

HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY¹

FOREWORD

by

Nurettin Şazi KÖSEMİHAL

How long have human beings thought about social matters? The answer to this question, undoubtedly, is buried in the lost pages of history.

In this case, as happens in the history of many events, in the history of social doctrines too, we are compelled to renounce a precise definite beginning and accept an approximate one based on ancient documents.

Actually, the most ancient documents in hand are "Myths". We know that myths are fantasies of human imaginations based on religious convictions.

As in many cases, as well as in social matters, it was possible for the ancient Greeks to get rid of mythological thoughts based on religious convictions and to pass to critical, or rather to philosophical thought. For that reason, as happens in many cases, the history of social doctrines can be traced to the Ancient Greeks.

In fact, human beings since ancient times, have concentrated their attention on social matters. But the thought of investigating this reality from a scientific viewpoint was born after the Renaissance. It developed gradually and only in the first half of the XIXth century came to full realization in the hands of Auguste Comte and Le Play. From this point of view it is possible to separate the investigations on social realities into two parts as follow:

1) This is the translation of the Foreword of "Sosyoloji Tarihi" (History of Sociology) which was written in Turkish by Nurettin Şazi Kösemihal, and edited by The University of Istanbul in 1956.

- a) The prescientific period
- b) The scientific period

Though the first one has a very long past, the latter has a life of only a hundred or a hundred and twenty years.

However, we must point out at once that although scientific investigations on social matters have a past of more than a hundred years, they have not been able to hinder the appearances of social doctrines and theories. We do not think that social reality will get rid of these theories for a long time. In fact, sociology which studies social reality with a scientific method, has spent its life of a hundred and twenty years by investigating its topic and its method. But during this period investigations based on positive facts have also been effected. In the investigation of these events only the method of observation has been used and not the method of experimentations.

The application of experimental method as used in natural sciences to social facts, in its full sense, began in the U.S.A. about 1918 and from that time on it has developed rapidly. Since that time the method of experimentation has spread to all America and Europe. There is no doubt that the investigations made in this way give very limited, but the truest and the most precise information. Only, these are far from satisfying the profound interest which we have in social facts as human beings. Therefore, sociologists, while investigating the relations among social facts by the experimental method of the natural sciences with all its details, will nevertheless not get themselves away from putting forward some theories based on the results of sociology which is obtained by the methods of experimentation and of observation. In short, today in the field of sociology, the analytical method of science and the synthetical method of philosophy have to walk parallel and to complete each other

It is seen that although sociology has entered the scientific age it could not get rid of putting forward some theories regarding social reality. As in the prescientific period, so in the scientific age, social doctrines and social theories have continued. The only difference is that today social theories must be based on the results of social science.

In this book we will discuss not the social doctrines or theories of the prescientific period, but the sociological theories from the the birth of sociology in the middle of the XIXth century, till today. It is for that

reason that we found the name "History of Sociology" more suitable than the names "History of Doctrines" or "History of Social Theories".

Why is it necessary to know the history of social doctrines? It is possible to discuss the answer to this question from three aspects.

a) Today the field of sociology is so broad that it becomes very difficult for a sociologist who is dealing with a certain aspect of this science, to have a complete knowledge about each branch of it. Especially for beginners in sociology this difficulty is serious. In fact, today it is impossible for those dealing with sociology not to get puzzled in front of the hundreds of sociological theories conflicting with each other. If one wishes to have a complete idea about these theories, it is necessary to read hundreds of books about them. But today the sociologist who has buried himself in the studies of his own field has no time to read these various sources one by one. The history of various social doctrines written from different viewpoints fills a need of those dealing with sociology.

b) Besides this, today, every sociologist has to know, on the one hand, the positive results of sociology, and on the other, the sociological theories more or less based on science. Otherwise over and over again it is possible to put forward an old subject which was discussed previously, as a new matter. As in every science so in the field of sociology, a scientist in order not to suffer such a surprise, has to know completely what was said and what results were obtained before him. From this point of view there is no doubt that "The History of Social Theories" can be very helpful to a sociologist.

c) Eventually, the sociologist would like to learn which of these hundreds of theories conflicting with each other has scientific value. In order to do this he has to look for hundreds of sources, books about them; to compare these, and then to survey the results obtained by the methods of observation and of experimentation. But as we have mentioned before, a sociologist who has devoted himself to his own branch has no time to deal with all that.

So, since the historians of social theory explain these hundreds of theories according to their viewpoint, classify them systematically and criticise them, they save sociologists from much long hard work.

In fact, the duty of the historian of social doctrines is not only to arrange social theories chronologically. Perhaps it is to make a syste-

matic classification of these hundreds of doctrines, and theories, and then to show their scientific value for sociology by making an explanation and a critique for each of them. Even to collect these hundreds of theories which constitute the materials of a historian of social doctrines, is work not to be despised. Especially, if this is to be collected from the first sources, long and patient work is necessary. But I think that the speciality, the personality, and the originality of the historian of social doctrines does not lie in this effort collecting theories, but in the classification and the connection among them.

In my work some of the theories are taken directly from first, some from secondary, and some from both sources.

The sources I have used are shown in the bibliography. I have used especially P. Sorokin's "Contemporary Sociological Theories (1928)" among the secondary sources. But only as a "material store". In fact in my book, "History of Sociology", the classifications of theories and the systems are completely based on my own viewpoint². It has nothing to do with P. Sorokin's classification. Here I would also like to point out that Sorokin, in his above-mentioned book, has made only a classification of social theories but has not thought it necessary to mention the synthesis on which his classification was based. I was very careful not to neglect this point, which I think very important, in my book. Therefore, I have devoted the introduction completely to the explanation of the synthesis which is the base of my classification.

In the other chapters, I have first made a brief historical note of the schools. So, it will be possible to understand what kind of development the main theories, representing each school, have had till today. After this short historical note I have explained the main theories and at the end I have made a critique (based on the results of today's scientific sociology) of each of the theories.

The plan of the book is shown at the end of the Introduction³. As shown in the plan, my work consists of two books. The first book is separated into five chapters besides the introduction. In these chapters respectively, the following subjects are discussed:

2) The system on which my classification is based is explained in the "Introduction" of my book. The English Translation of this Introduction is titled: "The Analysis of a Concrete Society" by N. Ş. Kösemihal, Published by The University of Istanbul, Faculty of Letters, 1960 Istanbul, Turkey.

3) N. Ş. Kösemihal "Sosyoloji Tarihi", page 16, Istanbul 1956.

Chapter I Society and Natural Events

Chapter II Society and the Human Body (Biological Organism)

Chapter III Society and the Events of individual Consciousness

Chapter IV Society and the Events of Collective Consciousness (Values).

Chapter V Global Viewpoints

The second is constituted of two chapters and an "Appendix". in the first chapter "The New Currents in Sociology", in the second chapter "Determinism in Sociology and Present Liberty Problem" and in the "Appendix" "Sociological Movements in Turkey will be discussed".

The first book of my work has already been printed. I expect to have my second book printed in the shortest time possible.

Before concluding, I would like to talk about the language and the expressions used in my book.

In the last twenty or thirty years the defenders of "Original Turkish", "Turkish terms" have depended on the following basic idea: "Now we no longer teach Arabic and Persian in our high schools! Therefore, we can not go back to the Ottoman Language, Ottoman terms. We can not teach Greek or Latin either. They have nothing to do with our language, so, we can not use terms originating in Greek or Latin. Then there is only one way : that is to derive terms from our original language."

I have used "original Turkish" and "Turkish terms" all my writing life of more than twenty years, and I will walk on this road I believe, till the end. Really, I presume that neither foreign nor Ottoman expressions can give an idea to a Turkish child. For instance "Deduction, Induction." Aren't these foreign terms meaningless for a child and even for those of us who know no foreign language? Can they cause an association of ideas in our minds?

On this occasion, let me tell you a memory of mine. If I am not wrong it was in 1942. In order to find Turkish words for philosophical expressions a committee constituted of high school and university teachers was founded. Chairman was Hasan Ali Yücel, the minister of Education at that time. In the committee, among the ones who were against

original Turkish there were a few assistant professors from the Faculty of Letters. I still hear the words of one of those: "We must take the Greek and Latin terms as they are. Whether people understand them or not. It doesn't matter to us. These terms must be our bird's language... We, scholars, can understand each other. Isn't it enough?" he had said. After a little while the same assistant professor started a discussion about the same subject with another professor. The professor suddenly asked, "Mr., do you believe in Mutation?" His colleague was surprised for a few minutes because he had not remembered the meaning of mutation at that moment. I could not keep myself from saying, "Here scholars have assembled and have been talking the bird's language you wish. Now please answer." Do you think that there would have been such surprise if the original Turkish word "sudden change" had been used instead of "Mutation"?

I think that all our learned men join in the idea of purifying our language of foreign words and if I am not wrong, the difference is not in the main idea but in the application of it. Really, some of them do not want to interfere and to force the people in order to reach this purpose. They want to let it happen naturally. Some are willing to interfere and to force. But they say this must be gradually. And some others try to reach the purpose in the shortest time.

In short, the first ones are delaying, the second ones are walking, and the third ones are running.

So far as original Turkish is concerned, my heart always wants to carry me among the third class. On the other side fear of not being read bridles the wish of my heart. Indeed, an article written in pure Turkish, require a tiresome effort of the reader. But many readers do not want to endure this weariness. They throw the book aside at once. Well, why must I lie? I do not wish to see my book, which is a result of long work, thrown aside. On the other hand, I can not give up writing in pure Turkish. While I was writing my book, this conflict inside me increased or decreased from time to time but never left me. Therefore, if you see some words far from pure Turkish in my book now and then, please, I beg you, read them with tolerance. It shows that during that time, the anxiety was at its highest.

*University of Istanbul, Faculty
of Letters, department of Sociology*