentalizm Korkusu, Avrupamerkezcilik ve İslamcılığın Doğuşu (The fear of fundamentalism, Eurocentrism and the Rise of Islamism)*, translated by Ebubekir Ceylan-Nuh Yılmaz (Ankara: Vadi Pub., 2000), 175.

<sup>37</sup> Amin, *Avrupa-merkezcilik (Eurocentrism)*, 97.

<sup>38</sup> Bhambra, *Rethinking Modernity*, 83.

<sup>39</sup> Bhambra, "Postcolonial Reflections on Sociology", *Sociology-The Journal of the British Sociological Association* 50, no. 5, (2016): 964 access 20.07.2017. <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/81982>

At the end of the 1990s, the idea of multiple modernity, which introduced new approaches with a critical view of modernity, is closely linked to the Eurocentrism paradigm. Unlike the advocates of modernity, multi-modernity theorists have opposed a single modernity idea by considering the cultural diversity. However, taking references to Western modernity while examining alternative modernity notions, and comparing cultural dynamics of other civilizations with those of the West has put them in a trap of the Eurocentric paradigm that they have criticized.<sup>40</sup>

The intolerance of Western understanding against differences forced those who wanted to use "the right to be different" to seek alternatives for the Eurocentric paradigm. Culturalism is one of the paradigms that have caused the Eurocentric paradigm to lean in as a result of these quests. The culturalist approach sees universality as unnecessary and believes in the superiority of its own culture. Samir Amin considers this attitude in the same way with the mentality of a Eurocentric approach, because the dominant Eurocentric current is a kind of culturalism as it accepts the pursuit of European culture.<sup>41</sup> Dirlik, on the other hand, defines culturalism as a hegemonic ideology. According to him, the culturalist reduces all areas of social experience to the issue of culture by accepting that the cult is autonomous (economically, ideologically). This approach not only legitimizes hegemonic associations among societies, but also is responsible for hegemonic relations, such as exploitation and oppression within societies. According to Dirlik, this understanding assumes that the society we are studying is a society separate from the others.<sup>42</sup>

This also will force the culturalist understanding to possess the characteristic of the criticized Eurocentric paradigm, since it would otherize the rest.

Amin's assessment of Eurocentricity as a culturalist approach can be questioned in several respects. Eurocentrism does not need culturalism as it can arbitrate its own dominance as a paradigm with the support of the phenomenon of globalization. Therefore, it cannot be considered as culturalism in our opinion. On the other hand, while Eurocentrism is de facto as being universal, culturalism is based on the perception of taking its own cultures to the center and othering others. The character of Eurocentrism is active and hegemonic, culturalism is passive and reducible because the Eurocentric idea procures acceptance in the world through a reactionary mental structure, and culturalism has to settle with a reactionary style that expresses itself through Eurocentrism. Again, the West's basing itself on Ancient Greece is only due to the need to lie somewhere as a source. Therefore, it would be a constrained assessment to say this should count as culturalism, in our opinion.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Bhambra, *Moderniteyi Yeniden Düşünmek*, 72.

<sup>41</sup> Amin, *Avrupa-merkezcilik*, 12.

<sup>42</sup> Dirlik, *Postcolonial Aura*, 51.

<sup>43</sup> We believe it is acceptable that, approaches based on cultural differences should be discriminating, due to the fact that they need to have origins. Therefore, it seems impossible to assess such discrimination on cultural terms. Because it must be stated that, the European thought does not make Ancient Greece mythical when announcing it as a root, on the contrary, it continuously updates it. Besides, today's advanced capitalist structure is so sure of

At this point, it would be appropriate to exemplify the point reached by culturalist view in sociology. It is a culturalism practice that Ziya Gökalp, a very famous name in Turkish sociology, translated the Arabic "hars" expression which is used for the word "crop", as the word "culture" in the translation of the verse of Koran (el-Bakara 2/205) "... they devastate the crops, ruin the generations."<sup>44</sup> It is possible and meaningful to consider this as a manifestation of the modernization project at a time when Westernization is gaining momentum. From this perspective, this approach is also an example of the self-orientalist approach I will examine later on.

The paradigm of multiculturalism in culturalism debates is another important point of criticism. It has been seen that people who lived in the colonies, returned to Europe, tried to maintain their own culture and created ghettos after the liquidation of the colonialism. The West has sought to solve cultural and political problems of these societies through the policy of multiculturalism and has used this framework of thought in the analysis of these societies. And with that, the West has tried to identify and analyze what is different from its own, as it has always done, even proposed a multicultural approach to other societies experiencing ethnic problems. In fact, even if multiculturalism claims that different cultures can exist in harmony, it "holds the attitude of a Eurocentric distance or respect that looks down on local cultures".<sup>45</sup> Thereby, how much can the multicultural mind structure that expresses itself with the possibilities of the globalizing world, provided by post-modern and post-structural criticism, which has been emerged as the "exploited alterity" of Europe, tell itself to the world? Even if it does, is it possible to call that expressing oneself?

As one of the methods for expressing oneself, the concept of hybridity, which is attributed to post-colonial theorist Homi Bhabha,<sup>46</sup> is also facing the danger of falling into identity traps according to Dirlik.<sup>47</sup> While it must remove the boundaries, which are supposed to separate identities and cultures from each

---

itself and the sense of entrapment is so deep that, it doesn't need legitimacy anymore. On the other hand, when we look at culturalism with respect to Dirlik's definition "it is the overall intellectual tendencies that have become crystallized around the reduction of social and historical questions to abstract cultural questions in terms of methodology" and thus, "it serves not only for the legitimization of the hegemonic relationships among the societies, but also for making the hegemonic exploitation and pressurizing relationships in societies, mythical", see Dirlik, *Postcolonial Aura*, 54 from Foucault's perspective, it is quite natural to say, based on the practices of the rulers until now, that, it is quite functional as a hegemonic discourse serving the rulers.

<sup>44</sup> Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (The principles of Turkism) (Ankara: Varlık Pub., 1968), 27.

<sup>45</sup> Slavoj Žižek, *Kırılğan Temas*, translated by Tuncay Birkan (Istanbul: Metis Pub., 2011), 282.

<sup>46</sup> Homi K. Bhabha, *Kültürel Konumlanış*, translated by Tahir Uluç (Istanbul: İnsan Pub., 2016).

<sup>47</sup> Dirlik, *Kriz, Kimlik ve Siyaset*, 245-272.

other,<sup>48</sup> hybridity itself often becomes an identity.<sup>49</sup> In the final analysis, like multiculturalism, which it grew together with in the process of globalization, it assumes that boundaries are certain cultural systems. It ignores violence that includes encounters, mixings and overlapping. It further codifies the cultures in question, homogenizes them, grants them authenticity, presents them to romantic attention and opens them to tourism.<sup>50</sup> According to Žižek's statement, while multiculturalism, as the motivation of Eurocentric paradigm, settles for the folkloric (non-dangerous) form of the *other*, which purified from the content, disregards its fundamentalist aspects. In the age of *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, the respect that is shown to the specificity of the *other*,<sup>51</sup> by multiculturalist, the ideal ideology form of global capitalism, is the exact form of expressing its own supremacy.<sup>52</sup>

As can be understood from the assessments we have made up to this point, it is an undeniable fact that postcolonial criticism of this ideology is inadequate, although it is the dominant ideology in social sciences as it is in all the practices of the West. Besides being a limited criticism due to the inadequacy of the conceptual equipment, the Reverse-Eurocentrism, which is seen in most of the critical approaches, has occasionally fallen into the error of strengthening the existing Eurocentric structure itself, by reason of the assessments made with an approach similar to the existing mind-structure or the starting points of the criticisms. According to Dirlik's analysis, in order to oppose Eurocentrism, East Asia's definition of its identity with the concepts of the West and with a Eurocentric spatialization, is an example of conceptual complexity / inadequacy. Thereby, this led Dirlik to reach the conclusion that, the anti-Eurocentric movements are in fact Eurocentric in essence, or more precisely, products of this perception.<sup>53</sup>

In the same way, appealing to other "centrist" perspectives while in search of an alternative for the Eurocentric mentality will also be an error for the seekers. Therefore, this understanding will not be able to go beyond being a bad copy of the structure of the Eurocentric mind-set, which pushes the different one into the background or ignores it, since it will bring along centering itself and alienating others.

Ultimately, multiculturalism, in Anne Phillips' words -despite its noble intentions- has not been able to free itself from being a "cultural straitjacket" rather than being a "cultural savior". The most criticized aspect of multiculturalism is its justified accusations on national identities that cause essentialism, which

<sup>48</sup> Sibel Yardımcı, "Canavar: Kültüralizm ne zamandı?" (Monster: When was culturalism?), [www.e-skop.com](http://www.e-skop.com). e-skop journal, 10/2012, Issue 3, access 19.07.2017 <http://www.e-skop.com/skopdergi/canavar-kulturalizm-ne-zamandi/928>

<sup>49</sup> Mahmut Mutman, "Postkolonyalizm: Ölü bir Disiplinin Hatıra Defteri," (*Postcolonialism: Diary of a Dead Discipline*) *Sociology Postcolonial Thought Special Edition*, p. 25, (October 2010): 124.

<sup>50</sup> Yardımcı, "Canavar: Kültüralizm ne zamandı?" (Monster: When was culturalism?),

<sup>51</sup> Žižek, *Kırılğan Temas*, 282.

<sup>52</sup> Žižek, *Kırılğan Temas*, 282.

<sup>53</sup> Dirlik, "Culture against History: Politics of East Asian Identity", *Development and Society* 28, 2 (1999): 176, trans. by Kerem Karaosmanoğlu-Defne Karaosmanoğlu, "A Critique of Eurocentrism: Bottlenecks and Alternatives", *İnsan & Toplum* 3, 6, (2014): 55.

excludes minorities, and that increase it. With a quote from Phillips, multiculturalism, "Exaggerates the internal unity of cultures, hardens the differences, which are not so stable now, and makes people from other cultures look like even more exotic and different than they actually are (a state of othering within itself). In that case, multiculturalism appears to us not as a cultural savior but as a cultural straitjacket."<sup>54</sup> Hence, the homogeneous and reifying approach of multiculturalism, which standardizes the culture, besides being far away from being the remedy for the masses of subaltern in the Third World, seems to have led to new problems, unintentionally even.

### 3. OTHERISATION

In his book, *The Eyewitnesses of History*, Peter Burke mentions two types of encounters with the Other.<sup>55</sup> The first reaction is to deny or ignore cultural distance and to make sense of others willingly or unwillingly based on our own insight and culture. The other is regarded as a reflection of our own. This can be seen in Christians' perception of Saladin Ayyub as a knight or in Vasco da Gama's perception of the statue of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva in a local temple as an image of the trinity or in the case of Chinese people perception of Virgin Mary as Buddhist goddess, Kuan Yin. Thus, the unrest caused by the first encounter with the other can be understood via simile.<sup>56</sup> The second reaction is exactly the opposite. Upon "otherizing" people who do not belong to his/her of culture, cultural codification is fictionalized. Demonization is then involved in this process. In *Roland's Song*, Islam is defined as evil mirror image of Christianity. Greek historian Herodot presents ancient Egypt culture as the opposite of Greek culture. In fact, the problem of "Other Cultures" has been an integral part of the Western social philosophy since Herodot indicated that all socio-cultural differences cause people to question the difference between natural and conservative.<sup>57</sup>

In the similar way, with the Enlightenment period the notion of otherization has become a prerequisite for the subject the West used while programing itself over pure epistemology. Only with the creation of an image of the other could the introduction of the motto "knowledge is power" enter in the development of modern identity in history. The presentation of the East as passive, irrational, conservationist, which Said

<sup>54</sup> Anne Phillips, *Multiculturalism without Culture* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2007), 14.

<sup>55</sup> Peter Burke, *Afişten Heykele Minyatürden Fotoğrafa Tarihin Görgü Tanıkları*, translated by Zeynep Yelçe (Istanbul: Kitap Pub., 2016), 137.

<sup>56</sup> Using the other on the known by reducing it through analogy and using "epistemic" violence: There is an anecdote of Nasreddin Hodja where the villagers insist that the stork is a bird. Nasreddin Hodja takes the scissors and cuts the long beak and legs of the stork, which he has never seen before and says "now it looks like a bird"; or in Greek mythology, Procrustes cuts the organs of his captives, which overflow from the bed (Procrustean bed) or if they are short, he extends them until they fit the length of the bed. These are good examples to show the irregularity of the othering.

<sup>57</sup> Bryan S. Turner, *Oryantalizm, Postmodernizm ve Globalizm*, translated by İbrahim Kapaklıkaya (Istanbul: Anka Pub., 2002), 147.

rightfully presented as the prerequisite of dominant rational subject, is inherent in West’s effort for establishing hegemony in wisdom and knowledge.<sup>58</sup>

Thus, the nature of the Western idea that tear down reality by making dual distinctions has rendered the notion of *otherization* inevitable. The idea, which deconstructs reality and which has become a rule via science and through which a hierarchical order just as in between subject-object, mind-body, west-east, center-periphery, fact-value, is unique to modern Western idea which started with Descartes. Ultimately, the relation between modernity and nature, human beings, history, relation with the society is based on hegemony. It is seen that the power volition based on Western envision, which tears down reality, aims to dominate *irrational* on behalf of *irrational*, manipulate and overthrow. As a matter of fact, Western rationality is characterized with identicalness principle. With the principle of no contradiction (A is A, A is not B) uncertainty /intrication is reduced to minimum. This is a dualism that is expressed with some contradictions like mind/body, subject/object and which argues that something is either itself or something else.<sup>59</sup>

Besides, the *order* that is observed by nature scientists has become deterministic in the development of modern paradigm. It is such that the exploration of order in the nature prescribed *order* in thought as well. Modernity regarded *ordering* as a duty, which is achieved via classification. Classification means dividing or separating. In other words, it entails attribution of a structure to the world. Classification can be achieved via naming, and naming brings about restrictions. Restriction is a kind of making definition. For modernity, making definition for knowing something is indispensable. That is why the definition theory developed by Aristoteles in ancient period has been the building block for modernity. For those who define others, making definition means dominating the things defined. Modernity likes naming most. It restricts others by naming them and it cannot do so without externalizing. Otherization emerges in this way.<sup>60</sup> Attributing a structure to earth is actually a matter of design and action. The *other* of the order is ambivalence. In Bauman’s words, “the effort to eliminate the ambivalence of *the other* is a typical modern practice; it is the essence of politics, modern reason and modern life. This is an attempt to pressurize or eliminate everything that can be and cannot be defined for certain.”<sup>61</sup>

With this aim, the perspective that we can be regarded as reasoning method of the modern paradigm from the 15<sup>th</sup> century and 20<sup>th</sup> century<sup>62</sup> grasps the world from the individual’s point of view–to comprise.

<sup>58</sup> Keyman, “Edward Said ve Bir Modernite Eleştirisi Olarak Oryantalizm”, 127.

<sup>59</sup> Madan Sarup, *Post-yapısalcılık ve Post-modernizm*, translated by A. Baki Güçlü (Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Pub., 1997), 172.

<sup>60</sup> Said argues that, during the construction process of the European concept that, the concept of the East came out first, then came the non-East (the West) and hence, he defines Orientalism as a “way of thinking based on the ontological and epistemological distinction between the East and West. See Edward W Said, *Orientalism, Orientalist Ideas of the West*”, translated by Berna Ülner (Istanbul: Metis Pub., 2001, 12.

<sup>61</sup> Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernlik ve Müphemlik*, translated by İsmail Türkmen (Istanbul: Ayrıntı Pub., 2014), 20-21.

<sup>62</sup> The perspective is a way of thinking which has generated the inventions related to the ‘modern’, which has started with *camera obscura*, the precursor of photography, has become three dimensional with *stereoscope* and has reached

The central perspective unique to the new age, this artistic method which determines what is in the front, what is at the back and what is far away, is an extension of Cartesian dominance. In this way, the world is converted into a tamed, reviewable and controllable extension.<sup>63</sup> However, artists of the Middle Age used to think that they could convey what they see before their eyes more demonstratively by walking around it, by feeling it from different perspectives and by almost touching it.<sup>64</sup> Besides, maps and chronometers that work on the principle of measurement and punctuality were the basic tools for removing ambivalence in the vision of the Enlightenment about how the world should be organized. All these organization practices are directed towards dominating, allotment, comprising, exercise dominance over and taming. The basic principle is not to leave anything desolate. All these episteme are the product of unprecedented will and effort to organize all knowledge about the world in a single systematic whole as in European-centralism definition of Dirlik. The main motive for writing this article is to reveal this fascistic character of the modern episteme.

In reality, the totalitarianism on this epistemic violence and knowledge could become possible with a continuous effort to reduce the other into the same. This integration effort in the western intellectual history has ended with somehow absorption of the other. Frantz Fanon, who is known to be the author of anticolonial manifesto, discusses the mirror stage which is regarded as the vital stage of subject creation in the scheme developed by Lacan. According to this, when human being watches himself in the mirror, he sees a smoother, more coordinated and balanced reflection. Thus, the (western) subject constructs itself by both imitating this image and by opposing it. Consequently, it can be argued that modernity is based on a compulsion applied on the other and otherness.<sup>65</sup>

Bryan Turner argues that the theological basis of otherization is the fact that everything that is different not included in the existence chain determined by God is regard to be problematic in Christianity. Under the influence of this theology, orientalism has created a profound "otherness" perception as it meets other cultures especially after the 17<sup>th</sup> century. This colonial experience with regard to otherness is an important

---

its peak point with *panopticon*. For further details, see Zeynep Sayın, Sunuş, and Pavel Florenski, *Tersten Perspektif*, translated by Yeşim Tükel (Istanbul: Metis Pub., 2013).

<sup>63</sup> Sayın "Sunuş", Florenski, *Tersten Perspektif*, 10 give important clues for the understanding of the central perspective modern thought as a way of thinking, in Summa systems used in primary academic studies as a product of the Scholastic principle of "illumination, manifestation and clarification, - Summa as a type of literature- and the perspective central modern thought as a way of thinking. For further information about Summa and a research where the explicit explanation practice of the scholastic thought and the similarities among art, philosophy and religion are studies, see Erwin Panofsky, *Gotik Mimarlık ve Skolastik Felsefe, Ortaçağda Sanat, Felsefe ve Din Arasındaki Benzerliklerin İncelenmesi* translated by Engin Akyürek (Istanbul: Kabalcı Pub., 2014), 27-66.

<sup>64</sup> Samuel Edgerton, *The Renaissance Re-discovery of Linear Perspective*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), trans. by David Harvey, *Postmodernliğin Durumu, Kültürel Değişimin Kökenleri*, translated by Sungur Savran (Istanbul: Metis Pub., 2014), 272.

<sup>65</sup> Dirlik, "Global in the Local", *Global/Local*, coll. by R. Wilson-W. Dissanayake (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1996), 25.

problem for a large existence chain in which God positioned both animal and human species.<sup>66</sup> As a matter of fact, masses that are trained with the Christian theology and believed in Christ the Jesus did not allocate any place in the future of this world for others who did not enter the God’s Kingdom. Therefore, this should be the theological ground for nationalism, multiculturalism, orientalism and colonial experiences in Europe to turn into painful and ready massacres and annihilation.<sup>67</sup>

#### 4. FROM OREINTALISM TO SELF-OREINTALISM

“Its fame, name, value, customary size –almost always wrong and random in the origin, left over it like a piece of cloth and strange to its nature and even to its skin- with his belief in it and in growth from generation to generation, it gradually covers it form inside and outside and it becomes the body itself: At the beginning, the thing that is appearance at the beginning and it almost always becomes the essence and becomes influential as the essence.”<sup>68</sup>

There are two basic approaches that make up orientalism: Euro-centerism and Otherization. Among these three concepts, Euro-centerism is deterministic thanks to the perspective that grasps the world from individual’s eye<sup>69</sup>. This strict central understanding based on over-regularatory fixed points of view of center as the pioneer of change and the periphery as its follower inevitably brings along otherization. The West first defines itself based on the East and then defines the East based on itself. With orientalism, these three approaches generate each other and enlarge each other’s scopes, and thus fortify their hegemony.

One of the questions that shape the sociological thought is “why did industrialism first emerge in the West?” has in fact become an indispensable component of intellectual calculation system.<sup>70</sup> The Western sociology characteristically defines Islam society<sup>71</sup> as lacking autonomous institutions of bourgeois that end the hegemony of feudalism. Accordingly, Muslim society lacks independent cities, autonomous bourgeois class, rational bureaucracy, autonomous law, and private property. *Iran Letters* Montesquieu has written

---

<sup>66</sup> Turner, *Oryantalizm, Postmodernizm ve Globalizm*, 269-270.

<sup>67</sup> Aktay, *Tarih Bozumu*, 231-232.

<sup>68</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, *Şen Bilim: Main Text 1*, translated by Ahmet İnam (Istanbul: Say Pub., 2004), 68.

<sup>69</sup> See. Footnote 58 and relevant chapter.

<sup>70</sup> It should be stated that, comparisons are generally problematic in the sociological thought and mainly serve to orientalism.

<sup>71</sup> Yasin Aktay argues that, Aziz el-Azmeh revealed out the handicap of the discourse on sociology, which deals with Islam as an integrated category, even if with delay. Aktay states that, Azmeh displays an anti-orientalist attitude against the “essentialist” reductions involved in the idea of “Islam”, assumed by the Orientalist literature as the origin of several clichés, through texts. Yet, he also criticizes Azmeh, arguing that his relationship with the anti-essentialist postmodern values involve too much essentialism. See Yasin Aktay, “Modernleşme ve Gelenek Bağlamında Dini Bilgi ve Otoritenin Dönüşümü”, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, İslamcılık*, (Transformation of religious information and authority in terms of modernization and tradition, “Political thought in modern Turkey”) (Istanbul: İletişim Pub., 2011), 6, footnotes 358 and 3.

from the point of view of Eastern observers is related to Eastern despotism and is an example of how the West define itself from the eyes of the East. Montesquieu criticized *ancien regime* based on the Eastern despotism of the time, thereby seeking to warn his own society. Another point of comparison between the West and the East is the notion of civil society notion. Especially, in Scottish enlightenment, the rise of civil society was regarded as the most fundamental social development indicator of transmission from barbarity to civilization because individuals could acquire legal rights of property and safety only thanks to civil society. Although the lack of civil society in oriental despotism is formulated with reference to whole Asia, this notion has had a significant place in the analysis of Muslim societies because this notion is one of the main features of orientalist discourse. Bryan Turner duly stated that the relation Western orientalists establish between the Eastern despotism and civil society is actually developed in an environment of uncertainty in intellectual's despotism and monarchy in Europe. According to Turner, "orientalist discourse about the lack of civil society in Islam is the reflection of the basic political concerns about the case of political freedom in the West. In this sense, the problem of orientalism is not Orient but it was Occident (the West). In time these problems and concerns were turned over Orient. Thus, Orient has become a caricature of the West not a representative of the East."<sup>72</sup> It is seen that at the bottom of the Eastern despotism lies the Western monarchy, which virtually proves that the problem of history is not the past but today. The essential character of the orientalist discourse is to reveal the difference to demonstrate "the uniqueness of the West".

As a matter of fact, the sociology of Max Weber is based on difference. The formative question of why capitalism emerged in the West but not in the East is also the basic question Weber asks. It can be argued that Weber's question gained importance as many historical experiences in Europe are considered as fixed points in history and the societies that did not go through these points are considered to be away from the course of history and thus history itself<sup>73</sup>, in other words with the development of Euro-centric history and society. Weber displayed his *skills* and contribution to the attribution of the negative picture of the West to non-Western societies with an effort to create a character of "other-societies" with his analysis of the emergence of the capitalism. Weber, who emphasizes the emergence of capitalism requires bourgeois class, money economy, autonomous cities, free market of labor and rational law as prerequisites, argues that capitalism did not emerge anywhere other than Europe following from the fact that these did not exist in non-European societies. In particular, Weber thinks that all these elements "are prevented by the patrimonial nature of the Islamic institutions."<sup>74</sup> By preferring to remain loyal to his ethnocentric links when it comes to Islam instead of an understanding expected from him, negative question of Weber, who is the great master of Anlamacı sociology, why capitalism did not emerge in non-European societies, has become one of the essential reference points of Euro-centrism, a chronic problem in social sciences. Since this is the case, we think that Weber is the person who directed both colonial period in the 19<sup>th</sup> century reformists and post-colonial critics to sociological interest, which opens to self-orientalism press. As a matter of fact, Weber's negative question was asked in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Islamic geography and in the East. Today, it is still asked

<sup>72</sup> Turner, *Oryantalizm, Postmodernizm ve Globalizm*, 63.

<sup>73</sup> Aktay, *Tarih Bozumu*, 130.

<sup>74</sup> Bryan S. Turner, *Max Weber ve İslam, Eleştirel Bir Yaklaşım*, translated by Yasin Aktay (Ankara: Vadi Pub., 1997), 20.

among post-colonial theoreticians.<sup>75</sup> However, as Aktay duly remarks “Once this questions is asked, not matter how it is answered, it is not possible to avoid from defening the rest of the world as “abnormal.”<sup>76</sup> This is the basis of simple operational logic of orientalism and the essentialism in this logic. Moreover, Bryan Turner thinks that almost all analyses social change were ironic when the 19<sup>th</sup> century Islam reformists started to define a new set of motives for Islam in the modern age.<sup>77</sup> In his work called *Max Weber and Islam*, Turner emphasizes that the heavy intellectual and cultural trauma Western emparialism and colonialism caused for deveout Muslims had great influence on this ironic case. Bryan Turner as the author of *The End of Marx and Orientalism*, which corresponds to the same year as Edward Said’s *Orientalism*, is one of the rare sociologists who criticizes orientalist paradigm in sociological idea and thus who problematize Euro-centerism in social sciences. His readings of Nietzsche over Weber, and sociology readings over Weber indicates that the classical period in sociology history is rich enough to respond to modern needs.<sup>78</sup> *Max Weber and Islam* is the first work of the author in which he determined his orientalism concern and it focuses on criticisms against Weber that positions Weber into an orientalist framework. Turner argues that Weber’s frequent reference to patrimonialism theory, which Weber designs as a model of society indigenous to the East, stems from Weber’s profound attachment to an orientalist bias. At the simplest platform, Turner tries to show that when Weber asked the question why capitalism, which is regarded to be a prerequisite for rationalism and development, did not emerge in the East, and that Weber contracted orientalist assumption and disclose this assumtiom. Turner refutes the arguments of Weber, which are inherently orientalist, in particular for Islamic and ingeneral for Eastern societies. With this aim in mind, Turner argues that Islam is actually civic religion- as a supplementary component of capitaslims. With examples from Islami history, Turner claims that the holders of Islam are not warriors, as Weber argues, but merchants. He even argues that the language of Quran is tradesman language given its terminology.<sup>79</sup> Accordign to Turner, Islam was born in a civic environment of Mecca and developed in Madina’s oasis. The teological basis of Prophet Muhammed is mostly related to problems in trade and the terminology used in Quran is trade terms. We can also see a similar approach by Sabri Ülgener, who is known as the pioneer of Weberian sociology and who has contributed to Turkish sociological and economic history with his research in mentality. According to Ülgener, many verses in Quran addresses to a civic society, which is beyond a simple society of carafitsman

<sup>75</sup> In this regard, for Chibber’s rightful criticism that the post-colonial theory and the views of post-colonial theoreticians, Chakrabarty and Chatterjee’s did not attack the Orientalist and colonial depictions of the East, but that, Sub-alternity studies sublimated these, see Chibber, *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*, particularly Shapters seven and eight.

<sup>76</sup> Yasin Aktay, “Akılın Sosyolojik Soykütüğü, Soy Akıldan Tarihsel ve Toplumsal Akla Doğru,” (The Sociologic Genealogy of the Mind: From Genealogic Mind to the Historical and Social Mind), *Toplum ve Bilim* 82,(1999): 17.

<sup>77</sup> Turner, *Max Weber ve İslam*, 249.

<sup>78</sup> For example, Georg Stauth-Bryan Turner, *Nietzsche’nin Dansı, Toplumsal Hayatta Hınç, Karşılıklılık ve Direniş (Nietzsche’s Dance, Resentment, Reciprocity and Resistance in Social Life)* (Oxford: Basic Blackwell, 1988), translated by Mehmet Küçük (Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Pub., 2005) and Bryan S. Turner, *Max Weber, From History to Modernity*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1993).

<sup>79</sup> See Turner, *Max Weber ve İslam* 177,-244.

and small bourgeoisie. Ülgener emphasizes that carriers of Islam are merchants (not warriors).<sup>80</sup> Furthermore, the studies on mentality by Ülgener seeks to reveal and rectify the fault Weber and the like have when regarding Islam as a religion with a feudal character. Besides, Ülgener pointed out that Sufism detracted Islam from its worldly and civic character and indicated Sufism as the reason for its regression.

In Turner's analyses, we get the impression that capitalism is regarded as the basic indicator of development.<sup>81</sup> It seems that he has not been able to protect himself from Euro-centric discourse, while proving that Weber's ideas about Islam and Islamic societies are orientalist and ontologically incorrect. Therefore, there is not a difference between Weber, who argues that Islamic societies do not have the necessary conditions for the emergence of capitalism, and Turner, who criticizes Weber for being orientalist and who claims that Islam has conditions necessary for the emergence of capitalism. We can also argue that Turner's approach is even stronger as it fortifies the position of capitalism regarding it the only factor for the development in all conditions. His argument that Islam is civic, its carriers are merchants and its language as merchant language is merely reproducing orientalism.

Ülgener's defending Islam by arguing it as civic religion since its birth, can be regarded as self-orientalism. As a matter of fact, given that he acts upon the presupposition that capitalism is a prerequisite for develop it seems that he seeks to modernize Islam as he cannot Islamicize modernity ment. This self-orientalist attitude developed as a result of dialogue with orientalism over the last two centuries is the reflection of an effort by societies to understand and express themselves over Western values, which we come across in the modernization process of non-Western societies. This kind of efforts to prove oneself means ultimately endorsing dominance of the West. On the other hand, while the relation Weber establishes between Protestant moral and capitalism should be understood as elective affinity relation instead of causal relation, the debates over the *protestanisation of Islam* in our country with an aim to reach level of contemporary civilization lay the dimension of such as ironic case bare. As a part of these debates, history was called in and Ahi-order as a merchant organization where the world and after-life balance is observed. Without caring about anachronic attitude, the achievements of people from Kayseri as *Muslim Calvinists* in business life was shown to all public and Europe. In fact, the arguments that "We also have them", which are indication that they expressed themselves over Western values, were actually imported hastily to save the Ottoman. These *borrowed terms* turn into self-orientalism, which is put into practice by actually accepting the superiority of Western values and by identification of democracy with consultation, public interest with affair, public opinion with idjma, and prosperity with civilization.<sup>82</sup>

Another example of self-orientalism, which expresses itself over Western values, is the culture definition of Ziya Gökalp. Gökalp interpreted the word "hars" in verse 205 of surah al-Baqarah "they destroy the

---

<sup>80</sup> Sabri F. Ülgener, *Din ve Zihniyet* (Istanbul: Der Pub., 1981), 65.

<sup>81</sup> Turner's further essays show that he corrected this mistake later.

<sup>82</sup> Likewise, there are many articles in our country arguing that the discipline of Mevlana or Yunus Emre was humanist. These articles, which we regard to be striking examples of self-orientalism, can be accessed by from ISAM's article database by entering the key word; 'humanism'.

crops and spoil generations” as culture. It is meaningful to interpret this as manifestation of modernization in a period when westernization speeds up. Besides, Gökalp’s well-known distinction between culture and civilization can also be read as a manifestation of Euro-centric argument that the West is materialist and the East is spiritualist. As in Milica Bakic-Hayden’s definition of “constantly increasing orientalisms” “ it is a reproduction model for the original dualism orientalism is based on”.<sup>83</sup> This culturalist and self-orientalist practice in Gökalp’s example, is actually a case of *plague from the West*, which is frequently observed in non-Western societies seeking to modernize. This case of plague from the west is also internalization of orientalism as westernism, which Edward Said criticizes for not discussing Easternizers who Easternize themselves when mentioning Easternizers.

We can formulize the cultural environment when the western expansion start to influence the Ottomans or when the superiority of the West reached at a global scale, around the following questions: How come a religion, which has reached perfection and sent by Allah, weakens and regresses; or in other words, if Christianity is a altered religion, what is then the secret for the power and superiority of the West? The answer should not be long; however, it should be able to present legitimate reasons for change in the modern world.<sup>84</sup>

The cultural trauma shaped around these questions, which we think is still valid, seems to have forced the victims of this trauma to think that the only way for change is “Islamization of Knowledge”. However, this coerced orientation was presented “Islamisation” as a challenge against West’s hegemonic intellectual paradigm and even as “return to self”. Yet, Islamisation of knowledge makes Islamisation of pleasure (as in the example of Cola-Turka, Zemzem Cola) and manifestation of oxidentalism in the form of orientalism inevitable.<sup>85</sup> In the same way, alternative readings of modernity, which claim that modernity is not only composed of Euro-centric axis and thus “non-western modernity” and “multiple modernities” are possible, ultimately take Europe as a point of reference could not go beyond discourses that are developed over it and that consolidate Euro-centerism. Therefore, the orientalist question “Why has the West advanced, and the East has fallen behind?” is asked with a defensive reflex, it tries to rescue itself from the hegemony of orientalism and the West, it unwillingly ends up in the mangle of self-orientalism. Consequently, the barbarians who Easternize themselves were tamed so much that they started to give birth to new barbarians among themselves.

## CONCLUSION AND ASSESSMENT

According to the Western thought knowledge is power. The western thought is based on an idealist and essentialist epistemology. According to this epistemology, knowing means dominating. It first defines what

---

<sup>83</sup> Milica Bakic-Hayden, Sürekli Çoğalan Oryantalizmler: Eski Yugoslavya Örneği, translated by Birgül Koçak in *Oryantalizm Tartışma Metinleri*, edited by Aytaç Yıldız (Ankara: Doğu Batı Pub., 2014), 356-357.

<sup>84</sup> Turner, *Max Weber and Islam*, 250.

<sup>85</sup> Ali Yaşar Sarıbay, Takdim yazısı, in Patrick Haenni, Piyasa İslamı, İslam Suretinde Neo-Liberalizm, translated by Levent Ünsaldı (Ankara: Heretik Pub., 2014), 6.

it wants to know for dominating it. Defining is manifestation of designing. As a requirement of organization, it also classifies and categorizes as a result of organization. The basic character of modern western thought is naming; it limits when naming and thus cannot avoid isolation. This makes otherization inevitable. The perspective that we assessed as the thinking method of the modern paradigm from the 15<sup>th</sup> century to the 20<sup>th</sup> century grasps the world from the point of the view of individual to embrace it and remains at bay. Therefore, orientalist perspectives having an objective attitude against the east in the ultimate analysis emerges by defining and thus actually by producing it. As a result, Orientalist point of view develops based on the inequality between "the defined-defining" and "active-passive". In fact, all dual controversions (indicator/ indicated, speaking/ writing, verbalism/ language, culture/nature, male/female, good/bad etc.) that take on metaphysical history is actually based on the notion of otherization that isolates each other using violence. Thus, when the west defines the Other, it controls, manipulates and even dmmoniates them by producing it. As a result, the identity or geographical location called as the East in the "imagery geography" is the product of orientalism emerged as a result of epistemology it belongs to. The process where the East is Easternized is discourse about the east is developed, reproduced and repeated, and taught by heart.

The self-orientalist attitude, which developed *against the Western thought* can be summarized as "Westernizing for resisting the west." After all, self-orientalism emerged as a result of dialogue with orientalism over the last two centuries. This attitude, which can also be regarded as oxidentalism, is the first manifestation of orientalism. However, it is very clear that orientalism cannot be a symmetrical counterpart of orientalist discourse, which created it, just because it is a reaction. According to the Western thought, the attitude it develops against the West is based on an epistemology which is based on the dichotomy like East-West distinction. However, Hegelian slave-master dialectic has already thought us that the dichotomous contradictions are hierarchically established in favor of each other and all conceptual pairs, reversals ultimately have to produce the same hierarchy. Therefore, this type of Oxidentalism or self-orientalism readings will have to reproduce orientalism at each step.

*In spite of the Western thought*, attitude does not determine its position as *according to Western thought*. Therefore, it saves itself from the trap the *opposite* attitude, which needs to reproduce orientalism, falls in. It does not act upon the presupposed distinction between the West-East because it establishes a dialectic relation but not a hierarchical relation. Islamization of knowledge "non-western modernity" and "multiple modernities" are actually a *despite* attitude. But it could not prevent them shape these *despite* attitudes on behalf of *contrary* attitudes on *according to axis*.

## REFERENCES

- Abrams, Philip. *Historical Sociology*. New York: Cornell University, 1982.
- Ahmad, Aijaz. *Teoride Sınıf, Ulus, Edebiyat, Jameson, Salman Rüşdi, Edward Said Eleştirisi*. Translated by Ahmet Fethi. Istanbul: Alan Publications, 1995.
- Aktay, Yasin. *Tarih Bozumu, Tarih Sosyolojisi Denemeleri*. Istanbul: Açılım Publications, 2010.
- Aktay, Yasin. "Modernleşme ve Gelenek Bağlamında Dini Bilgi ve Otoritenin Dönüşümü". *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, İslamcılık*. 345-393. Istanbul: İletişim Publications, 2011.
- Al-Azmeh, Aziz. *İslamlar ve Moderniteler*. Translated by Elçin Gen. Istanbul: İletişim Publications, 2014.

- Amin, Samir. *Avrupa-merkezcilik, Bir İdeolojinin Eleştirisi*. Translated by Mehmet Sert. Istanbul: Chiviyazıları, 2007.
- Asad, Talal. *Dinin Soykütükleri, Hristiyanlıkta ve İslamda İktidarın Nedenleri ve Disiplin*. Translated by Ayet Aram Tekin. Istanbul: Metis Publications, 2015.
- Asad, Talal. *Sekülerliğin Biçimleri, Hristiyanlık, İslamiyet ve Modernlik*. Translated by Ferit Burak Aydar. Istanbul: Metis Publications, 2007.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *Kültürel Konumlanış*. Translated by Tahir Uluç. Istanbul: İnsan Publications, 2016.
- Bhambra, Gurinder K.. “Postcolonial Reflections on Sociology”. *Sociology-The Journal of the British Sociological Association* 50, no. 5 (2016): 964 Accessed 20.07.2017. <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/81982>
- Bhambra, Gurinder K.. *Moderniteyi Yeniden Düşünmek, Post-kolonyalizm ve Sosyolojik Tahayyül*. Translated by Özlem İlyas. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Publications, 2015.
- Bakic-Hayden, Milica. “Sürekli Çoğalan Oryantalizmler: Eski Yugoslavya Örneği”. Translated by Birgül Koçak *Oryantalizm Tartışma Metinleri* Edited by Aytaç Yıldız. 355-374. Ankara: Doğu Batı Publications, 2014.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernlik ve Müphemlik*. Translated by İsmail Türkmen. Istanbul: Ayrıntı Publications, 2014.
- Burke, Peter. *Afişten Heykele Minyatürden Fotoğrafa Tarihin Görgü Tanıkları*. Translated by Zeynep Yelçe. Istanbul: Kitap Publications, 2016.
- Chibber, Vivek. *Post-Kolonyal Teori ve Kapitalizmin Hayaleti*. Translated by Afife Yasemin Yılmaz. Istanbul: İletişim Publications, 2016.
- Carr, Edward H.. *Tarih nedir?*. Translated by Misket Gizem Gürtürk. Istanbul: İletişim Publications, 2016.
- Dirlik, Arif. *Postkolonyal Aura, Küresel Kapitalizm Çağında Üçüncü Dünya Eleştirisi*. Translated by Galip Doğdu-aslan. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Publications, 2010.
- Dirlik, Arif. “Culture against History: Politics of East Asian Identity”. *Development and Society* 28/2 (1999): 167-190.
- Dirlik, Arif. “Global in the Local”. *Global/Local*. der. R. Wilson-W. Dissanayake. 21-45. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Dirlik, Arif. *Kriz, Kimlik ve Siyaset, Küreselleşme Yazıları*. Translated by Sami Oğuz. Istanbul: İletişim Publications, 2009.
- Edgerton, Samuel. *The Renaissance Re-discovery of Linear Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
- Florenski, Pavel. *Tersten Perspektif*. Translated by Yeşim Tükel. Istanbul: Metis Publications, 2013.
- Foucault, Michel. *Nietzsche, Soybilim, Tarih, Felsefe Sahnesi, Seçme Yazılar 5*. Translated by Işık Ergüden. Istanbul: Ayrıntı Publications, 2011.
- Fukuyama, Francis. *Tarihin Sonu mu?* Edited by Mustafa Aydın-Ertan Özensel. Ankara: Vadi Publications, 2002.
- Go, Julian. “For a Postcolonial Sociology”. *Theory and Society* 42/1 (January 2013): 25-55.
- Gökarp, Ziya. *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. Ankara: Varlık Publications, 1968.
- Gündüz, Mustafa. “Kültür ve Medeniyet Bağlamında Batı Merkezci Eğitim ve Eleştirisi”. *İnsan & Toplum* 3/6 (2014): 223-243.
- Harvey, David. *Postmodernliğin Durumu, Kültürel Değişimin Kökenleri*. Translated by Sungur Savran. Istanbul: Metis Publications, 2014.

- Karaosmanoğlu, Kerem-Defne Karaosmanoğlu. "Avrupa-merkezciliği Eleştirmek: Çıkmazlar ve Alternatif bakışlar". *İnsan & Toplum Dergisi* 3/6 (2014): 49-68.
- Kaya, İrfan. "Klasik Sosyolojide Nostaljik Paradigma ve İslamcılıkta Asr-ı Saadet Özlemi". *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi* 21/1 (June 2017): 81-105.
- Kavakçı, Merve. "Questioning Turkey's Role Model Status: A Critical Examination of the Social and Political Implications of the Headscarf Ban in Turkey". Doctoral thesis, Howard University, 2007.
- Keskin, Ferda. Sunuş: Özne ve İktidar, Michel Foucault, Özne ve İktidar, Felsefe Sahnesi 2, Translated by Işık Ergüden-Osman Akınhay. 11-24. Istanbul: Ayrıntı Publications, 2016.
- Keyman, Fuat. "Edward Said ve Bir Modernite Eleştirisi Olarak Oryantalizm". *Uluslararası Oryantalizm Sempozyumu*. Istanbul: IBB Publications, 2007.
- Mutman, Mahmut. "Postkolonyalizm: Ölü bir Disiplinin Hatıra Defteri". *Toplumbilim* 25 (2010): 117-128.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Ahlakın Soykütüğü*. Translated by Orhan Tuncay. Istanbul: Gün Publications, 2005.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Şen Bilim: Ana Metin 1*. Translated by Ahmet İnam. Istanbul: Say Publications, 2004.
- Panofsky, Erwin. *Gotik Mimarlık ve Skolastik Felsefe, Ortaçağda Sanat, Felsefe ve Din Arasındaki Benzerliklerin İncelenmesi*. Translated by Engin Akyürek. Istanbul: Kabalcı Publications, 2014.
- Phillips, Anne. *Multiculturalism without Culture*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Prakash, Gyan. "Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography". *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 32 (April 1990): 383-408.
- Said, Edward S. *Şarkiyatçılık, Batı'nın Şark Anlayışları*. Translated by Berna Ülner. Istanbul: Metis Publications, 2001.
- Sanjay Seth, "Historical Sociology and postcolonial Theory: Two Strategies for Challenging Eurocentrism". *International Political Sociology* 3 (September 2009): 334-338.
- Sarıbay, Ali Yaşar. Takdim yazısı, Patrick Haenni, Piyasa İslamı, İslam suretinde Neo-Liberalizm. Translated by Levent Ünsaldı. Ankara: Heretik Publications, 2014.
- Sarup, Madan. *Post-yapısalcılık ve Post-modernizm*. Translated by A. Baki Güçlü. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Publications, 1997.
- Sayın, Zeynep. Sunuş. *Tersten Perspektif* Translated by Yeşim Tükel. Istanbul: Metis Publications, 2013.
- Sayyid, Bobby S. "Kötü Niyet: Anti-Özcülük, Evrensellik ve İslamcılık", trc. Nuh Yılmaz, *Tezkire* 18 (2000): 71-87.
- Sayyid, Bobby S. *Fundamentalizm Korkusu, Avrupamerkezcilik ve İslamcılığın Doğuşu*. Translated by Ebubekir Ceylan-Nuh Yılmaz. Ankara: Vadi Publications, 2000.
- Sunar, Lütfi. "Weber'in Tarihsel Şehir Sosyolojisi: Modern Toplumun Temeli Olarak Şehir". *Sosyoloji Dergisi* 3/22 (2011): 423-442.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Madun Konuşabilir mi?*. Translated by Dilek Hattatoğlu-Gökçen Ertuğrul-Emre Koyuncu. Ankara: Dipnot Publications, 2016.
- Stauth, Georg-Bryan S. Turner. *Nietzsche'nin Dansı, Toplumsal Hayatta Hınç, Karşılıklılık ve Direniş*. Translated by Mehmet Küçük. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Publications, 2005.
- Sunar, Lütfi. "Şarkiyatçılığı Niçin Yeniden Tartışmalıyız?" *Uluslararası Oryantalizm Sempozyumu*. Istanbul: IBB Publications, 2007.
- Turner, Bryan S. *Oryantalizm, Postmodernizm ve Globalizm*. Translated by İbrahim Kapaklıkaya. Istanbul: Anka Publications, 2002.

- Turner, Bryan S..*Max Weber ve İslam, Eleştirel bir Yaklaşım. Translated by Yasin Aktay. Ankara: Vadi Publications, 1997.*
- Turner, Bryan S..*Max Weber, From History to Modernity. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.*
- Ülgener, Sabri F..*Zihniyet ve Din. Istanbul: Der Publications, 1981.*
- Yardımcı, Sibel. “Canavar: Kültüralizm Ne Zamandı?” [www.e-skop.com](http://www.e-skop.com). e-skop dergi. 10/2012. sayı 3, Accessed 19.07.2017 <http://www.e-skop.com/skopdergi/canavar-kulturalizm-ne-zamandi/928>
- Young, Robert J..*Postkolonyalizm, Tarihsel bir Giriş. Translated by Burcu Toksabay Köprülü-Sertaç Şen. Ankara: Matbu Publications, 2016.*
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. “Eurocentrism and Its Avatars: The Dilemmas of Social Science”. *New Left Review* 226 (1997): 93-108.
- Weber, Max. *The Agrarian Sociology of Ancient Civilizations*.trc. Richard I. Frank. London: Verso Books, 1988.
- Zizek, Slavoj. *Kırılğan Temas. Translated by Tuncay Birkan. Istanbul: Metis Publications, 2011.*